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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

From 2012 to 2016, UNICEF CO Croatia supported the Croatian government through the implementation of the program “Alliances for equity and social inclusion of the most vulnerable children”. One of the program’s components aims to strengthen the justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings. This component is the one that is being evaluated (hereafter “the program component”). Although the implementation of the program component ended in 2016, new activities in the field of child-friendly justice are planned as part of the 2017-2021 UNICEF Country Program Document (CPD).

The intended outcome of the intervention was that, by the end of 2016, the Croatian judicial system would provide an improved child-friendly environment to child victims and witnesses during court proceedings through the achievement of activities linked to three related outputs:

➢ supply of training to legal and non-legal justice professionals on “Child-sensitive treatment of child victims and witnesses of crime”, and training on “Child-sensitive interviewing” and supervision of non-legal child professionals (NLCPs);
➢ supply of audio-visual material to 10 courts to increase their technical capacities when interviewing child victims and witnesses;
➢ advocacy targeting decision-makers, particularly the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) and the Judicial Academy, to promote making child-friendly justice a priority target in the national agenda and ensuring sustainable child-friendly procedures.

This report is the summative and formative external evaluation of the program component. The evaluation purposes are to determine whether the program component has improved the justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings, and to draw up concrete recommendations on key components for future programming. In addition, the report aims to serve as a source of information for the MoJ to support its future programming and policy, for the Ombudsman for Children to strengthen its monitoring and advocacy efforts, and for UNICEF. Considering that the evaluation is conducted concurrently with discussions on the 2017-2021 CPD, the evaluation will provide key information and recommendations to guide the Government’s and UNICEF’s efforts in the field of justice for children for the next five years.

This evaluation objective is to assess the program component’s performance and to draw up conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. To that end, this evaluation uses the standard OECD-DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, and takes into consideration UNEG’s standards and guidelines for evaluation. Equity, gender and human rights are analyzed as cross-cutting issues.

The evaluation team adopted a mixed methodological approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data collecting and analysis methods in order to ensure data reliability and validity through triangulation: review of literature, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with key informants and judicial professionals, on-line
questionnaires for training participants and observation of all 10 courts that received the audio-visual equipment. The executive summary only presents **key findings**.

In terms of **relevance**, despite the lack of a written and comprehensive logical framework, all programmatic activities were rated as highly relevant considering the needs of child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings. Training of judicial professionals on this matter was designed to address their lack of comprehensive training, which often resulted in secondary victimization of children during court proceedings. The supply of quality audio-visual equipment to the courts that have the highest number of cases of child victims and witnesses aimed to reduce the occurrences of multiple interviews of children. Advocacy activities aimed at addressing the lack of an operational plan for child-friendly proceedings and lack of programmed training for judicial professionals. UNICEF is the only external institution that has financially supported the system of justice for children in the last few years, which strongly adds to the relevance of the intervention. Although the program component was not intended to target specifically gender and equity dimensions, results demonstrate that these issues have been taken into consideration in programmatic activities. Finally, the MoJ was fully involved in the design and implementation of the activities. All activities are aligned with Croatian law and regulations and international practices regarding child-friendly justice. Overall, program activities were assessed as complementary and the combination of approaches used was fully appropriate.

In terms of **effectiveness**, the number of trained judicial professionals exceeds the initial projection. All interviewed professionals rated the quality of the general training as excellent, due to the use of a mixed approach including theoretical presentations, video footages and practical exercises comprising role play. It must, however, be noted that some judges and State attorneys who are very often in contact with children have not been trained by the program component. An additional training course and supervision sessions were provided for all 24 NLCPs in the country, who are in direct contact with children, to further increase their capacities. Capacity-building activities were completed by the dissemination of child-friendly brochures for children and parents or guardians and booklets on the collaboration of experts working with child victims and witnesses, as well as the translation of one reference handbook on child-friendly justice. High-quality audio-visual equipment was provided to 10 courts and is currently used in all courts, despite some issues with the recording devices, which resulted in re-interviewing the child in a few cases. Nevertheless, in all courts, the new system was assessed as being better than the previous one. Moreover, activities were implemented to increase the capacities of the MoJ and the Judicial Academy on child-friendly justice.

In terms of **efficiency**, funds that were used to implement the programmatic activities are relatively low compared to the results achieved and the program thus appears to be cost-efficient. This is partly due to the high level of participation by governmental authorities and to the implementation of open tender procedures. Highly qualified human resources were mobilized as part of the intervention: people with complementary profiles suited to the implementation of the program component. It must be stressed that all stakeholders praised the excellent quality of communication with UNICEF and the
technical support they received from its team. Despite the lack of a written logical framework, monitoring tools were implemented to assess the level of achievement of activities. A quality assurance system was also implemented for all activities.

In terms of impact, training of judicial professionals resulted in a significant increase in knowledge about child victims and witnesses, leading to a positive change in their behavior and practices toward children during interviews. As a result of training activities and supply of audio-visual equipment, children are rarely still subjected to repeated interviews. Training must, however, be continuous to further strengthen the capacities of judicial professionals who have been trained but who still implement practices that could lead to secondary victimization of children, such as interfering during interviews, asking the child to come to the courtroom after the interview or requesting forensic assessments. Moreover, the need for additional training for judges who have not participated in the training as well as lawyers and social workers has been emphasized by most stakeholders. In addition, although programmatic activities also managed to scale-up the issue of child-friendly justice for child victims and witnesses at the highest level, and managed to mobilize new human resources for child-friendly justice, advocacy targeting the Judicial Academy aiming to continue training activities has not been successful so far. Nevertheless, efforts to reach this goal are to continue in the future. The program component has directly contributed to enhanced consideration of the best interests of the child in criminal matters and, to a certain extent, to their right to be heard.

In terms of sustainability, the design of the program component included several elements aiming at making activities sustainable after 2016: extensive involvement of the MoJ, transfer of ownership of audio-visual materials to the MoJ, and negotiations to ensure that the Judicial Academy continues training activities. The program component managed to develop courts’ capacities to ensure the continuation of audio-visual material use in all 10 courts. Furthermore, the improvement in judicial professionals’ knowledge, behaviors and practices is very likely to be long term, considering the positive change in practices two years after the initial training. On the other hand, although the MoJ's commitment in terms of mobilization of human and technical resources will continue beyond 2016, the lack of training activity sustainability is concerning. The evaluation consultants, however, positively note that discussions are still underway between UNICEF, the MoJ and the Judicial Academy and that specific activities are planned in this regard in the new 2017-2021 UNICEF Strategy Note for the Croatia Child Protection Program Component.

In conclusion, based on a review of literature, discussions with UNICEF, key informants, training participants, observation and on-line questionnaires results, this report shows that the program component has successfully strengthened the justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings.

Key lessons learned
➢ Participation of national stakeholders is key to the program component’s performance
➢ An open non-mandatory selection procedure for training does not ensure participation of all target groups
➢ One training course, despite its high quality, is not sufficient to fully change training participants' practices
➢ Closer involvement of the institution likely to continue implementation of the activities is needed

Key recommendations

Use of audio-visual equipment
➢ To the MoJ: promptly engage in discussions with the company in charge of maintaining the audio-visual equipment to find a durable solution to remaining recording problems, by June 2017

Continuity of training for judicial professionals
➢ To UNICEF CO and the MoJ: consider a higher level of advocacy targeting Judicial Academy Program Board members, to guarantee that the issue of child victims and witnesses is included in the next training agenda, by December 2017
➢ To UNICEF CO: consider the development of more in-depth training modules on equity and gender dimensions, by December 2017
➢ To the MoJ and the Judicial Academy: provide initial training for all investigative judges who have not been targeted by the program component, by December 2018

Monitoring
➢ To the MoJ: implement a data monitoring system to record the number of cases of children in courts and the number of interviews of children that use the video link, disaggregated by gender, age and disability groups, by December 2018.

Strengthening the impact of training for previously trained judicial professionals
➢ To the MoJ and the Judicial Academy: provide regular and continuous training for previously trained participants to strengthen the level of their commitment and avoid practices that lead to secondary victimization, by December 2018
➢ To the MoJ: reflect on the possibility of working toward the specialization of judges, by December 2018; consider promoting a framework to establish regular exchanges between NLCPs, judges and State attorneys at court level to further strengthen cooperation

Reinforcing coordination and multidisciplinary activities in the field of child victims and witnesses
➢ To the MoJ: develop standardized procedure and increase coordination among actors and professionals in contact with child victims and witnesses of crimes, by July 2019
➢ To UNICEF CO: provide training on child victims and witnesses for social workers, lawyers and healthcare professionals, by July 2019
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Intervention context

Croatia is a high-income country that became a member of the European Union (EU) in July 2013. As mentioned by Committee on the Rights of the Child in its 2014 concluding observations on the reports of Croatia, progress has been made by Croatia in harmonizing its legislation with the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and many positive results have been achieved through the implementation of the National Plan of Activities for the Rights and Interests of Children 2006–2012. Croatia comprises an independent monitoring system for children, in the form of the Ombudsman for Children, whose role is to protect, monitor and promote the rights and interests of children.

Legal framework on child victims and witnesses

According to Croatian legislation, the term “child witnesses and victims” defines human beings younger than 18. Children younger than 18 do not have legal capacity, but they can acquire legal capacity where they are married or are a parent from 16 years upwards.

The rights of the child victims and witnesses are regulated by several laws, all of which are aligned with international standards on Human Rights and on the United Nations (UN) common approach to justice for children. These laws include, among others, the Criminal Procedure Act, the Criminal Code, Misdemeanor Act, Juvenile Courts Act, Act on the Execution Imposed on Juvenile for Criminal Offenses and Misdemeanors, as well as the 2014-2020 National Strategy for the Rights of Children in Croatia (hereafter “the National Strategy”), that takes into account the CRC, the 2012-2015 Council of Europe Strategy on the Rights of the Child, the Council of Europe Guidelines on Child-Friendly Justice and the EU Agenda for the Rights of the Child.

Specifically, the Criminal Procedure Act provides that judicial professions must treat the child victims with special care and concern, taking into account their age, personality and other relevant circumstances, in order to avoid additional damage and harmful consequences to a child’s development and education.

Several provisions of the Croatian legislation detail how to conduct interviews with child victims and witnesses. According to the legislation, child witnesses below 14 years and child victims up to 16 years may only be interviewed via audio-visual equipment with the Judge, State attorney, the defendant and his/her lawyer sitting in a separate room.

---

1 United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child (2014), Concluding observations on the third and fourth reports of Croatia, CRC/C/HRV/CO/3-4, paras. 6, 8.
2 Article 113, Juvenile Courts Act.
3 Ministry of social policy and youth (2014), National strategy for the rights of children in the republic of Croatia from 2014 to 2020, Class 011-04/14-01/5, Reg. No 519-03-1-2/8-14-98, 17 September 2014, pp. 9, 18-23. Although the Strategy was developed after the beginning of the program, the evaluators consider that it presents important bottlenecks that needed to be addressed.
4 Article 44(2), Criminal Procedure Act.
Legislation also provides that all questions from judicial professionals must be directed through non-legal child professionals (NLCPs). Children from 16 years upwards may be interviewed in the same manner as children under 16 years, if the judge determines it is in the best interests of the child and the proceedings.\(^5\)

Article 292 of the Criminal Procedure Act also provides that all interviews shall be recorded and that the recording shall be sealed immediately and enclosed with the record. The child may be interviewed again only in exceptional cases and in the same manner.\(^6\)

**Bottlenecks to be addressed**

Despite important achievements, the Committee on the Rights of the Child expressed its concern “about the lack of adequate support systems for victims, incidents of re-victimization of children, insufficient measures aimed at deterring perpetrators and limited access to prevention programs for children, because they are not systematically organized.”\(^7\)

Indeed, several societal problems (bottlenecks) need to be addressed. Children's best interests are not systematically taken into consideration in all criminal justice matters. The protection system for child victims and witnesses remains inadequate: children and their parents or guardians generally lack information on their rights and on available services. Moreover, despite the law that provides that cases regarding children should be handled by specialized professionals, justice professionals and other involved stakeholders had not been provided with specialized training, with the exception of police professionals (see Box 1).

Courts lacked human, financial and technical resources to respond to children's needs. Although the Criminal Procedure Act states that children cannot be interviewed more than once, exceptionally twice, at criminal courts, children

---

\(^{5}\) Article 115, Juvenile Courts Act; Article 292, Criminal Procedure Act.

\(^{6}\) Article 292, Criminal Procedure Act. The legislation provides no indication as to what can be considered as an exceptional case.

\(^{7}\) Committee on the Rights of the Child (2014), Concluding observations on the third and fourth reports of Croatia, CRC/C/HRV/CO/3-4, para. 34.
were often interviewed several times by several stakeholders – police forces, State attorneys, judges and NCLPs – which resulted in harmful consequences for the children and in re-victimization in judicial proceedings.\textsuperscript{8} The lack of adequate training and specialization of judicial professionals and the lack of information and communication technology to shield children from the stress of attending courtrooms and to avoid direct contact with the accused, had been highlighted in the 2014-2020 National Strategy. Those needs have also been stated in the Ombudsman for Children's 2014 report:

“There are still examples in practice where children are interrogated repeatedly and in an inadequate manner, where the legal limitation on the number of interrogation sessions is not always observed [...] The practice of expert associates and judges, especially with regard to the use of technical appliances, ensuring the presence of experts and exploiting the possibilities of out of court testifying, is uneven.\textsuperscript{46}

In addition, the awareness of justice professionals about gender-sensitivity and equity was very limited, resulting in stereotyping along gender and diversity lines, and consequently in biased treatment. The situation was particularly problematic for vulnerable groups of children, such as children with intellectual difficulties, who were sometimes considered as non-reliable witnesses due to weak capacities of judicial professionals, while recent reports demonstrate that they are more likely to experience sexual violence.\textsuperscript{10}

Finally, even though child-friendly justice was seen as a priority by the Government of Croatia in its 2006-2012 National Action Plan for Rights and Interests of Children, there was no clear plan on its implementation nor allocated resources to support improvements in justice procedures for children.

To address these needs, the National Strategy sets as one of the strategic goal the need to “improve the protection and realization of the rights of child victims of criminal offences and to provide them with adequate information and participation during criminal procedure” through, \textit{inter alia}:

- Providing all County courts with appropriate and modern audio-visual equipment for interviewing children, as well as rooms specifically equipped for interviewing children;\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{8} See \textit{inter alia} Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child on Croatia (2014), CRC/C/HRV/CO/3-4 (2014).
\textsuperscript{9} Republic of Croatia (2014), Report on the Work of the Ombudsman for Children for 2013. In the framework of this evaluation, expert associates are referred to as NCLPs.
\textsuperscript{10} Several recent studies underlined the high prevalence of sexual violence against children with disabilities (CWDs) worldwide. Compared to children without disabilities, CWDs are almost three times more likely to experience sexual violence. Within this population, children with mental or intellectual impairments appear to be among the most vulnerable, with 4.6 times the risk of sexual violence than their non-disabled peers. This holds true regardless of the country concerned, its level of economic development or its culture. See for instance Jones and Bellis (2012), Prevalence and risk of violence against children with disabilities: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies; Smith and Harrell (2013), Sexual abuse in children with disabilities, Vera institute for justice.
\textsuperscript{11} It must also be noted that the European Court of Human Rights has condemned Croatia in 2015 for its failure to investigate promptly allegations of ill-treatment, due \textit{inter alia} to the lack of equipment of video-link device at police station and in court to address cases of abuse regarding children. In this case, the European Court of Human Rights
➢ Ensuring that child victims are given appropriate verbal and written information on the procedures and their rights;
➢ Ensuring that children and parents/legal representatives have the possibility of continuous consultation and support.

The National Strategy provides that there are two authorities competent for the implementation of this strategic goal: the MoJ and the Croatian Bar Association.

According to the 2015 Ombudsman for Children’s report, the MoJ reported 4,504 child victims of crimes in 2015.12

1.2. Evaluated object

From 2012 to 2016, UNICEF CO Croatia has supported the Croatian government through the implementation of the program “Alliances for equity and social inclusion of most vulnerable children”. According to the 2012-2016 UNICEF Country Program Document (CPD), the overall goal of the program of cooperation was to “support Croatia to advance appropriate legislative, administrative and other measures for the implementation of the rights recognized in the Convention on Rights of the Child, especially in accordance with article 4 of the Convention.”13 This partnership was aiming to tackle the “interrelated problems of social exclusion, disparities and discrimination in education, health, justice and social systems.”14

Two main results were expected.
➢ The first result was “that national and local authorities ensure that girls and boys from the poorest families, including those with disabilities or developmental risks, and those from the Roma minority benefit from (a) inclusive, community-based preschool services for children and families; (b) family-based early childhood intervention programs and services; and (c) perinatal care services and better parenting education.”15
➢ The second result was that “the country advances the infrastructure for the increased realization of child rights, through (a) increased prevention and intervention for the protection of children from violence, abuse and neglect; (b) the planning, budgeting and monitoring of policies and decisions of national and subnational authorities, which will increasingly address social exclusion of children; and (c) the increased engagement of public and private stakeholders in supporting children’s rights.”16

In the framework of the second result, intermediate Result 2.1. provided that “by the end of 2016, the child protection system applies a case management approach to child clients

held that there had been a violation of Article 3 (prohibition of inhuman and degrading treatment). Case of M and M versus Croatia (application no. 10161/13).

14 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
and ensures the availability and functioning of specialized services in accordance with international standards and best interests of children”. Result 2.1. includes several areas of work:

➢ Area of work 2.1.1. relates to the need to advance accountability of child protection system to provide efficient support to child victims, witnesses and offenders;
➢ Area of work 2.2.2. focuses on family based care;
➢ Area of work 2.1.3. focuses on violence prevention.

Within area of work 2.1.1., a program component specifically dealing with child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings has been designed, focusing on the improvement of the justice system in these matters. Child victims and witnesses of crimes were considered particularly vulnerable and needed that specific attention is paid to them during proceedings. The improvement of the justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings is a key factor to increase equity and social inclusion of most vulnerable children. This component is the one that is being evaluated (hereafter “the program component”

Other components of area of work 2.1.1. complement the UNICEF program and deal with the following justice matters: increasing the quality of educational measure for juvenile offenders; increasing the knowledge of State attorneys and other professionals on diversion module of out-of-court settlement for juvenile offenders; and improving assessment standards for children at risk or with existing behavioral disorder.

Although the implementation of the program component ended in 2016, new activities in the field of child-friendly justice are projected in the framework of the 2017-2012 UNICEF CPD.

1.3. Theory of change

No written and comprehensive theory of change (ToC) was developed by UNICEF CO in the framework of this program component, although some indicators, goals and targets had been defined in the letter of agreement (LoA) signed between UNICEF and the MoJ in 2014 and in UNICEF CPD and Country Program Action Plan (CPAP) matrix. To identify the data that needed to be collected for the evaluation and how to analyze these data, it was essential that a ToC gets reconstructed and that impact, outputs, outcomes and activities get (re)defined. To do so, the consultants held two Skype discussions with UNICEF CO team, exchanged several emails with UNICEF CO on this specific topic and analyzed relevant documentation. The ToC was reviewed and approved by UNICEF CO team during inception phase. The ToC is schematically depicted on the following page.

---

1717 In order to differentiate between the program and the component under evaluation, it has been jointly decided with UNICEF to refer to it as “program component” throughout the evaluation report, although it somewhat overburdens the reading of the report.
Chart 1: Theory of Change Diagram

**IMPACT:** Child victims and witnesses involved in criminal matters are protected and re-victimization is avoided, in the best interest of the child

**OUTCOME:** By the end of 2016, through the support to criminal justice system stakeholders, Croatian judicial system provides improved child-friendly procedures to child victims and witnesses during court proceedings

**OUTPUT 1:** By the end of 2016, legal and non-legal judicial professionals have enhanced capacities (awareness, knowledge and skills) for implementing child-friendly procedures in matters related to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings

**OUTPUT 2:** By the end of 2016, Croatian criminal courts have adequate technical capacities (audio-visual equipment and knowledge for its usage) for interviewing child victims and witnesses

**OUTPUT 3:** By the end of 2016, relevant authorities have increased capacities (motivation, knowledge and resources) to ensure sustainability and scaling up child-friendly procedures within judicial system

**INPUTS:** human resources (UNICEF, MoJ, Judicial Academy, national / international experts & consultants), financial resources, audio-visual equipment

**UNICEF core roles/strategies defined for the CEE/CIS region:** Advocacy, policy dialogue and advice, capacity development of professionals and organizations, service delivery

**Assumptions**
- Political will to address child's rights issues
- Involved stakeholders have political will and commitment to respect legal provisions

**Activities related to Output 1**
- Developing, implementing and evaluating training for judicial professionals on child-friendly procedures and interviews, considering equity and gender dimensions
- Developing, implementing and evaluating training for non-legal judicial professionals on forensic interviews
- Implementing supervision activities for non-legal justice professional trainees
- Developing and disseminating material on justice in matters involving child victims / witnesses

**Activities related to Output 2**
- Assessing needs for audio-visual equipment
- Providing audio-visual equipment to selected courts
- Assessing the functionality of the equipment
- Providing warranty certificates for the technical equipment and instructions for IT experts on courts for the usage of equipment.

**Activities related to Output 3**
- Advocating for sustainability and scaling-up plan for child-friendly procedures, including allocation of sufficient resources (funds, staff, space, etc.)
- Advocating to include child-friendly procedures as part of the regular curricula of the Judicial Academy

**Bottlenecks**
- Judicial professionals lack knowledge and skills on child-sensitive procedures and interviews
- Judicial professionals lack awareness and knowledge on gender and equity issues
- Courts lack technical equipment to implement child-friendly procedures to child victims and witnesses during interviews according to national framework
- Relevant authorities have not developed adequately resourced operational plan on child-friendly proceedings implementation, sustainability and scaling up. Transfer of knowledge on child-friendly justice is not anticipated for judicial professionals
This ToC proposes a theory about how to get from the initial situation to the desired situation and how the intervention was to trigger this change. The ToC starts by designing activities aiming to address identified bottlenecks. Those designed activities aimed at reaching certain outputs, that aimed to procure change on the levels of outcome and, ultimately, impact. The ToC that is proposed follows international standards relating to evaluation and research, as developed by UNICEF's Office of Research.¹⁸

The rationale for choosing to strengthen justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceeding was based on discussions held with the MoJ, the Ombudsman for Children and other justice professionals. Discussions with UNICEF CO revealed that the protection of child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings was a high priority by the MoJ in the framework of the ongoing reform of the judiciary.

The objective of cooperation and UNICEF's technical assistance to the MoJ on child-friendly justice for child victims and witnesses in crimes have been agreed in 2013, and has been formalized in Biannual Work Plans¹⁹ and in the LoA. According to the LoA, the estimated budget for the program component was 1,765,000 Kuna (local currency), which, in December 2014, represented 279.715 USD.²⁰ According to the ToR, the budget was to be supported by UNICEF Headquarters, public and private support in Croatia.

Based on this situation, a program component that enhances capacities of the Croatian criminal justice stakeholders in child-sensitive justice proceedings was considered as the most relevant intervention logic. The goal was to develop a model of intervention for criminal courts dealing with child victims and witnesses, that would provide improved child-friendly procedures for this target group. UNICEF CO chose, as an entry point, to work and support justice professionals. The outcome of the intervention was that, by the end of 2016, through the support to criminal justice system stakeholders, Croatian judicial system provides an improved child-friendly environment to child victims and witnesses during court proceedings.

This intervention logic has resulted in the design of three sets of program component activities that aimed to achieve three related outputs. Firstly, supply of training and supervision services to 110 legal and non-legal justice professionals were provided, in order to build and enhance knowledge of these professionals, thereby contributing to a positive change of behavior and practices towards child victims and witnesses involved in criminal proceedings. To enhance their capacities, brochures were also widely disseminated to judicial professionals, Centers for social welfare (CSW) and police posts in the country. Secondly, through the supply of audio-visual equipment, based on a need assessment and on the analysis of equipment functionality, the program component was set to improve courts’ technical capacities to provide better protection to children when


¹⁹ During the project, two Biannual work plan were prepared: Biannual Work Plan January 2013 to December 2014 and Biannual Work Plan January 2015 to December 2016.

²⁰ In December 2014, the exchange rate was 1 USD = 6,31 Kn (31 December 2014). Source: European Central Bank http://freecurrencyrates.com/en/exchange-rate-history/USD-HRK/2014/eucb. In January 2017, the exchange rate was 1 USD for 6,98 Kn.
interviewing child victims and witnesses. This activity aimed at ensuring that children do not need to come before court to testify, and risk to meet the defendant, thereby resulting in further victimization and / or traumatization. It was projected that this activity would further contribute to positively empowering courts to provide better protection to child victims and witnesses of crimes. Finally, by advocating on the importance of child-sensitive proceedings in matters regarding child victims and witnesses, the program component was set to contribute to putting child-friendly justice as a priority target in the national justice agenda and ensuring sustainable child-friendly procedures throughout Croatia.

These outputs of child-friendly justice were intended to complement each other in order to reach the achieved outcome, which is that the Croatian judicial system provides improved child-friendly procedures to child victims and witnesses during court proceedings by the end of 2016. Ultimately, the projected impact is that child victims and witnesses involved in criminal matters are protected and avoid re-victimization, in their best interest.

**Indicators**

Table 1 shows the indicators that were developed during the reconstruction of the ToC. The ToC and its indicators have been developed for the period of implementation of the program component, i.e. until the end of 2016. They will be reviewed and complemented in the new UNICEF program cycle.

**Table 1: Outcome and output indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target (by the end of 2016)</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome: By the end of 2016, through the support to criminal justice system stakeholders, Croatian judicial system provides improved child-friendly procedures to child victims and witnesses during court proceedings</strong></td>
<td>8 County Courts and 2 Municipal Courts</td>
<td>Baseline: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of courts that implement improved child-friendly procedures (judicial professionals have adequate knowledge and technical requirements for interviewing children)²¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% training participants who report new child-friendly practices towards child victims and witnesses, that includes gender and equity issues</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>No baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of comprehensive training module on child-friendly procedures in regular curricula of the Judicial Academy</td>
<td>Comprehensive training module</td>
<td>Baseline: no training module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1: By the end of 2016, legal and non-legal judicial professionals have enhanced capacities (awareness, knowledge and skills) for implementing child-friendly procedures in matters related to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baseline: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># training curricula developed for justice professionals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Baseline: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># judicial professionals (judges, State attorneys, non-legal child professionals) in contact with child victims and witnesses</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Baseline: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²¹ This outcome indicator is based on UNICEF CEE/CIS' Regional Knowledge and Leadership Agenda on Access to Justice. UNICEF CEE/CIS (2016), Regional Knowledge and Leadership Agenda on Access to Justice: common indicators and benchmarks, working version
witnesses during criminal proceedings are trained on child-friendly procedures

% of training participants who report an increase of awareness on child-friendly justice resulting from the training sessions

70% No baseline

Output 2: By the end of 2016, Croatian criminal courts have adequate technical capacities (audio-visual equipment and knowledge for its usage) for interviewing child victims and witnesses

# courts equipped with audio-visual material

10 No baseline

# courts who report having gained knowledge on the use of audio-visual material for testimonies of child victims and witnesses

10 No baseline

Output 3: By the end of 2016, relevant authorities have increased capacities (motivation, knowledge and resources) to ensure sustainability and scaling up child-friendly procedures within judicial system

Existence of a plan developed by decision-makers that ensures adequate resources for child-friendly procedures within judicial system

Plan developed22 No plan

Existence of a plan developed by decision-makers for sustainability and scaling up child friendly procedures within judicial system

Plan developed No plan

The program component has targeted judicial professional throughout Croatia, including Zagreb, Velika Gorica, Zlatar, Varaždin, Čakovec, Koprivnica, Bjelovar, Virovitica, Sisak, Osijek, Rijeka, Slavonski Brod, Split, Dubrovnik, Vukovar, Šibenik, Požega, Gospić, Pula and Karlovac.

Potential risks were identified at each level of the intervention. Each risk is linked with mitigation strategies and assumptions. These risks, mitigation measures and assumptions are presented in the following table.

