Partnership Programme for the Protection of Children (3PC)

REVIEW

May 2014

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

3PC	Partnership Programme with Civil Society Organizations to Strengthen Child Protection Systems
CM	Case management
CS	ChildSafe
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CCWC	Commune Committee for Women and Children
DoSVY	District level Social Affairs, Veteran and Youth Rehabilitation
DT	Damnok Toek / Goutte d'Eau
FGD	Focus group discussion
FI	Friends International
KAP	Knowledge, Attitude and Practices
KII	Key informant interview
KM	Kaliyan Mith
KMR	Komar Reagrey
LA/s	Local authority/ies
LAC	Legal Aid Cambodia
MS	Mith Samlanh
MT	M'Lop Tapang
MoSVY	Ministry of Social Affairs, Veteran and Youth Rehabilitation
NFE	Non formal education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OEC	Opération Enfants du Cambodge
PPS	Phare Ponleu Selpak
Q1, Q2…	Quarter 1, Quarter 2 and so on
SKO	Samatapheap Khnom Organisation
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It is clear to see 3PC is achieving what it set out to do. Though at this date the program has not yet reached all expected outputs the 3PC network obviously benefits member organizations, their staff and beneficiaries and has increased potential to positively impact external stakeholders, including government and wider networks of Child Protection (CP) organizations.

In its first two years of operation the program has been heavily internally focused and prioritizing this has paid off in terms of organizational and staff capacity as well as great collaborations between members. The program is now well-placed to externalize its focus to government and other NGOs. This requires developing the network's brand to build awareness of the purpose and function of 3PC. It should also include 3PC partners inviting local and national stakeholders to understand and contribute to the network in ways that are collaborative and complementary.

Participating Community Service Organizations (CSOs) have so far proven very successful in terms of strengthening their child protection systems, mostly via building linkages and networking within 3PC, with some challenges still faced in terms of links with Government actors. With 3PC support, CSOs are boosting their organizational capacity, including developments in staff capacity, M&E, reporting and finance systems. Improvements to the quality of services include diversion programs in Siem Reap scaling up to meet demand; vocational training (VT) in Battambang expanding curriculum to foster more digital, employable skills, and new Childsafe groups in three provinces. Beneficiaries are overwhelmingly satisfied with the services they receive and appear to be adopting new practices, with 81% of parent interviewees saying they had applied what they had learnt from the CSO to take better care of their children.

Networking and coordination among service providers has significantly improved. 3PC has increased cross-partner activities, such as referrals in which 96% of staff and managers/directors spoke positively about making and receiving referrals between organisations. Other examples include shared research into drugs and alternative care, case management across provinces and TA support between partners. Learning and sharing has occurred via more than 50 exchange visits, which in turn make it easier for 3PC colleagues to contact, request assistance and support one another due to increased rapport and understanding. 89% of CSO managers say being a member of 3PC is empowering and the knowledge that they are part of something bigger encourages them to strive for better practice. All members would like to recommence regular 3PC meetings to continue the learning and sharing opportunities and plan future collaborative activities. While internal networking has been highly successful, opportunities exist to extend the reach to satellite networks in each of the partner's five provinces and perhaps beyond.

In order to realize sustainable CP mechanisms in Cambodia, all partners recognize the importance of collaborating with government at all levels. While most CSOs have strong, cooperative relationships with DoSVY and local authorities, this is mostly due to pre-existing connections and is largely unrelated to 3PC. Here again is an opportunity to raise awareness of the network and more formally engage with local and provincial level government departments for the purpose of sharing expertise and resources to strengthen capacity of government staff. Similar possibilities exist at a national level. All partners agree that 3PC and MoSVY should increase collaborations. A simple step would be for FI to send MoSVY 3PC quarterly reports. Another way is for both parties to establish more direct lines of communication, especially when MoSVY releases its 2014-18 Strategy Plan that will undoubtedly present opportunities for increased harmonization across CP and social welfare activities.

Although the 3PC national database project has not been fully realized, much work has been done towards achieving consistent, electronic data for Childsafe and Case Management services within the network. This has been utilized for most but not all 3PC partners, due to capacity levels. For example, all partners operating Childsafe are collecting consistent data, however partners operating Case Management services still collect and collate their data in different ways due to pre-existing systems and capacity to update systems. Thus, the database project remains in an extended pilot period and requires more effort from 3PC to firstly ensure data collected across the network is consistent, and secondly that training takes place to effectively roll out the system with all partners. Currently, 3PC and MoSVY are in discussions about how 3PC data will be integrated to any government databases. This is due to the reasons stated above and also because existing MoSVY databases do not necessarily focus on all the same services and outcomes as 3PC. Furthermore, since 2012 MoSVY has been in the process of drafting and updating their M&E guidelines and all parties agree it will be more effective to harmonize data when this process is finalised. FI continues to monitor this, working closely with MoSVY to collaborate when all parties are ready.

The achievements of the past 30 months highlight the importance of programs with long term goals – family reintegration, education and VT, diversion, social economic services and community education – to support people to create better futures for themselves and their communities. In many ways 3PC has done the internal work, such as networking, building systems and organizational capacity, to form a solid base and valuable momentum for its future. Combined with the lessons learnt, the expertise, the opportunities for external networking and the energy and commitment of partners, 3PC is a program very well placed to continue.

I - INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Beginning in November 2011, Friends-International (FI), MoSVY andUNICEF, initiated the three-year Partnership Program for the Protection of Children (3PC) Program. The program, funded by UNICEF, follows a system building approach to promote and enhance aid effectiveness and collaboration with the Government of Cambodia to accelerate the development of comprehensive prevention and response child protection systems.

Table 1 List of 3PC partners

 The program aims at building and strengthening national and sub-national capacities on child protection systems, improving networking and coordination among service providers as well as communication and awareness raising in communities. The partnership includes FI, UNICEF, Ministry of Social Affairs, Veteran and Youth Rehabilitation (MoSVY) and nine civil society organization (CSO) partners across five provinces. The provinces; Battambang, Banteay Meanchey, Phnom Penh, Siem Reap and Preah Sihanouk, are highly populated urban areas, attract tourism or are migration hubs along the Thai and Cambodian borders. They were selected based on a gap analysis carried out by FI and UNICEF.

Location	Partner
Battambang	Komar Reagrey (KMR)
	Opération Enfants du Cambodge (OEC)
	Phare Ponleu Selpak (PPS)
Banteay Meanchey	Damnok Toek / Goutte d'Eau (DT)
	Legal Aid Cambodia (LAC)
SihanoukVille	M'Lop Tapang (MT)
Phnom Penh	Mith Samlanh (MS)
	Samatapheap Khnom Organization (SKO)

The 2011 gap analysis informed the program design, including the selection of Provinces and the identification of gaps in the current child protection system at national as well as sub-national level in the target provinces. It focused on identifying areas and approaches where CSOs can make the most effective contributions.

In addition to the gap analysis, a desk review of relevant literature and interviews with key informants from international organizations, CSOs and government officials, were undertaken to identify the following four key result areas - which were agreed with MoSVY as being the pillars of this Child Protection partnership:

Result 1 - Data, research and advocacy: An age and sex disaggregated data collection system on vulnerable children for a minimum of 9 CSOs in 5 provinces is operational, feeds into the government data system, and is used to collect evidence and inform policies, strategies, and programming.

Result 2 - Capacity building and social service provision: Quality services to prevent and respond to child protection violations, including emergencies preparedness and response, directly benefit 32,000 vulnerable children and their families in five provinces and efficient referral systems are in place.

Result 3 - Communication and awareness raising in communities: Communication strategies are reaching 150,000 children, as well as their families and communities to reduce harmful social norms and prevent and respond to child abuse, exploitation and violence.

Result 4 - Networking and coordination: 9 CSOs regularly contribute to CSO and government coordination mechanisms to reduce overlapping risks and vulnerabilities among children and families at risk.

In late 2012, a revision of M&E system of the program was undertaken by an M&E consultant to review FI's and partner's log frames for the program; assess partner log frames for increased areas of harmonization and whole-of-program consistency. With technical guidance from UNICEF and in close collaboration with MoSVY a new 3PC log frame and M&E system report was agreed and finalized by FI. The following two key outputs have been adapted from its previous identified outputs in response to the need of the program:

1 - Output FI: Capacity building of partners related to child protection services, raising awareness and advocating for child protection issues.
2 - Output CSOs: Service provision and networking to prevent and respond on child protection violation.

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF REVIEW

In order to track the progress of the program and its impact against the log frame and work plan, this review was conducted among 9 CSO partners, MoSVY, FI and UNICEF. Initially scheduled in Q6 as a mid-term review, the review was conducted in Q9. Therefore it is not a mid term review and is described in this report simply as a review. The review time period covered Q1 2011 (FY1) to Q8 2013 (FY2) for the following criteria:

- Review the progress of the programme against the log frame and work plan.
- Evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the activities conducted in the frame of every specific objective of the project.
- Assess how the partnership management has increased capacity of CSO partners for program effectiveness and efficiency.
- Assess the performance of program implementation in term of service delivery and networking by each CSO partner against its intended objectives and make recommendation to assist their implementation over the remainder of its term.
- Identify any areas for improvement and draw recommendations for any revisions and adjustments needed in order to enhance the results of the 3PC programme.
- This is an assessment of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact/sustainability of the activities conducted in the program's log frame.
- In response to the log frame, the review focuses importantly on two main components: Partnership Management facilitated by FI and Program Implementation performed by each partner including CSO capacity CSO service, and CSO networking.
- Conclusions are in perspective with previous monitoring exercises carried out by FI staff or TAs. Conclusions will be shared with CSO partners, UNICEF and MOSVY. All information should be used to inform decision making to improve program quality and management.

Table 2 List of services reviewed

	Services	Partners
1	Clients have accessed to a drop-in or good practice rehabilitation center	DT, KM, KMR & MS
2	Clients are supported to access remedial education	PPS, KMR, KM & DT
3	Clients are supported to access vocational training	PPS, KMR & KM
4	Clients are supported for family reintegration	PPS, KMR, KM, DT, MS & MT
5	Clients are supported to reintegrate to public school system	KMR, KM & DT
6	Clients in prison receive support	KM & LAC
7	Peer educators provide education and prevention activities to children in communities	LAC & OEC
8	Parent Association (PA) provide education and prevention activities to communities	OEC
9	Clients receive social economic support	DT, KM, KMR & MS.
10	Community members receive education in terms of Child Protection	All CSOs

The review team consisted of one independent consultant and four Friends-International staff , who conducted FGDs and most of the KIIs in Khmer language and provided translation of all field work and documents to English and two interpreters assisted with MOSVY interviews at national level.

1.3 METHODOLOGY

As much as possible, this review has been disaggregated by gender. Anonymity is ensured for all interviewees. See Appendix, table 3 for total audience reviewed. The audience is separated into the following three categories:

CSO partners

At partner level, the review examined management, coordination, implementation and sustainability of 3PC from the perspective of CSO staff, program managers and/or directors. Participants were selected based on their exposure to the program or their direct experiences with relevant services. Face-to-face interviews were conducted in English and Khmer. 80% of staff and managers interviewed have been working at the CSO for 3+ years, i.e. since 3PC began.

Community level

The review team instructed CSOs to randomly select five young people per 3PC-funded activity to participate in Focus Group Discussions (FGD). This number was not always achieved due to availability of appropriate participants. During FGDs participants were encouraged to talk about their level of satisfaction with relevant services. The review team also considered levels of enthusiasm or engagement with the CSO.

The review team instructed CSOs to randomly select families to interview about their experience and level of satisfaction with social economic support services and other relevant education and awareness activities. Almost half of the families interviewed have been engaged with the CSO for 2+ years, with a further 37% being involved with the CSO for 1-2 years.

FGDs with local authorities included local police officers (usually 1), CCWC (usually 2) and other commune staff or village chiefs. The aim of these discussions was to identify networking and coordination issues, achievements or opportunities between CSOs and local authorities. For each CSO partner, relevant DoSVY staff participated in KIIs to examine networking and collaboration between 3PC partners and local Social Affairs officers.

National level
Two key MoSVY staff from the Department of Welfare and one colleague from D&D were interviewed to identify the achievements, challenges, impacts, and effectiveness of the program from MOSVY perspective. Three key staff of UNICEF (one at provincial level) were interviewed to identify the impact, effectiveness, and value of the program. Three key FI staff were interviewed to determine the impact, lessons learnt, sustainability and future of the program.

1.4 REVIEW TOOLS

Review tools were written by the consultant after completing the desk review, with contributions from key FI and UNICEF staff. Due to time constraints there was no testing of tools with participants before the review began, however some minor changes were made to questions after the team realized there was duplication of questioning, respondents didn't understand the questions or the interviews were taking too long.

Review tools are displayed in table 4 and were developed to collect information for qualitative and quantitative analysis and identify practical recommendations to address the barriers in implementing the program. The review analyzed 3PC Quarterly Reports from Q5-Q8. Reports from Q1-Q4 do not contain consistent and/or relevant

Table 4 Review tools and analysis

Tool	Analysis	Number of respondents
Key informant interviews (KII)	For qualitative analysis of staff and parent's experiences, opinions and feelings about the program, to identify patterns regarding strengths, weaknesses and suggestions for the future of the program. Frequency of responses was calculated and analysis of ratings and scaled responses provided quantitative data to understand issues and trends. KIIs also provided opportunity to fact check, seek clarification and cross check.	112
Focus group discussions (FGD)	Analysis of what is working and not working by identifying common or shared responses from different groups across different services, locations and ages. The frequency of similar responses was used to identify trends. This included analyzing faciliators' observations to identify overall level of engagement and interest of the participant relating to the CSO.	158
Questionnaire	Survey results, including ratings of program staff and services.	49
Desk review	Review of program and M&E documents to provide context. Review of quarterly reports to compare and analyze progress of program against log frame and work plan.	

numerical and other information. All CSOs contribute data to these reports, which are compiled by FI 3PC team. Due to the high number and length of surveys, questionnaires and FGD guidelines, these are not included in the appendix of this report but should be attached in a separate document.

1.5 LIMITATIONS IN THE REVIEW

All but two services operating under the 3PC umbrella are co-funded by 3PC (UNICEF) funds and support from other donors, with those two services being solely funded by 3PC. Additionally, 3PC activities such as training, systems building and networking aim to promote improvements *across* organizations, creating holistic outcomes or flow on effects to 3PC and non-3PC activities. These factors present some challenges in measuring the specific impacts of 3PC. Where possible, the review team collected and analyzed data related to 3PC activities only. However, it is worth noting here this review contains results which are representative and indicative of the impacts of 3PC.

23 fewer participants (8 children/young people and 15 parents) in were included the review than initially planned. This was because CSOs had not always randomly selected young people and families for interview, due to confusion, poor timing or (un)availability of clients; some participants were too young for inclusion; and one CSO presented parents and children/young people for interview who knew nothing about the services being discussed. In these cases, responses were not included in analysis for the review because the information obtained was not substantial or relevant and would negatively skew data. Overall, the decrease in community participants does not present any problems relating to data quality, however it may be of relevance when planning future research activities.