Table 2: Risks, mitigation measures and assumptions linked to the program component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies &lt;-&gt; outputs</th>
<th>Outputs &lt;-&gt; outcome</th>
<th>Outcome &lt;-&gt; impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Poor motivation of judicial professionals to learn new skills and practices</td>
<td>Lack of will of judicial stakeholders to respect the rights of children during proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor quality of audio-visual technical equipment and/or lack of motivation to use and take care of the equipment</td>
<td>Lack of budget resources to improve child-sensitive justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of political will to increase budget allocations for child-sensitive justice</td>
<td>Lack of will of Judicial Academy to include this child-friendly justice in their training curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measures</td>
<td>Involvement of the MoJ in all planning and implementation of all activities (training, meetings, need assessment, etc.)</td>
<td>Providing supervision for trained professionals. Advocate high-level authorities for the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 It is important to note that the “plan” does not refer specifically to a written document, but also to the activities, actions or discussions.
Ensure a monitoring system for the use and care of equipment
Involvement of Judicial Academy in planning and conducting training activities
Develop training modules aligned with needs of professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal justice professionals opened and motivated to change</td>
<td>Will of judicial stakeholders’ to improve the rights of children during proceedings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual equipment available, used and taken care of</td>
<td>Availability of financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy makers willing and able to increase budget allocations</td>
<td>High-level authorities are interested and motivated to consider child-friendly justice as a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Academy opened and willing to modify training curricula</td>
<td>Political will to address the rights of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involved stakeholders willing and committed to respect legal provisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4. Stakeholders analysis

The program component intended to develop a multidisciplinary approach within the judicial sector, with the intention to enhance cross-sectorial cooperation. This objective is reflected in the number and diversity of stakeholders involved in the development and implementation of the program component, as will be described in the following sections. The level of participation of all stakeholders in the evaluation is also set out in the following sections.

1.4.1. Stakeholders in charge of planning and implementation

Several stakeholders have been involved in the planning and implementation of the program component: UNICEF CO, the MoJ, comprising a Deputy Attorney General who was on a special assignment to the MoJ, the Judicial Academy, and international and national experts (two forensic psychologists, two juvenile judges, one State attorney and one international justice for children expert).

UNICEF CO was the main institution in charge of implementing the program component. UNICEF CO developed the training curricula on child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings in cooperation with international and national experts. UNICEF CO coordinated and provided technical support in organizing training sessions. UNICEF CO provided the audio-visual equipment to 10 courts.

The MoJ and its staff actively participated in prioritizing issues, planning and implementing activities with UNICEF CO. The MoJ was thus involved at all stages of the program component’s implementation.23 The MoJ issued joint certificates to training participants and assisted UNICEF CO in developing technical specifications for the audio-

---

23 See specifically on the MoJ involvement, Section 3.1.
visual material. Their financial contribution included the costs of MoJ staff who worked closely with UNICEF team, contribution in kind through distribution of handbooks and covering postal costs.

The Judicial Academy was involved in the discussions at the beginning of the planning phase; its level of involvement was weaker during the implementation phase, particularly during the phase of training content design, due to a change of leadership in its institution. Nonetheless, the Judicial Academy co-organized the last two training sessions with UNICEF CO and issued joint certificates to training participants. Their financial contribution included the costs of the Judicial Academy's staff who worked closely with UNICEF team, staff costs for experts, and logistic costs for implementing training sessions.

International and national experts developed the training package and implemented training activities.

A private company was contracted to train courts’ staff and provide the audio-visual material to courts.

All key stakeholders in charge of planning and implementation have participated in the program component's evaluation as key informants through individual or group interviews.

1.4.2. Target groups

There are several groups of direct and indirect beneficiaries. In the framework of the evaluation, direct beneficiaries are the people who were direct recipients of technical assistance and who benefited initially from the program component. Indirect beneficiaries are the people who did not directly participate but who derived benefits from the intervention.

➢ Direct beneficiaries:

The first target group includes judges of County courts and Municipal courts, State attorneys at County and Municipal levels and NLCPs who participated in training sessions. 3 other professionals participated in the training: one person from the MoJ, one representative of the Ombudsman for Children and one person from the Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences at University of Zagreb. According to the list of trained participants, 157 judicial professionals participated in the general 3-day training, from institutions located throughout the country: Bjelovar, Čakovec, Dubrovnik, Gospić, Karlovac, Koprivnica, Osijek, Požega, Pula, Rijeka, Šibenik, Sisak, Slavonski Brod, Split, Varaždin, Velika Gorica, Virovitica, Vukovar, Zagreb and Zlatar.

In addition to the general training for justice professionals, specialized training composed of two modules and supervision sessions were provided to all 24 existing NLCPs at national level. One NLCP who participated in supervision had not participated in the general 3-day training.
In total, 158 persons participated in the training and/or supervision sessions. The following table presents the training participants per category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Judges</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Court</td>
<td>Municipal Court</td>
<td>County level</td>
<td>Municipal level</td>
<td>NLCPs</td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As will be elaborated in Section 2.2.1., 33 individual interviews were carried out by the evaluation team with training participants. 46 other participants responded to the evaluation. In total, 50% of trained judges, State attorneys and NLCPs participated in the evaluation.

The second target group is the information technology (IT) personnel of the 10 courts that received audio-visual equipment for testimonies of child victims and witnesses, who benefited from one-on-one training on how to use the new equipment, organized by the supplier. The 10 courts are the following: County Courts of Zagreb, Split, Osijek, Rijeka, Bjelovar, Sisak, Varaždin and Velika Gorica; and Municipal Courts of Zagreb and Split. The evaluation team individually met with 9 out 10 IT personnel as key informants.

The third target group is composed of authorities of the MoJ and Judicial Academy, who were targeted by advocacy activities. Considering that the program component had a strong advocacy component and that one of the mitigation measures to their lack of motivation was to involve authorities in planning and implementation phases, these target groups were also involved as stakeholders in charge of planning and implementation.

➢ Indirect beneficiaries

Law enforcement personnel and staff from CSW indirectly benefited from the program activities, through the dissemination of published brochures. The evaluation team individually discussed with 5 law enforcement officers and with the president of the Croatian Association of Social Workers, as key informants.

Moreover, even though they had not been directly involved in the program activities, all activities were directed towards indirect final beneficiaries: child victims and witnesses and their families or guardians, who were to benefit from the positive behavior change of justice personnel, new facilities equipment and program sustainability. As will be explained below\(^{24}\), the evaluation team did not meet with children, their families or guardians.

\(^{24}\) See Section 2.3. Limits and Weaknesses of the evaluation.
1.5. Implementation status

At the time of the evaluation field mission in December 2016, most programmatic activities had been already implemented, comprising: training towards judicial professionals, supply of audio-visual equipment and publication of brochures. Some supervision activities were still ongoing with NLCPs, as well as advocacy activities to ensure the sustainability of the program component.

Although the implementation of the program component was to end in 2016, new activities in the field of child-friendly justice are projected in the framework of the 2017-2021 UNICEF CPD. The evaluation will thus provide information about how best to revise and modify for improvement. Moreover, sufficient time had passed between the implementation of most activities and the evaluation mission, to enable the evaluation team to analyze at least some impact of the program component. Consequently, the evaluation is both a summative and formative evaluation.
2. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

2.1. Evaluation purposes, objectives and scope

2.1.1. Evaluation purposes

UNICEF Croatia requested that an external evaluation of the program component be conducted to gain insights into program’s results and impacts at the end of the implementation of the program component. Even though the 2012-2016 “Alliances for equity and social inclusion of the most vulnerable children” program was ending at the end of December 2016, further activities in the field of child-sensitive justice were anticipated in the next years. As mentioned in Section 1.5., the evaluation is a summative and formative evaluation. It analyzes the impact of the program component and provides information about how best to revise and modify for improvement.

In accordance with the Terms of reference (ToR)\textsuperscript{25}, the evaluation purposes are to determine whether this program component has improved the justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings. The report aims to be used as a source of information by three primary intended users:

- the MoJ to support its future programming and policy;
- the Ombudsman for Children to strengthen its monitoring and advocacy efforts; and
- UNICEF for its future programming and future steps in the next CPD (2017-2021).

Considering that the evaluation is conducted concurrently with discussions on the next CPD, the evaluation will provide key information and recommendations to guide the Government’s and UNICEF’s efforts in the field of justice for children for the next five years.

2.1.2. Evaluation objectives

To respond to the evaluation purposes, this evaluation seeks to assess the program component’s performance and to draw up conclusions, recommendations on key components and lessons learned. To that end, this evaluation uses the standard criteria of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Equity, gender and human rights are analyzed as cross-cutting issues throughout the report.

The following table details Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs). The questions that appear in italics are questions that have been added or modified by the evaluation team from the KEQs initially suggested in the ToR. In particular, some questions related to effectiveness and impact have been revised to be more specific and directly based on the outputs and corresponding outcome that were developed in the framework of the ToC, in accordance

\textsuperscript{25} See Appendix 8: Terms of reference.
with UNEG’s Norms and Standards. In the efficiency section, the evaluators included questions on the quality of program management in terms of communication, monitoring and response to potential delays in implementation. Additional reference has been included to pay special attention to the gender and equity dimensions and to the rights of children in criminal proceedings. Other additions or revisions had been suggested to ensure that important aspects are also taken into consideration during the evaluation, such as the involvement of national stakeholders in program design or the existence of unforeseen and/or negative impact.

Table 4: Key Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>KEQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>To what extent are programmatic activities aligned with the government policy priorities regarding child-friendly justice / justice for children? To what extent have relevant governmental authorities been involved in the design of program activities? Are these programmatic activities relevant to the actual needs of the child victims and witnesses, in terms of improved protection and respect for the rights of children in criminal proceedings, and professionals who work with them? Did program planning include consulting with other UNICEF Country Offices and/or international practices? Was an appropriate combination of approaches used in the implementation of the programmatic activities? Do undertaken activities consider gender and equity dimensions in capacity development of professionals and publications?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Have legal and non-legal judicial professionals enhanced their capacities for implementing child-friendly procedures in matters related to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings? Have Croatian criminal courts increased their technical capacities for interviewing child victims and witnesses? Have relevant authorities increased their capacities to ensure sustainability and scaling-up child-friendly procedures within judicial system? Have internal or external factors influenced achievement or non-achievement of the outputs and how?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>To what extent did program activities contribute to change of behaviors and practices of legal and non-legal judicial professionals toward child victims and witnesses? To what extent did program activities contribute to change of behaviors and practices of legal and non-legal judicial professionals regarding gender and equity dimensions (particularly gender equality, children with disabilities and Roma children)? To what extent did program activities contribute to new practices regarding the use of audio-visual equipment when interviewing children and is there any difference in the use of audio-visual equipment based on gender or equity dimensions? To what extent did program activities contribute to the recognition among decision-makers and professionals of the need for providing child-friendly services to child victims and witnesses of crimes? To what extent did the program contribute to increased respect of rights of children and protection in criminal proceedings? Have the activities of the project resulted in negative and/or unforeseen impacts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>Were key UNICEF staff and involved stakeholders qualified and numerous enough to implement the project, considering the activities to implement? To what extent have UNICEF and other stakeholders made good use of the financial and technical resources in implementation of program activities? Were key program activities cost-efficient in regard to the achieved outputs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.3. Evaluation scope

Although the ToR provides that the evaluation was to cover only the period from 2014 to the end of 2016, the evaluation team considered that it was useful to include some preparatory activities that were implemented in 2013. Therefore, the evaluation team extended the scope of the evaluation: the evaluation covers the period from 2013 to the end of 2016. All programmatic activities have been covered by the evaluation. Gender and equity dimensions have been taken into consideration in the development of tools and in the evaluation analysis.

Considering that the geographical scope of the program component is throughout Croatia, the evaluation team collected data throughout Croatia: interviews and focus groups were carried out in 8 target cities, and questionnaires were sent to judicial professionals based in criminal courts all over the country.

2.2. Evaluation methodology

2.2.1. Data collection methods

The evaluation team adopted a mixed approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data collecting and analysis methods in order to ensure data reliability and validity through triangulation, as set *inter alia* in UNEG's Norms and Standards and UNEG's Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation: review of literature, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, questionnaires and observation.

An evaluation matrix and data collection tools were specifically designed for the evaluation of the program component. A field mission was conducted in Croatia in December 2016.

---

26 See Appendix 4: Data collection tools.
27 Different data collection methods were used to collect data from places where the evaluation team was not physically deployed, such as on-line questionnaires. For more information, see Section 2.2.1.
28 Questionnaires and observation were not mentioned as data collection methods in the evaluation’s ToR. For more information on the rationale for adding these methods, see following sections.
29 See Appendix 3: Evaluation matrix.
30 See Appendix 4: Data collection tools.
Review of literature

Review of literature enabled the team to gather contextual information. Documents are also important sources that reflect information regarding program component activities, strategies and action plans. The literature relevant to the evaluation included inter alia: the 2014-2020 National Strategy for Children, reports of the Ombudsman for Children, training documents, UNICEF internal documents and reports, published material, general observations and general comment of the Committee on the Rights of the Child, questionnaires and transcripts from interviews and focus group discussions.  

Semi-structured interviews with key informants

Semi-structured interviews were preferred over other type of interviews because they are qualitative research methods that provide enough space to the interviewee to express himself/herself freely, while following a set of structured themes set out in a previously established interview guide. Semi-structured interviews were carried out with key informants, who have been involved in the program component. This comprises of:

- 4 MoJ representatives: Deputy Minister of Justice and 3 representatives of the MoJ in charge of project development and implementation and the IT development and maintenance;
- State Attorney formerly in charge of justice for children at the MoJ & focal point of the UNICEF program component;
- Head Adviser of the Ombudsman for Children from 2006-2013;
- 2 staff members from the Judicial Academy;
- 5 national consultants and 1 international consultant involved in the development and delivery of the training curricula;
- 5 law enforcement officers: in Bjelovar, Rijeka, Sisak, Split and Zagreb;
- President of the Croatian Association of Social Workers;
- Representative of the company in charge of supply and maintenance of audio-visual equipment;
- UNICEF CO staff: 1 Program Coordinator, 1 Child Protection Officer, 1 Child Protection Program Associate, 1 Child Rights Monitoring Officer and 1 Operations Officer.

Semi-structured interviews and focus groups discussion with judicial professionals

Judicial professionals are the main direct beneficiaries of the project. The evaluation team met face-to-face with 42 judicial professionals:

- 10 judges (semi-structured interviews)
- 10 State attorneys (semi-structured interviews);

---

31 See full list in Appendix 6: Bibliography.
32 The discussion with the international consultant took place after the field mission. It was conducted using an audio conferencing device.
33 The discussion with the head of the Centre for Social work took place after the field mission by phone.
➢ 13 NLCPs (semi-structured interviews in all cities outside Zagreb and one focus group discussion in Zagreb);  
➢ 9 IT personnel in charge of the use and maintenance of Courts’ audio-visual equipment (semi-structured interviews).

**Questionnaire towards trained participants**

Questionnaires were not initially envisaged to be used by the evaluation ToR. The evaluators suggested to consider one questionnaire-based study in order to analyze the evolution of training participants’ knowledge, attitudes and practices, gained from the implementation of program component activities. This data collection method was selected because it enabled the evaluators to reach a larger number of beneficiaries. The questionnaire was short and included specific questions on child-sensitive justice.

A questionnaire was sent by email to all training participants that the evaluation team had not interviewed, in order to include their views and opinions in the evaluation. 46 training participants responded, out of 106 questionnaires sent, which represents a response rate of 43.5%:

➢ 21 judges;  
➢ 11 State attorneys;  
➢ 9 NLCPs.

Quantitative data was analyzed comparing proportions and using statistical significance testing. Considering that samples sometimes had different sizes, the statistical analyst measured $p$ and statistical variable $z$.

The following calculation methods have been used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample “before training”</th>
<th>Sample “after training”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$p_1$</td>
<td>$p_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>$s_1$</td>
<td>$s_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>$n_1$</td>
<td>$n_2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$p = \frac{n_1p_1 + n_2p_2}{n_1 + n_2}$$

$$z = \frac{(p_1 - p_2)}{\sqrt{p(100 - p)\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

If $z > 1.96$, the difference between both samples was statistically significant.

---

34 One focus group discussion was organized in Zagreb with NLCPs. This has been made possible because the number of NLCPs was higher in Zagreb (6 NLCPs) than in other cities, where there are only one or two NLCPs.  
35 See questionnaire in Appendix 4.  
36 Questionnaires were sent to all training participants, except people that the evaluation team met and people who were not in the office anymore (following confirmation from the State attorney’s Office).  
37 The number of respondents differed in some cases, because some respondents did not fill in some questions.
Observation

Although observation was not included in the ToR as a data collection method, the evaluators deemed important to directly observe how the audio-visual equipment provided by the program component was placed at courts’ premises.

2.2.2. Sampling method

Considering that the program component was implemented throughout the country, the evaluation team was deployed in different regions of Croatia to reach the personnel of several County Courts, Municipal Courts and State attorney's offices. Multiple criteria were considered while preparing the sample:

- The evaluation team spent more time in Zagreb than other cities, to guarantee that the evaluators meet with institutions, consultants and experts who have been involved in the program component activities, as well as judicial professionals of Zagreb County and Municipal Courts and State attorney's offices.

- The evaluation team was deployed in all 10 courts that have received audio-visual equipment through the program component, that represent 70% of cases dealing with child victims and witnesses at national level: County courts of Zagreb, Split, Osijek, Rijeka, Bjelovar, Sisak, Varaždin, Velika Gorica; and Municipal courts of Zagreb and Split.

- In order to analyze the impact of the program component at a structural level in these 10 courts, to ensure cost-efficiency and to guarantee the credibility and the validity of data through triangulation, priority was given to interviews conducted with a variety of stakeholders in each of these 10 courts.

- Individual interviews were conducted separately between legal and non-legal professionals, *inter alia*, to analyze specifically the impact of training and supervision activities implemented during the program component towards NLCPs.

- In the same spirit of ensuring cost-efficiency, the evaluation team organized as many interviews as possible with involved actors in each location.

- Bearing in mind the number of days of the field study and the program component's national scope, the evaluation team could not be physically deployed in all courts of the county. Nevertheless, all trained professionals who were not interviewed during the field mission received an on-line questionnaire to ensure that their views are also taken into account in the evaluation.
➢ All training participants who were interviewed were randomly identified based on a list of trainees provided by UNICEF. One person was randomly selected for each group (County Court Judge, Municipal Court Judge, State attorney at County court, State attorney at Municipal court, NLCP). This person was contacted by phone before the field study, usually followed up by an email, to ensure his/her availability.

➢ Some interviews have also been carried out with other professionals dealing with criminal proceedings involving child victims and witnesses (juvenile police and CSW) to understand the effects of the program component activities and published material beyond direct beneficiaries.

➢ Considering the important advocacy component of the program component, the MoJ, the Judicial Academy and the Ombudsman for Children were also met, as well as UNICEF CO staff and experts and consultants who have been involved in the program component.

The sample of informants for the field visit is presented in the following table:

**Table 5: Sample of informants for the field visit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>People to interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>UNICEF CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representatives of Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Representative of Judicial Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National experts and consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 County Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Municipal Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 State attorney (County level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 State attorney (Municipal level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 non-legal professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 IT persons in charge of audio-visual equipment (1 per court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 police high-ranking officer involved in criminal matters dealing with children who benefited from the published material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split</td>
<td>1 County Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Municipal Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 State attorney (County level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 State attorney (Municipal level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 non-legal professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 IT persons in charge of audio-visual equipment (1 per court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 police high-ranking officer involved in criminal matters dealing with children who benefited from the published material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velika Gorica</td>
<td>1 County Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 State attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 non-legal professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 IT person in charge of audio-visual equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 police high-ranking officer involved in criminal matters dealing with children who benefited from the published material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjelovar</td>
<td>1 County Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 County State SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 non-legal professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 IT person in charge of audio-visual equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the in-depth interviews with the above-mentioned trainees, on-line questionnaires were sent to all other people who benefited from the program component’s training sessions. Therefore, all stakeholders mentioned in the stakeholders’ analysis\(^{38}\) have been reached, depending on their availability.

### 2.2.3. Data management and analysis

All data was analyzed according to each evaluation criteria and KEQ. In accordance with UNEG's Norms and Standards, to ensure credibility and validity of data, multiple sources of data and methods were utilized. All data have been thus analyzed following the triangulation principles.\(^{39}\) Gender and equity dimensions have been analyzed using the same techniques. Three triangulation methods were used:

- triangulation of sources by examining the consistency of different data sources from within the same method (for example, between different interviews);
- methods triangulation by analyzing the consistency of findings generated by different data collection method (for instance, data from interviews cross-referenced with questionnaires);
- investigator triangulation by analyzing the views of several researchers involved in data collection.

---

\(^{38}\) See Section 1.4.

\(^{39}\) See also Appendix 3: Evaluation matrix.
2.2.4. Ethical principles

Ethical guidelines were adhered to throughout the study. Confidentiality and protection of participants’ identities are crucial and have been taken into account at all times. Therefore, the confidentiality process, the purposes of the evaluation, the expected duration of interviews or focus groups and the use of collected data were orally explained to all participants and discussed prior to any data collection. Interviews and focus group discussions took place only if participants agreed to its terms and conditions. To this aim, consent forms were signed by all respondents.\(^{40}\) In accordance with UNEG’s standards, for ethical purpose and to avoid secondary victimization, child victims and witnesses of crimes were not involved in the evaluation process.\(^{41}\)

The evaluation team was composed of three complementary team members: two international lawyers and Human Rights consultants with a strong experience in evaluating justice programs, including juvenile justice programs, and one national consultant with a strong background in evaluation who has previously successfully cooperated with UNICEF.\(^{42}\) The team was composed as to avoid any potential conflict of interest or partiality. No team member had been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of the program component that was evaluated. All evaluators are experienced in research and have undertaken ethics training during their studies, with ample application of these standards in previous research assignments. Moreover, all evaluators have a strong understanding and practice of evaluation norms and standards. International evaluators also hold in-depth knowledge and expertise of international Human Rights instruments and standards.

Considering that the usefulness of every evaluation relies on local ownership by the program staff, particular attention was paid to the involvement of UNICEF CO team at each phase of the consultancy. Observations were regularly shared with UNICEF CO team during the evaluation mission, and a short debriefing was held at the end of the data collection to discuss the field mission and present some preliminary findings.

In accordance with UNEG’s Norms and Standards, special attention was paid to gender and equity dimensions throughout the evaluation. Specific questions were included in all tools, so as to understand the extent to which these dimensions were taken into consideration during design and implementation.

Detailed notes were taken for all the interviews and focus groups and then transcribed into English to facilitate data sorting and analysis.

2.3. Limits and weaknesses of the evaluation

---

\(^{40}\) See Appendix 5: Consent forms. The consent forms were translated into Croatian language.

\(^{41}\) See more information on Limits and weaknesses of the evaluation in Section 2.3.

\(^{42}\) See Appendix 1: Evaluation team competences.
The evaluation achieved the objectives set out in the ToR.\textsuperscript{43} A few obstacles were encountered but do not challenge the validity of the evaluation's analysis.

Due to the lack of data at court level, the evaluation team has not been able to assess the exact number of interviews that take place via video-link. This prevented the evaluation team from assessing the precise impact of this activity with quantitative data. Nevertheless, the evaluation team was provided with some estimates of the number of interviews during the field mission. Moreover, other data collection methods, such as interviews and focus group discussions, were used to assess whether the extent of use of the audio-visual material when dealing with child victims and witnesses. Nonetheless, it must be noted that the lack of data monitoring system prevented the evaluation team from collecting quantitative gender- and equity-related data.\textsuperscript{44}

The response rate of the on-line questionnaire for trained justice professionals is a little lower than expected: 43% versus 50%. The evaluation team sent three messages to trained justice professionals regarding the on-line questionnaire and set out a first deadline in December 2016 and a second deadline in January 2017. Considering that the response rate is above 40% and that responses of 43% of trained participants are fully consistent with the individual interviews and focus group carried out with judicial stakeholders, the evaluation consultants consider that the data is reliable, even though it has not reached the expected 50% response rate. Moreover, in total, 50% of trained justice professionals participated in the evaluation, either through questionnaires or individual interviews and focus groups.\textsuperscript{45}

Child victims and witnesses have not been involved in the evaluation process for ethical purposes. The risks of secondary victimization were considered high, considering the specific vulnerability of child victims and witnesses of crimes. Their participation in the evaluation appeared in contradiction with the objectives of the program and was not in the best interested of the child. The impact on the increased respect of children’s rights and protection could therefore only be assessed through secondary sources. In order to mitigate a potential bias in this regard, the evaluation team multiplied sources and discussed with legal and non-legal judicial professionals, law enforcement professionals and national consultants in charge of supervision.

Finally, the evaluation team intended to organize interview with at least one NLCP, one Judge and one State attorney for each court that received the audio-visual equipment. This has been possible in all courts but one (Rijeka County Court). The interview with the selected Judge was cancelled the day before the planned interview, due to a meeting. In order to mitigate this challenge, the interviews with the NLCP in this court and the State attorney were completed by an in-depth interview with one IT technician and one interview with a police officer. Moreover, the data from the interviews was cross-referenced with results of the on-line questionnaires.

\textsuperscript{43} See Appendix 8: Terms of reference.
\textsuperscript{44} For more information, see Section 3.4. Impact
\textsuperscript{45} See above, Section 1.4.2.
3. FINDINGS

The report is structured around the main evaluation criteria, following OECD-DAC: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

3.1. Relevance

The section on relevance aims at assessing the extent to which the program component is consistent with needs and priorities on different levels. In order to do so, this section assesses the program component’s alignment with government policy priorities, the level of involvement of governmental authorities, the consultation with international practices and stakeholders, the consistency of the program component with needs of child victims and witnesses and professionals who work with them, the relevance of combination of approaches used, and the consideration of gender and equity dimensions in programmatic activities.

To what extent are programmatic activities aligned with the government policy priorities regarding child-friendly justice / justice for children?

Review of literature and discussions with stakeholders revealed that, although relevant legislations and regulations comply with international instruments on Human Rights and Children’s Rights international instruments, they are not fully implemented. This need to shield children from secondary victimization is highlighted in the 2014-2020 National Strategy and the Ombudsman for Children’s 2014 report.46

This analysis is confirmed by key stakeholders that the evaluation team met with. In practice, children are “heard”47 multiple times: by school teachers, by social workers from the CSW48, by police officers, by healthcare professionals, by judges and by external forensic experts.49

As mentioned above,50 in order to address these needs, the National Strategy sets as one of the strategic goal the need to “improve the protection and realization of the rights of child victims of criminal offences and to provide them with adequate information and participation during criminal procedure” through, inter alia, the provision of audio-visual equipment for children, increased information of child victims on procedures and on their rights, and increased support to children and their parents or guardians.

It must also be noted that this strategic goal is fully aligned with the Committee on the Rights of the Child, which recommended that Croatia provides adequate training to

46 See also more information in Section 1.1. Intervention context.
47 The term “interview” was not used on purpose, to differentiate “interviews” that are admissible evidence in court, and other types of discussions with children, that are inadmissible in court
48 CSW are in charge of the protection of the child and may suggest protective measures, such as removing the child from his/her family if needed.
49 Chart 2 depicted on the following page
50 See Section 1.1. Intervention context.
members of judiciary and professionals working with and for children with the aim of prevent re-victimization.\textsuperscript{51}

Chart 2: Possible occurrences of discussions / interviews with child victim or witness

![Chart 2: Possible occurrences of discussions / interviews with child victim or witness](image)

Therefore, the supply of audio-visual equipment, training of judicial professionals, including NLCPs, and publication of brochures, are directly in line with Croatian laws and regulations and governmental policy priorities. This analysis has been confirmed by several representatives of the MoJ and the Ombudsman for Children.

Consequently, the evaluation consider that programmatic activities were fully aligned with national priorities regarding child-friendly justice.

To what extent have relevant governmental authorities been involved in the design of program activities?