Many clients access multiple services (3PC and non-3PC funded) from 3PC partners and non-3PC organizations. This presented some difficulties when questioning participants about 3PC services because they are not aware of the names of services or are unable to distinguish between services and organizations. With this in mind, tools were edited in the field to focus information gathering and assessment on the general quality and level of satisfaction of the ten services listed in Table 2.

II - FINDINGS

The following tables are categorized to meet the review ToR and outline key findings based on information obtained from KIIs with staff, managers, key partners and beneficiaries. 'Areas for improvement' are ideas and suggestions from interviewees. Quotes are used to highlight common or standout themes that emerged during interviews and discussions. The term 'Managers' is used in reference to the manager's KII, which included an even mix of CSO managers and directors.

At the date of the review:

2.1 NETWORKING: 3PC has been much more successful at facilitating internal networking, than external networking.

Table 5 Key finding 2.1 - Networking

Finding	Evidence	Remarks
2.1.1 **3PC has facilitated valuable, positive outcomes through internal networking.**	Referrals are the most common collaborative activity between partners. 96% of staff and managers/directors discussing this positively in their interviews.	At the time of review there were 38 whole cases referred between partners but this figure does not reflect the high volume of collaborative case work anecdotally mentioned throughout interviews. Partners are in regular contact about issues regarding drug or alcohol cases; strategies regarding family reintegration; tips for introducing new home-based productions and sharing information between prison support services such as how to approach prison staff and supporting clients once they are released.
	Staff (66%) and managers (89%) said they now have more direct, personal connections with other 3PC partners. From 51 exchange visits, 100% of exchange participants interviewed say the visit led to increased understanding of processes, programs and new ideas.	12 trainings have been delivered by one partner to another. Because of training and exchange visits, for example on the topic of drugs and alcohol, staff say it is much easier to phone/email partners because they have more personal connections or increased rapport. Another example of the benefits of exchange visits includes a Battambang CSO visiting a Phnom Penh partner to observe finance and reporting systems. This resulted in better invoicing, improved staff confidence and fewer numerical errors in reporting for the Battambang CSO.
	Staff and managers from 8 of the 9 CSOs said 3PC had given them a sense of professional empowerment.	Most participants spoke about *'feeling stronger'* and more credible, accountable and assured that they belonged and are contributing to something that's bigger than their own organization. This positive underlying sentiment appears to be a great encouragement for staff and managers/directors to strive for excellence in service delivery and organizational capacity.

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership collaboration was key to the research and reporting of the KAP Alcohol Survey in 2013.</td>
<td>This is an excellent example of partners utilizing local knowledge and networks in different geographical locations to address major community issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Areas for improvement:
• Recommence quarterly meetings to acknowledge and address members' concerns or issues, celebrate achievements and further promote internal networking.
• Remind 3PC member organizations of their obligations to each other regarding timely follow ups and accepting difficult cases.
• Consider facilitating more exchange visits (75% of staff and managers said they would like more). Broad reasons include building staff capacity via exposure to different professional settings and programs and boosting staff morale when they see they are not alone in the challenges they face. Specific requests include increased visits to address alcohol problems in social economic services and more visits focused on remedial education tools like lesson plans, activities and curriculum designed to
• address different developmental or learning levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2
Most CSOs have positive, collaborative relationships with local authorities, however this is not specific to 3PC and is mostly due to pre-existing processes or relationships.</td>
<td>94% of LA interviewees described their relationship with CSOs as harmonious, productive, and valuable and with great outcomes for beneficiaries.</td>
<td>While most interviewees expressed an interest in further developing relationships, 8 of 49 said their relationship was 'difficult or challenging' but did not explain why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAs said there is a high level of contact from CSOs. 55% said they are in weekly or monthly contact, 14% are in contact each quarter, 20% are in contact only once or twice a year.</td>
<td>7 of the 9 CSOs attend monthly meetings with commune or LAs. Specific reference was made to increases in communication with police regarding diversion programs and increases in the level of communication between partners and CCWC in Bantay Meanchey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85% of LAs have attended training and found it to be relevant and helpful.</td>
<td>Training was the most popular request from local authorities. 'Training is very related to my work in CCWC', 'I get more knowledge about child rights and information about cases in my community'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69% of LA interviewees had made a direct referral to CSO in the last three years and 83% said the outcome of referral was positive. When asked about they type of support they receive from CSOs, 85% said knowledge-based capacity building, such as training; 25% said transportation to attend meetings or for assessments/follow ups; 25% said they</td>
<td>Referrals are the number one reason for collaboration between CSOs and local authorities. Reasons for referrals: at risk children (6 responses), sexual or violent abuse (7), diversion (3), temporary accommodation (4), trafficking, child labor, orphan, HIV, drug, family poverty.</td>
</tr>
</table>

	receive money or budget support from CSOs.	
		Areas for improvement: • 3PC management should follow up with two CSOs who do not report to LAs to ensure partners are meeting their obligations to regularly share information with LAs. • 3PC/CSOs should consider hosting meetings in each province to formally introduce and explain the purpose and function of 3PC and outline opportunities for increased collaboration between partners and LAs. (Seven of nine LAs had no understanding of 3PC).
2.1.3 **3PC should increase engagement with government at national and sub-national levels.**	All key partners spoke about the lack of communication and collaboration between MOSVY and FI (on activities specific to 3PC) and recognized this as a shortfall in the program.	The review found that MoSVY has been involved in two meetings of all 3PC partners at national level to date. Regarding DoSVY, there have been no meetings hosted by 3PC or specifically relating to 3PC. However, partners are regularly involved with DoSVY in local meetings, reporting and other forums. All key partners confirm the importance of harmonization between 3PC activities and government policy and/or practice. MOSVY expressed concern that all partners are not following government policies, for example OVC standards and the recently implemented Alternative Care policy, a concern that is largely unfounded as the majority of partners stated they do adhere to these and other government guidelines by incorporating their principles in their organizational policies and programs. Furthermore, this is monitored by FI who confirmed 3PC members follow government guidelines in their work. This is an example of a lack of communication between 3PC and MoSVY, but also between DoSVY and MoSVY as interviews with government staff revealed information sharing between DoSVY and MoSVY could be improved to increase MoSVY's understanding of the activities of 3PC partners. This shows the need to strengthen regular coordination and information sharing between 3PC partners and MoSVY at national and sub national level. The review found that UNICEF provides a supportive and in some ways facilitative role in communications between FI and MoSVY. Moving forward, UNICEF and FI want to establish more direct lines of communication between FI and MoSVY to reduce future reliance on UNICEF as a connector between parties.