According to current and former representatives of the MoJ, the program component on child victims and witnesses in criminal justice was a joint MoJ/UNICEF initiative that was triggered by several events. Firstly, the MoJ personnel in charge of the equipment indicated that a study visit was organized in Slovenia by the MoJ to present the material used to protect child victims and witnesses during criminal proceedings. The MoJ personnel considered that the program in Slovenia was well implemented and wished to implement similar activities. According to the MoJ representative, internal briefings reported several lacks in the area of protection of child victims and witnesses during criminal proceedings, which led in 2012 to the temporary appointment of one State attorney at the MoJ to deal with justice for children.

Around the same period, in 2012, the Regional Office of UNICEF in Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CEE/CIS) with United Nations

\textsuperscript{51} United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child (2014), Concluding observations on the third and fourth reports of Croatia, CRC/C/HRV/CO/3-4, para. 35
Office on Drugs and Crimes (UNODC) organized a workshop in Vienna on child victims and witnesses in which UNICEF CO, the Croatian Ministry of Interior (MoI) and the Croatian MoJ participated.

According to key stakeholders, following those events, all stakeholders showed interest to work together on this issue and the first negotiations with UNICEF and the MoJ started in September 2013.

The person appointed at the MoJ to deal with justice for children became UNICEF’s focal point for the program component. Discussions with MoJ staff and review of notes of meetings revealed that the MoJ was fully involved from the planning phase of the program component and that the MoJ co-designed the content of programmatic activities with UNICEF. The final proposal was jointly agreed by UNICEF and the MoJ and formalized by the signature of LoA in 2014, that details all planned activities: education of 110 judicial professionals, equipment of 10 courts with audio-visual equipment, preparation of materials, and development of sustainability mechanisms.

Review of notes of meetings between UNICEF and the MoJ showed that the MoJ actively participated in the implementation of the program component together with UNICEF: initial selection of courts that will benefit from the equipment, discussions regarding the audio-visual equipment’s technical specifications, field visits to assess logistics matters before the supply of video equipment, selection and invitation of judicial professionals to participate in training sessions, discussions on the number of training sessions, discussions on the involvement of Judicial Academy, etc.52

It is important to note that the Ombudsman for Children was also invited to discuss with UNICEF regarding the program component and provided recommendations and suggestions.

Therefore, the evaluation consultants consider that relevant government authorities were fully involved in the design of programmatic activities.

**Did program planning include consulting with other UNICEF Country Offices and/or international practices?**

UNICEF CO indicated that its involvement in juvenile justice started after the above-mentioned Vienna workshop on child victims and witnesses, co-organized by UNICEF CEE/CIS and UNODC. This workshop enabled UNICEF CO to gain more knowledge on child-friendly justice and thus to compare international standards with national practices. Following this workshop, UNICEF CO indicated that they consulted other UNICEF country offices to exchange information, particularly UNICEF CO Bosnia and Herzegovina and UNICEF Montenegro, who had previously implemented similar programs.

---

52 See more information on relevance of these activities below.
In order to ensure that the programmatic activities were in line with international practices, UNICEF CO contracted an international justice for children expert, who had extensive experience working with UNICEF in CEE/CIS region. This international expert had a key role in the coordination of the training workshop and exercises and she was consulted on the type of audio-visual equipment to use in the context of Croatia.

Based on the above, the evaluation consultants consider that the program planning has successfully consulted with other UNICEF Country offices and international practices.

Are these programmatic activities relevant to the actual needs of the child victims and witnesses, in terms of improved protection and respect for the rights of children in criminal proceedings, and professionals who work with them?

Although no written and comprehensive ToC was developed before or during the implementation of the program component, programmatic activities aimed at addressing several gaps. Discussions with several stakeholders revealed that the legislation regarding rights of child victims and witnesses was not properly implemented due to a lack of training of judicial professionals on child victims and witnesses, including on gender and equity dimensions; a lack of quality audio-visual equipment, resulting in occurrences of multiple interviews; a lack of information of children and parents or guardians; a lack of operational plan on child-friendly proceedings; and a lack of anticipation of training for judicial professionals.

Suppling audio-visual material was deemed essential because it prevents the child from meeting the defendant in court, thereby reducing occurrences of re-victimization. Moreover, it provides more space to NLCPs, who are in charge of reformulating questions from the courtroom to the child, to avoid further trauma. Recording was also considered crucial because it guarantees that children is not interviewed several times: if needed, the video tape is simply reproduced during further hearings. It was therefore important to target courts with cases involving children victims and witnesses.

The priority was given by UNICEF and the MoJ to the supply of new audio-visual material to 10 courts in the country: 8 County Courts and 2 Municipal Courts, out of 15 County Courts and 22 Municipal Courts throughout the country. One may argue that the program component did not manage to cover all courts. The evaluation consultants consider that the fact that the funds were not sufficient to cover all courts is not an issue. On one hand, based on discussion with the MoJ and UNICEF and on review of National Reform Program, the current government policy is to decrease the number of courts in the country and to move towards enhanced court specialization\(^{53}\), providing material to courts that may

---

\(^{53}\) As part of the National Reform Program, the number of courts is currently decreasing: the number of Municipal Courts has decreased in a few years from 64 to 22. Currently, 15 County Courts are operational. Republic of Croatia (2016), National Reform Program, p. 23 (http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/csr2016/nrp2016_croatia_en.pdf, Accessed in January 2017). The appointment of specialized judges or magistrates for dealing with cases of juvenile justice is a recommendation from the Committee for the Rights of the Child's General Comment n. 10 (2007), Children's rights in juvenile justice, para. 93.
disappear is not sustainable. Moreover, other material, transferred from the MoI, may soon be available to other courts, as a result of the IPA project.\footnote{See above, Section 1.1., Box 1.}

On the other hand, according to key stakeholders and review of literature, the criteria to determine which court was receiving the material was directly correlated to the number of hearings involving child victims and witnesses, following an analysis of data from 2008 to 2012 conducted by the MoJ. Based on this analysis, 7 County Courts were selected: Osijek, Zagreb, Varazdin, Bjelovar, Rijeka, Sisak and Velika Gorica. The only County Court that was included without delivering data was the Split County Court, but its workload was well-known, which explains the inclusion in the process. In addition, two Municipal Courts were included: Zagreb Municipal Court, that is too far from the city centre to share equipment with the County Court; and Split Municipal Court, that did not have any previous equipment. Those 10 courts cover 70% of all cases involving child victims and witnesses. The supply of the audio-visual equipment was thus particularly relevant to these cases considering the selection process that has been used.

Interviewed judicial professionals from the 10 courts reported that the previous video recording material in criminal courts was either outdated (in most courts, still using VHS tapes) or non-existent (Split Municipal court). This situation had several negative consequences that directly led to secondary victimization: in some cases, children testimonies were not recorded, which resulted in children having to testify at least one more time. In other cases, the video equipment was of poor quality: children had to repeat their answers several times because the judge could not hear them, which was a source of stress, or the NLCP heard several voices at the same time in her headsets due to poor quality material. In some cases, the use of big headsets was reported to have distracted children during hearings. IT technicians also indicated that the supply of new VHS tapes was a huge challenge.

In this regard, UNICEF's involvement in the supply of good quality audio-visual material was projected to have a direct impact on the well-being of child victims and witnesses. All technical specifications were discussed and negotiated between UNICEF and the MoJ.

As mentioned above, review of documents and discussions with key stakeholders revealed that the legislation was not properly respected and that children could be “heard” multiple times. There was therefore an important lack of \textit{training of involved stakeholders}. UNICEF CO indicated that, although a multidisciplinary approach including CSW, police, justice, healthcare and psychosocial services would have been the most appropriate way to tackle the issue of secondary victimization of child victims and witnesses, available financial and human resources were too limited to implement this approach. UNICEF chose to focus on judicial system. Considering that police officers had been previously trained by the IPA project\footnote{Ibid.}, the evaluation consultants consider that police officers did not need to be included in the training to increase their capacity.
Nevertheless, the consultants consider that working on coordination between stakeholders is an important element to consider in the future.⁵⁶

Several key informants, including the MoJ representative and the Ombudsman for Children, reported that children were interviewed several times before the courts due to a lack of training of judicial professionals: Judges, State attorneys and NLCPs. The program component projected to address this need through training.

80% of NLCPs⁵⁷ who responded to the on-line questionnaire revealed that the training that was implemented was the very first training that they were ever invited to attend on this topic. This was confirmed by individual interviews with NLCPs. In addition, although 80% of Judges and State attorneys who responded to the on-line questionnaire⁵⁸ indicated that they had previously been trained on some aspects relating to justice for children, discussions revealed that the training that was organized was the first comprehensive training on child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings targeting those professionals.

Key stakeholders that the evaluation team met with indicated that the MoJ invited all criminal justice professionals who were in contact with criminal cases involving child victims and witnesses throughout the country to the MoJ/UNICEF training: all presidents of County courts and State attorneys were asked to disseminate the invitation to the training to all professionals under their jurisdiction who are in contact with children, and all NLCPs at national level received the invitation.

Children and their parents or guardians were not provided with written educational information on the judicial process prior to the intervention. The dissemination of brochures to children and parents or guardians was projected to be complementary to other activities: they aimed at guaranteeing that children and parents increase their participation in a meaningful way and understand the criminal process that affects them. Children's active participation in proceedings is encompassed in the right of children to be heard, which is one of the basic principles set out by international instruments on child-friendly justice.

On a general level, it is also important to note that, according to key stakeholders, UNICEF is the only external institution that has financially supported the system of justice for children since the end of the IPA project in 2013. Institutional stakeholders explained that, since Croatia is part of the EU, donors have decreased focus on criminal justice, more prominently funded during the pre-accession period. Donors have shifted their focus on other matters, rooted in Europe 2020 Strategy. This is confirmed by the analysis of documentation: the only reference to the justice system in the National Reform Program

---

⁵⁶ In this regard, evaluation consultants positively note that this element has already been taken into account in the next UNICEF CPD. See Conclusion.
⁵⁷ N=9.
⁵⁸ N=32.
concerns the efficiency and quality of the justice system, which is to be addressed through a reorganization of courts and the digitization of the judicial system.\textsuperscript{59}

Based on the fact that the program component aimed to address needs of child victims and witnesses, and that no other external stakeholder is targeting this issue, the evaluation consultants consider that the programmatic activities were highly relevant in terms of improved protection and respect for the rights of children in criminal proceedings, and enhanced capacities of professionals who work with them.

**Was an appropriate combination of approaches used in the implementation of the programmatic activities?**

Discussions with all stakeholders and review of documents revealed that several approaches were used: supply of equipment and training on its use, training and/or supervision of judicial professionals, and sustainability activities.

Several judicial professionals indicated that those components were complementary. For instance, training on how to concretely use the equipment and interview children was deemed important by NLCPs, who had to self-educate themselves on how to reformulate questions from judicial professionals to children.

In addition, training on how to avoid secondary victimization would have been less relevant for judicial professionals if no material was available to avoid contact between child victims and witnesses and the defendants. This was the case in Split Municipal court that had no audio-visual equipment prior to the program component: one judge explained that meeting with other judges who were previously using the equipment was highly appreciated and that it helped him to concretely use the audio-visual equipment.

The evaluation consultants consider that the approaches used were particularly relevant and complemented each other. The combination of approaches was fully appropriate.

**Do undertaken activities consider gender and equity dimensions?**

The program was not initially designed to directly tackle gender and equity issues. In particular, the program was not specifically designed to target specific groups of direct beneficiaries. All judicial professionals were invited to participate in the training, regardless of their gender or whether they were working in urban areas or more isolated courts. It must however be highlighted that, according to monitoring tools, many judges and State attorneys who participated in the training activities were working in remote areas. Similarly, brochures for children and their parents or guardians were widely disseminated to CSW and police posts in the country, including in rural areas.

\textsuperscript{59} Europe 2020 is the European Union's strategy that was launched in 2010 to create the conditions for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. Five headline targets have been agreed for the EU to achieve by the end of 2020: employment; research and development; climate/energy; education; social inclusion and poverty reduction. See National Reform Program, p. 23-25.
Moreover, review of documentation and discussions with stakeholders demonstrate that specific attention has been paid to the specificity of CWDs during training sessions. Video footages were screened to participants and specific exercises were conducted during training to encourage participants to reflect on the reliability of testimonies of children with intellectual disabilities.\textsuperscript{60}

Similarly, sexual violence against children was specifically taken into consideration during the training, being one of the most common criminal act judicial professionals face during proceedings regarding child victims and witnesses. Moreover, examples of sexual violence against girls and boys were included and discussed during training activities, thereby addressing the issue of gender bias in criminal proceedings. For instance, footage of expert psychologists interviewing a boy CWD, victim of a sexual assault committed by a young man, was screened and discussed. This example dealt with gender-based stereotypes, targeting mistaken beliefs that victims are typically girls assaulted by someone for the other gender.

Moreover, all brochures that were developed towards children and parents or guardians are child-friendly in the sense that the used language is non-technical and includes several drawings to explain the criminal process. All drawings depict both a girl and a boy.

Consequently, the evaluation consultants consider that although the program was not designed to address specifically equity and gender, several elements of equity and gender dimensions were taken into consideration by the program component.

**Key findings on relevance**

- Customization of programmatic activities to the national context enables to cover the needs of children, despite the lack of written and comprehensive ToC.
- Active participation and full involvement of national stakeholders in the design and implementation of activities ensures relevance.
- Discussions with practitioners experienced in other countries enables exchanges of experiences that facilitate the implementation of activities.
- The assessment on the number of cases of child victims and witnesses that was conducted in each court prior to audio-visual equipment supply guaranteed that the courts that received the materials had the most important number of cases.
- The implementation of training sessions towards professionals who have never been trained guaranteed that the training was particularly valuable.
- The use of an adequate combination of approaches reinforced the relevance of the program component.
- Gender and equity dimensions have been taken into consideration during the design and implementation phases.

\textsuperscript{60} More information on the impact of these activities in Section 3.4.
3.2. Effectiveness

This section assesses the level of achievement of the program component's outputs and outcome. As mentioned above\(\textsuperscript{61}\), programmatic activities were implemented without a comprehensive ToC model being designed, although some indicators, goals and targets were defined in the LoA and in the CPD and CPAP matrix. A ToC was reconstructed by the evaluation team in collaboration with UNICEF CO. Three outputs were formulated.\(\textsuperscript{62}\)

Each of the first three following sub-sections addresses one output. The fourth sub-section address a cross-cutting issue, namely the factors that influenced achievement of outputs.

Have legal and non-legal judicial professionals enhanced their capacities for implementing child-friendly procedures in matters related to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings?\(\textsuperscript{63}\) \textit{(output 1)}

Output 1 is formulated as follows:

“By the end of 2016, legal and non-legal judicial professionals have enhanced capacities (awareness, knowledge and skills) for implementing child-friendly procedures in matters related to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings”

This sub-section is divided into three parts: firstly, the general 3-day training, aiming at all judicial professionals (Judges, State attorneys, NLCPs); secondly, a specific training and supervision activities for NLCPs; thirdly, the dissemination of materials.

- General 3-day training for judicial professionals

The LoA projected that 110 judicial professionals benefit from a 3-day training on rights of child victims and witnesses. Considering that the training sessions lasted 3 full days, several sessions were organized in order to address potential unavailability of judicial professionals: four sessions were implemented by the MoJ and UNICEF in May, June, July and September 2014, each session targeting trainees from different courts and backgrounds (Judges, State attorneys, NLCPs). In addition to the education towards judicial professionals of 8 target cities that was planned in the LoA, two additional sessions were implemented together with Judicial Academy in May 2015.\(\textsuperscript{64}\)

As a whole, 157 persons participated in the general 3-day training on “\textit{Child-sensitive treatment of child victims and witnesses of crime}”. 55 Judges, 65 State attorneys, 23 NLCPs and 3 persons from other institutions. This number largely exceeds what was initially projected in the LoA.

---

\(\textsuperscript{61}\) See Sections 1.3. and 3.1.

\(\textsuperscript{62}\) See Section 1.3.

\(\textsuperscript{63}\) This section does not deal with the impact of capacity development activities. Impact will be assessed in Section 3.4.

\(\textsuperscript{64}\) See more information on the Judicial Academy below.
The content of the general 3-day training reflects the multidisciplinary approach that was used to develop the training material. The modules were designed by a team composed of five national consultants and one international consultant with complementary profiles: two judges, one State attorney, two forensic psychologists and one expert in child protection and interactive training methods. The training modules thus include legal and psychological content, as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Titles of presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>Testimony about abuse: chance or trauma? Child victims and witnesses in light of international and national laws Basic criminal procedure and legal protection of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 2</td>
<td>Forensic interview of child victims and witnesses: the protocol of the National Institution of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Preparation of the child for court Type of questions regarding types of abuse Preparation of child victims and witnesses for court interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>Steps for the future Approach to the child in connection to the developmental phases: cognitive, socioeconomic and moral development Trauma and Recovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All trained participants and Judicial Academy representatives who were interviewed praised the excellent quality of the training. Training participants rated the content of the training as very interesting. The practical approach that was used was highly appreciated. Training modules contained theoretical presentations, video footages and many practical exercises. Participants explained that they appreciated to watch the footages that enabled them to learn how children concretely react during interviews. Many participants revealed that this was one of the best trainings they have ever had in their career.

Training participants were divided into groups, each group comprising judges, State attorneys and NLCPs. Most participants indicated that role playing exercises were particularly valuable to them considering that different judicial professionals were invited to the training. For most training participants, this was the first time they encountered a mixed group (see Box 2).

**Box 2**

“In the role play I was a non-legal professional and I started to think like the victim. I saw how difficult it is for the non-legal professionals to approach children. I was startled at first.” State attorney

“It was really good to have State attorneys with us, to meet together. They encountered problems faced by other professionals.” Judge

All quotations are from the people who were interviewed by the team. Quotations have been included to illustrate or summarize some ideas that are shared by several people. They do not represent the opinion of only one person. To keep confidentiality, the evaluation team did not include the respondents’ names or cities.

65 See more information on the profiles of training designers, Section 3.3.

66 This internationally-used and evidence-based protocol has been developed by NICHD, an American research facility, to interview children, taking into account child development issues, including linguistic capabilities, memory, suggestibility, forensic needs, interviewer behavior, and the effects of stress and trauma. See [http://nichdprotocol.com/](http://nichdprotocol.com/) (accessed on 23 January 2017).
Moreover, they particularly enjoyed exchanging experiences with trainees from other courts.

Although 95% of respondents to the on-line questionnaire (N=42) answered that they knew at least partially the concept of secondary victimization, all participants indicated that they acquired new knowledge on child-friendly procedures related to child victims and witnesses as a result of the training. When asked about the knowledge gained from participating in the training, judicial professionals reported that they learned new elements that they were unaware of regarding the legislation, including how to avoid multiple interviews or the importance of avoiding contact between the child and the defendant. NLCPs indicated that they had no knowledge of the legal aspects, as this was, for most of them, the very first training in which they participated. Conversely, legal professionals indicated that they had no previous knowledge of the psychological aspects linked to the interview of children, as is illustrated in Box 3.

➢ Additional training and supervision for NLCPs

Additional capacity development was organized towards NLCPs titled “Child-sensitive interviewing”. All 24 NLCPs in the country were invited to participate in an additional specialized training, dealing only with forensic interviews, as well as supervision sessions.

Three sessions of this 3-day training were organized, respectively in September, November and December 2015. The training comprises the following modules:

| Day 1 | Review of legal provisions regarding children and characteristics of children as actor in the criminal proceedings  
Child and Trauma  
Reconstruction - Exercise for sensitization of the position of the victim  
How children remember - Reconstructive nature of memory |
|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Day 2 | Recognizing the rights of children  
Similarities and differences of different protocols of interviewing children in connection to specific interview and children’s own characteristics  
Skills of interviewing children  
Empowering non-legal professionals in relation to other actors of the proceedings |
| Day 3 | Cognitive interview and criteria for analyses of authenticity of statements  
Specifics of adolescence  
Special challenges in work with juvenile offenders  
Improving skills of interviewing children and adolescent when are offenders  
Risk and protective factors for juvenile delinquency |

Box 3

“This training is important because we are lawyers and not psychologists, so we were lacking practical knowledge as how to be sensitive to children.” State attorney

“I knew the legal aspects and I learned non legal aspects. Especially, I learned how to interview a child. I deal with sexual crimes and I needed to understand the needs of children. It is important not to cross the line for the well-being of children.” State attorney
Analysis of the evaluation sheets revealed that, at the end of the training, 100% of trainees “fully agreed” or “agreed” with the fact that the content of the education was relevant to their job and that 100% “fully agreed” or “agreed” with the fact that this specific education met their expectations. Several trainees suggested to add supervision activities, which was implemented in 2016.

The supervision took the form of group sessions: NLCPs indicated that they came to the supervision sessions with a footage of an interview they conducted with a child, the only condition being that the case was closed. The footage was analyzed in small groups between NLCPs and trainers. This activity was very appreciated by NLCPs, who indicated that they were glad to reflect on their behaviors and practices, as illustrated in Box 4.

Trained NLCPs reported a strong increase of their knowledge regarding forensic interview. Interviewed NLCPs indicated that they learned, *inter alia*, how to avoid certain questions, how to reformulate questions, how to establish contact with children, what are the rights and duties of children, and how to prepare an interview. They reported that they gained more knowledge on the legal rationale behind interviews and on their role in the proceedings under the law, which increased their self-confidence during interviews. Prior to the training, they explained that they were mostly following their intuition.

It should also be stressed that the existing NICHD protocol was modified during the training, based on the experiences of attending NLCPs. Good practices of the NLCPs were compiled during the training and added to the protocol. The approach towards training was therefore participatory.

➢ Dissemination of materials on child victims and witnesses

Review of documents and discussions with key stakeholders and UNICEF demonstrated that several materials were designed or translated, and disseminated during program component’s implementation. All publications are available on UNICEF CO’s website:\[67\]

- Brochure for child victims and witnesses;
- Brochure for the parents or guardians of child victims and witnesses;
- Booklet on collaboration of experts when working with child victims and witnesses in criminal cases, that provides details on the roles and

---

responsibilities of all professionals involved with child victims and witnesses in criminal cases;


Except the Handbook, which existed in English, all other publications were designed by national experts and disseminated during program component's implementation. The Handbook is a 2009 UNODC document, that is internationally recognized as a guideline on justice matters regarding child victims and witnesses. This document was translated into Croatian during the program component's implementation and disseminated towards judicial professionals.

Brochures for children and brochures for parents or guardians were designed by one highly-recognized forensic psychologist. In total, 3670 copies of the brochures for children and 3670 copies of the brochures for parents or guardians were distributed. Out of 7340 copies, 2400 brochures were disseminated towards judicial professionals (judges, State attorneys and NLCPs); postal costs were covered by the MoJ. In addition, 3600 brochures were disseminated towards CSW and 500 police officers.

![Picture 2: Brochures in a police station](image)

According to the President of the Croatian Association of Social Workers and police officers, the brochures were well appreciated because of their level of clarity. The President of the Croatian Association of Social Workers explained that brochures were disseminated to CSW throughout the country. Interviewed police officers indicated that they disseminated the brochures to other police stations. Thus, police officers generally remained only with one or two copies, thereby not allowing the children or their parents to take the brochure back home. This difficulty seems to be linked to two factors. Firstly, UNICEF indicated that brochures were disseminated following an estimation by each institution. The needs were thus underestimated by the institutions before their

---

68 See more information on the experts in Section 3.3.
69 For more information on the role of CSW, see above Section 3.1.
dissemination to professionals, particularly NLCPs and police officers. Secondly, discussions revealed that there was some miscommunication with professionals working with children, who were not aware that they could ask for more copies of the brochures. This situation could be easily corrected, considering that brochures are still available for this purpose at UNICEF CO office.

According to key stakeholders, the booklet on collaboration of experts was also disseminated but the MoI decided not to distribute this guide. Even though one high-ranking police officer participated in the drafting of the booklet, the MoI had reservation on the role of police, as stated in the material.\(^70\) Review of UNICEF monitoring tools showed that some copies were also distributed to the Ombudsman for Children, to reviewers and during a conference on alternative measures. In total, 1129 copies of the booklet were distributed. 45% of judicial professionals who responded to the on-line questionnaire (N=44) indicated that they received this document, 16% do not remember and 39% reported that they had not received it.

➢ Conclusion on the enhancement of capacities of judicial professionals

Based on discussions with legal and non-legal judicial professionals, the evaluation consultants consider that all judicial professionals indicated that they enhanced their capacities in matters related to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceeding as a result of programmatic activities. The evaluation consultants also positively note that the projected number of trained judicial professionals and the projected number of courts reached by the program component (110 judicial professionals for 10 courts) was exceeded (158 trained professionals for 20 courts). Education material was disseminated to involved stakeholders, and children and their parents or guardians.

Have Croatian criminal courts increased their technical capacities for interviewing child victims and witnesses? (output 2)

Output 2 is formulated as follows:
“By the end of 2016, Croatian criminal courts have adequate technical capacities (audio-visual equipment and knowledge for its usage) for interviewing child victims and witnesses”

The evaluation consultants observed the audio-visual equipment in all 10 courts: 8 County Courts and 2 Municipal Courts. As mentioned in Section 3.1., the specifications of the audio-visual material were discussed between UNICEF and the MoJ before the material was supplied. Stakeholders revealed that the audio-visual material was first supplied to two courts, namely Zagreb Municipal Court and Split Municipal Court, and that an assessment was done before the material was supplied to the remaining eight courts.\(^71\)

The audio-visual material enables instant video conferencing between two rooms: the courtroom, where the Judge, the State attorney, the defendant and his/her lawyers are

\(^70\) See also Section 1.1. on this challenge.
\(^71\) See more details on the assessment, Section 3.3. Efficiency.
present; and the room where the child is interviewed. Both rooms are physically distant, sometimes on a different floor, to avoid contact between the child and the defendant.

For each court, this material comprises:

- **Courtroom:** one large monitor for the audience, one monitor for the judge, one microphone for the judge, one speaker system;
- **Room where the child is interviewed:** small headset for the NLCP, one microphone, two cameras (one focused on the child's face; one showing the overall room).

**Picture 3: Video equipment**

**Courtroom**
(Rijeka County Court)

**Room for the child's interview**
(Split County Court)

Discussions with IT technicians working in courts revealed the company that was selected to provide the material trained them on the use of material. All IT technicians indicated that the use of audio-visual equipment was explained to them prior to the supply of material. They reported the use as very simple.

The evaluation consultants observed that the equipment was installed in all selected courts in the intended manner. However, in some courts, there is no general courtroom: courtrooms are dedicated to specific judges. In these cases, there was no option other than providing the audio-visual material to the courtroom of one judge. If there are cases involving child victims and witnesses that are dealt with by another judge from that court, judges have to exchange their courtrooms. Judges reported that this is not a major difficulty, although it complicates the organization of the hearings. In one court, due to a lack of space (Velika Gorica), the equipment to interview the child has been placed in a room that is used by a judge: in this court, the equipment has to be set up every time by the IT technician.
Discussions with judicial professionals revealed that the equipment is in use in all 10 courts. All interviewed professionals indicated that the quality of equipment regarding video conference, in terms of sound and image, is very high.

The MoJ and UNICEF mentioned that they were rarely informed of problems with the equipment. One difficulty, however, has been mentioned by several courts regarding the recording. In some instances, although the equipment indicates that it is working properly – a red button appears, showing that the device is in theory recording the interview - IT technicians could not stop the recording and discovered at the end that the device was not recording at all. This difficulty has been reported at least once by five courts and is still ongoing for two courts (see Box 5). In Zagreb County Court, it represents 3 to 5% of recordings out of approximately 400 per year. Consequences were reported as traumatic for children.

The company that provided the material has a 5-year contract maintenance. Discussions with IT technicians from the courts revealed that the responses from the company were not always the same depending on the location of the court. In some cases, the company replaced several components but could not identify the problem. In these cases, interviewed IT technicians indicated that they stopped contacting the company as this problem continued occurring. In one case, however, the company proposed to replace the hard disk and to use a computer as storage device: this court never had the problem again. According to them, the difficulty comes from the hard disk drive, that has a very high storage capacity (2 terabytes) and that does not function when it is too full. The difference in answers was probably due to the fact that the company has two branches: one in Zagreb for courts located in the North; one in Rijeka for courts located in the South. Increased communication between the company branches, or increased communication between IT technicians and the MoJ could probably have fixed this technical issue. It is, however, important to highlight that the company has always responded in a timely manner to any request, although this problem had not been solved in all courts. Moreover, despite this difficulty, the new system has been considered as a better system than the previous one, even in cases where the system still presents this recording problem.

Therefore, the evaluation consultants consider that the 10 selected courts increased their technical capacities for interviewing child victims and witnesses.

---

**Box 5**

“There were problems with the external disks when there were 4, 5 or 6 recordings. It would not record, but we would not know it did not record. Everything shows it is filming. We contacted [the company] and [they] proposed to save everything on a local computer. Now it is functioning but the disk with large capacity is not used anymore. We use an external computer to save the material.” IT technician

---

72 This was reported by Zagreb County Court, Velika Gorica County Court, Rijeka County Court (problem has been solved by the use of external computer), Zagreb Municipal Court (decided to empty the disk regularly, the problem stopped occurring), Sisak County Court (also decided to empty the disk regularly, the problem stopped occurring).

73 This hypothesis seems consistent with the fact that the problem stopped occurring in Zagreb Municipal Court and Sisak County Court after the IT technicians decided to regularly empty the hard disk device.
Have relevant authorities increased their capacities to ensure sustainability and scaling-up child-friendly procedures within the judicial system? *(output 3)*

Output 3 is formulated as follows:

“By the end of 2016, relevant authorities have increased capacities (motivation, knowledge and resources) to ensure sustainability and scaling up child-friendly procedures within judicial system”

Several activities were implemented to ensure that the MoJ and the Judicial Academy are motivated and committed to continue improving the judicial system as regards to child victims and witnesses, thereby contributing to the replication of the intervention throughout the country and to the sustainability of the intervention in the long-term.

According to key stakeholders and minutes of meetings, UNICEF paid special attention to the MoJ's involvement at all levels, to encourage ownership. Several meetings were conducted with high-level representatives of the MoJ to highlight the need to improve the judicial system regarding child victims and witnesses. Discussions with decision-makers revealed that, although they are not formalized in a document, many activities have been implemented to ensure that human and technical resources are allocated for child-friendly procedures.

Firstly, according to key stakeholders, there was no NLCP in four County Courts in the country prior to the implementation of the program component: Dubrovnik, Rijeka, Sisak and Slavonski Brod. This lack was identified and corrected during the program component's implementation. Considering that the program component was implemented during a time of recession, new employment was prohibited in public institutions. To overcome this obstacle, the newly-employed NLCPs were CSW employees, under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Social Policy and Youth.

Secondly, the MoJ indicated that it intended to continue to expand the supply of equipment to all courts, based on the future transfer of video equipment bought in the framework of the 2009 IPA project from MoI to MoJ.

Moreover, UNICEF and the MoJ worked closely with the Judicial Academy, which is the official body in charge of training all legal judicial professionals. The Judicial Academy representatives indicated that they were involved in two sessions of the general 3-day training. They explained that, although they usually develop themselves their training content, training modules were already finalized when they became fully involved. As mentioned above, although the Judicial Academy was involved from the start of the program component's implementation, they had not participated in the design of the training modules due to change of leadership in their institution at this time. To overcome this challenge, UNICEF experts indicated that they developed the training tools in a way.

---

74 See also Section 3.1.
75 See more information in Sections 1.1. and 3.5.
76 See Section 1.4.1.
that ensured that these could be used by the Judicial Academy in the future. The Judicial Academy was particularly involved in organizational and logistical issues: they invited participants, duplicated materials and developed the training certificates with UNICEF. The Judicial Academy explained that they are used to work with most trainers, as they are experts in their respective fields of expertise.

Consequently, the evaluation consultants consider that the program component included several activities that projected to lead to increasing capacities of the MoJ and the Judicial Academy on child-friendly procedures within the judicial system.

**Have internal or external factors influenced achievement or non-achievement of the outputs and how?**

Discussions with judicial professionals, experts and UNICEF revealed that no internal or external factors negatively influenced the achievement of the outputs. All activities were implemented as projected or exceeded and, despite a challenge regarding the recording of interviews, all outputs were achieved.

The achievement of these outputs was made possible by a series of factors:

- The quality of cooperation between UNICEF and the MoJ enabled a very high level of involvement of MoJ representatives throughout program component’s implementation. All key stakeholders that were interviewed praised UNICEF for their professionalism and their communication skills. The MoJ’s involvement since the planning phase ensured strong ownership and facilitated the implementation of program component.
- Similarly, the division of roles and responsibilities between UNICEF and the MoJ simplified the implementation process: the MoJ was mainly in charge of inviting participants to the training sessions, while UNICEF was responsible for the development of training material. This is also the case with the Judicial Academy.
- The availability of high quality experts at national level was an important factor that positively influenced the achievement of the outputs.

**In summary: effectiveness**

Based on the ToC, the following table shows the result of key activities compared to projected activities. The following color code was used: dark green – exceeded target; green – met target; yellow – partially met; red – did not meet target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Implemented activities compared to planned key activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1: By the end of 2016, legal and non-legal judicial professionals have enhanced capacities (awareness, knowledge and skills) for implementing child-friendly procedures in matters related to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

77 See more information in Section 3.3.
### Key findings on Effectiveness

- The multiplicity of approaches used in training activities, namely theoretical presentations, video footages and practical exercises was highly appreciated by the participants.
- The use of practical and interactive exercises, such as role playing exercises, implemented in groups composed of different categories of professionals ensured that training participants remained active throughout the training and led to an increased understanding of other professionals’ roles and challenges in court.
- The supervision sessions carried out were a very valuable complement to training sessions and enabled an increased change of practice on NLCPs.
- Despite the high quality of audio-visual equipment, sporadic problems on the recording device resulted in occurrences of repeated interviews of children. Moreover, the lack of consistent communication system between the maintenance company, the courts and the MoJ regarding the equipment prevented that this problem was fully solved, even though corrective measures were adequately applied in some courts.

---

78 One must recall that the plan was not intended to be a written documentation.
3.3. Efficiency

The efficiency section assesses whether the effects of the program component were obtained with the least possible resources. It analyzes the mobilization of human resources, the level to which UNICEF and other stakeholders made good use of their financial and technical resources, the program component's cost-efficient and the quality of program component's management.

Were key UNICEF staff and involved stakeholders qualified and numerous enough to implement the program component, considering the activities to implement?

Several key staff were involved in the implementation of the program component. At UNICEF level, four key persons were involved in the program component: one Program Coordinator, one Child Protection Officer, one Child Protection Program Associate and one Child Rights Monitoring Officer. The Program Coordinator participated mainly in high-level discussions and supervised the program component implemented by the Child Protection Officer and the Child Protection Program Associate, who were in charge of daily operational activities. The Child Rights Monitoring Officer was more generally in charge of following up, monitoring and reporting activities. The UNICEF team also relied on one Operations Officer for all equipment-related issues. Discussions with key stakeholders at the MoJ and the Judicial Academy revealed that program component’s implementation was smooth, mainly resulting from the involvement, qualification and communication skills of UNICEF staff. Key UNICEF staff indicated that they were also supported by UNICEF regional office.

To implement the program component, UNICEF relied on a multi-disciplinary team composed of five national consultants and one international consultant:

➢ One County Court judge was involved in the development of training material, training of participants and design of one publication. The judge who was selected is the main judicial expert of Juvenile Justice in Croatia. She is the president of the Juvenile Department at Zagreb County Court. She acts as an expert outside Croatia, and has a long-lasting experience as a trainer for judges, State attorneys and lawyers for UNICEF and NGOs.
➢ One other County Court judge and one State attorney were involved in the development of training material and training of participants. Both had particular knowledge in Juvenile Justice. Although they had no previous experience in training, they were supported by the international trainer on education methodology.
➢ The Director and Founder of the Child Protection Centre of Zagreb was involved in the development of training material, training of participants and design of publications. She is a highly-recognized expert in children psychology in Croatia and is an Associate Professor in psychology. She cooperates with courts in cases including credibility evaluations of physically and sexually abused children. She works as an expert for UNICEF and the Council of Europe and has a long-lasting experience as a trainer for judges, State attorneys and police officers.
➢ One psychologist was involved in the training and supervision of NLCPs. She is a forensic psychologist and a certified court expert witness. She has worked with courts in cases which include credibility evaluations of physically and sexually abused children. She has an extensive experience as a trainer in this area. She is an Associate Professor on Children and Adolescent Forensic Psychology and she works at the Child Protection Centre of Zagreb.

➢ One international expert in child protection and justice for children was responsible for the coordination of the training modules, timetable, structure and exercises. She is experienced in working with UNICEF in several European and Asian countries and at regional level, particularly in the field of juvenile justice. She is also an expert in interactive training methods.

During the implementation of the program component, UNICEF was also in direct link with the MoJ focal point, a Deputy State attorney assigned to work specifically on Child Justice.

The evaluation consultants consider that the level of qualification of all stakeholders was very high and that profiles were complementary and fully adapted to the implementation of the program component.

To what extent have UNICEF and other stakeholders made good use of the financial and technical resources in implementation of program activities?

Were key program activities cost-efficient in regard to the achieved outputs?

For the assessment of the budget, the evaluation team only analyzed the budget that comprised programmatic activities. The budget does not include salaries of UNICEF staff. Moreover, one should take into consideration the important variation of exchange rate between USD and Kunas during program component’s implementation.79 Thus all amounts that are indicated in the following section are approximate amounts.

According to the LoA, the estimated budget for the program component was 1 765 000 Kuna (Kn - local currency): 720 000 Kn for the education of justice professionals, 45 000 Kn for the preparation and publication of materials and 1 000 000 Kn for the audio-visual equipment. In December 2014, 1 765 000 Kn represented 279 715 USD.80 The global financial report from 2014-2016 expenses revealed that 323 707 USD had been spent from 2014 until October 2016: 43 992 USD were overspent compared to the initial budget. The most important variation (+26%) is the difference between the costs projected for the education of judicial professionals and budget used for this activity. UNICEF explained this difference by an underestimation of this item during program planning and by variation of training costs depending on the time of year. Moreover, the number of trained professionals was higher than initially projected.81 The following table compares the projected budget and the used budget for each set of activities:

79 In December 2014, the exchange rate was 1 USD = 6,31 Kn (31 December 2014). Source: European Central Bank http://freecurrencyrates.com/en/exchange-rate-history/USD-HRK/2014/eucb. In January 2017, the exchange rate was 1 USD for 6,98 Kn.
80 Ibid.
81 See above, Section 3.2.
### Table 9: Projected costs vs Used budget lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Projected costs (USD)</th>
<th>Used budget (USD)</th>
<th>% Variation between projected costs and used budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply of audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>158 479</td>
<td>171 183</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of judicial professionals</td>
<td>114 105</td>
<td>143 653</td>
<td>+26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education materials</td>
<td>7 132</td>
<td>8 871</td>
<td>+24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>279 715</td>
<td>323 707</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the general financial report revealed that the 2014-2016 expenditures had incurred for the following activities:

### Table 10: Used budget lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Used budget (USD)</th>
<th>% of total budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply of audio-visual equipment</td>
<td>171 183</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of judicial professionals</td>
<td>143 653</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education materials</td>
<td>8 871</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis shows that the most important budget lines related to the two main activities of the program component. Firstly, for the supply of audio-visual equipment, 171 183 USD were spent to equip 10 courts. This represents 53% of the total budget. The education of judicial professionals is also an important budget line, representing 44% of the total budget. These two budget lines represent 97% of the total budget. The balance of financial allocations is thus consistent with the program strategy.

Discussions with stakeholders revealed that the company that contracted with UNICEF for the supply of audio-visual equipment was selected following a competitive call for tenders. According to UNICEF’s Operations Officer, the company was selected because it balanced a high-level of functionality with limited budget. Similarly, review of documentation demonstrated that all consultants who participated in the programmatic activities were selected following a competitive call for application for individual consultancy services. According to available documentation, UNICEF selected national consultants from 24 applicants, based on the quality of offers and their success in past assignments.

Based on a comparison of costs in the country, the evaluation consultants consider that the funds that were used to implement the audio-visual component of the program were relatively low, compared to other similar programs. For instance, the 2009 IPA project planned a budget line of 489 000 euros to buy 28 sets of equipment for interviewing children – which represented 17 464 euros or 23 227 USD per set that globally comprises similar equipment. This amount is 35% higher than what was spent in the current project: 17 118 USD per set.

---

82 Based on the exchange rate 1 USD = 6.31 Kn.
83 Based on the exchange rate of January 2009 (when the IPA program started), 1 euro = 1.33 USD. [http://www.x-rates.com/average/?from=EUR&to=USD&amount=1&year=2009](http://www.x-rates.com/average/?from=EUR&to=USD&amount=1&year=2009)
84 For each set of equipment: microphones, headphone, cameras, hard-disc digital recorder, computer, DVD multiplicator and other support equipment (power supply, audio monitoring base station, telemetry keyboard controller, cabling and testing). This does not include the storage device. See details of equipment in IPA (2009).
The costs that were used for the training component are low considering that the following training were organized with 143,000 USD:

- General 3-day training sessions towards 157 judicial professionals;
- Specific 3-day training sessions towards 24 NLCPs;
- Supervision sessions in small groups for 24 NLCPs.

Indeed, according to key stakeholders, the division of roles and responsibilities between UNICEF on one hand and the MoJ and the Judicial Academy on the other hand enabled many activities to be implemented with limited financial resources: the MoJ and the Judicial Academy financially participated in the implementation of training activities, while UNICEF was mostly in charge of training design and implementation, design of publications and supply of audio-visual equipment. Therefore, the evaluation consultants consider that programmatic activities were cost-efficient.

In addition, as will be demonstrated in Section 3.4., it is clear from the discussions with stakeholders that all the supply of audio-visual equipment and the training activities had a direct positive impact, that was directly aligned to the program component’s outputs. This analysis has been confirmed by MoJ representatives, that indicated that they consider that results largely surpass the used resources. The evaluation consultants thus consider that there was a direct link between the funds used and the program component’s outputs.

It must nevertheless be noted that several Judges and State attorney participated in the training, while they are almost never in contact with children, as illustrated in Box 6. This questions the use of resources to reach the output.

This is confirmed by the fact that 14% of Judges and 18% of State attorneys who responded to the on-line questionnaire indicated that they deal with cases involving child victims and witnesses once per 6 months or less, as shows Chart 3 on the next page.

Box 6

“I was picked because we needed to fill the space.” State attorney
This element should, however, be qualified by taking into account that judges can be appointed to deal with cases involving children even though they do not have any prior experience in this field. In one court, even though there were a few judges specifically experienced in such cases, decision was made in 2016 that all sitting judges are now in charge of cases involving child victims and witnesses, regardless of their prior experience. This seems contrary to the current effort to work towards more specialization of judge, as is recommended by the Committee for the Rights of Children. It must be however noted that this element was out of the scope of the program component.

Consequently, the evaluation consultants consider that UNICEF and other stakeholders made good use of the financial and technical resources in implementation of programmatic activities and that programmatic activities were cost-efficient.

How has the implementation of activities been managed, in terms of communication and coordination with stakeholders, quality and use of monitoring system and response to potential delays in implementation?

In terms of communication and coordination, respective roles and responsibilities of UNICEF and the MoJ were detailed in the LoA: UNICEF was mostly in charge of the organization and delivery of the training, the assessment and the supply of audio-visual equipment to courts, and the preparation and publication of materials; whilst the MoJ was responsible for the invitation of judicial professionals, facilitation of the process of equipping courts and developing sustainability mechanisms to carry out continuous education.

85 The establishment of juvenile courts or, where it is not immediately feasible, the appointment of specialized judges or magistrates for dealing with cases of juvenile justice is recommended by the Committee on the Rights of the Child's General Comment n. 10, para. 93
All involved stakeholders (MoJ, Judicial Academy, UNICEF consultants, judicial professionals) praised the excellent quality of communication with UNICEF and the technical support they received from UNICEF team. UNICEF team was always considered as particularly supportive and transparent in its cooperation with other actors.

**In terms of monitoring and quality assurance mechanisms**, although as mentioned above, no written and comprehensive ToC was designed prior or during the implementation of the program component, review of documentation and discussions with UNICEF and key stakeholders revealed that all activities to implement were clear from the start of the program component. This enabled the use of several monitoring tools and quality assurance mechanisms during the course of the program component that were assessed by evaluation consultants:

- Progress of implementation of programmatic activities, based on UNICEF biannual workplans, detailing each set of activities and using a color code depending on their level of implementation (green: completed; yellow: in progress; orange: on hold; red: postponed). UNICEF indicated that this plan is updated at least twice a year.
- Pre- and post-tests towards all training participants. Prior to the training, participants were invited to self-assess the level of their knowledge on 15 items regarding child victims and witnesses on a scale from 1 to 5. The same test was proposed to the participants after the training to assess the level of increase of knowledge, if any. An external analysis of the data was conducted by a poll company: the company established an important increase in knowledge according to participants. According to UNICEF, this increase may have been even more important. Indeed, the topic was new to most participants, who had no clear idea about their previous knowledge on this issue. Therefore, several participants stated that they over-estimated their knowledge before the training.
- A quality assurance system was implemented for the development of publications: brochures and guides for professionals were shared with stakeholders at several levels (MoJ, State attorneys, police, social welfare, experts) for a peer review before their publication. Other UNICEF Country Offices and UNICEF regional office were also consulted during the course of the program component's implementation.
- In order to assess the relevance and functionality of the video equipment, UNICEF first contracted the supplying company for two courts (Zagreb and Split Municipal Courts) and sent out a questionnaire to NLCPs and judges to get their feedback on the first tapings. The questionnaire included seven questions, including, *inter alia*, whether the equipment is discretely positioned and does not interfere with the interview process, the clarity and coherence of sound, the quality of image and the ease of use. The contract was extended to all courts after UNICEF received positive feedback.

---

86 See more information on ToC, Section 1.3.
87 See also Section 3.4.
88 To avoid over-estimation of knowledge before training, one best practice in terms of training evaluation is that participants complete a self-assessment at the end of the training on their knowledge before and after the training; by doing so, they have a point of comparison about the knowledge they gained. Another best practice is to develop a questionnaire with correct and incorrect answers, to be completed before and after the training, to assess the level of increase of correct answers. See recommendations.
feedback from judicial professionals from these two courts, including 6 NLPCs, 2 IT technicians and 1 judge.

➢ The international consultant involved in the training activities also provided feedback following the first training implemented by the national team of consultants towards judicial professionals, to suggest possible improvements for future training sessions.

In terms of delays, discussions with stakeholders revealed that no delay negatively impacted the implementation of the program component.

Consequently, even though no written and comprehensive ToC had been developed prior to program component’s implementation and that the training evaluation system could be improved, the evaluation consultants consider that the implementation of activities has been well managed.

Key findings on Efficiency

➢ The selection of a multidisciplinary and complementary team of consultants to design the training program enabled the training to tackle both psychological and legal issues.
➢ The selection of an international expert who is specialized in both child-friendly procedures and interactive training methods was particularly valuable to the quality of the training.
➢ The implementation of calls for tenders for external companies and consultants guaranteed that the selection was competitive and based on the quality of offers.
➢ The financial participation of national stakeholders participated in the cost-efficiency of the program.
➢ The good communication skills of UNICEF team resulted in a high level of appreciation from their partners, which resulted in an increased consideration and commitment towards the program component.
➢ The lack of written ToC prior or during the implementation of the activities has been balanced by the clear definition of activities from the start of the program component.
➢ Some Judges and State attorneys who are not or only very rarely involved in cases dealing with child victims and witnesses participated in training activities.
➢ The use of self-assessed tests for judicial professionals before and after the training was not fully appropriate, considering the lack of point of comparison on their level of knowledge before the training.
➢ The implementation of quality assurance mechanisms for all activities has resulted in a high quality of implementation.
3.4. Impact

This section addresses the extent to which the program component has contributed to changes of behaviors and practices of judicial professionals, to the development of new practices on the use of audio-visual equipment, to the recognition of the need to provide child-friendly services among decision-makers and professionals, and globally to increased respect of rights of children and protection in criminal proceedings. Unforeseen impacts have been considered in a separate sub-section, at the end of this section.

To what extent did programmatic activities contribute to change of behaviors and practices of legal and non-legal judicial professionals toward child victims and witnesses?

Discussions with training participants revealed that the training resulted in important increase of knowledge on child victims and witnesses, that led to a positive change of their behaviors and practices. This is confirmed by the analysis of the 149 evaluation sheets, based on participants' self-assessment of their knowledge on a scale of 1 to 5 before and after training, that reveals an increase of knowledge on all aspects of the education:

Chart 4: Participants’ self-assessment of knowledge before and after the training

---

89 This evaluation has been done by the poll company IPSOS in 2015. The graph was translated into English by the consultants during the evaluation. It must be noted, however, that there have been reports of over-estimation of knowledge before the training. See more information in Section 3.3.
➢ Avoiding contact between children and the defendant

The percentage of trained professionals who responded to the on-line questionnaire and who consider it is “very important” that “a child avoids contact with the defendant during trial” significantly increased\(^\text{90}\): the rate is 98% after the training, versus 80% before the training:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Chart 5: Level of importance given to the fact that a child should avoid any contact with the defendant during trial (before and after training)}\(^\text{91}\)
\end{itemize}

This change of behavior was substantiated during the interviews with judicial professionals.

➢ Preparation of interviews with children

UNICEF experts in charge of supervision, who watched footages of hearings, confirmed the positive change of practices of NLCPS. They reported that it was obvious that NLCPS now prepare their interviews with children in advance and that they manage to establish a real contact with children. NLCPS confirmed that they take more time to prepare the interviews: one NLCP for instance indicated that she sometimes goes the children’s house if necessary; another one explained that she asks the parents and the child to come twice to the court in order to have a meeting with them prior to the day of the interview. This is confirmed by NLCPS who responded to the questionnaire: the percentage of NLCPS who always prepare the interviews with children in advance increased from 14% before the training to 57% after the training. At the same time, the percentage of NLCPS who only rarely prepare the interview in advance decreased from 57% before the training to 0% after the training:

\(^{90}\) See calculation methods for significance in Section 2.2.1. The same method has been used throughout the report.

\(^{91}\) n1 before training=44, n2 after training=42
To prepare children, 100% of NLCPs respondents (N=7) indicated that they provided brochures to children and to their parents or guardians. However, as mentioned above, NLCPs could not systematically disseminate brochures because they were not provided with enough copies and did not know they could ask for more. Children or their parents or guardians thus read the brochure at the court and give it back. In one court, the NCLPs photocopied the brochure to provide it to children and their parents or guardians. This situation will soon be corrected: according to UNICEF, more than 2 000 brochures will be disseminated in the next few months. It must, however, be noted that in some cases, the preparation of the child takes place the same day than the interview, which limits the usefulness of providing a brochure at this stage in the judicial process.

➢ The specificity of the interview process

All interviewed trained stakeholders reported a positive change on how they talk to children, as demonstrated in Box 7.

This is confirmed by the fact that the rate of professionals who consider “very important” that the “same questions should not be asked several times to children” significantly increased from 32% before the training to 61% after the training.

Box 7

try to ask all the right questions and to be concise and precise at the first interview. This has lowered possibility of secondary victimization.” State attorney

---

92 See Section 3.2. Effectiveness.
Interviews and focus groups with trained NCLPs and consultants revealed that the program component strongly contributed to the standardization of procedures when interviewing children, as a result of training on the NICDH protocol and supervision. This enabled NCLPs to step back and reflect on their mistakes, which is essential to improve their practices. One person in charge of supervision gave the example of a NLC who realized she was uncomfortable after the child mentioned the word “penis” and that this discomfort had an impact on the quality of the interview.

In some courts, NCLPs reported that judges deeply changed their behaviors towards them, which increased the level of cooperation and interaction between stakeholders. Most judges indicated that they learned about the value of NCLPs. Some NCLPs stated that they discuss with judges on cases before the interview, to make sure they understand the specificity of each case. This practice is, however, not widespread.

It must be noted that several NCLPs indicated that a few judges still interfere with the interview process: those judges insist that questions are asked the way they formulate them or interrupt the NCLP during interview. This practice has been reported on a few judges who were trained. It must however be noted that this depends deeply on the judge: some trained judges are reluctant to provide more space to NCLPs, while others on the contrary allow more freedom and respect to NCLPs as a result of the training (see Box 8).

When judges interfere with the process, several NCLPs reported that they remove the headset until the child becomes calmer, and put it back afterwards to resume the

---

Box 8

“One judge put some pressure. While the child is spontaneously narrating the story, the judge interrupts […] One other judge allows more freedom to follow the protocol, he would say “colleague, please proceed”.” NLC

---

93 n1 before training=n2 after training=44
interview. As a result of the training, NLCPs thus learned new mechanisms to conduct the interview with less interference. NLCPs also reported an increase of their self-confidence as a result of the training and supervision.

- Limiting the number of interviews

Most trained professionals indicated that they now try as much as possible to limit the number of interviews of child victims and witnesses: the percentage of trained participants who consider that it is “very important” that “children testify only once, exceptionally twice, during criminal proceedings” significantly increased from 61% before the training to 95% after the training:

**Chart 8: Level of importance given to the fact that a child should testify only once, exceptionally twice, during criminal proceedings (before and after training)**

Several State attorneys reported that they avoid questioning the interview of children, which is a new phenomenon. Indeed, in the vast majority of courts, interviewed trained professionals from different background indicate that there are almost no repeated interviews of children, which is a great achievement of the program component.

Nevertheless, despite the globally applauded training quality, several interviewed judicial professionals stated that a few judges continue to interview children more than once. Some professionals explained that several judges prefer to interview children themselves, despite the “exceptional” nature of the second interview according to the legislation. In most cases, the repetition of the interview is due to requests from lawyers, who complain to the judge that questions are reformulated by NLCP. In a few cases, judges decided to organize additional hearings (Box 9).

---

**Box 9**

“Even though we try to avoid repeated interviews, it still happens. Usually the lawyers insist on that. I personally think that the initial interviews were great and that the repetition was not necessary, but the lawyers insisted and the judges agreed to it.” NLCP

---

94 n1 before training=44. n2 after training=43
Main limitation to the impact

Although the training participants’ selection process was designed to ensure the availability and interest of justice professionals, discussions with trained stakeholders revealed that many judges who are often in contact with children, particularly investigative judges, did not register to participate in the training, as is illustrated in Box 10. Reversely, as mentioned above95, some Judges and State attorneys who were not involved in such cases participated in the training. This has been reported by stakeholders at all levels.

Conclusion on impact of judicial professional

It is clear from the discussions with trained judicial professionals that the training had a positive impact on their behaviors. Most Judges, State attorneys and NLCPs also demonstrate a positive change of their practices. Overall, 21% of judicial professionals who responded to the on-line questionnaire indicated that they “always” minimize secondary victimization of children during criminal proceedings as a result of the training and 57% of judicial professionals answered that they “most of the time” minimize secondary victimization:

Chart 9: Frequency of minimization of secondary victimization of children during criminal proceedings as a result of the training

This is an important achievement of the program component, considering that this was the first comprehensive training that was organized on this matter. There is, however, still room for improvement, particularly for legal professionals. It must be noted that judicial professionals participated in only one training, contrary to NLCPs who participated in two training sessions and in a supervision. The need for additional training sessions for legal

95 See Section 3.3.
professionals was highlighted by many NLCPs, Judges and State attorneys, who indicated that the training was not sufficient to deeply change practices.

**To what extent did programmatic activities contribute to change of behaviors and practices of legal and non-legal judicial professionals regarding gender and equity dimensions?**

As mentioned in Section 3.1., the issues of sexual violence, gender bias and equity dimensions were taken into consideration during the design and implementation of programmatic activities.

Many judicial professionals reported that they learned several elements regarding children's development phases. They learned, for instance, that testimonies of young children can be considered as reliable evidence. Nevertheless, only a limited number of interviewed judicial professionals, whether legal or non-legal professionals, remembered that the specificity of interviewing CWD or the issue of gender bias in proceedings was particularly considered. Some NLCPs asked that the issue of interviewing children with intellectual disabilities be taken into consideration in the future.

Consequently, although the program was not intended to directly tackle gender and equity issues, the evaluation consultants consider that training activities had an impact – although very limited - on the consideration of gender and equity dimensions when interviewing children. This limited impact has reached all courts, whether in urban or more remote areas.