		Areas for improvement: • 3PC management team should send quarterly reports to MoSVY. This was an expectation of the original agreement which has not been carried out, largely due to confusion and staff changes at FI. The reviewer suggests FI share a global report with MoSVY and partner CSOs which might be different to the one send to UNICEF in that it excludes financial or other necessarily confidential information. • There should be more joint meetings between key partners to build the intended partnership: a more collaborative approach to awareness, planning, development and implementation of 3PC activities, one that reflects a truer partnership of three groups, rather than an imbalanced partnership which is very FI-focused. • Consider a meeting of key partners to discuss roles and responsibilities as per the original 3PC agreement, with a view to clarifying these roles and responsibilities (including ways of communicating and sharing information between partners) for the future of the program. Partners should determine appropriate timelines for responding to requests to avoid delays when collaborating.
2.1.4 **CSOs and DoSVY have good levels of collaboration, but this is not specific to 3PC.**	8 of the 9 CSOs report monthly to DoSVY. 85% of DoSVY interviewees said communication and collaboration between DoSVY and CSOs had improved in the past few years. However, only two CSOs said their relationship with DoSVY had strengthened since 3PC.	DoSVY staff said information from CSOs is helpful. From one DoSVY interviewee: '*It helps us a lot in keeping track and make report to our office.'* Overall, DoSVY interviewees said CSOs are positive and helpful:*"We have more contact, more often in a more understandable manner. They always respond to our request on time, like meetings, reports, updates'.*
	5 of the 7 DOSVY interviewees said that CSOs provide transport and training to support their delivery of child protection services.	From one DoSVY interviewee: *'(CSO) helps us a lot in terms of prevention and protection as government doesn't have enough resources to act on time'.* Based on interviews with MoSVY, this information is not being shared up to national level.
	In contrast to DoSVY responses, most CSOs said there was no change in collaborations with DoSVY. Furthermore, 81% of staff and managers discussed similar constraints when working with DoSVY.	Two CSOs reported a negative impact in the past few years due to a lack of resources at district level. This is outlined in greater detail in finding 2.2.2.
	50% of CSO managers/directors said DoSVY is very helpful with difficult cases as they can exercise influence with community members, other authorities or government.	CSO interviewees referred to contacting DoSVY when they need a higher, authoritative type of assistance. This does not occur regularly. One example involves DoSVY staff assisting a CSO with a complex adoption case involving a commune chief.

	57% of DoSVY interviewees had no knowledge of 3PC. 43% said their understanding was medium to good, however only one interviewee successfully explained the purpose and function of 3PC, indicating an overall low understanding of 3PC.	Although there is no record of 3PC-specific meetings with DoSVY occurring in any of the five provinces, CSOs connect with DoSVY for referrals and placements of children into centers and foster care, as well as administrative matters such as obtaining formal documents like birth certificates.
		Areas for improvement: • Consider ways to develop more direct lines of communication between CSOs and DoSVY/MoSVY. • MoSVY might look at its internal reporting mechanisms to ensure information received at local level, regarding CSO's activities, is shared at provincial level. This will help raise wider awareness of 3PC activities and assist MoSVY in ensuring CSOs are adhering to government policies and strategies. • Consider ways to utilize UNICEF zone officers to raise awareness/increase coverage of 3PC at provincial level. • FI should send global quarterly reports to MoSVY for the reasons mentioned in 2.1.3.
2.1.5 **3PC should increase the level of engagement with partners' own networks (satellite networks)**	All CSOs have existing relationships with non-3PC CSOs, however few new collaborations have formed or existing relationships been leveraged or strengthened as a direct result of 3PC activities.	All CSOs are involved in local or national networks or committees, such as BIGC, OVCTF, CRC, arts or law related networks, and the Foster Care subcommittee. All CSOs attend at least one regular (monthly or quarterly) meeting with satellite networks. However, discussion of 3PC with satellite networks is very limited and this review found only two examples, which included the sharing of KAP survey results and invitations for satellite organizations to attend training.
	All FI and UNICEF interviewees, at national and zone levels, said more work needs to be done to raise awareness of 3PC with satellite networks.	**Areas for improvement:** • FI is currently mapping satellite networks to maximize coverage of the network in 2014 and should consider how to actively encourage CSOs to raise awareness of 3PC with satellite networks by providing workshops or clear instructions/guidance on how to do this. • Recommence provincial 3PC-specific meetings, designed for partners to connect with each other and external organizations at provincial level. • Key partners should consider prioritizing or targeting specific satellite networks/organizations, as some 3PC members are better positioned to offer support to external NGOs than others. For example, three 3PC members already invite satellite partners to

		attend training and workshops, whereas others remain internally focused, mostly due to their own capacity (or lack thereof).

2.2 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION: 3PC program implementation, regarding client satisfaction and Child Protection, has been mostly successful.

Table 6 Key finding 2.2 – Program implementation

Finding	Evidence	Remarks
2.2.1 Beneficiaries and local authorities connected to or involved in of 3PC programs are overwhelmingly satisfied with the provision and quality of services delivered in five provinces.	Regarding skills and attitude of staff, children and young people rated high (52%) or very high (21%) levels of satisfaction. 52% said staff's support, advice and guidance is one of their favorite things about the CSO.	Discussions about staff focused heavily on their friendliness and kindness. In all except one (where participants had met staff only once before) of the FGDs, youth participants and staff were observed to be respectful and familiar with one another.
	Regarding services, most children and young people rated a high (63%) or very high (21%) level of satisfaction. FGD facilitators reported that every group said they want the services to continue. When asked about their favorite things at the CSO, 57% said games and activities, 52% said health care, 37% said NFE and remedial education and one third said receiving help with family reintegration.	Participants highlighted art (including circus) classes, vocational training and their experiences in transitional homes as being very good services. Several young people stated they were very happy about the support they were given while in prison as this made them feel safer and more positive about the future. *'I was helped so much by this and it can help other boys like me to stay on a good path when they leave prison'.*
	100% of families interviewed endorse CSOs and said they would recommend the CSO to others with similar circumstances to their own. 11% had already connected a relative or community member to services such as NFE and school reintegration. Of parent interviewees who have been engaged with the CSO for between 2-3 years, 90% said services had improved, with participants choosing counseling and outreach as the two highest ranking services in terms of quality.	Many interviewees said they hope other poor and vulnerable families can also benefit from the services and support.

	Regarding staff knowledge and skills, 40% of parents said the level is very high and 53% said the level is good.	The majority of parents interviewed said they feel comfortable and safe with staff and happy with advice they receive about how to improve their lives and the lives of their children. Although a few parents said *'some staff good and some can improve',* overall there is a very high level of trust in and respect for skills and knowledge of CSO staff.
		Areas for improvement: • Seven of the 55 parent interviewees suggested staff could improve with more training, conducting more visits and providing updated information about staff. • From FGDs with children and young people, 19 of the 110 participants made suggestions about how to improve services. Responses focused on continued provision of materials (books, bikes, school uniforms, equipment for VT); learning new languages; increasing sports and computer activities.
2.2.2 **3PC is making a positive impact regarding Child Protection and prevention in communities across five provinces, however all partners agree further work must be carried out to strengthen sustainable Child Protection mechanisms in Cambodia.**	81% of parent interviewees said they had applied what they had learnt from the CSO to take better care of their children. Many parents expressed a good understanding of child rights and about 10% said they had passed this information and learning on to others in the community.	Parents referred specifically to keeping their children in school; protecting them from domestic violence; using advice they had received about hygiene, bathing and nutrition. From two parents: *'I respect (my children's) views, I don't hit them', 'Since I got involved in small business, I make them stay in school'.*
	89% of LA interviewees rated CSOs' contribution to Child Protection and prevention systems in their jurisdiction as good, high or very high. A further 86% said CSO staff have good or high levels of skills, knowledge and experience to deliver Child Protection activities.	One LA interviewee in Siem Reap said *'regarding street children, since 3PC there has been a decrease in the number of children living and working on the streets and positive remarks from police, who are implementing a more child-friendly approach to petty crime or begging. They learnt this from the diversion program'.* Regarding CP capacity building, almost a quarter of LA interviewees referred to an increase in community and LA's understanding of Child Protection and response to violations since 3PC began.
	88% of managers ranked the skills and experience of staff to be good or high.	A further 77% said there are high levels of motivation from staff to lean more about Child Protection theory and practice, for example positive discipline.
	Key partners believe 3PC is on track to achieving its goals related to Child Protection.	UNICEF said CSOs have adopted a more holistic approach to Child Protection, partly due to increased collaborations amongst partners, and there has been a shift in focus from issues-based problems to prevention and response since 3PC began. FI and UNICEF stated that excellent improvements had been made at subnational level. This is supported by 89% of managers who rated the impact of 3PC on local

		and district authorities to be high.
	FI, UNICEF and all managers agree that the role of 3PC is to strengthen Child Protection mechanisms, not take the lead role. MoSVY interviewees also agree and referred to the MoSVY Strategy Plan 2014-2018 (currently in draft), which outlines the government's coordinating role.	Interviewees often spoke about 3PC as part of a broader national strategy, recognizing that major impacts with sustainable outcomes require action from the Cambodian national government. Interviewees are motivated to increase collaborations with MoSVY, DoSVY and other government departments that focus on influencing long term protection and prevention mechanisms. From one manager: *'The Cambodian government could be a shining example about how to improve national child protection systems. They could say to the world "Look at how we take care of our children, despite our history and our challenges, look how we protect them from all harm and encourage them to build strong lives". We must find ways to support government to do this job, their job'.* Through the 2014-18 Strategy Plan, MoSVY intends to link with CSOs to achieve national targets, for example in case management, family assessment and reunification.
	Of the seven CSOs with Child Protection Policies in place, the majority of staff and managers say policies are strictly followed all the time.	All CSOs with Child Protection Policies run annual or semester training/refresher courses to complement or educate about their policies, as well implementing policy updates, since 3PC began.
		Areas for improvement: • MoSVY should disseminate the 2014-18 Strategy Plan with 3PC members and, together, investigate opportunities for harmonization and collaboration. • It may be helpful for 3PC to document the roles and responsibilities of government and CSOs. This document could assist in guiding government and CSO staff at a local level about, but not limited to, these examples: appropriate response times, requests for money, payments or equipment between CSO and government staff and accessibility or transport necessary to complete field assessments. The aim of this is to ensure greater accountability and efficiency and decrease duplicity of services. • 3PC management team should continue to support two CSOs to finalize their Child Protection Policies in 2014. • FI and UNICEF should collect all existing policies and collaborate with MoSVY to establish standardized Child Protection Policies or Codes of Conduct to be championed by MoSVY and disseminated at a national level for organizations whose programs or activities involve working with children. • Although this has improved since the beginning of 3PC, UNICEF

		highlighted that there are still many more males than females accessing services and partners should consider ways to address this discrepancy, perhaps in collaboration with MoSVY's 2014-18 Strategy Plan.
2.2.3 3PC is successfully improving organizational capacity of its partners, with the most significant improvements concentrated on the less advanced CSOs.	KIIs clearly revealed that three of the less advanced CSOs have dramatically improved their organizational capacity since 3PC began.	3PC has successfully applied deeper levels of organizational support to those CSOs requiring in-depth technical assistance, such as upgrading from paper records to electronic management of finance and data; improvements in staff capacity; and implementation of guidelines and SoPs for Child Protection, accommodation and foster care.
	89% of managers said their organizational capacity has improved as a result of 3PC.	The most common response referred to faster and easier reporting (to 3PC, MoSVY, donors and others) due to improved data collection, tools and monitoring systems, and M&E and report training which had increased accuracy, efficiency and confidence of staff. From one manager, *'Previously no data collection for foster care, but we now have a system for recording this information', ''It's so interesting to see what are the old numbers and what are the new numbers, so within a year we can see, wow, it's really changing, and we would know exactly how it's changing and this is so great'.* Three CSOs spoke about improvements in their finance systems, *'We have improved our invoicing system for less errors and easier work. Because we are better at recording and providing support documents, we got better finance reports for donors and we can attract more funding. This already happened, we got more funding and this is only because of 3PC'.* Four CSOs referred to improvements in staff structure or reporting lines. Outcomes included more empowerment to staff, greater accountability and better lines of communication (through more regular, focused meetings) for various staff levels.
		Areas for improvement: • Key partners suggested all CSOs review their mission statements to ensure their activities are community-focused rather than center-based. • 3PC could more actively encourage specialization in specific programs which require advanced learning for areas such as disability, family reintegration and preservation, case management, foster care and social economic services. Specialization may occur

		at staff level (to address locally contextual issues) or CSO level (to leverage access and reach of 3PC network and avoid duplication) however the topic of specialization emerged in interviews with eight of the nine CSOs and may require more investigation/consideration from 3PC management.
2.2.4 **Some 3PC partners require a more advanced level of TA or program support.**	Four managers said their CSOs are not receiving an appropriate level of TA support and appear to be contributing more to the program than they are gaining from it.	**Areas for improvement:** • More advanced or more established CSOs would benefit from opportunities to network with or learn from international, innovative organizations whose programs are recognized as good practice, specifically in the areas of law, drugs and alcohol, social economic services and family reintegration (including family tracing).
2.2.5 **Some CSOs are working with most vulnerable families in communities.**	Most CSO staff and managers believe they are working with the most vulnerable families. 55% of LA interviewees said CSOs are 'always' working with most vulnerable community members and 44% said 'sometimes'. This view is shared by 84% of parent interviewees who said CSOs are working with very vulnerable people.	Overall, interviewees spoke highly of CSOs' persistence in locating and assisting the poorest families or families with complex, overlapping risks. Staff and managers from 5 CSOs said they want to do more to reach vulnerable people but are challenged by distance, migration issues and staff capacity. From one CSO: *'With regards to supporting, monitoring and following up, this is limited because for the very hard cases there is not enough time in meetings to cover all the issues and so sometimes it's not addressed'.* From another staff member: *'This is very hard to define. We follow MoSVY criteria to assess cases, so in that way we are already working with vulnerable beneficiaries. We want to work more with street children, but it's very difficult to ensure we have correct capacity to address their needs. Maybe don't have capacity right now'.* * Target audiences for each CSO were reviewed and set at the beginning of this program and did not necessarily include definitions of most vulnerable or most at risk populations. The reviewer suggests 3PC conduct specific research on this topic if required, as this was not a focus of the review. **Areas for improvement:** - Continue technical support from FI to CSOs to enhance the selection criteria and mechanisms as well as outreach to ensure that the most vulnerable people in the target areas are reached and able to benefit from the services.

2.3 MANAGEMENT OF 3PC: Despite some shortfalls, management of 3PC has been of a very good standard.

Table 7 Key finding 2.3 – Management of 3PC

Finding	Evidence	Remarks
2.3.1 **Overall, CSOs and key partners are very satisfied with 3PC management.**	90% of CSO and key partner interviewees said that FI manages and responds to issues in a timely and helpful way and no interviewees reported problems or issues with FI's management of the 3PC budget.	The review team observed very positive and respectful relationships between 3PC management and CSOs. The only negative comment about FI management related to staff changes, which have caused delays and confusion during the course of the program.
	100% of CSO and key partner interviewees indicated they are pleased with FI's management of reporting and shared ideas for improvement.	**Areas for improvement:** • When updating reporting processes, training or other resources, FI should provide more in-depth conversation or meetings, rather than solely relying on email. • It was generally expressed by most interviewees that they would like to know more about each other's activities, areas of focus or concern and upcoming events, to identify where there is crossover of ideas or find opportunities to collaborate with or support other 3PC members. FI is aware of this and intends to use the quarterly reports and meetings to increase awareness about partner's plans for upcoming quarters.
	Most managers/directors ranked FI's provision and management of TA support, training, SoPs and guidelines to be at a good or high level.	**Areas for improvement:** • UNICEF might be more involved in development of training (to help avoid duplication and utilize existing resources) and participate in training to expand their understanding of resources being used. • FI staff have identified a gap in evaluating the outcomes of 3PC training in that there is no universal monitoring form. This could be developed to increase consistency and better evaluate the effectiveness of training and learning workshops. • As mentioned in other sections of this report, training topics could assist staff to specialize in specific areas like reintegration or business skills. • FI would like to increase opportunities for CSO partners to develop and deliver training to each other and external audiences.