**To what extent did programmatic activities contribute to new practices regarding the use of audio-visual equipment when interviewing children?**

Discussions with IT technicians and trained professionals revealed that the new audio-visual equipment is systematically used in cases involving child victims and witnesses, as prescribed by law. As mentioned in Section 3.1., this was not always the case prior to the supply of the equipment. This is thus a new practice in several courts. Discussions with IT technicians and NLCPs however revealed that they do not systematically record the number of interviews conducted. This has not been projected by the program component. Due to the lack of data monitoring system at court level, the evaluation team has not been able to assess the exact number of children who benefited from this new equipment. However, estimations were provided by court staff during the evaluation mission.

Several interviewed judicial professionals explained that they used to repeat children's interviews due to serious technical shortcomings in the previous equipment. As a result of the supply of the audio-visual equipment, technical difficulties are a ground for re-
taping in much fewer cases: occurrences of repeated interviews have been reported due to technical issues only when there is a difficulty in recording (see Box 11). The supply of audio-visual equipment has thus contributed to the prevention of repeated interviews of children.

Judicial professionals also reported that they tried to connect several courts using the audio-visual equipment, in cases where a child, who is located in another city, needs to come to court. This situation involves the payment of transportation costs. The MoJ indicated that this was technically possible, but that the bandwidth between courts does not enable this system. The number of such cases is, however, very limited.

Based on the above, the evaluation consultants consider that the supply of the video-equipment has strongly contributed to improve practices of judicial professionals when interviewing children.

Is there any difference in the use of audio-visual equipment based on gender or equity dimensions?

All involved stakeholders indicated that the audio-visual equipment is used for all cases involving child victims and witnesses, regardless of gender, origin or disability group. It must be however noted that the lack of a monitoring system at court level prevents the precise assessment of number of interviews or children benefiting from the equipment, disaggregated by gender, age and disability group.

It must be noted that, due to the young age of the child or due to the importance of a child's intellectual disability, some interviews take place out of the courts in more specialized institutions, particularly in the Child Protection Centre of Zagreb. This possibility is provided for by the Juvenile Court Act, that allows the interview of a child outside the court if there is a special equipment in place. Discussions revealed that this opportunity has been used a few times in Zagreb. This practice is in the best interests of the child and is fully consistent with international best practices and standards relating to child-sensitive justice.

It is also important to note that some courts go beyond what is prescribed by law: although it is not compulsory to use video equipment for children

---

Box 11

“Before, the quality of the footage was not good, so judges would not use the system systematically.” State attorney

“I was working as a judge before the new equipment was installed and I know how it was before. We had to re-tape the interviews of children due to the old equipment. Since we have the new equipment, we only re-tape one interview.” Judge

Box 12

“For children up to 16, we definitely use it all the times. When it is a case of sexual assault or a CWD, we use it up to 18.” NLCP

“Now we use it systematically even when we are not bound to use it legally.” NLCP

---

96 For more details, see above Section 3.2.
above 16 years old\textsuperscript{97}, several courts indicated that they use the equipment for cases involving children until 18, as is illustrated in Box 12.

Therefore, despite the lack of precise and disaggregated data, the evaluation consultants consider that the audio-visual equipment is used in all cases, and that the only difference in the use of the equipment based on equity dimensions is done in the best interests of the child.

To what extent did programmatic activities contribute to the recognition among decision-makers and professionals of the need for providing child-friendly services to child victims and witnesses of crimes?

As mentioned in Section 3.2., new NLCPs, transferred from the CSW, were designated to work in four courts. The evaluation consultants consider that the approach that was used to ensure that at least one NLCP is located in each County Court, despite the prohibition of new employment in public institutions, demonstrates strong ownership of the MoJ regarding the program component's objectives. Moreover, it showed that the need to prioritize the issue of child-friendly justice was recognized by stakeholders at the highest level. This is an important achievement of the program component.

This analysis was confirmed by high representatives of the MoJ, who indicated that they are advocating to include the training on child victims and witnesses as part of the mandatory curricula for professionals and continuous training, through the involvement of the Judicial Academy. Nevertheless, despite several discussions with the Judicial Academy to this end, the Judicial Academy revealed that the need to organize continuous training has been heard and recognized but that training on this topic is not planned in 2017. Judicial Academy representatives explained that they are not the ones in charge of selecting the topics but can only make suggestions. All training needs are reviewed every year by a Board, composed of 12 high-level representatives of several courts in the country. The Program Board is the instance that could decide to include a training on child victims and witnesses in criminal courts. Discussions with the Judicial Academy revealed that, although child-friendly justice in criminal proceedings was included in the list of suggestions, this training has not been selected in the training agenda for 2017. The needs in terms of training for judicial professionals in the country are indeed important and the issue of child-friendly justice in criminal matters has not been considered a priority. Nevertheless, it must be stressed that the Judicial Academy indicated that child-friendly justice in civil matters is embedded in the 2017 agenda.

It is also important to take into account that the Judicial Academy stated that the training, as was developed by UNICEF consultants, was too lengthy. The Judicial Academy explained that they are reluctant to organize training exceeding 2 days because of financial constraints. It is important to note that discussions are still ongoing with the Judicial Academy in this regard.

\textsuperscript{97} See above, Section 1.1.
Based on the above, the evaluation consultants consider that the programmatic activities have managed to scale-up the issue of child-friendly justice towards child victims and witnesses of crimes throughout Croatia. It is clear that new human resources have been allocated to child-friendly justice. Nevertheless, training sessions have not been included in the Judicial Academy’s curricula so far.\textsuperscript{98}

**To what extent did the program component globally contribute to increased respect of rights of children and protection in criminal proceedings?**

The Committee on the Rights of the Child provides for a number of fundamental principles when dealing with Juvenile Justice, namely non-discrimination, protection of the best interests of the child, the right to life, survival and development, the right to be heard and dignity.\textsuperscript{99} In the framework of the program component, the evaluation consultants particularly considered the protection of the best interests of the child, the right to be heard and non-discrimination – the latter principle was previously assessed in preceding sections.

- **Best interests of the child**

As provided in the CRC, *“in all actions concerning children, whether undertaken by public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies, the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration.”*\textsuperscript{100} This provision has been detailed by the Committee on the Rights of the Child, that stated that, *“for rights to have meaning, […] States need to give particular attention to ensuring that there are effective, child-sensitive procedures available to children and their representatives”*\textsuperscript{101} and that *“child victims of violence should be treated in a child-friendly and sensitive manner throughout the justice process, taking into account their personal situation, needs, age, gender, disability and level of maturity and fully respecting their physical, mental and moral integrity.”*\textsuperscript{102}

Discussions with judicial professionals revealed that programmatic activities globally resulted in decreased occurrences of secondary victimization of children in courts. As mentioned above, the training and increase of knowledge of judges and State attorneys led to children being less often interviewed in courts. Moreover, due to the supply of new and more reliable equipment, interviews are less often re-taped, even though a few technical errors still occur.

UNICEF experts who watched NCLPs’ interviews footages indicated that the programmatic activities directly resulted in a decrease of anxiety in children. This was also confirmed by several judicial professionals, who reported that children are now more relaxed and more talkative.

\textsuperscript{98} See also more information on sustainability, Section 3.5.
\textsuperscript{99} Committee of the Rights of the Child, General comment n. 10, para 6-13.
\textsuperscript{100} Article 3.1, Convention on the Rights of the Child.
\textsuperscript{101} Committee on the Rights of the Child, General comment n. 5, para 24.
\textsuperscript{102} Committee on the Rights of the Child, General comment n. 13, para 54.
However, some issues should be considered to fully achieve the program component’s outcome. Firstly, the program component could only tackle a few elements regarding secondary victimization in courts. The program component adequately addressed the need to avoid contact between child victims and witnesses and the defendant through the supply of video equipment and professionals’ training. Nevertheless, a few NLCPs indicated that, despite the use of video material, some children are requested to come to the courtroom to sign the transcript at the end of the interview, even though the defendant is present in the courtroom. Additional training is required towards judges to avoid such practices.

Secondly, NLCPs reported that some judges request them to present the psychophysical abilities of the child and his/her level of development at the beginning of the interview, while the child could hear it. This could lead to frustration from the child and subsequent lack of trust in the NLCPs during the interview.

Thirdly, as mentioned above, video recordings may be re-taped following a request of lawyers. Although it is for the judge to refuse to repeat children’s interviews if they consider that the first interview was conducted in an appropriate manner, several judicial professionals indicated that they wish that lawyers receive additional training in these matters.

➢ The right to be heard

According to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, the right to be heard encompasses the concept of child’s participation.103 The Committee on the Rights of the Child provided that “the right of the child victim and witness is [...] linked to the right to be informed about issues such as [...] the role of a child victim and/or witness, the ways in which “questioning” is conducted, existing support mechanisms in place for the child when submitting a complaint and participating in investigations and court proceedings, the specific places and times of hearings...”104

In this regard, the increased capacities of NLCPs and the dissemination of brochures to children and parents to several professionals involved in child victims and witnesses projected to increase the children’s right to be informed and participate in the process. As mentioned above, discussions with NLCPs revealed that they strongly increased their level of discussions with children before the interviews as a result of the program component. It must nevertheless be stressed that brochures are mostly shown but not disseminated to children, parents or guardians in police or NLCP’s offices, due to insufficient number of copies. As mentioned above, UNICEF indicated that this situation, caused by an underestimation of needs and some miscommunication, will soon be corrected.

103 Committee on the Rights of the Child, General comment n. 12, para. 13
104 Ibid, para. 64.
Moreover, except police officers that have been trained in the 2009 IPA program\textsuperscript{105}, many other professionals outside the judicial system are still not trained and discuss with the child at one point without properly informing the child. Judicial professionals indicated that some professionals, specifically healthcare professionals and CSW, revictimize the child because of a lack of training. According to several NLCPs and judges, this has led in some cases, to a refusal of some parents that their child be interviewed in court.

➢ Conclusion on the respect of rights of children and protection in criminal proceedings

The evaluation consultants consider that the program component has directly contributed to enhanced consideration of the best interests of the child in criminal matters. In addition, children are more informed of the processes, which also positively contributes to a certain extent to their right to be heard. Consequently, despite several areas for improvement, the evaluation consultants that the program component contributed to increased respect of rights of children and protection in criminal proceedings.

Have the activities of the project resulted in negative and/or unforeseen impacts?

Some rooms where the interviews of children take place are more appropriate compared to the situation prior to the intervention. Indeed, even though it was not initially intended in the program component, several judicial professionals requested more appropriate rooms to carry out interviews with children, as a result of the programmatic activities. In a few courts, including Bjelovar, Rijeka and Varaždin, new rooms were designated to interview children. In the case of Rijeka for instance, although the new room dedicated for the interviews does not appear fully adequate\textsuperscript{106}, the change of room was particularly appropriate considering that interviews were previously taking place in a room dedicated for postal services. Interviews were often interrupted by people entering the room. In Osijek, the court was under renovation when the evaluation field mission took place, and judicial professionals reported that it is expected that the location of the new interview room prevents any meeting with the children and the defendant. In Sisak and Varaždin, a special entrance was dedicated for children to avoid contact with the defendant. This is a positive unforeseen impact of the program. Nevertheless, it must be noted that this unforeseen impact is not widespread in all courts. Some rooms that the evaluation team observed remain inappropriate to interview children.\textsuperscript{107}

Observation in courts also revealed that video equipment is sometimes located in a building that comprises both a County Court and a Municipal Court. In such cases, the impact of the supply of video equipment exceeds what was initially projected because the system is used for both courts in cases of child victims and witnesses.

\textsuperscript{105} According to interviewed judicial professionals, the police training was of very good quality.

\textsuperscript{106} The room is the office of the NLCP, that is shared with another judicial professional.

\textsuperscript{107} For instance, the interview room for children in Velika Gorica is the room of one judge, who has to leave his office each time that there is an interview.
It must also be noted that judicial professionals reported that the audio-visual material was used beyond the scope of interviews of child victims and witnesses. Almost all courts professionals indicated that they use the audio-visual material in some cases of sexual assault involving vulnerable adults, such as adult victims with disabilities. The evaluation consultants consider that, even though the material was intended to target only child victims and witnesses, the use of this material by courts for cases involving vulnerable victims contributes to the impact of the program component and is an adequate response, as long as it does not interfere with interviews of child victims and witnesses.

Although many judges do not interview the child several times as a result of the training, several interviewed professionals indicated that they sometimes ask for an additional assessment done by an external forensic expert, to guarantee that the child’s testimony is reliable. This practice has been reported by some key stakeholders and judicial professionals from several courts.

Judicial professionals stated that, in some cases, the judge asks that a forensic expert makes a judgement based on the video tape of the interview. In other cases, the judge asks that the child physically discusses with the forensic expert. One trained judge for instance indicated that he does not consider this as an additional interview, because the expert does not ask specific questions on the criminal act. It is important to note that this practice results in yet another contact between the child and an expert and is to be avoided, to avoid secondary victimization, according to best practices.108

As is illustrated in Box 13, this practice has been reported as more frequent since there is no repeated hearing: judges indicated that they are reluctant to take a decision based only on one testimony. This is an unintended negative impact of the program component.

**Box 13**

“I deal with serious cases. It is a common practice that testimonies of children are assessed by a psychologist.” State attorney

“I see more often the practice of new interview of children with a psychologist after the hearing. In any serious act, it would be important to assess the reliability of witnesses, [to assess] if the child as a pathology, or if he remembers properly. Sometimes, the psychologists would look at the video link, sometime there would be a discussion with the child. They do not ask specific details on the crime, so it does not re-traumatize the child.” Judge

Key findings on Impact

- The good quality of training design has led to strong increase of knowledge, which led to positive change in trainees’ behaviors and practices towards child victims and witnesses.
- The training activities resulted in a decrease of repetition of children’s interviews, although the training was not always sufficient to change the practices of all targeted legal judicial professionals. Particularly, some occurrences of secondary victimization are still reported: interference during interview, repetition of interviews following requests from lawyers, request that the child comes to the

---

108 See for instance, EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (2017), Child-friendly justice - Perspectives and experiences of children involved in judicial proceedings as victims, witnesses or parties in nine EU Member States.
courtroom after the testimony and increased cases of requests for external forensic assessments of the child.

➢ The participation of NLCPs with legal professionals together in the training resulted in increased cooperation and appreciation of each other's work.

➢ The lawyers' lack of awareness and lack of training on child victims and witnesses leads to repeated interviews, if the judge allows it.

➢ The selection procedure used for the training of judicial professionals did not ensure the participation of all judges dealing with cases involving child victims and witnesses, particularly investigative judges.

➢ The consideration of equity dimensions, particularly regarding CWD, through video footages and discussions during training was not sufficient to change behaviors and practices of judicial professionals.

➢ The lack of monitoring tool to assess the number of children benefiting from the program component prevented the assessment of the impact of the program with quantitative data. Moreover, the lack of disaggregation prevented the analysis of data along gender and equity lines.

➢ The supply of audio-visual equipment resulted in interviews with children being systematic used and recorded in all cases prescribed by law. In addition, due to the supply of equipment and training sessions, the audio-visual material is more widely used for older children, although it is not prescribed by law, which demonstrates ownership.

➢ The supply of audio-visual equipment to buildings that comprise both a County Court and a Municipal Court resulted in the material being used in both courts, which multiplied the impact of the program component.

➢ The level of involvement of the Judicial Academy in the training design, particularly in terms of format, length, funding and advocacy, was not sufficient to result in a strong commitment of this institution considering the training needs for judicial professionals in the country.

➢ Commitment of judicial professionals as a result of the training led in some cases to the identification of new and more appropriate rooms in courts to interview child victims and witnesses, and in a few instances, to the use of separate entrances between children and the defendant to avoid contact during proceedings.

➢ Secondary victimization of children continues occurring outside the courts, particularly by CSW and healthcare professionals.
3.5. Sustainability

The section on sustainability analyzes if the program component has included an appropriate sustainability strategy and what is the potential for continuation of the activities and of stakeholders’ commitments. The key factors that influence program component's sustainability are cross-cutting issues that have been assessed in the following sub-sections.

**Did programmatic activities include appropriate sustainability strategy?**

Discussions with key stakeholders and UNICEF, and review of documents, revealed that high-level discussions were implemented with the MoJ since the very beginning of the program component's implementation. As mentioned in Section 3.1., all activities were co-designed and co-implemented with the MoJ and discussed with the Ombudsman for Children. This approach aimed to ensure that the intervention is subsequently led by national stakeholders, through a strong ownership of governmental authorities and decision-makers.

Moreover, the LoA included several provisions that were designed to ensure sustainability. According to the LoA, full ownership of the audio-visual equipment was to be given to the MoJ upon the satisfactory installation and initial use of the equipment. The LoA also provided that the MoJ has the right to use educational curriculum and all training materials developed by UNICEF.

In addition, discussions revealed that the Judicial Academy was involved in two training sessions, which aimed to ensure the continuation of training activities after 2016. UNICEF covered the costs of the training, while the Judicial Academy invited participants and dealt with logistical issues.

Based on the above, the evaluation consultants consider that programmatic activities included appropriate sustainability strategy during design phase.

**To what extent has UNICEF been able to support its partners in developing capacities and establishing mechanisms to ensure continuation of activities?**

**To what extent is stakeholders’ commitment likely to continue beyond the end of the intervention?**

**Regarding judicial professionals,** all trained professionals indicated that they now apply, at least to a certain extent, the knowledge they gained from the training and that they changed their practices towards children. This is particularly important considering that the evaluation is taking place one to two years after the initial training. Participants still apply their knowledge, which demonstrates sustainability.

Nevertheless, most trained professionals mentioned that there is a need to organize continuous training in this regard. Indeed, as mentioned in Section 3.4., there are still gaps in the training of judicial professionals. Moreover, several judges have not been trained...
because they have not registered in the training program. This is also due to the fact that there is an important turn-over of judges that is outside of the scope of the program component.

**Regarding the audio-visual material** that was provided to 8 County Courts and 2 Municipal Courts, observation and discussions with professionals revealed that the audio-visual equipment is currently used in all cases involving child victims and witnesses. This has been made possible thanks to the combination of approaches that were used: training was directly complementary to the supply of audio-visual equipment.

It must be stressed that UNICEF included a 5-year maintenance provision following the supply of equipment to guarantee its maintenance. It is also important to note that it is clear to the MoJ that they will take care of the audio-visual equipment after the end of the 5-year maintenance contract. Discussions with MoJ representatives revealed that they consider the audio-visual equipment as their own and are thus willing to be in charge of its maintenance after the expiration of the 5-year maintenance phase. The material will most likely be used and maintained in the future.

**Regarding high-level authorities**, key stakeholders are positively considering implementing future activities pertaining to child victims and witnesses. They indicated that the program component managed to scale-up the issue of child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings and envision to strengthen the results that were achieved in the last years.

Firstly, the employment of social workers in four courts as NLCPs contributes to the long-term consideration of child-friendly justice in these courts.

Moreover, as mentioned in Sections 1.1. and 3.2., and although it is not within the scope of the program component, the future transfer of video equipment bought in the framework of the 2009 IPA project from the MoI to the MoJ is a factor of expansion of the program component. Stakeholders indicated that, following the signing of the agreement with the MoI, which occurred in February 2017, 28 sets of equipment will be transferred to the MoJ. It is projected that one set will be transferred to the Judicial Academy and the 27 remaining to the courts. The supply of new material transferred from the MoI to the MoJ is likely to have a positive impact on child-friendly justice, depending on the method that will be used to select courts that will benefit from the equipment.\(^{109}\)

In addition, the MoJ indicated that it wishes to continue to train professionals in this field. Nevertheless, at the time of the evaluation and as mentioned in Section 3.4., programmatic activities with the Judicial Academy aiming at sustainability of training after 2016 have not been successful so far: the training on child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings has not been included in the Judicial Academy's 2017 agenda. This is an important point of concern.

\(^{109}\) Some factors could be taken into consideration, such as the quality of existing material or the number of cases involving child victims and witnesses.
Nonetheless, the evaluation consultants positively note that discussions are still underway between UNICEF, the MoJ and then Judicial Academy, and will continue. These ongoing discussions are consistent with the new 2017-2021 UNICEF Strategy Note for Croatia Child Protection Program Component: "the county program aims to increase capacities of policy makers, child protection and justice professionals for effective implementation and monitoring of child-friendly and gender-sensitive justice...".

Discussions with UNICEF and review of literature revealed that the Judicial Academy is one key partner for this future activity.

Consequently, it is clear that the judicial professionals and the MoJ's commitments will continue beyond 2016, and that UNICEF has adequately supported judicial professionals and courts in developing their capacities. However, the program component has not managed to ensure the continuation of training on child victims and witnesses so far, which is essential for the sustainability of activities.

Key findings on Sustainability

➢ The consideration of sustainability from the very start of the program component's implementation resulted in a high involvement and participation of the MoJ. This has led to a strong commitment that is likely to continue after 2016.
➢ The including of a provision on the transfer of ownership of audio-visual material at the beginning of the implementation ensured a high level of commitment and ownership of the MoJ in this activity.
➢ The training activities resulted in concrete changes of practices of the majority of trained judicial professionals when dealing with child victims and witnesses, that are reflected one two years after the initial training.
➢ The lack of consideration of training activities on child victims and witnesses by the Judicial Academy in 2017 prevents the training activities to be continuous, which will have a negative effect on the sustainability of the program component if high-level additional discussions in this regard are not conducted.

---

4. CONCLUSION

This section provides additional information on the program component’s main strengths and weaknesses and further reflections on child-friendly justice in Croatia.

All programmatic activities were highly relevant to the national context and fully aligned with international practices regarding child-friendly justice. The program component was a joint initiative between UNICEF and the national authorities (MoJ). The full involvement and participation of the MoJ in the design, implementation and funding of the program component contributed to the relevance of the intervention. Moreover, UNICEF is the only external institution that has financially supported the system of justice for children since 2013, which strongly adds to the relevance of the intervention. The supply of audio-visual equipment and training of judicial professionals were projected to reduce the repetition of interviews of children victims and witnesses. Legal and non-legal judicial professionals lacked knowledge on child-friendly justice, especially on the issue of child victims and witnesses of crimes: the training was the first comprehensive training on children victims and witnesses in which legal judicial professionals participated. The implementation of training sessions towards professionals who have never been trained ensured that the training was particularly valuable. The use of an adequate combination of approaches towards the issue of child victims and witnesses in courts reinforced the relevance of the program component. Although the program component was not intended to target specifically gender and equity dimensions, results demonstrate that these issues have been taken into consideration in programmatic activities.

The program component was effective. One general 3-day training “Child-sensitive treatment of children victims and witnesses of crime” was delivered to 157 Judges, State Attorneys, NLCPs and a few other professionals, which exceeds the initial projection of 110 participants. The quality of the training was assessed was excellent, due to the use of a multiplicity of approaches used in training activities, including theoretical presentations, using video footages and practical exercises comprising role plays. The use of interactive exercises implemented in groups composed of different categories of professionals ensured that training participants remained active throughout the training and led to an increased understanding of other professionals’ roles and challenges in court. Another training, titled “Child-sensitive interviewing”, together with supervision sessions, were conducted with all NLCPs throughout the country, which resulted in an additional increase of their capacities. The supervision sessions carried out were a very valuable complement to training sessions. Capacity development activities were completed by the dissemination of child-friendly brochures for children and parents and booklets and the translation of one reference handbook on child-friendly justice. Audio-visual equipment was also provided to 10 courts. The evaluation demonstrated that this high-quality material is used in all courts. Although it functions generally fine, there are some issues with the recording device, which results in re-interviewing the child in a few cases. Nevertheless, in all courts, the new system is assessed as a better system than the previous one. Moreover, several activities were implemented to increase the capacities of the MoJ and the Judicial Academy on child-friendly procedures within the judicial system.
The program component was generally **efficient**. The level of qualification of UNICEF team, consultants and key stakeholders was very high and all profiles were complementary and adapted to the implementation of the program component: both psychological and legal issues were addressed, which was considered particularly valuable to judicial professionals. All stakeholders praised the excellent quality of communication with UNICEF and the technical support they received from its team. Compared to other programs, funds that were used to implement the programmatic activities were relatively low. This is partly due to the high level of participation of governmental authorities in the implementation of the activities. However, some Judges and State Attorneys who are only very rarely in contact with children were trained. The implementation of activities has been generally well managed, even though there was no written logical model: several tools were implemented to assess the level of achievement of activities; a quality insurance system was implemented for all activities; and no delay negatively impacted the implementation of the program component.

The **impact** of the program component was important. Training of judicial professionals resulted in an important increase of knowledge on children victims and witnesses that led to a positive change of their behaviors and practices towards children during interviews, despite a few shortcomings. Shortcomings include interference from judges during interview, request that the child comes to the courtroom after the testimony and increased cases of requests for external forensic assessments of the child. In the vast majority of courts, interviewed trained professionals indicated that there is almost no repeated interview for children. However, several judges who are often in contact with child victims and witnesses – particularly investigative judges – have not participated in training sessions, as a result of the open procedure to select training participants. This lack of training has led to the repetition of interviews for children, mostly at the request of lawyers. The joint participation of NLCPs and legal professionals during training sessions has shown positive impact in terms of increased cooperation and appreciation of each other's work, which contributes to the improvement of the child-friendly justice. The new audio-visual equipment is systematically used in cases involving child victims and witnesses. The combination of supply of long-lasting high-quality audio-visual equipment for 10 courts and training of 158 judicial professionals throughout the country successfully managed to reduce the repetition of interviews of child victims and witnesses by most trained professionals. Although the lack of monitoring tool in courts prevented the evaluation team to assess the number of final beneficiaries, and to analyze this data along gender and equity lines, findings showed that these positive results target all groups of children victims and witnesses of crimes, namely girls and boys, children with and without disabilities, and generally at least all children below 16 years. At court level, it must be positively noted that the program component had an impact beyond its scope. The audio-visual material is sometimes used for older children, although it is not prescribed by law. Moreover, new and more appropriate rooms have been identified in some courts to interview children. Programmatic activities also managed, to a certain extent, to scale-up the issue of child-friendly justice towards child victims and witnesses and has led to a better recognition of the need to provide child-friendly services. However, the level of involvement of the Judicial Academy in the training design, particularly in
terms of format, length, funding and advocacy, was not sufficient to result in a strong commitment of this institution, considering the important training needs for judicial professionals in the country. Overall, although the need for additional training of Judges and other professionals has been widely highlighted, programmatic activities resulted in decreased occurrences of secondary victimization of children in criminal courts. The program component has directly contributed to enhanced consideration of the best interests of the child in criminal matters and, to a certain extent, to their right to be heard.

The gains in judicial professionals’ behaviors and practices towards children during interviews are sustainable: the change of behaviors and practices could still be observed one to two years after the training took place. Nevertheless, at the time of the evaluation, the Judicial Academy has shown interest in training activities but had not included the training on child victims and witnesses of crimes in its training agenda, while additional training activities are needed in terms of continuous training of judicial professionals who have been previously trained and of initial training of judicial professionals who had not been trained. However, the consideration of sustainability from the very start of the program component’s implementation resulted in a high involvement and participation of the MoJ, which is likely to continue after 2016. In this regard, the ongoing discussions between UNICEF, the MoJ and the Judicial Academy are welcome.

In conclusion, based on a review of literature, discussions with UNICEF, key stakeholders, training participants, IT technicians, and on-line questionnaires results, this report shows that the program component has successfully strengthened the justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings. The program component provided a great opportunity to scale-up the issue of child-friendly justice in the county. The importance of child-friendly justice has been highlighted in the justice system and standardization of procedures became a reality in the justice system.

Although it is not within the evaluation scope, international best practices recommend that children’s interviews be preferably conducted outside the court. Croatian legislation allows out-of-court interviews for children if audio-visual equipment is used. This option has been used in Zagreb by a few judges, but it required that the judge leaves his/her courtroom to sit in a facility outside the court. One other option is to upgrade the existing audio-visual material and use it to link the courtroom on one hand, and the facility with compatible material outside the court on the other. According to interviewed judicial professionals, this option has not been tested nor used so far. This could be beneficial for all children, and particularly for children of vulnerable groups, such as CWD or young children.