	Regarding FI's facilitation of external networking, all key partner interviewees and 89% of managers identified a need to improve relationships with government and satellite networks.	5 of 9 CSO managers said most of their external networking is unrelated to 3PC. Overall, the majority of interviewees acknowledge there has been a lot of energy focused on internal networking and 3PC now needs to shift the focus to external networking opportunities.
2.3.2 **3PC members would like internal communications to increase.**	**Areas for improvement:** • FI would like to develop a 'Partner Support Plan' to outline upcoming plans/actions/tasks, who is responsible and time in order to increase accountability for FI staff (including Technical Advisors) and CSO staff, and allow the 3PC team to more effectively monitor progress. • Based on feedback collected in this review, FI intends to share a global report with CSOs and MoSVY. This global report would include a new section to outline 'upcoming actions' for CSOs, FI, MoSVY and UNICEF, for all 3PC members to be informed of projected activities or priorities for the next quarter. • Recommence 3PC quarterly meetings. • The 3PC Facebook page was raised in several interviews with managers and staff and might be better utilized to foster the professional learning of members via sharing of lessons learned, research papers, articles and links to good practice projects or organizations. While this may require some training for those CSOs not using Facebook, and this review does not suggest the page be used for personal or social topics or discussions, anecdotal evidence suggests the majority of organization staff are familiar with Facebook and this appears to be an opportunity to leverage an existing 3PC communications tool. • Some staff and manger interviewees suggested FI and UNICEF increase field visits to observe and advise on programs. FI said this had decreased due to funding reductions, however this might be reconsidered in planning for the program's future. • Two key partner staff discussed increasing opportunities for MoSVY and DoSVY staff to participate in field visits. The aim of this would be for government staff to directly experience and/or observe programs and activities; increase government understanding about beneficiaries' needs, their interactions with CSOs an the challenges faced by both parties; for government staff to observe and/or monitor the ways in which CSOs implement government policies and guidelines and, finally to identify opportunities for increased collaboration between government and non-government staff.	
2.3.3 **3PC members would like external communications to increase.**	**Areas for improvement:** • Consider greater promotion of the partnership value 3PC. From one key partner about how 3PC might increase its impact on the Child Protection sector in Cambodia: *'More emphasis should be placed on acknowledging the work that's being done on a (3PC) partnership level, rather than work done by FI, or work done by UNICEF for example. It's important for the future of the program that we stress the value of 3PC is the partnership with UNICEF, MoSVY and FI and all the CSOs. The combined influence is very high, our credibility should be leveraged more'.* • Consider creating standardized communications material for all partners to use, for example utilizing the 3PC logo and letterheads, to encourage CSOs to raise awareness with their satellite networks.	

2.3.4 **Clarity of the roles and responsibilities of key partners would benefit the ongoing management of 3PC.**	**Areas for improvement:** • Consider increasing responsibilities of UNICEF zone officers regarding 3PC activities at the provincial and local levels. This could include more direct lines of communication between zone offices and CSOs to improve understanding and foster more efficient collaborating. • The division of labor between FI and UNICEF in terms of hiring of staff, procurement of external services and consultants should be clarified with staff, especially considering recent staff turn-over. Consider clarifying who is responsible for hiring, support and management of 3PC staff, including external consultants. • Regarding key partners, consider clarifying appropriate 'reply times' or deadlines for providing feedback, to be adhered to by all key partners, with the aim of reducing delays in decision-making and program implementation. • 3PC should consider the benefits of increased technical support from UNICEF because of its involvement in a variety of programs including violence, health, drug and/or gender, its long history in Cambodia and ability to identify gaps and duplications.
2.3.5 **Future staffing of the program must be considered as reductions and changes to staff in the 3PC team has caused and causes delays and disruptions to program implementation.**	**Areas for improvement:** • Most disruptions and delays in program implementation, for example the development and delivery of training packages and the database system, are due to staff changes or losses in the 3PC management team. This is, in many ways, an uncontrollable factor of program management, however key partners should consider how to address human resource capacities to deliver the program in its final stages and in its potential future. • FI and UNICEF should consider a) the duration of the program, i.e. if it is to continue and for how long, b) the priorities of the program in the future and c) staff requirements regarding skills and characteristics needed to deliver a future program. For example, the need for internal and external networking and promotion of 3PC has been noted in this review. This requires increased stakeholder liaison, development and execution of communication and engagement strategies to broaden the reach of the program. All FI interviewees acknowledge the importance of these activities, but said it is difficult to prioritize or address these activities within the current workload.

2.4 KEY FINDING – SERVICE SUMMARIES

This section outlines the status, at the time of review, of each service funded under 3PC. This includes a summary of the strengths and weaknesses; cost effectiveness; staff capacity and sustainability of each service, based on information from KIIs with staff, managers, key partners and beneficiaries. Regarding staff capacity and cost effectiveness, interviewees were asked to rate Low, Medium or High. 'Areas for improvement' are based on ideas and suggestions from interviewees.

Table 8 Key finding 2.4 – Summary of services

2.4.1	Drop in center, rehab center or transitional home (5 CSOs)
Strengths	Centers are implementing government policies, providing materials and emotional support. One CSO said they are the only center in town working with drug users. One CSO said they improved their DIC management system with 3PC support. From one CSO: *'Many sources feed into the Transitional Home, like CCWC and diversion program, and it runs smoothly because we have capacity and experience to accept all these referrals. Especially from police because we know they are looking out for children too and also they trust us. The centers offer immediate safety for children during the reintegration process, it's usually the first step of family reintegration, so we get to know the clients well'.* Parents are pleased because their children have a safe place to stay, study and/or play, access NFE and food and enjoy being with other children. *'My children stayed a short time, but are better in both physical and mental manner'.*
Staff cap.	Medium. One CSO mentioned a new staff structure that has improved accountability by implementing work plans for all staff.
Cost effect.	Medium.
Challenges, constraints	Dealing with theft, drug affected or aggressive clients; housing children with psychological problems 'mixed in with other children'; one Transitional Home is now surrounded by beer gardens and is no longer an ideal setting for children; conflicts with neighbors who do not like the center being in their area; re-zoning of drug zones, imposed by NCHAD to avoid duplication, has impacted the consistency of services for PWID/PWUD clients.
Areas for improvement	Two CSOs said they would like more technical support regarding their monitoring systems. Another CSO said they have been receiving *'different types of clients since 3PC, and they are older, stronger and in conflict with the law. Staff are coping well, but we need more expertise'.*
Sustainability	CSOs said their services would continue without funding. Most CSOs referred to the importance of Transitional Homes in the reintegration process. One CSO is considering ways to *'reduce the length of stays and the number of students in Transitional Homes and increasing options for independent living'.*
2.4.2	Remedial education, NFE (4 CSOs)
Strengths	Most CSOs have increased client numbers since 3PC. Most referred to flexible and interesting activities for children. From one staff member, *'We encourage children to use their imagination and engage through enjoyment. More freer, less boring, less focused on right and wrong, more about process of learning, inquiry'.* Parents are very satisfied with the opportunities for their children and themselves: *'When my children are at the center I can do my business. This is good for the whole family'.* Two CSOs said they have strong systems for follow ups, social workers receive a daily attendance list from the teachers. A follow-up is done if a newly (re)integrated child is missing for one day, and also to verify whether the (re)integrated child is attending classes.
Staff cap.	High. Most CSOs employ qualified teachers.