On a more general level, it must be stressed that the program component has focused particularly on child-friendly justice in criminal matters, while child-friendly justice in civil matters remains problematic according to several interviewed stakeholders, considering that audio-visual material is not used in such cases. The evaluation consultants note that this issue has been included in the next 2017-2021 UNICEF Strategy Note.
5. LESSONS LEARNED

The evaluation team identified four main lessons learned.

➢ Participation of national stakeholders is key to the program component’s performance
The MoJ’s active participation and full involvement in the design and implementation of activities ensured that programmatic activities were relevant to needs of judicial system. One important factor was the good communication skills of the UNICEF team, resulting in a high level of appreciation from their partners, and in increased consideration of and commitment to the program component. Moreover, the financial participation of national stakeholders contributed to the program’s cost-efficiency. As a lesson learned from this program, in any new program, the level of operational and financial participation of national stakeholders should be maintained from the design phase and throughout the implementation phase, as it contributes to the programs’ good performance.

➢ An open non-mandatory selection procedure for training does not ensure participation of all target groups
The invitation process that was used for the training of judicial professionals did not ensure the participation of all judges dealing with cases involving child victims and witnesses: judges who are only rarely in contact with the children participated in the training, while others who are in regular contact with them did not register. As a lesson learned from this program, in any new program comprising training sessions, special attention should be paid to the trainee selection process, to ensure that the participation of professionals is based on their role in the future implementation of the training knowledge.

➢ One training course, despite its high quality, is not sufficient to fully change training participants’ practices
The use of practical and interactive exercises, such as role playing, ensured that training participants remained active throughout the training and led to an increased understanding of other professionals’ roles and challenges. The participatory nature of the training design has led to a strong increase in knowledge, and thus to a positive change in trainees’ behaviors and practices towards child victims and witnesses; these changes are likely to be long-term. Moreover, the participation of all relevant stakeholders in the training sessions, namely judges, State attorneys and NLCPs, improved cooperation and coordination in the best interests of the child. Nevertheless, the training was not always sufficient to fully change the practices of all targeted judicial professionals. In particular, some occurrences of secondary victimization are still reported: interference during interviews, repetition of interviews following requests from lawyers, requests for the child to come to the courtroom after the testimony, and increased cases of requests for forensic assessments of the child. NLCPs, who benefited from further training and supervision sessions, reported a more significant change in their practices. Program component’s designers considered the need for continuous training in the programming phase through the implementation of advocacy activities towards the Judicial Academy. However, those activities were not successful during the program component’s
implementation. As a lesson learned from this program, in any new program, monitoring or follow-up of training should be considered after the training takes place. In the framework of the program component, this could take the form of regular exchanges between judicial professionals working in the same court, comprising trained and untrained professionals.

- **Closer involvement of the institution likely to continue implementation of the activities is needed**

The Judicial Academy’s level of involvement in training design and implementation, particularly in terms of format, length, funding and advocacy, was not sufficient to result in a strong commitment by the institution, considering the important other training needs for judicial professionals in the country. At the time of the evaluation, training activities on child victims and witnesses were not included in the Judicial Academy’s 2017 training agenda, which prevented training activities from being continuous. This will have a negative effect on the sustainability of the program component. As a lesson learned from this program, in any new program, special attention should be paid to the full involvement of stakeholders likely to implement the activities at the end of the intervention, at all stages of the program implementation, particularly during the design of the activities and their content, to ensure sustainability.
6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are based on the evaluation findings. Although they have not been discussed with key stakeholders, all findings are fully aligned with discussions with key stakeholders and training beneficiaries and reflect international practices and research on child victims and witnesses of crimes. The report and its recommendations will be presented and discussed during a workshop that will be held in May 2017, with UNICEF CO, the MoJ, the Judicial Academy, the Ombudsman for Children and other actors.

The evaluation consultants consider that child-friendly justice in criminal matters should still be reinforced with the continuation of activities and technical assistance in the future. This report’s findings, lessons learned and recommendations could be useful planning tools to guide the design of activities for such a program. In this regard, the evaluation consultants positively note that some key elements have been included in UNICEF 2017-2021 Strategy Note for Croatia Child Protection Program Component. The following recommendations will highlight elements that have been taken into account in the next 2017-2021 UNICEF Strategy Note in order to guide activities and elements that have not been considered so far.

6.1. Recommendations for the continuation of the activities on child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings

The following recommendations are classified according to their level of priority, indicating to whom they are primarily directed:

**Use of audio-visual equipment**
To the MoJ:
➢ Promptly engage in discussions with the company in charge of maintaining the audio-visual equipment to find a durable solution to the remaining recording problems, by June 2017

**Distribution of education material**
To the MoJ and other governmental stakeholders:
➢ Ensure that the education material to children and their parents / guardians is distributed and provided to beneficiaries in advance of interview dates, by December 2017

**Continuity of training for judicial professionals**
To UNICEF CO:
➢ Consider reducing the number of days of the training curricula towards judicial professionals to ensure that the training is conducted by the Judicial Academy in the future, by December 2017

---

111 Including the recent report: EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (2017), Child-friendly justice - Perspectives and experiences of children involved in judicial proceedings as victims, witnesses or parties in nine EU Member States.
As planned in UNICEF 2017-2021 Strategy Note, consider the development of more in-depth training modules on equity and gender dimensions, including on gender bias and on CWD in criminal proceedings, by December 2017. In doing so, to ensure that the topics are understood and taken into consideration, use a multidisciplinary approach including at least theoretical presentations and interactive exercises.

**To UNICEF CO and the MoJ:**
- Consider a higher level of advocacy targeting Judicial Academy Program Board members, to guarantee that the issue of child victims and witnesses is included in the next training agenda, by December 2017

**To the MoJ and the Judicial Academy:**
- To ensure the participation of all investigative judges in training, rely on the presidents of County courts to transfer invitations to training and consider making the attendance mandatory for all investigative judges, by July 2018
- Provide initial training for all investigative judges who have not been targeted by the program component, by December 2018

**Strengthening the impact of training for previously trained judicial professionals**

**To the MoJ and the Judicial Academy:**
- Provide regular and continuous training for previously trained participants to strengthen the level of their commitment and avoid practices that lead to secondary victimization, such as interfering in the interviews, requesting the child to come to the courtroom after his/her testimony or requesting forensic assessments, by December 2018

**To the MoJ:**
- Consider promoting a framework to establish regular exchanges between NLCPS, judges and State attorneys at court level to further strengthen cooperation and discussions in the best interests of the child, by December 2018
- Reflect on the possibility of working toward the specialization of judges in courts and ensure dissemination of this information to all presidents of courts, to avoid having contradictory practices, resulting in unspecialized and untrained judges dealing with cases of child victims and witnesses, by December 2018

**Monitoring**

**To the MoJ:**
- Implement a data monitoring system to record the number of cases of children in courts and the number of interviews of children that use the video link, disaggregated by gender, age and disability groups, by December 2018. In this regard, take into consideration that one recording can include several children

**To the Ombudsman for Children:**
- To advice the MoJ on the conception and implementation of the data monitoring activity.

**Reinforcing coordination and multidisciplinary activities in the field of child victims and witnesses**

**To the MoJ and other governmental stakeholders:**
➢ Develop standardized procedures and increase coordination among actors and professionals in contact with child victims and witnesses of crime, by July 2019. Reflect on the possibility to limit the number of professional contact persons to support children during proceedings.

To UNICEF CO:
➢ Provide training on child victims and witnesses for social workers, lawyers and healthcare professionals, in partnership with relevant ministries and institutions, by July 2019
➢ Tackle the challenge in coordination between the police and the judiciary by ensuring more multidisciplinary activities between these two bodies, as is intended in the 2017-2021 Strategy Note, by July 2019

Use of audio-visual equipment
➢ Consider the possibility to upgrade the audio-visual equipment to enable interviews between courts, and interviews between a court and other facility with a similar material, so as to enable out-of-court interviews of children, by December 2019

Improving interview rooms for children in courts
To the MoJ:
➢ Improve the rooms where the children are interviewed to make them more child-friendly, by December 2019.

6.2. General recommendations for similar programs

Program design
To UNICEF CO:
➢ Design a written and comprehensive ToC workshop prior to the programming of activities and implementation of future programs
➢ Ensure a high level of involvement of all stakeholders in charge of implementing the activities after the end of the intervention, at all stages of the program implementation, to ensure that future activities are consistent with their policies

Training evaluation
To UNICEF CO:
➢ Modify the method used to test the knowledge of training participants. Implement a method that ensures that participants have a point of comparison when they self-assess their knowledge. Consider for instance, that self-assessments (knowledge prior and following training) are both conducted only at the end of the training to measure the evolution or, if appropriate, conduct before and after training a test of their knowledge with correct and incorrect answers

Distribution of information
To UNICEF CO and the MoJ
➢ Regularly duplicate/publish education material to ensure that beneficiaries receive a copy that they can review outside of the offices of involved professionals
APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Evaluation team competences

Ms Carole Berrih, evaluation team leader, is the manager of Synergies Cooperation. She is a French Human Rights professional (advanced Master at Law) who also holds a degree in Sociology (Masters). Carole Berrih has more than 15 years’ experience as an expert in the planning, formulation, implementation and evaluation of Human Rights projects.

She is specialized in the protection and promotion of Human Rights. During the last three years, Ms Berrih has led many evaluation missions for international NGOs funded by international donors, using both qualitative and quantitative collection methods, including in the Balkans. She has a deep knowledge of evaluation principles and methodology, including logical framework and the theory of change approach. Ms Berrih is a member of the Société française d’Evaluation.

Ms Berrih has in-depth experience in matters related to child protection and juvenile justice. In the last two years, she implemented several missions related to the access to judicial services of child victims of violence: evaluation of a project on justice for child victims of sexual violence, particularly children with disabilities (2015-2016), evaluation of a project aiming to strengthen the access to justice of child victims of worst forms of child labour (2015), baseline survey of a program on peacebuilding and youth (2014), baseline survey of a project dealing with children’s access to justice (2014). She systematically implements a gender-based approach and gender equality in all activities.

Prof Bistra Netkova, international consultant, is a child protection expert based in the Balkans. She has extensive experience in monitoring and evaluation of Juvenile Justice law through creation and implementation of country specific indicators, implemented in Macedonia, Kosovo and Montenegro through her consultancies with UNICEF. She has experience in violence against children in the region, in the area of legislation and policy development, and evaluation and monitoring.

Prof Netkova has extensive experience in conducting Final Project Evaluations in the Balkans, working with donor organizations such as UNICEF, AMICA e V., Secours Catholique; and she has experience in coordination, design, implementation and monitoring of projects. Furthermore, she has experience in data collection and analysis.

Ms Maja Horvat, local consultant, holds an MSc degree in Public policy from Queen Mary, University of London and MA degree in Political Science from the Faculty of Political Science, University of Zagreb. She has ample experience in ex-post, periodic/mid-term and ex-ante evaluations of projects, programs, strategic documents and even laws. These cover various social development areas from social integration of marginalized groups,
development of human resources and employment, protection of human rights, education on various levels and sustainable development.

In 2015, she co-authored, with dr.sc Eben Friedman, evaluation of the National Roma Inclusion Strategy and its Action Plan for the period 2013-2015, commissioned by the Government Office for human rights and right of national minorities, representing one of the first evaluations carried out for national policies, not driven by a foreign donor. In 2014/2015, she had a chance to be part of the international evaluation team, which assessed the impact on sectors of employment, social inclusion and education of Croatian IPA Human Resources Development Operative Program 2007-2013, including almost 200 projects funded through this program, so far representing one of the largest evaluation carried out in Croatia. Based on her academic background and professional experience, she has excellent knowledge of quantitative and qualitative social science research methods (document analysis, content analysis, surveys, semi-structural individual and group interviews, focus groups). She is a member of the Croatian Evaluation Network (CEN), as a part of the Regional Network of Policy Evaluators from the Western Balkans (REMEVA).
Appendix 2: List of institutions consulted

In order to keep confidentiality, only the names of the institutions consulted are detailed in the following list:

➢ Judicial professionals

**In Zagreb**
Ministry of Justice
Judicial Academy
Municipal Court
County Court
State attorney’s Office

**In Split**
Municipal Court
County Court
State attorney’s Office

**In Bjelovar, Osijeka, Rijeka, Sisak, Varaždin, Velika Gorica**
County Court
State attorney’s Office

➢ Non-judicial professionals

**In Zagreb**
Police
Centre for the Protection of Children
Ombudsman for Children
Croatian association for Social Work
Company selected to supply the equipment

**In Rijeka, Sisak and Split**
Police
## Appendix 3: Evaluation matrix

The following evaluation matrix presents data sources, indicators and data collection methods for the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria and questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Evaluation Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are programmatic activities aligned with the government policy priorities regarding child-friendly justice / justice for children?</td>
<td>Evidence of alignment of project outcomes with national objectives</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have relevant governmental authorities been involved in the design of project activities?</td>
<td>Existence of minutes of meetings or documents relating to the design of the project, discussions with authorities indicating government bodies’ involvement in the design of project activities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are these programmatic activities relevant to the actual needs of the child victims and witnesses, in terms of improved protection and respect for the rights of children in criminal proceedings, and professionals who work with them?</td>
<td>Evidence of discussions with judicial professionals indicating the need to improve protection and respect for children</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did planning include consulting with other UNICEF CO and/or international practices?</td>
<td>Evidence of discussions, emails, with other UNICEF CO to discuss design of J4C program Reference to international practices or documents in documents related to program</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was an appropriate combination of approaches used in the implementation of the programmatic activities?</td>
<td>Existence of different approaches to the implementation of activities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do undertaken activities consider gender and equity dimensions in capacity development of professionals and publications?</td>
<td>References to gender studies or publication in documents related to program</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have legal and non-legal judicial professionals enhanced their capacities for implementing child-friendly procedures in matters related to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings?</td>
<td>Existence of 2 training curricula for justice professionals Evidence of increased awareness on child-friendly procedures related to child victims and witnesses (70% training participants) Evidence of training on child friendly procedures of judicial professionals (judges, State attorneys, non-legal child professionals) in contact with child</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criteria and questions</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Evaluation Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Croatian criminal courts increased technical capacities for interviewing child victims and witnesses?</td>
<td>Observation of equipment of 10 courts audio-visual material (8 County Courts and 2 Municipal Courts) Examples by 10 courts that their staff has gained knowledge on the use of audio-visual material for testimonies of child victims and witnesses</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have relevant authorities increased capacities to ensure sustainability and scaling-up child-friendly procedures within judicial system?</td>
<td>Existence of plan or activities developed by decision-making that ensures adequate resources for child-friendly procedures within judicial system (baseline: no plan; target: plan developed) Existence of a plan or activities developed by decision-makers for sustainability and scaling up child friendly procedures within judicial system</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have internal or external factors influenced achievement or non-achievement of the outputs and how?</td>
<td>Reports of internal or external factors by stakeholders that influenced achievement of outputs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did program activities contribute to change of behaviors and practices of legal and non-legal judicial professionals toward child victims / witnesses?</td>
<td>Existence of an increase between pre and post knowledge tests during training Report of new child-friendly practices towards child victims and witnesses (70% training participants)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did program activities contribute to change of behaviors and practices of legal and non-legal judicial professionals regarding gender and equity dimensions (particularly gender equality, children with disabilities and Roma children)?</td>
<td>Examples of new behaviors and practices regarding gender and equity dimensions (70% training participants)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did program activities contribute to new practices regarding the use of audio-visual equipment when interviewing children and is there any difference in the use of audio-visual equipment based on gender or equity dimensions?</td>
<td>Examples of use of systematic audio-visual equipment when interviewing children by Courts No report of difference of equipment use based on gender or equity dimension</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criteria and questions</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Evaluation Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did program activities contribute to the recognition among decision makers and professionals of the need for providing child-friendly services to child victims and witnesses of crimes?</td>
<td>Evidence of allocation of new resources (human, financial, etc) for child-friendly justice</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the program contribute to increased respect of rights of children and protection in criminal proceedings?</td>
<td>Examples by judicial professionals of positive change in behaviors of children &amp; their guardians during criminal proceedings resulting from increased protection and respect (secondary source)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the activities of the project resulted in negative and/or unforeseen impacts?</td>
<td>Discussions with stakeholders revealing unforeseen impact</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were key UNICEF staff and involved stakeholders qualified and numerous enough to implement the project, considering the activities to implement?</td>
<td>Report of Level of experience of UNICEF staff involved in project (years of practice, diplomas)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have UNICEF and other stakeholders made good use of the financial and technical resources in implementation of program activities?</td>
<td>Evidence of no discrepancy between projected budget for program component and actual costs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were key program activities cost-efficient in regards to the achieved outputs?</td>
<td>Evidence of no discrepancy between important budget lines and impact of outputs related to budget lines</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How been the implementation of activities been managed, in terms of communication and coordination with stakeholders, quality and use of monitoring system and response to potential delays in implementation?</td>
<td>Evidence of use of monitoring tool</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustainability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria and questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Evaluation Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did programmatic activities include appropriate sustainability strategy?</td>
<td>Evidence of degree of involvement and ownership of national authorities in the activities Evidence of degree of implementation of gained skills and knowledge by training participants</td>
<td>Review of literature X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews X Focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observation X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has UNICEF been able to support its partners in developing capacities and establishing mechanisms to ensure continuity of activities?</td>
<td>Existence of technical or financial partnerships Evidence of technical assistance of a partner for the continuation of the project</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is stakeholders’ commitment likely to continue beyond the end of the intervention?</td>
<td>Evidence of training module on child-friendly procedures in regular curricula of the Judicial Academy</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the key factors that have positively or negatively influenced sustainability of programs?</td>
<td>Reports from discussion with stakeholders and evidence of main strengths and weaknesses of the project</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Data collection tools

Note on the guides: interview guides only aim at **guiding the interviews or focus groups** and ensuring that the research team do not omit important elements during the discussions. Questions will not necessarily be asked in the order described in the following guides. Questions may vary depending on the reactions of participants. New points of interest may appear during discussions.

**Interview guide for judges and State attorneys**

*Estimated time: 60 min*

**Relevance**

Do you think that the program component aiming at strengthening the judicial systems in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings implemented in partnership with UNICEF was relevant to your needs? How?

Had you already participated in training sessions regarding child victims and witnesses of crimes previously to the training?

How were you selected to participate in the training sessions?

Are you familiar with other institutions that intervene in supporting judges and State attorneys regarding protection of child victims and witnesses? If so, to which extent are these institutions overlapping or complementary?

Do you think that all relevant institutions have been involved in the program component to ensure increased protection to children from secondary victimization? If not, which ones do you consider were left out?

What is your opinion of the approach that has been used for the program component (training, supervision, equipment, publication)?

Were some needs relating to the protection of child victim and witnesses not been addressed or covered by the program component?

**Effectiveness**

Do you consider that the training sessions have been successful? Why?

To what extent did the training sessions contribute to enhance your capacities in matters relating to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings?

What is your opinion of the content, design, evaluation and monitoring system of training activities?

To what extent has the court in which you work developed its audio-visual equipment capacities to provide better protection to children when interviewing child victims and witnesses?

What is your opinion of the audio-visual equipment provided to the courts?
What is your opinion of the material that was developed regarding child victims and witnesses?

What are according to you the main strengths and weaknesses of the implementation of the program component?

Impact
To what extent do you consider that the training contributed to change your behaviors and practices when dealing with child victims and witnesses?
To what extent has the training changed your behaviors and practices towards gender equality?
To what extent has the training changed your behaviors and practices towards children with disabilities?
To what extent has the training changed your behaviors and practices towards Roma children?
To what extent is the audio-visual equipment being used for testimonies of child victims and witnesses in your court?
Is there any difference in the use of audio-visual equipment depending on the status of the child (girls, boys, children with disabilities, children from minorities)? Please explain
Have there been challenges in the implementation of these new capacities in your court?
Can you provide examples of practices you have been able to implement and practices you have not been able to implement?
To what extent do you use the material that was developed by the program component regarding child victims and witnesses?
To what extent did the program component activities globally contribute to prevent secondary victimization of children during proceedings in the court in which you work?
To what extent did the program component activities globally contribute to increase the protection and well-being of child victims and witnesses that you encounter in your work and/or their parents?
Have the activities resulted in any unforeseen impact, whether positive or negative?

Efficiency
How do you assess the collaboration and communication with UNICEF?
How do you assess the collaboration and communication with the MoJ and the Judicial Academy, in the framework of the program component?
How do you assess the communication with national and international experts and consultants trainers?
Sustainability
According to you, what actions shall be implemented to ensure that the benefits from the program component activities continue?
Can you identify key factors that will facilitate the sustainability of the program component regarding child victims and witnesses?
Can you identify key factors that will diminish the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?
How do you see your role in implementation of child-friendly justice in the future?

Is there anything that was not covered with these questions but you feel that should be noted?

Guide for non-legal child professionals
Estimated time: 60 min (interviews) or 90 min (focus group)

Relevance
Do you think that the program aiming at strengthening the judicial systems in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings implemented in partnership with UNICEF was relevant to your needs? How?
Had you already participated in training sessions regarding child victims and witnesses of crimes previously to the training?
How were you selected to participate in the training sessions?
Are you familiar with other institutions that intervene in supporting judges and State attorneys regarding protection of child victims and witnesses? If so, to which extent are these institutions overlapping or complementary?
Do you think that all relevant institutions have been involved in the project to ensure increased protection to children from secondary victimization? If not, which ones do you consider were left out?
What is your opinion of the approach that has been used for the program (training, supervision, equipment, publication)?
Were some needs relating to the protection of child victim and witnesses not been addressed or covered by the program?

Effectiveness
Do you consider that the training sessions have been successful? Why?
To what extent did the training sessions contribute to enhance your capacities in matters relating to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings?

What is your opinion of the training content, design, evaluation and monitoring system of training activities?

To what extent has the court in which you work developed its audio-visual equipment capacities to provide better protection to children when interviewing child victims and witnesses?

What is your opinion of the material that was developed regarding child victims and witnesses?

Have there been any constraints or obstacles in the implementation of the activities?

What are according to you the main strengths and weaknesses of the implementation of the program?

**Impact**

To what extent do you consider that the training contributed to change your behaviors and practices when dealing with child victims and witnesses?

To what extent has the training changed your behaviors and practices towards gender equality?

To what extent has the training changed your behaviors and practices towards children with disabilities?

To what extent has the training changed your behaviors and practices towards Roma children?

To what extent is the audio-visual equipment used for testimonies of child victims and witnesses in the court in which you work?

Is there any difference in the use of audio-visual equipment depending on the status of the child (girls, boys, children with disabilities, children from minorities)? Please explain

To what extent do you use the material that was developed regarding child victims and witnesses?

Did you have the opportunity to disseminate the brochures to children and their parents?

Have there been challenges in the implementation of these new capacities in your court?

Can you provide examples of practices you have been able to implement and practices you have not been able to implement?

To what extent did the program activities globally contribute to prevent secondary victimization of children during proceedings in the court in which you work?

To what extent did the program activities globally contribute to increase the protection and well-being of child victims and witnesses that you encounter in your work and/of their parents?

Have the activities resulted in any unforeseen impact, whether positive or negative?
**Efficiency**

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with UNICEF?

How do you assess the communication with national and international experts and consultants trainers?

**Sustainability**

According to you, which actions shall be implemented to ensure that the benefits from the programmatic activities continue?

Can you identify key factors that will facilitate the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

Can you identify key factors that will diminish the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

How do you see your role in implementation of child-friendly justice in the future?

Is there anything that was not covered with these questions but you feel that should be noted?
Interview guide for the MoJ

Estimated time: 60 min (interview)

Relevance

To what extent do you think that the program aiming at strengthening the judicial systems in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings implemented was relevant to the needs of judicial professionals?

To what extent is the program aligned with national policies regarding child victims and witnesses?

To what extent has the MoJ been involved in the design of the programmatic activities?

What was their expertise regarding child victim and witnesses of crimes?

Are you familiar with other programs aiming at protecting of child victims and witnesses? If so, to which extent are these programs overlapping or complementary?

Do you think that all relevant institutions have been involved in the project to ensure increased protection to children from secondary victimization? If not, which ones do you consider were left out?

What is your opinion of the approach that was used to implement the program (training, supervision, equipment, publication, advocacy)?

Were some needs relating to the protection of child victim and witnesses not been addressed or covered by the program?

Effectiveness

According to you, to what extent did the training sessions contribute to enhance the capacities of judicial professionals in matters relating to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings?

What is your opinion of the content, design, evaluation and monitoring system of training activities?

To what extent have criminal courts developed their audio-visual equipment capacities to provide better protection to children when interviewing child victims and witnesses?

What is your opinion of the material that was developed regarding child victims and witnesses?

Have there been any constraints or obstacles in the implementation of the activities?

What are according to you the main strengths and weaknesses of the implementation of the program?

Impact

To what extent do you consider that the training contributed to change judicial professional's behaviors and practices when dealing with child victims and witnesses?
In your opinion, to what extent is the audio-visual equipment used for testimonies of child victims and witnesses in criminal courts? How many courts have appropriate equipment at national level?

According to you, to what extent have the activities changed judicial professionals’ behaviors and practices on gender equality? Towards children with disabilities? Towards Roma children?

According to you, are there challenges in the implementation of these new capacities in criminal courts?

According to you, to what extent did the program activities globally contribute to prevent secondary victimization of children during proceedings?

To what extent did the program activities globally contribute to increase the protection and well-being of child victims and witnesses and/of their parents?

Have the activities resulted in any unforeseen impact, whether positive or negative?

**Efficiency**

Do you consider that the UNICEF staff, involved stakeholders and consultants and experts were numerous and qualified enough to implement the project? How many people were involved in the implementation of the program? What were the positions and role of each of the people involved in the program?

In your opinion, were national and international experts and consultants qualified to implement training activities?

To what extent have the MoJ and UNICEF make good use of their financial and technical resources?

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with UNICEF? With the Judicial Academy?

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with national and international experts and consultants trainers?

How do you rate the ratio between the resources used and the results of the program? Can you explain why?

Has there been any delays in the implementation of the project that could potentially negatively impact the project? If so, what were the responses to these delays?

**Sustainability**

What actions shall be implemented to ensure that the benefits from the programmatic activities continue?

Can you identify key factors that will facilitate the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

Can you identify key factors that will diminish the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?
How do you see the role of the MoJ in future implementation of child-friendly justice program?

Is there anything that was not covered with these questions but you feel that should be noted?
Interview guide for Judicial Academy

Estimated time: 60 mn (interview)

Relevance

To what extent do you think that the program aiming at strengthening the judicial systems in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings implemented was relevant to the needs of judicial professionals?

To what extent has the Judicial Academy been involved in the design of the programmatic activities?

To what extent is the program complementary or duplicating already training provided by your institution?

Are you familiar with other programs aiming at protecting of child victims and witnesses? If so, to which extent are these programs overlapping or complementary?

Do you think that all relevant institutions have been involved in the project to ensure increased protection to children from secondary victimization? If not, which ones do you consider were left out?

What is your opinion of the approach that was used to implement the program (training, supervision, equipment, publication, advocacy)?

Were some needs relating to the protection of child victim and witnesses not been addressed or covered by the program?

Effectiveness

According to you, to what extent did the training sessions contribute to enhance the capacities of judicial professionals in matters relating to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings?

What is your opinion of the content, design, evaluation and monitoring system regarding training activities?

What is your opinion of the material that was developed regarding child victims and witnesses?

Have there been any constraints or obstacles in the implementation of the activities?

What are according to you the main strengths and weaknesses of the implementation of the program?

Impact

To what extent do you consider that the training contributed to change judicial professional's behaviors and practices when dealing with child victims and witnesses?

According to you, are there challenges in the implementation of these new capacities in criminal courts?
According to you, to what extent did the program activities globally contribute to prevent secondary victimization of children during proceedings?

To what extent did the program activities globally contribute to increase the protection and well-being of child victims and witnesses and/of their parents?

To what extent has the program have an impact on the training curricula of the Judicial Academy?

Have the activities resulted in any unforeseen impact, whether positive or negative?

**Efficiency**

Do you consider that the UNICEF staff, involved stakeholders and consultants and experts were numerous and qualified enough to implement the project? How many people were involved in the implementation of the program? What were the positions and role of each of the people involved in the program?

In your opinion, were national and international experts and consultants qualified to implement training activities?

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with UNICEF? The MoJ?

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with national and international experts and consultants trainers?

How do you rate the ratio between the resources used and the results of the program?

**Sustainability**

What actions shall be implemented to ensure that the benefits from the programmatic activities continue?

Can you identify key factors that will facilitate the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

Can you identify key factors that will diminish the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

How do you see the role of the Judicial Academy in future implementation of child-friendly justice?

Is there anything that was not covered with these questions but you feel that should be noted?
Interview guide for UNICEF consultants

Estimated time: 60 mn (interview)

Relevance

To what extent do you think that the program aiming at strengthening the judicial systems in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings implemented was relevant to the needs of judicial professionals?

To what extent have you been involved in the design of the programmatic activities?

Are you familiar with other programs aiming at protecting child victims and witnesses? If so, to what extent are these programs overlapping or complementary?

Do you think that all relevant institutions have been involved in the project to ensure increased protection to children from secondary victimization? If not, which ones do you consider were left out?

What is your opinion of the approach that was used to implement the program (training, supervision, equipment, publication, advocacy)?

In your opinion, were some needs relating to the protection of child victim and witnesses not been addressed or covered by the program?

Effectiveness

According to you, to what extent did the training sessions contribute to enhance the capacities of judicial professionals in matters relating to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings?

What is your opinion of the content, design, evaluation and monitoring system of training activities?

Have there been any constraints or obstacles in the implementation of the activities?

What are according to you the main strengths and weaknesses of the implementation of the program?

Impact

To what extent do you consider that the training contributed to change judicial professional's behaviors and practices when dealing with child victims and witnesses?

According to you, are there challenges in the implementation of these new capacities?

According to you, to what extent did the program activities globally contribute to prevent secondary victimization of children during proceedings?

To what extent did the program activities globally contribute to increase the protection and well-being of child victims and witnesses and/or their parents?

Have the activities resulted in any unforeseen impact, whether positive or negative?
Efficiency

Do you consider that the UNICEF staff and involved stakeholders were numerous and qualified enough to implement the project?

Can you provide some additional information on your background?

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with UNICEF?

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with other national and international experts and consultants trainers?

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with the MoJ, the Judicial Academy and trainees?

Sustainability

What actions shall be implemented to ensure that the benefits from the programmatic activities continue?

Can you identify key factors that will facilitate the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

Can you identify key factors that will diminish the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

Is there anything that was not covered with these questions but you feel that should be noted?
Interview guide for courts’ technical staff
Estimated time: 30 min (interview)

Effectiveness
What is your opinion of the audio-visual material that has been provided to the court?
To what extent have you increased your capacities on the use of audio-visual material?
Have there been any constraints or obstacles in the implementation of the activities?
How are you involved in the use and care of the material?

Impact
To what extent is the material used and taken care of in the court?
According to you, are there challenges in the use and care of this material in your court?
Has the provision of this material resulted in any unforeseen impact, whether positive or negative?

Efficiency
How do you assess the collaboration and communication with the company STORM?

Sustainability
What actions shall be implemented to ensure that the material remains operational?
Do you think that some factors may facilitate the sustainability of the audio-visual material regarding child victims and witnesses?
Do you think that some factors may diminish the sustainability of the audio-visual material?
How do you see your role in use and care of audio-visual equipment?

Is there anything that was not covered with these questions but you feel that should be noted?
Interview guide for UNICEF  
*Estimated time: 90 min (interview)*

**Relevance**

To what extent do you think that the aiming at strengthening the judicial systems in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings implemented was relevant to the needs of judicial professionals?

To what extent is the program aligned with national policies regarding child victims and witnesses?

To what extent have government authorities involved in the design of the programmatic activities? What was their expertise regarding child victim and witnesses of crimes?

What were the steps of the development of programmatic activities?

Did you consult other UNICEF County offices or international practices while designing programmatic activities?

Are you familiar with other programs aiming at protecting of child victims and witnesses? If so, to which extent are these programs overlapping or complementary?

To what extent do programmatic activities consider equity and gender dimensions (training and publication of material)?

Can you describe how training participants were selected for the training sessions?

Do you think that all relevant institutions have been involved in the project to ensure increased protection to children from secondary victimization? If not, which ones do you consider were left out?

What is your opinion of the approach that was used to implement the program (training, supervision, equipment, publication, and advocacy)?

Were some needs relating to the protection of child victim and witnesses not been addressed or covered by the program?

**Effectiveness**

According to you, to what extent did the training sessions contribute to enhance the capacities of judicial professionals in matters relating to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings?

What is your opinion of the content, design, evaluation and monitoring system of training activities?

To what extent have criminal courts developed their audio-visual equipment capacities to provide better protection to children when interviewing child victims and witnesses?

What is your opinion of the material that was developed regarding child victims and witnesses? How many copies of each material were developed and disseminated? Who received the copies of this material?
Do you consider that the advocacy has been successful? How would you define successful in this regard?

Have there been any constraints or obstacles in the implementation of the activities?

What are according to you the main strengths and weaknesses of the implementation of the program?

**Impact**

To what extent do you consider that the training contributed to change judicial professional's behaviors and practices when dealing with child victims and witnesses?

To what extent is the audio-visual equipment used for testimonies of child victims and witnesses in courts throughout the country?

In your opinion, to what extent has the material that was developed regarding child victims and witnesses been used?

Do you know of challenges that have been reported in the implementation of these new capacities by judicial professionals?

To what extent has this program have an impact on the consideration of protection of child victims and witnesses of crimes in national strategies or plans by the MoJ?

In your opinion, to what extent did the program activities globally contribute to the number of interviews of child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings?

To what extent did the program activities globally contribute to increase the protection and well-being of child victims and witnesses and/of their parents?

Have the activities resulted in any unforeseen impact, whether positive or negative?

**Efficiency**

Do you consider that your staff, involved stakeholders and consultants and experts were numerous and qualified enough to implement the project? How many people were involved in the implementation of the program? What were the positions and role of each of the people involved in the program?

How were national and international experts and consultants selected to support the implementation of the program?

According to you, to what extent have UNICEF and other stakeholders make good use of their financial and technical resources?

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with the MoJ and Judicial Academy?

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with national and international experts and consultants trainers?

How do you assess the communication with training and court beneficiaries?
How do you rate the ratio between the resources used and the results of the program? Can you explain why?

Have you implemented a monitoring system during the program? If so, to which extent did the monitoring system allow you and other stakeholders to assess the level of achievement of planned outputs and outcome throughout the project?

Has there been any delays in the implementation of the project that could potentially negatively impact the project? If so, what were the responses to these delays?

**Sustainability**

Has a sustainability strategy been developed in the framework of the project? If so, can you explain it and to what extent do you consider it appropriate?

What actions shall be implemented to ensure that the benefits from the programmatic activities continue?

Can you identify key factors that will facilitate the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

Can you identify key factors that will diminish the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

How do you see the role of UNICEF in future implementation of similar programs?

Is there anything that was not covered with these questions but you feel that should be noted?
Interview guide for police officers

*Estimated time: 45 min*

**Relevance**

Do you think that the program aiming at strengthening the judicial systems in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings implemented in partnership with UNICEF was relevant to your needs? How?

Do you think that all relevant institutions have been involved in the project to ensure increased protection to children from secondary victimization? If not, which ones do you consider were left out?

What is your opinion of the approach that has been used for the program such as the publication?

 Were some needs relating to the protection of child victim and witnesses and involving your profession have not been addressed or covered by the program?

**Effectiveness**

What is your opinion of the content and design of the publication?

To what extent did the publication contribute to enhance your capacities in matters relating to child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings?

**Impact**

To what extent do you consider that the publication contributed to change your behaviors and practices when dealing with child victims and witnesses?

To what extent has the publication influenced your behaviors and practices towards gender equality, and children members of vulnerable groups?

To what extent do you use the material that was developed by the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

Have the activities resulted in any unforeseen impact, whether positive or negative?

To what extent has the program activities have directly or indirectly resulted in changing your behaviors and practices regarding State attorneys and Courts?

**Efficiency**

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with UNICEF?

How do you assess the collaboration and communication with the Courts and State attorneys in the framework of the program?
Sustainability

According to you, what actions shall be implemented to ensure that the benefits from the programmatic activities continue?

Can you identify key factors that will facilitate the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

Can you identify key factors that will diminish the sustainability of the program regarding child victims and witnesses?

Is there anything that was not covered with these questions but you feel that should be noted?
Questionnaire for trained justice professionals (English version)

The questionnaires are short and easy to conduct. They will be filled directly on-line using Survey Monkey or Google Form. The questionnaires are mainly composed of closed-ended questions. The questionnaire will be translated into Croatian language.

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are contacting you on behalf of the evaluation team led by Synergies Cooperation. In cooperation with international, regional and local experts, we are currently conducting an external and independent evaluation of the justice for children program that is being implemented in partnership with UNICEF since 2013 in Croatia. This evaluation aims at assessing the program’s impact inter alia on raising capacities of justice professionals. Once completed, the evaluation report will be provided to UNICEF and other key stakeholders, including the MoJ and the Ombudsman for Children. In the framework of this study, this short questionnaire aims at assessing the knowledge, behaviors and practices of justice professionals who participated in the training sessions regarding child victims and witnesses of criminal acts, after the training sessions were conducted.

You are invited to answer to a few questions. Completing the questionnaire should not take more than 10 minutes of your time. Please note that your replies will be treated strictly anonymously. We would very much appreciate to have your feedback. Your opinion regarding the training sessions is particularly valuable and will inter alia help us to provide recommendations for future programming in matters relating to justice for children.

- On average, how often do you deal with cases involving child victims and witnesses during criminal proceedings?
  Less than 1 per 6 months / 1 per 6 months / 1 per 3 months / 1 per month / 1 per week / More than 1 per week

- Have you participated in any training on Child victims and witnesses prior to the training organized by UNICEF and the MoJ?
  Yes / No / I don't remember

  If answer is yes to previous question, which institution or organization organized this training?
  Judicial Academy / Other UN agency / NGO / University / Other, please specify:

- Did you know of the concept of secondary victimization prior to the training?
  Yes / No / Partially

- According to you, which professionals can potentially re-victimize children during criminal proceedings? (multiple choices)
  Police / Judicial professionals (State attorneys and judges) / Non legal child professionals / I don't know
Before the training, how important were you considering the following elements:

The child should avoid any contact with the suspect during trial
Very important / fairly important / slightly important / not at all important / I don't know

All questions addressed to the child during the investigation should be directly asked by an investigative judge and reformulated by a specialized non legal expert in order for questions to be in line with child’s development age, gender, understanding and other traits.
Very important / fairly important / slightly important / not at all important / I don't know

During a hearing, the same questions should not be asked several times to child victims and witnesses
Very important / fairly important / slightly important / not at all important / I don't know

The child should testify only once, exceptionally twice, during criminal proceedings
Very important / fairly important / slightly important / not at all important / I don't know

After the training, how important were you considering the following elements:

The child should avoid any contact with the alleged offender during trial
Very important / fairly important / slightly important / not at all important / I don't know

All questions addressed to the child during the investigation should be directly asked by an investigative judge and reformulated by a specialized non legal expert in order for questions to be in line with child’s development age, gender, understanding and other traits. Very important / fairly important / slightly important / not at all important / I don’t know

During a hearing, the same questions should not be asked several times to child victims and witnesses
Very important / fairly important / slightly important / not at all important / I don’t know

The child should testify only once, exceptionally twice, during criminal proceedings
Very important / fairly important / slightly important / not at all important / I don’t know

Did you change your opinion regarding reliability of children with intellectual disabilities as result of the training?
Yes / No / Partially

For non-legal child professionals only. Before the training, did you prepare interviews with child victims or witnesses in advance
Never / Rarely / Sometimes / Most of the time / Always
• *For non-legal child professionals only.* Now, do you prepare interviews with child victims or witnesses in advance
Never / Rarely / Sometimes / Most of the time / Always

• What have you learned during the training session that you implement in your regular activities (several answers possible)?
*Open question*

• What have you learned during the training sessions that you are not able implement in your regular activities (several answers possible)?
*Open question*

• *If previous question is answered:* can you explain what are the challenges to implement what you have learned during the training sessions?
*Open question*

• Overall, according to your self-assessment, do you minimize secondary victimization of children during criminal proceedings as a result of the training:
Never / Rarely / Sometimes / Most of the time / Always

• Have you been provided with a copy of the *Handbook for Professionals and Policymakers on Justice in matters involving child victims and witnesses of crime*?
Yes / No / I don't know

• *If yes to previous question:* Do you use this handbook:
Never / Rarely / Sometimes /Most of the time / Always

• Have you been provided with a copy of the publication *collaboration of experts when working with child victims and witnesses in criminal cases*?
Yes / No / I don't know

• *If yes to previous question:* Do you use this publication:
Never / Rarely / Sometimes /Most of the time / Always

• *Only for non-legal child professionals:* Have you been provided with brochures for children and their parents or guardians in courts?
Yes / No / I don't know

• *Only for non-legal child professionals:* Do you distribute these brochures to children or their parents / guardians:
Never / Rarely / Sometimes /Most of the time / Always

• What is your position
Judge / State attorney / Non-legal child professional /Other, please specify:

• Do you work at:
County level / Municipal level / Both

- In which city do you work?  
  *Open question*
  
- Do you have any additional comment or recommendation?

*Thank you very much for your participation!*
Appendix 5: Consent forms

The consent form was translated into Croatian language

Mr. / Ms Name: ..............................................................................
First name: ..............................................................................
Position: ..................................................................................

Is invited to participate in the evaluation of the justice for children program component that was implemented in partnership with UNICEF since 2013. This evaluation aims at assessing the program component’s impact on justice professionals. Once completed, the evaluation report will be provided to UNICEF and other stakeholders, including the MoJ and the Ombudsman for Children. This evaluation will be conducted from 7 to 18 December 2016 in Croatia. The evaluation team is composed of Carole Berrih, Bistra Netkova and Maja Horvat.

The participant is invited to participate in interviews and focus group discussions (1h to 1h30). There will be no financial compensation to participate in the study.

The participant certified that he/she accepts to participate freely in this study. He/she could decide to withdraw from the study at any time, without having to justifying him/herself. He/she has the right to retain from answering to certain questions, without having to justify him/herself.

The participant allows the research team to take written notes during the interview.

The research team will ensure that the participant’s name or function will not appear in the report if the participant does not wish to be identified.

Those data will not be used in another manner than the one described in the present document.

This form is signed by the participant. A copy is provided upon the participant request.

Date:
Location:
Signature of participant:
Signature of research team:
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## Appendix 7: Field work execution table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Team 1: BN</th>
<th>Team 2: CB &amp; MH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed 7/12</td>
<td>Zagreb:</td>
<td>Zagreb:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu 8/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 9/12</td>
<td>Meeting with UNICEF project team</td>
<td>Meetings with UNICEF project team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with Ministry of Justice</td>
<td>Interview with firm in charge of IT equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint interview with Ombudsman for Children from 2006-2013 + advisor</td>
<td>Interview with experts and consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with police</td>
<td>Interview with people in charge of equipment at MoJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus groups with non-legal child professionals</td>
<td>Interview with 1 County Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 Municipal Court Judge</td>
<td>Interview with IT (County Court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with IT (Municipal Court)</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 10/12</td>
<td>Transcribing notes</td>
<td>Transcribing notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun 11/12</td>
<td>Debriefing between teams</td>
<td>Departure to Split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debriefing between teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 12/12</td>
<td>Osijek:</td>
<td>Split all day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 County Court Judge</td>
<td>Interview with 1 County Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 State attorney</td>
<td>Interview with 1 Municipal Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 non-legal professional</td>
<td>Interview with 2 State attorneys (County level + Municipal level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with IT (County Court)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 13/12</td>
<td>Sisak:</td>
<td>Interview with 1 non-legal professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 County Court Judge</td>
<td>Interview with IT (County Court + Municipal Court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 State attorney</td>
<td>Interview with 1 police high-ranking officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 non-legal professional</td>
<td>Observation at County Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with IT (County Court)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 police high-ranking officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation at County Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 14/12</td>
<td>Bjelovar:</td>
<td>Rijeka:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 County Court Judge</td>
<td>Interview with 1 County Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 State attorney</td>
<td>Interview with 1 State attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 non-legal professional</td>
<td>Interview with 1 non legal professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with IT (County Court)</td>
<td>Interview with IT (County Court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 police high-ranking officer</td>
<td>Interview with 1 police high-ranking officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation at County Court</td>
<td>Observation at County Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu 15/12</td>
<td>Varaždin:</td>
<td>Velika Gorica:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 County Court Judge</td>
<td>Interview with 1 County Court Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 State attorney</td>
<td>Interview with 1 State attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 non-legal professional</td>
<td>Interview with 1 non legal professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with IT (County Court)</td>
<td>Interview with IT (County Court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 police high-ranking officer</td>
<td>Observation at County Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation at County Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 16/12</td>
<td>Zagreb:</td>
<td>Zagreb:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 State attorney</td>
<td>Interview with Judicial Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debriefing between team</td>
<td>Interview with 1 expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview with 1 judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Debriefing between teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Background

1.1. Economic, social and political country context

According to the 2011 Census data (Croatian Bureau of Statistics), the population of Croatia is 4,284,889 people, of which 48.2% are men and 51.8% are women. There is 896,605 children and youth in the age group from 0 to 19 years old.

Croatia became a member of the European Union in 2013 and as a country has a strong policy framework for the protection and fulfilment of child rights. In addition to the highly developed strategic frameworks and legislation, Croatia has institutionalized an important mechanism for monitoring and promoting child rights in the form of the Ombudsman for Children.

Croatia is a high-income country with GNI per capita in 2014 was $13,020 which is slightly above the line for high income countries of $12,736. The global economic crisis contributed to the negative gross domestic product growth (GDP) and triggered a six years long recession (lasting from 2009 to 2014). This was reflected in the labor market and increased unemployment and insolvency rates, which translated into increased vulnerabilities for children in households with low work intensity. Modest recovery from the recession started in 2015. However, the country is still facing high public debt, reaching 86 per cent of GDP in 2015. The crisis had a negative impact on the well-being of children and widened the equity gaps. Registered unemployment rate has seen slight decrease to 17.9% in January 2016 (compared to 20.3% in January 2015). At risk-of-poverty rate for the total population in the Republic of Croatia was 19.4% in 2014. In Croatia, (in EU28 at risk-of-poverty rate was 16.7 %). According to the Eurostat data for 2014, in the EU27, 27.8% of population under the age of 18 were categorised as children at risk of
poverty or social exclusion, while in Croatia this figure increases to 29%. Additional challenges include aging population and declining birth rates.

The Croatia's judicial system involving children in order to provide appropriate protection of child victims and witnesses rights is affected by the economic crisis as well. The courts are dealing with the insufficient number of specialized non-legal professionals whose expertise is now being shared between courts (e.g. County Courts offer their non-legal professional to the Municipal Courts) and some courts still cannot afford a full time non-legal professional. Furthermore, additional funds are required to provide specialized trainings for all professionals working with child victims and witnesses within the judicial system to ensure standardized procedures in the “best interest of the child”. In addition, the lack of funds is reflected in inappropriate technical equipment used for interviewing a child, including the inappropriate interview room set up. However, awareness on the importance of child-sensitive environment results in continuous efforts of court officials to ensure the most appropriate approach and environment in order to protect child victims and witnesses rights.

In June 2016, Croatia's parliament has voted to oust Prime Minister who took office earlier that year, triggering the fall of the government. Technical government will be in place until either new Government is formed or new elections are held. This is likely to slow down new initiatives and agreements involving government partners.

1.2. Key national policies, laws and international recommendations on justice for children

Prior to the accession to the EU, Croatia has made considerable progress in the ongoing reforms of the country's judicial system and developed a good national legislation that corresponds to the relevant international standards.

In the Croatian legal framework the rights of the child victim and/or witness are regulated by the Criminal Procedure Act\textsuperscript{112}, Criminal Code\textsuperscript{113}, Misdemeanor Act\textsuperscript{114}, Juvenile Courts Act\textsuperscript{115} and various implementing regulations (ordinances) derived from them. These laws are in line with international conventions on human rights, children's rights, recommendations by the Council of Europe and the European directives. Although laws and many of the legal provisions are aligned with the UN common approach to justice for children, in practice the legal and court procedures and available assistance to children have not been fully adopted to their needs.

\textsuperscript{112} The Criminal Procedure Act (Official Gazette, No. 152/08, 76/09, 80/11, 121/11, 91/12, 143/12, 56/13, 145/13)
\textsuperscript{113} The Criminal Code (Official Gazette, No. 125/11, 144/12)
\textsuperscript{114} The Misdemeanour Act (Official Gazette, No. 107/07, 39/13, 157/13)
\textsuperscript{115} The Juvenile Courts Act (Official Gazette, No. 84/11, 143/12, 148/13)
In 2014, the Government of Croatia adopted a comprehensive National Strategy for Child Rights 2014 – 2020 (NSCR), defining core national priorities for the systemic advancement of child rights in Croatia. NSCR is particularly focused on improving systems and ensuring child-friendly services in various important areas of the child's life, including the justice system, eliminating all forms of violence against children, guaranteeing the rights of children in vulnerable situation and ensuring active participation of children.

Significant progress in a number of child rights areas in Croatia was noted by the Committee on the Rights of the Child in its 2014 Concluding Observations on the combined third and fourth periodic reports of Croatia. Whilst welcoming the achieved progress, the Committee also identified a number of areas that require improvement and expressed concern, inter alia, over the situation of disadvantaged groups of children in Croatia, especially highlighting children entering justice system. In spite of Croatia's child rights orientation and the effort invested so far, the Committee also noted a discrepancy between the established policy framework and its implementation in practice. In the Concluding Observations it noted that ‘children’s best interests are not adequately taken as a primary consideration in all matters that affect them and this right should be appropriately integrated and consistently applied in all legislative, administrative and judicial proceedings, as well as in all policies and programmes relevant to and having an impact on children’. The Committee expressed their concern due to frequent incidents of re-victimization of children in judicial proceedings, inadequate support systems for victims and lack of quality training of those working with and for children with the aim of preventing re-victimization (police personnel, justice and other professionals) and assuring adequate training of those involved in the administration of justice involving children.

Likewise, Guidelines of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on child-friendly justice (2010) emphasize the importance of promoting child-friendly actions by ensuring that all concerned professionals working in contact with children in justice systems receive appropriate support and training, and practical guidance in order to guarantee and implement adequately the rights of children, in particular while assessing children’s best interests in all types of procedures involving or affecting them.


[117] Committee on the Rights of the Child: Concluding observations on the combined third and fourth periodic reports of Croatia, available at: http://docstore.ohchr.org/SelfServices/FilesHandler.ashx?enc=6QkG1d%2FPPrICaghKb7yhsp7zGar7ID0FuXla4BEx9U7iQDOqTPw1CEHNLPEe8G%2FFTZ010rcpyYjzR2qbbB51Nib19f1Z1nUbN1ZkNCIN89jPGKrfBi%2BAXB7aQiE313 (accessed on 15th of June 2016).
1.3. Key issues and inequities in justice in matters involving child victims and witnesses

In Croatia, approximately 5,000 children enter the justice system as victims and/or witnesses of crime on a yearly basis according to the Ombudsman for Children\(^\text{118}\). In 2015, according to the statistical report from the Ministry of Interior Affairs, 4,504 children were victims of crimes, often perpetrated by those closest to them (by family members within the family environment). Out of that number, 590 children were victims of sexual violence and exploitation. More reliable data on number of children interviewed at courts or in pre-trial criminal investigation is not available.

Annual reports\(^\text{119}\) published by Ombudsman for Children continuously provide a list of recommendations related to improvement of protection of child victims and witnesses' rights. A key barrier in the functioning of the justice system and the serious obstacles for implementation of new legislations and procedures, is a lack of cross-sectorial cooperation and the multidisciplinary approach. Child-sensitive, effective and efficient processes are not guaranteed, and in fact, they often lead to rights violations and secondary traumatization and victimization of children.

Criminal proceedings involving children should be guided by the “best interest of the child” principle. Child should be treated with dignity and compassion, protected from discrimination and irrespective of his/her age child should be treated as a capable witness and his or her testimony should not be deemed invalid or untrustworthy by reason of his/her age. Child victims and witnesses, their parents or guardians, should be adequately informed of available relevant services, support mechanisms, judicial procedures and their rights. Child should be protected from hardships during justice processes through effective assistance, guaranteed expeditiousness of the proceeding and child friendly procedures.

Unfortunately, child victims and witnesses in Croatia still lack adequate protection. According to the Croatian law children’s cases should be handled by specialized professionals. The police employ police officers for youth, at the court level there are youth judges and non-legal child professionals (social pedagogues and social workers), and the public prosecutor’s offices employ non-legal child professionals (social pedagogues and social workers) as well as specialized defense lawyers. However, the level of knowledge and skills varies greatly due to the lack of comprehensive and continuous

---


training. Croatian law stipulates that the child and family should be informed of their rights in the justice process and where to seek support but the legal practice is varied. Although, children's cases should be prioritized with applicable deadlines and restricted trial timelines, in practice cases can last a long time, due to filling of complaints, retrials and other issues. Direct contact between the child victims and witnesses and the accused should be prevented and video-conferencing links should be used to interview child. In criminal cases children almost always have court interviews in a separate interviewing room that is connected with courtroom through video link, although legally they could also be interviewed at another safe place (for example their home). Given that currently not all of the criminal courts have separate entrances for children, concerted efforts should be made to schedule interview with a child in such a way to prevent contact with the accused. It is important to note that similar legal provisions also apply to the misdemeanor courts, however in practice these courts have a severe lack of needed staff, equipment and training to protect child victims and witnesses.

According to the Criminal Proceeding Act children should not be questioned more than once, exceptionally twice at criminal courts. However, in practice this stipulation is not fully enforced. Criminal courts employ a non-legal child professionals whose responsibility is to provide assistance to child victims and witnesses by preparing them for the court interview. Some of the courts have victim support services that are not specifically tailored to child needs and are not involved in cases involving child victims and witnesses. However, they may provide some assistance to parents/legal guardians, but are not available during the entire justice process. According to the law children have a right to be accompanied by person of their choice whom they trust during judicial procedures, however it is not clear how often children are actually exercising this right. Social, psychological, medical and other support services are available only in largest cities/municipalities while in rural areas there is a significant lack of services and support mechanisms. Before a case appears at the court, during the investigation phase, the police staff speaks about the allegation violation directly with the child quite often. Sometimes school personal, doctors and other professionals question the child and a child may also have a forensic interview, all this unfortunately leaves the child with a sense that he or she had to re-tell the story many times. It is important to assure education and specialization of all participants in procedures involving children, licensure, immediate and fast procedures and timely support for the child victims and witnesses in order to mitigate harmful consequences resulting from the perpetrated criminal offense. Child friendly approach and procedures should be equally implemented in all justice institutions, no matter on their size and financial capacity, to prevent inequities and discrimination of child victims and witnesses based on their origin/place of living.
Furthermore, strong efforts should be invested in addressing inequalities of child victims and witness belonging to vulnerable groups of children, such as children with disabilities and Roma children, who may be confronted with communication barriers or architectonic barriers which is very relevant obstacle for children with disabilities. Moreover, children with intellectual difficulties are sometimes considered as non-reliable witnesses due to the inappropriate interview approach and weak capacities of the professionals of involved judicial experts. Particular attention should be put on children whose families are facing poverty since one can expect weak parent’s financial capacity to ensure access to professional psycho-social support for their child which is not available in non-urban parts of Croatia.

The awareness about gender issues among justice professionals is very limited. Their understanding of the importance of gender sensitive approach with child victims and witnesses needs to be developed. The lack of disaggregated data by gender in field of justice reflects the systemic lack of importance given to the gender sensitive approach. Stereotyping along gender lanes is still taking place, mostly in subtle ways, resulting in judgement and biased treatment. Furthermore, the staffing structures currently do not allow gender considerations, which in some cases can be critical and concerning to the child victim and witness and affect judicial processes.