Cost effect.	High. *'Many children coming for little running costs'*.
Challenges, constraints	At one CSO the remedial class is located in a family house, this is not private or established enough; collaboration with and support from parents can be difficult. From one manager, *'If level of poverty is very high, it is difficult to retain children because of earning opportunities (begging, rubbish collecting). The challenges are not just to provide alternatives to the parents, but it's also hard to work with the emotional and mental state of the child - they can feel guilty if they are in school and not helping to support their family, the parents sometimes blame the child. Social workers provide a lot of encouragement during this time to always remind the parents about the benefits of school, always encourage them to support education pathways'*.
Areas for improvement	Consider providing more child-friendly materials; some staff want to learn how to adapt materials for different learning levels. Consider facilitating more training and more exchange visits to improve overall capacity. Three CSOs said they need more staff.
Sustainability	All CSOs say they will continue with or without funding, but with funding means they can reach more clients. NFE is taken very seriously by all CSOs because it is an important step in case management. From interviewees, *'There is a lot of follow up, NFE is part of the holistic approach. It could be a big problem for children if the funding stops or reduces because without constant support it's so easy for them to drop out'* and *'If we have 3PC it means that staff improve capacity to be more professional'*.
2.4.3	**Vocational training (3 CSOs)**
Strengths	Two CSOs said they are more organized in running VT since 3PC. One CSO said their VT program contributes to the national and regional art scene by raising the profile of local artists; the same CSO is adopting new digital arts curriculum to address local sector demands and offer students a higher level of employability upon completion of their studies. Some staff and family interviewees spoke about VT as a positive way to prevent young people migrating to Thailand.
Staff cap.	High.
Cost effect.	Medium. Some interviewees spoke about high inputs, but also high outcomes for individuals and their families. *'It is very expensive to gather equipment for new curriculum (computers, tablets etc.) but it means students gain the most useful skills for getting jobs'*. One manager said *'even though the budget is small, drop out rates are high so value for money is not great'*.
Challenges, constraints	All CSOs spoke about high drop out rates. The most popular reasons for this are (in order) students coming from complex and damaged backgrounds; students wanting to migrate to Thailand to earn money; family responsibilities preventing ongoing studies; students becoming bored or frustrated with studies, mainly due to lack of educational experience.
Areas for improvement	Regarding retention rates, 3PC might consider reviewing or researching this further. Several interviewees said they would like to have a meeting with 3PC partners, and other good practice organizations who have better retention rates, to develop strategies to improve retention. Consider different curriculum, more on-the-job training and better selection process for matching students with subjects. Consider opportunities for increased collaboration with LAs and satellite networks to appropriately match students with training/jobs.
Sustainability	VT will continue at CSOs. However, funding is required to improve pedagogy; provide materials and equipment and ensure staff numbers do not reduce. One CSO, whose target group is normally much younger, has a very small number of VT clients and, with the support of 3PC, should consider the viability of continuing this service as it requires a high number of resources with unfortunately low retention rates.
2.4.4	**Family reintegration (6 CSOs)**

Strengths	CSOs spoke about strong collaborations with CCWC, DoSVY and LAs obtain documents and locate families. Most CSOs provide follow ups and other services to families well beyond the point of reintegration, as part of a holistic approach to family preservation.
Staff cap.	Medium to high. Managers said staff are *'patient, committed and have a lost of trust',* but require increased training specific to reintegration and tracing.
Cost effect.	Medium. One CSO said *'it's hard to say, the service has not been operating effectively'.*
Challenges, constraints	The three most common constraints to family reintegration are migration, alcohol and/or the family's economic situation. One manager said "*CSO's should work more directly with families to help them stabilize incomes. This means more training to social workers. But we need to think about how we approach reintegration, especially when the family is unwilling or unable to take the child back because they are too poor. They just go in bad circles until they can earn regular income and support themselves'.* One CSO said not having a physical space or house for children and families to interact together was a big problem, because clients need sufficient time to meet and be around one another before living together again. Another CSO said '*only 60% of families are okay after one year'* and cited alcohol as the major problem along with children being sent to work in tourist seasons/areas. All CSOs said they need more support from government, with about 50% describing a need for case-level assistance and the other half stating strategic, holistic approaches to address alcohol and extreme poverty in communities.
Areas for improvement	Most interviewees, including key partners, want increased training and staff learning in family tracing, preservation and reintegration skills. CSOs should consider providing observational visits or 'on-the-job training' to DoSVY and LAs to increase capacity of authorities to take on more cases. 3PC should increase collaborations with satellite networks to share requests, and expand resources, especially in isolated areas and border communities.
Sustainability	CSOs will continue providing services, however all interviewees request funding because they believe this work will continue to build over the next few years as more institutions (orphanages) close and until the Alternative Care policy takes full effect. Most interviewees said more staff and more funding is required to continue providing successful reintegration services, and emphasized greater success will be achieved with continued funding, building staff capacity, continuing to strengthen links with authorities and satellite networks and community education/awareness raising.
2.4.5	**Reintegration to public school education (3 CSOs)**
Strengths	Transition to school is often viewed as a big success that is positive for children and their families. CSOs have strong monitoring systems, contacting schools multiple times per week to confirm attendance and following up where necessary. CSOs said their programs strengthen links with the provincial and municipality office of education and the public school or NGO who runs the school. Social workers work with teachers to solve problems and intervene to support difficult students. Case management systems have also improved to cover school reintegration.
Staff cap.	Medium to high.
Cost effect.	High. '*Children are motivated so outputs are good when compared to the cost'.*
Challenges, constraints	The biggest challenge on this service is students dropping out because they are unable to pay teachers' requests for money (teachers ask for money due to low salaries). Other constraints include transport difficulties in accessing schools; children being forced to earn money especially during peak tourist times; migrating families who do not have birth certificates, family book or other information to enroll, and lack of information provided by schools about registration dates for schools which means some parents miss the deadline and their children miss out. One CSO said they have very high drop out rates because they are often unable to provide enough financial support to cover overlapping issues

	such as transport to school, uniforms/materials, as well as supporting the family to prevent them from sending the child back to work.
Areas for improvement	Consider increased focus on income generation for clients with high risk of sending their child to work. Consider hosting formal meetings with 3PC key partners, DoSVY, LAs and schools to increase awareness and collaborations with teachers/schools about how to support vulnerable families and students. Consider higher-level advocacy with government to increase teachers' salaries.
Sustainability	All CSOs will continue to deliver the service and rate it as one of their most important programs. However, funding is needed to support work that has recently begun, including: • one CSO is reducing center-based learning and increasing remedial classes at local schools and in communities to broaden awareness of the importance of education • one CSO will organize events with DoSVY to raise awareness of school registration dates as well as hosting parents' meetings twice a year in 2014 to raise awareness of the value education. • CSOs would like to increase the numbers of social enterprise clients (to help families generate income and keep children in schools and out of labor), but require more staff and organizational capacity building to deliver income generation services.
2.4.6	**Prison support services (2 CSOs)**
Strengths	One CSO says their service is '*strong enough to can pick up DoSVY workload in 2014 because they can't do it. Of course we prefer that they can do it, but it shows our program is strong if we can scale up'.* Qualified teachers visit clients twice a week in prison, fostering good relationships between clients and the CSO to transition easily to case management when clients are released. Social workers spend a lot of time relaying messages between clients and families to maintain family connection during incarceration. One CSO is leveraging their long legal history and experience in Cambodia to provide counseling and legal representation to individuals, but says some of their greatest achievements are *'in the diversion project, encouraging courts to adopt child friendly measures. They agree to pre-trial detention, alternative sentencing and they have adopted the language and integrated ideas of Child Protection in juvenile justice'.*
Staff cap.	Medium to high. *"Need more counseling and integration skills'.*
Cost effect.	High. *'All expenses go to stakeholders, outcomes are very high when client avoids prison'.*
Challenges, constraints	One CSO said *'sometimes the prison limits access to clients, this can be difficult because they* (prison staff) *have all the control'.* One CSO said a gap in the program is providing VT to young people '*so they have more options in prison or on release. Many currently migrate to Thailand because they have low or no job skills'.*
Areas for improvement	Consider, as soon as possible, addressing one CSO's issue of being solely funded by 3PC and therefore needing clarity about the continuation of 3PC and any subsequent ongoing support for diversion/prison programs. Consider strategies to decrease DoSVY dependence on CSOs to deliver government services by focusing on shared workloads or collaborative practices.
Sustainability	One CSO said at the time of review they are able to meet client needs, but if numbers were to rise they would struggle to adequately support clients.