2. **Description of the programmatic activity to be evaluated: “Strengthening justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings”**

Within the programme component “Alliances for equity and social inclusion of most vulnerable children” and according to Country Programme Action Plan 2012 – 2016 UNICEF CO is supporting Government’s efforts in improving justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings. Special attention is given to the most vulnerable groups of children, including those who are victims and witnesses of crimes. Due to limitations in terms of funding and human resources, UNICEF CO decided not to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the training needs of justice professionals but to rely on evidence collected in Situation Analysis of Children in Croatia¹²⁰, insights gathered through consultations with stakeholders, partners and experts involved in this area, and careful planning, ongoing assessment during the implementation of programmatic activities.

The rational for choosing to strengthen justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceeding was based on identification of this area as a priority

---

for the Ministry of Justice, Ombudsman for Children and other child/justice professionals, and a premise that positive changes and progress would be possible within existing Country Programme 2012 – 2016. The objectives of cooperation and UNICEF’s technical assistance to the Ministry of Justice have been agreed in 2013, and cooperation was formalized in Biannual Work Plans and Letter of Agreement between UNICEF and Ministry of Justice.

Key objective is to support Government’s efforts in realization of child rights and protection of child’s best interest in criminal proceedings. This includes protecting the child from secondary victimization and hardship while involved in the justice process as victim or witness, and furthermore enhancing the child’s capacity to contribute to that process, giving the best interests of the child primary consideration and safeguarding rights outlined in the Convention on the Rights of the Child. A key barrier and a serious obstacle in the functioning of the justice system is a lack of cross-sectorial cooperation and the multidisciplinary approach. This is particularly relevant during the investigative process in matters involving child victims and witnesses of crimes, when different sectors (including, police, social welfare system, health care providers) are involved. Within this specific programmatic activity, the focus was primarily on developing the multidisciplinary approach within the judicial sector, while in future particular attention should be given to enhancing the cross-sectoral cooperation (police, social welfare, health, etc.).

The supply component of the system was hindered by limited access and availability of adequately staffed services and budget constraints due to continuous financial crisis. In terms of access and quality of services the following bottlenecks were identified: significant lack of Justice for Children training curricula, lack of non-legal child specialists and outdated equipment for interviewing child victims and witnesses at courts, as well as lack of Justice for Children specialization for justice professionals in general. UNICEF Office for Croatia has been a strong advocate of justice for children regarding these issues and has supported the efforts of the line ministry and provided technical assistance.

Key efforts have focused on strengthening three main areas outlined below:

a) **Strengthening capacities of justice system to apply child-friendly procedures in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceeding by:**
   - developing comprehensive training on child-friendly procedures and interviews;
   - conducting training for justice professionals (judges, State attorneys, non-legal child professionals working at courts) with the aim of preventing hardship during justice process and re-victimization;
   - providing technical assistance in improving mechanisms adapted to the needs and rights of children during the investigative process;
   - developing and publishing needed written materials (listed under 2.1).
b) **Equipping courts with necessary audio-visual (video-conferencing) technical equipment for interviewing child victims and witnesses:**

- 10 courts with largest caseloads were selected (8 county courts and 2 municipal courts) covering more than 70% of all cases involving child victims and witnesses.

c) **Advocating for sustainability**

- advocating for increasing number of court staff (non-legal child professionals) and including training as a part of regular curricula of Judicial Academy.

### 2.1. Strengthening capacities of justice system to apply child-friendly procedures in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings

In order to improve uneven court practices, it become apparent that there is a need for multidisciplinary education (contained in both content of the training, and multidisciplinary training participants/teams) on the ways to appropriately communicate and conduct the investigative interviews with child victims and witnesses for justice professionals, in particular judges, State attorneys' and non-legal child professionals. The investigative judge play a critical role in deciding how the interview will be conducted and what questions will be allowed during the interview, while the non-legal child professionals communicate directly with child victims and witnesses. Special considerations must be given to children with disabilities, children from ethnic minority groups, children from socio-economically deprived families, and other vulnerable groups of child victims/witnesses.

In partnership with Ministry of Justice, State attorney's Office and with the assistance of international and national justice experts, a comprehensive training on child-friendly procedures and interviews in criminal justice proceedings was developed. The training brought theoretical, as well as, practical knowledge and experiences to help justice professionals learn and practice new knowledge and skills and increase their capacity to carry out interviews in a child sensitive, developmentally appropriate way and prevent secondary traumatization of child victims and witnesses. UNICEF CO in partnership with the Ministry of Justice and Judicial Academy carried out educations for more than 150 judicial professionals from 31 criminal courts and 26 State attorney's offices (prosecutors) in the country, increasing their capacity to conduct quality interviews with child victims and witnesses by using multidisciplinary approach focused on the best interest of the child. The focus was on improving mechanisms and tools during interviews so that they reflect the needs and rights of children such as necessary preparation for the interview, developmental needs of children, protocols for conducting forensic interview, etc. Some
parts of trainings were designed specifically to examine and address gender and diversity issues.

UNICEF has published written materials designed to answer challenging questions that professionals as well as children and their parents/legal guardians have as they enter criminal proceedings. Croatian edition of the handbook for professionals and policymakers on Justice in Matters Involving Child Victims and Witnesses of Crime was published and distributed to the justice professionals. The guide for professionals working with child victims and witnesses of crimes and brochures for children and their parents/guardians have been developed taking into account developmental and gender dimensions. They were published in 2016 and widely distributed.

2.2. Equipping courts with necessary audio-visual (video-conferencing) technical equipment for interviewing child victims and witnesses

In order to achieve this goal UNICEF undertook assessment of needs for audio-visual (video-conferencing) technical equipment at criminal courts in the country. Eight major county courts (Zagreb, Split, Osijek, Rijeka, Bjelovar, Sisak, Varaždin and Velika Gorica) and two biggest municipal courts (Zagreb and Split) that serve approximately 70% of all child victims and witnesses in the country were selected to receive new audio-visual equipment. After piloting the equipment at two county courts to assess the functionality of the equipment, all 10 above named courts have received necessary audio-visual equipment for interviewing child victims and witnesses, and are currently using equipment. Equipment is enabling recording of hearing sessions (interviews) with child victims and witnesses, thus preventing unnecessary additional interviews with child victims and witnesses.

2.3. Advocating for sustainability

Aligned with capacity building efforts and due to active advocacy of UNICEF CO and justice professionals, Ministry of Justice hired additional staff at courts – (non-legal) child professionals, which contributed to strengthening professional support for child victims and witnesses that can now access assistance of non-legal child professionals at all county criminal courts. Additional advocacy efforts were focused on including this training into regular educational curricula/program of Judicial Academy.

2.4. Key stakeholders and partners

The development and implementation of the programmatic activity to strengthen justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings was done in close consultation and collaboration with Ministry of Justice, State attorney’s Office, Judicial Academy, international and national experts and professionals (international
expert/consultant, multidisciplinary national team of experts/trainers, and other professionals from the municipality and county courts. Additionally, Ombudsman for Children was consulted in developing training concept.

Key stakeholders/partners, their roles and financial contributions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder/Partner</th>
<th>Roles/Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNICEF</strong></td>
<td>Development of the training package in cooperation with international and national justice for children experts. Coordination and providing technical support in organizing trainings. Equipping 10 courts with necessary audio-visual equipment. Developing, publishing and disseminating publications. Providing technical guidance to the MoJ, including: knowledge sharing; covering financial cost for consultants; technical and financial support for developing training materials and publications; technical and financial support for audio-visual equipment; provision of a platform for dialogue among relevant stakeholders, and related communication activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministry of Justice</strong></td>
<td>Active participation in prioritizing issues and planning all programmatic activities. Providing necessary data and information relevant for program planning and implementation. Issuing joint certificates to training participants. Assistance with developing technical specification for the audio-visual equipment. Leadership roles and active support were to be assumed by the line ministries. Financial contribution included covering staff cost of appointed representatives of MoJ who worked closely with UNICEF team. Additional in kind contributions through distribution of handbooks and covering postal costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judicial Academy</strong></td>
<td>Co-organizer of the trainings. Issuing joint certificates to training participants. Leadership roles and active support to be continued in licensing and carrying out permanent training of judicial professionals. Financial contribution included covering staff cost of appointed representative of JA who worked closely with UNICEF team, staff cost for experts/trainers, logistic costs for implementing trainings and issuing certificates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International justice experts, UNICEF consultant</strong></td>
<td>Supporting development of the programme and training materials. Providing technical assistance in developing specialized training for justice professionals (including judges, State attorneys/prosecutors and others). Providing technical assistance and support to national team of experts/trainers with developing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
training materials, making adjustments based on their experience and the evaluation of the training based on participants’ feedback. Ensuring high quality and compliance with the highest professional J4C standards and CRC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National justice experts, UNICEF consultants</th>
<th>Development of training package and implementation of training activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County and municipal courts</td>
<td>Enabling capacity building of professionals and exchange of knowledge and experiences through active training participation. Enabling installation and appropriate use of audio-visual equipment. Covering travel costs and DSA for their staff while attending trainings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State attorney’s Office</td>
<td>Enabling capacity building of professionals and exchange of knowledge and experiences through active training participation. Covering travel costs and DSA for their staff while attending trainings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The financial contribution of UNICEF from 2014 until now is calculated at $345,898.00 USD. The other partners have made modest financial contribution such as, covering the costs of staff time and the associated travel costs during trainings (by county and municipal courts as well as State attorney offices). The exact amount and share of their in-kind contribution has not been explicitly expressed, but could be further assessed and discussed with partners during the evaluation process. General narrative overview of financial contribution of partners is described in table above.

This programmatic activity does not have explicit results framework or specific document describing theory of change and respective indicators/targets that would allow to discuss clearly defined results of the programme activities. Therefore, an evaluator will be asked to support UNICEF team in reconstructing *Theory of Change* in the evaluation field preparation phase.

3. **Evaluation purpose and objective**

In order to corroborate results achieved by programmatic activity and to ensure recommendations for further improvements and sustainability, UNICEF will conduct a formative evaluation of the programmatic activity proposed by Terms of Reference (TOR).

The purpose of this formative evaluation is to primarily review and assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact to the extent possible, of the implemented Government of Croatia and UNICEF’s Justice for Children program focusing on strengthening justice system in matters involving child victims and witnesses in criminal proceedings.
The evaluation is undertaken at this specific point of time because of the end of UNICEF supported country programme for 2012 – 2016 agreed with the Government of Croatia, and it will identify and document lessons learned and UNICEF contribution so far in the application of international norms and standards in judicial practice in matters involving child victims and witnesses. However, as agreed with the Government of Croatia, UNICEF CO will continue to support strengthening national capacities for the full realisation of the child victims and witnesses’ rights within judicial system in the next Programme Cycle. Therefore, evaluation will ensure recommendations to guide Government’s and UNICEF’s justice for children efforts in the period 2017-2021. This, if required, includes adjustments of the current joint programme activities approach.

Evaluation results and recommendations will inform key decision makers, such as Ministry of Justice, State attorney’s Office, Judicial Academy, Ombudsman for Children and other relevant public institutions, NGOs and experts. The results will also be shared with media and donors in order to increase an understanding of the importance of child friendly justice and strengthen advocacy efforts.

The knowledge generated by the evaluation should be used by:
- the MoJ as an important source of information for the further policy work and programming in the area of justice for children and access to justice;
- Ombudsman for Children to further strengthen their monitoring and advocacy efforts;
- UNICEF - for future programing and support to advancing the rights of children when they come into contact with the justice system or related systems.

3.1. The specific objectives of this evaluation are to:
1. Provide evidence on the achieved programme results and answer whether undertaken activities were relevant, efficient and effective against each programme objective:
   a. to strengthen capacities of the judicial professionals working with child victims and witnesses of crimes;
   b. to improve judicial procedures to become more child-friendly and assure its sustainability;
   c. to equip courts with needed audio-visual equipment, that enables recording interviews and prevent secondary victimization.

The key evaluation questions grouped by the evaluation criteria are suggested as follows:
| Relevance | • To what extent are programmatic activities aligned with the government policy priorities regarding child-friendly justice/justice for children?  
• Are these programmatic activities relevant to the actual needs of the child victims and witnesses and professionals who work with them?  
• Did programme planning include consulting with other UNICEF Country Offices and/or international practices?  
• Do undertaken activities consider gender and equity dimensions in capacity development of professionals? |
| Effectiveness | • To what extent were objectives of the programmatic activities achieved?  
• What were the internal factors that influenced achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?  
• What external factors (e.g. geographical, gender and cultural beliefs and aspects of institutional characteristics) affected the effectiveness of programmatic activities?  
• Was an appropriate combination of approaches used in the implementation of the programmatic activities? |
| Efficiency | • To what extent have UNICEF and other stakeholders made good use of its human, financial and technical resources in implementation of programme activities?  
• Were key programme activities cost-efficient in regards to the achieved outputs?  
• How well has the implementation of the activities been managed? |
| Sustainability | • What are the key factors that have positively or negatively influenced sustainability of programmes?  
• To what extent has UNICEF been able to support its partners in developing capacities and establishing mechanisms to ensure continuity of activities?  
• Did programmatic activities include appropriate sustainability strategy? |
| Impact | • To what extent did programme activities contribute to positive changes in judicial procedures?  
• To what extent did programme activities contribute to the recognition among decision makers (at both national and local level) and professionals of the need for providing child-friendly services to child victims and witnesses of crimes? |
Please note that all evaluation questions need to be reviewed and revised (if/as needed) once the Theory of Change has been reconstructed.

To serve the interest of UNICEF, these criteria should be applied in the framework of UNICEF's Equity-based Approach\textsuperscript{121} and Human Rights Based Approach.

4. Scope of the evaluation and limitations
The evaluation covers the period from 2014 to present, during which the Government and UNICEF jointly contributed by developing and implementing this programmatic activity.

Geographical scope is throughout Croatia.

Identified evaluation limitations are as follows:

- Limited availability of disaggregated data/information on children involved in justice procedures as victims and/or witnesses
  One of the major limitations of this evaluation refers to the lack of disaggregated data (gender, age, socioeconomic status, etc.) on children involved in justice procedures as victims and witnesses. However, to the extent possible, this can be mitigated by conducting in-depth interviews and/or focus group discussions with key informants and data providers who can provide sufficient insight information that will serve to indicate estimates of missing data.

- Children witnesses and victims of crime and their parents/caregivers are not expected to be involved in the evaluation process
  This evaluation will not involve children witnesses and victims of crimes and their parents/caregivers directly, given the sensitivity of the issue and in order to avoid possible secondary victimization. Instead, opinions and information will be sought out from professionals helping them.

- No documented/explicit results frameworks
  Another limitation is that there are no documented/explicit results frameworks or specific documents with theory of change and respective indicators/targets that limits the analysis and discussions about process and results of the programme activities. Therefore, evaluators are expected to support UNICEF team in reconstructing Theory of Change during the evaluation field preparation phase.

- Difficult access to some of the relevant informants

\textsuperscript{121} Please see guidelines at \url{http://mymande.org/content/how-design-and-manage-equity-focused-evaluations}
Due to the changes within the Government structure, some relevant stakeholders who participated in development of programme activities might not be in position to inform the evaluation process. However, UNICEF team and current Ministry's officials will support the evaluation team as much as possible to reconstruct the process.

Please note that all mitigation strategies suggested above will be further discussed and agreed upon with the evaluation team within the inception phase.

5. Sources of information
   - Description of services provided by international and national experts/consultants (Terms of References)
   - Annual Work Plans
   - Annual reports of the Ombudsman for Children
   - Published materials (Handbook for professionals and policymakers on Justice in Matters Involving Child Victims and Witnesses of Crime, Guide for professionals working with child victims and witnesses of crimes and Brochure(s) for children and their parents/guardians)
   - Situation Analysis of Children in Croatia (2012 and 2015)
   - Training and workshop materials
   - Other programmatic documents and reports (training evaluations, results of pre and post self-assessment of training participants)
   - Data/information collected through questionnaires, interviews with key stakeholders and focus groups discussions

All needed documents, together with a list of courts, contact list of key stakeholders (representatives of the MoJ, JA, SAO, justice professionals, national experts, and others) whose views should be taken into consideration, will be provided to the evaluation team once a contractual agreement has been made.

6. Evaluation process and methodology
In this evaluation, mixed method approach will be applied by combining qualitative and quantitative methods. The analysis will be built on information collected from variety of stakeholders, including documentation review. It should critically examine the information gathered from the various sources, and synthesize the information in an objective manner. If contradictory information is obtained from different stakeholders, an effort should be made to understand the reasons for such information, including any gender-based differences.

The evaluation process should start with the in-depth desk review of available related documentation that will be mainly provided by UNICEF. Evaluation key questions will be
assessed through focus group discussions, semi-structured interviews, comprehensive review of documents as well as synthesis and analysis of data/information. Wherever monitoring systems will not be able to bring enough evidence (e.g. limited gender/equity focus), the assessment will be based on stakeholders' perceptions. The evaluation results will be validated with national partners and key stakeholders.

A detailed design and methodology with relevant and high-quality tools for information/data collection and analysis is expected to be developed by evaluation team within the inception phase. Approval of the UNICEF team is required prior to implementation. All materials should be gender-competent in language and presentation.

Interviewers/facilitators utilized by the Evaluator must have relevant qualifications and be adequately trained/consulted prior to fieldwork (including gender-competency knowledge). Prior to fieldwork the Evaluator will be responsible for pre-testing some of the instruments to be utilized.

Key stakeholders and informants for this evaluation will be identified within the inception phase. The evaluation should follow the evaluation criteria mentioned above as well as evaluation questions with appropriate additions to cover the scope of the evaluation. The approach should be participatory, gender and human rights responsive with a special focus on equity aspects.

**UNICEF and line ministry will ensure access to courts and State attorney's office.**

The evaluation will follow the principles of the UN Evaluation Group's norms and standards in particular with regard to independence, objectiveness, impartiality and inclusiveness and will be guided by the UN ethics guidance\(^\text{122}\) as guiding principle to ensure quality of evaluation process, especially apropos conflict of interest, confidentiality of individual informants, sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs, discrimination and gender equality, to address issues of vulnerable population, particularly families with children that are disadvantaged and excluded.

### 7. Major tasks to be accomplished and key deliverables

Table below shows a preliminary evaluation schedule that may be subject to change during the process in agreement with UNICEF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Expected Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\(^{122}\) Please see guidelines at [http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102)
## Evaluation – inception phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desk review of reference material</th>
<th>Evaluation team, UNICEF team and implementing partners</th>
<th>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September–15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• UNICEF team will support compilation of a list of the most important background material, documents, and reports.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing work plan and methodology</th>
<th>Evaluation team</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The set of evaluation questions will be finalized, and the instruments developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In cooperation with the UNICEF team, efforts will be made to reconstruct a suitable basis for assessment (theory of change) to guide the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Field work schedule and approach will be developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitting Inception report&lt;sup&gt;123&lt;/sup&gt; (up to 50 pages)</th>
<th>Evaluation team</th>
<th>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation work plan with timeline, methodological approach, finalised set of evaluation questions, instruments to be used, annotated outline of final report, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approving Inception report</th>
<th>UNICEF team and external reviewers</th>
<th>31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; October 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Inception report to be reviewed and approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Evaluation – implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection and analysis</th>
<th>Evaluation team</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; of November 2016 – 31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; December 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Collection of evaluation data (primary and secondary) is expected to be carried out through different techniques, including desk-reviews, in-depth, informal and semi-structured interviews.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The analysis will be based on detailed protocols/transcripts of interviews and focus groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debriefing meeting</th>
<th>Evaluation team</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Debriefing meeting will be organized to showcase the preliminary findings,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>123</sup> The inception phase will clarify the methodology and approach to be taken for this evaluation; depending on this there might be some changes to the contract initiated with the evaluation team.
testing elements for conclusions and tentative recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation – reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Development of the 1\textsuperscript{st} evaluation draft report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consolidated comments by UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} evaluation draft report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review by UNICEF and external experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submission of the Final Evaluation Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Development of: \(\text{(a) an Evaluation Summary with findings and recommendations from the main report}
\(\text{(b) a Power Point Presentation of the evaluation report} | Evaluation team | 30\textsuperscript{th} April 2017 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of evaluation findings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Presentation of key findings of the evaluation to UNICEF Croatia team, major stakeholders and partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dissemination of evaluation report/key report findings (to key stakeholders and partners, Regional Office, media and donors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation team is expected to produce and submit the following deliverables:

• Inception report (including evaluation work plan, presentation of methodological approach, instruments to be used, annotated outline of final report described in the next paragraph), to be presented and approved by UNICEF and implementing partners by 1\textsuperscript{st} of October 2016;
• 1st draft evaluation report (draft findings, conclusions and recommendations from all data sources used in the evaluation) by 15th of February 2017;
• 2nd draft evaluation report by 15th of March 2017;
• Final evaluation report (upon external review) by end of April 2017;
• Evaluation Summary Document and Power Point Presentation summarizing key findings and recommendations from the main report by end of April 2017;
• Final presentation - delivery of Power Point Presentation of the evaluation to stakeholders by end of May 2017.

Please note that Inception report, draft reports and final evaluation report shall be submitted in English while an evaluation summary document and a Power Point Presentation shall be submitted both, in English and in Croatian.

Final report (approximately 50-70 pages) should contain following chapters and be aligned with the UNICEF- - Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards\textsuperscript{124} and the Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System\textsuperscript{125}:

\begin{itemize}
\item Title page and opening pages
\item Executive summary
\item Program description (including the logic of the project design and/or expected results chain)
\item The role of UNICEF and other stakeholders involved
\item Purpose of the evaluation
\item Evaluation criteria
\item Evaluation scope and objectives
\item The evaluation design
\item Description of methodology
\item The stakeholders participation
\item Ethical issues
\item Findings
\item Analysis of results
\item Constraints
\item Conclusions
\item Recommendations
\item Lessons learned
\item Annexes
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{124} Available at: https://intranet.unicef.org/epp/evalsite.nsf/0/2BDF97BB3F789849852577E500680BF6/$FILE/UNEG_UNICEF%20Evaluation%20Report%20Standards.pdf

8. **Accountabilities and reporting**

The evaluation leader will lead the evaluation process and the evaluation team (consisted of up to four evaluators) at all stages and coordinate cooperation with UNICEF and other stakeholders involved. The evaluation leader will be responsible for all components of the evaluation including development and implementation of the evaluation methodology and quality assurance of the process of data analysis and report writing. He/she will be responsible for provision of deliverables listed previously on time and of acceptable quality.

The evaluation leader will work in close cooperation with UNICEF Croatia Programme team and will report to UNICEF Child Protection Officer and Social Policy Officer (UNICEF M&E focal point).

The evaluation team should act with integrity and respect for all stakeholders according to UNEG Ethical Guidelines for evaluation. In the report, evaluators should not refer to any personal data obtained during the evaluation. They should not share any findings with media in Croatia or abroad concerning individual children, families or individual institutions.

At all times, it is important to communicate to all the participants that the evaluation does not refer to their efforts and that a failure to implement some components of programmes would not be considered their personal failure.

UNICEF staff will review and approve the deliverables and provide relevant documents.

9. **Qualification requirements**

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of evaluators (team of individuals, company, organisation or agency); consisted of up to four evaluators. If the selected evaluation team is international, it needs to include at least one national expert. The composition of the team should be gender balanced. The evaluation team should be a multidisciplinary team of experts led by an evaluation leader, in order to ensure technical expertise at each point of the evaluation.

UNICEF shall approve all members of the team (national and international) upon receipt of individual CVs and work samples for the entire team.

**The evaluation leader is required to possess following competencies:**

- Advanced university degree in law or social science (certificates in evaluation studies is an asset);
• Extensive experience in designing and conducting evaluations and surveys, quantitative and qualitative analysis and data analysis (minimum of 8 years);
• Excellent knowledge of monitoring and evaluation methodologies; sound judgment and ability to objectively evaluate programmes in terms of processes, as well as results achieved (evidenced through previously conducted evaluations and references);
• Experience in conducting evaluations related to child friendly justice or child protection;
• Proven knowledge on child rights, human rights, gender equality and social inclusion;
• Excellent written and spoken English required if the team leader is an international expert, while excellent written and spoken Croatian and English is required if the team leader is a national expert;
• Excellent communication and presentation skills;
• Excellent skills in working with people and organising team work;
• Excellent analytical report writing skills;
• Excellent conceptual skills;
• Ability to keep with strict deadlines;
• Knowledge of the country context related to justice system is an asset;
• Familiarity with UNICEF’s mission and mandate is an asset.

Member(s) of the evaluation team are required to possess following competencies:
• Advanced university degree in law or social science;
• Minimum 3 years of expertise in the area of evaluation and experience in programmes related to justice and child protection;
• Proven knowledge on child rights, human rights, gender equality and social inclusion;
• Proven knowledge of the justice system and child protection system in Croatia;
• Demonstrated ability to prepare interview/focus groups protocols and other evaluation instruments and to work with databases;
• Excellent communication and presentation skills in English for international team members; excellent communication and presentation skills in Croatian and English for national team members;
• Excellent analytical and report writing skills;
• Familiarity with UNICEF’s mission and mandate is an asset.

While it is expected, and understood that each of the team members has different competencies, the specific nature of each expertise required should be made explicit in the proposal and will be further discussed.

The contractor will be selected based on the following four criteria: (i) experience in conducting programme and sector evaluations, primarily in the area of justice and child
protection, (ii) technical expertise of the members of the evaluation team, (iii) quality of the technical proposal, and (iv) value of the technical proposal (financial offer).

The proposal will be assessed as follows:

1. **Technical components (total of 70%)**
   - Experience in conducting programme and sector evaluations, particularly in the area of justice and child protection – 20%
   - Technical expertise of the members of the evaluation team – 20%
   - Quality of the technical proposal – 30%

2. **Financial component (total of 30%)**
   - Value of the technical proposal (financial offer) – 30%

10. **Duty station and official travel involved**
    All of the field work will take place in Croatia; all official travels will be scheduled, agreed and approved by UNICEF during the Inception phase.

11. **Duration**
    Expected duration of the contract is from 15th of September 2016 to 31st of May 2017.

12. **Performance indicators**
    Criteria for performance are quality of process and delivered products (instruments, reports, etc.), timeliness, accuracy, initiative, responsibility, competence and communication.

13. **Estimated cost**
    All financial costs need to be proposed by the applicant.

    International evaluators, please note that travel costs to and from Croatia have to be itemised within the proposed budget.

    Costs for travel and accommodation during field work (within Croatia) will be agreed and approved by UNICEF during the inception phase, according to UNICEF policies and procedures.

    The evaluation team/company/agency/institution will be paid upon successful completion of assignments and submission of the deliverables in accordance with the following suggested payment schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Percentage of payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon approval of the inception report</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upon completion of the evaluation and submission of the final evaluation products: final evaluation report, evaluation summary and Power Point Presentation, endorsed by UNICEF.

70%

The final payment schedule will be discussed and defined with selected contractor.

All the original invoices related to the contract (e.g. transportation costs, accommodation, etc.) should be kept and submitted to UNICEF for reimbursement itemized and agreed in the inception report.

14. UNICEF recourse in case of unsatisfactory performance
The payments may be reduced if the assignments/deliverables are not fulfilled to the required standard. In case of serious dissatisfaction with the performance of the company the contract may be terminated in line with UNICEF procedures and as spelled out in the institutional contract.

UNICEF reserves the right to withhold all or a portion of payment if performance is unsatisfactory, if work/outputs are incomplete, not delivered or for failure to meet quality standards and deadlines (fees reduced due to late submission: 20 days 10%; 1 month – 20%; 2 months – 50%; more than 2 months – payment withhold). All materials developed will remain the copyright of UNICEF and UNICEF will be free to adapt and modify them in the future.

Source of funding/PBA reference (date of expiration of the PBA):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SC 140254</th>
<th>Expiry date: 31/12/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Prepared and reviewed by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mirjana Bijelić, Programme Associate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martina Tomić Latinac, Child Protection Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijana Šalinović, Social Policy Officer (M&amp;E focal point)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved: Šurđica Ivković, Deputy Head of Office, OIC

Date: July 6th 2016