	One CSO is very worried about the future of their program as 3PC is their sole funder for prison support and diversion services. *'Right now there is high interest, from national to commune level, about acting in the best interests of the child. After many years of advocating, teaching, discussing...court officials are happy to support child friendly courts, but as funding is coming to an end it is difficult to provide a guarantee to stakeholders that prison diversion is the right way. Courts are finally understanding and adopting the principles of UNHCR, child rights and child protection, but we have no way to ensure this will continue. With programs already closing in two provinces, we need this to continue because it is very successful at promoting and providing better alternatives for young people. Aside from outcomes for clients, (ending the service) will also be a problem for the court because they rely on our service for TA and information about the law'.*
2.4.7	**Peer educators (2 CSOs)**
Summary	• The original 3PC program supported two CSOs to deliver Peer Education services, however one CSO has not delivered this service in their area. This CSO will recommence Peer Education activities as part of their new work plan for 2014 and is therefore not included in this review. • The other CSO is experiencing great success in delivering Peer Education services. Members of the groups are very motivated about learning, practicing and sharing the principles of Child Rights. Young interviewees were very pleased to be part of the program and were very satisfied with the CSO's guidance and support to discuss Child Rights in their villages and with their peers. They identify and report violations to their LA or the CSO and encourage others to do so. Staff capacity to deliver this service is high. Staff say the cost efficiency is also high because *'little costs but high benefits because the children increase their knowledge and share with others, so the reach gets wider over time'.* Staff and participants said they would like more capacity building, for example training on life skills and advanced training in Human Rights and other law or justice related topics.
2.4.8	**Parents association (1 CSO)**
Summary	• The original 3PC program supported one CSO to develop Parents Associations, however it was identified in 2013 that this was a duplicate service of pre-existing community groups, made up mostly of CCWC and LA members. • This CSO's work plan has been redesigned to deliver training to CCWC and LA groups in 2014 and as such is not included in this review.
2.4.9	**Social economic support, Home Based Production, Micro-finance (4 CSOs)**
Strengths	All CSOs say addressing issues of income generation is the most important factor in assisting vulnerable families to have more stable lives. One CSO said since 3PC they are able to provide financial assistance *before* reintegration and they are seeing positive impacts with families staying together longer. One CSO generates sales through their shop for the CSO's benefit. 73% of parent interviewees said HBP meant their children stayed in school.
Staff cap.	Medium. From one manager *'Staff are excellent at psychosocially support. But the program needs more technical advise about business and finance skills, so staff can offer more credible advice to help families set up the RIGHT type of business'.*
Cost effect.	Low to medium. One manager said *'Social workers need to spend a lot of time with Home Based Production clients before, during and after they learn the skills to continue to encourage and support them. This takes a long time'.*
Challenges, constraints	All CSOs say staff need much more training in business, retail, finance and other economics related subjects, to provide accurate, realistic advice with longer term outcomes for clients. CSOs said alcohol is a major constraint as social workers must invest majority of efforts on alcohol-related issues. For Micro-Finance one CSO said single payments of $200 are not always appropriate (some clients need more, some need less, depending

	on their business). More flexibility is needed to carry over funds from one payment cycle to the next.
Areas for improvement	3PC should provide more training on business-specific topics or provide support to CSOs to ensure they are hiring the right people with the right skills for business-related positions. 3PC should consider reviewing client selection criteria to address issues related to alcohol. Regarding Micro-Finance, consider reviewing the carrying over of funds to provide larger initial payments where appropriate.
Sustainability	All CSOs said these programs would continue, however all require funding in order to deliver much-needed staff training and capacity building. All CSOs said clients spread the word so more people understand the processes of HBP or MF and it is important to leverage this momentum.
2.4.10	**Community education about Child Protection (9 CSOs)**
Summary	- Since 3PC began, all CSOs have been delivering more education and awareness activities in their areas via different formats including performances, workshops, training, mobile library, theatre, Parent and Child activity sessions and through Childsafe networks. - The most popular topic is Child Rights, followed by other related topics including Child Protection; domestic violence; health care; human, sex or labor trafficking; child learning and development; parenting skills, and identifying and reporting violations. - The most popular audience is Childsafe members and community members (via outreach, workshops), followed by LA/CCWC, NGO staff, foster carers and police. - Most CSOs said the biggest change is that more people are informed and seem interested to learn more. Some CSOs said there have been obvious behavior changes in their communities with increased calls to hotlines, fewer instances of violence and abuse and cases of community members responding to violations independently (without calling the CSO or authorities). Also, more LA staff are making referrals. From one manager, *'We did a survey in 2013 on the knowledge of child protection in community members and it showed that in 12 months there was an increase of 52% to 82% of knowledge in child protection issues, and 51% of respondents knew hotline number compared to only 25% in 2012'.* These statistics clearly demonstrate community education is working in terms of increasing awareness and providing intervention strategies for community members. - All CSOs agreed that behavior change takes a long time, and that increasing awareness-raising activities is a good way of leveraging current momentum. Regarding the sustainability of services, all CSOs will continue to deliver CP education in their communities in some form. All CSOs said continued funding would increase the size of their audience and the depth of knowledge being shared.

2.5 PROGRESS OF PROGRAM AGAINST WORK PLAN

This page illustrates the progress of 3PC against the joint FI/UNICEF work plan that was developed as part of the original M&E plan. Table 9 shows how the program is delivering against the four result areas.

   	Scheduled
   	Completed or mostly complete
   	Not initiated
*	Underway, but different to the original activity

Table 9 Key finding 3 – Progress against work plan

Result	Activities	Timeframe in months							Remarks
		0-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-30	31-36	
Result 1 An age and sex disaggregated data collection system on vulnerable children for a minimum of 9 CSOs in 5 provinces is operational, feeds into government data system, and used to collect evidences and inform policies, strategies, and future programming.	1.1 FI/UNICEF Conduct assessment of the data collection system by CSOs in provinces.	🟩	🟩					The 3PC Database Assessment Report was completed in May 2012. The report concluded to build the database but to also consider that some CSOs 'need to have full IT capacity and Human resource for using the database system and they also need to build/upgrade their IT environment such as computer equipment, internet and IT support staff'.
	1.2 FI/UNICEF Design harmonized and confidential data collection system created and train a minimum of 9 CSOs in 5 provinces to collect and report data on a regular basis, including data collection in the context of emergencies.	🟥 *						In 2011, the 3PC team discovered that MoSVY and 3PC partners do not use the same M&E indicators. Furthermore, MOSVY was, and remains, in the process of updating their M&E forms. In order to initiate information gathering in some form, 3PC created excel sheets to collect data from CSOs and then began development of the database, focusing on common 3PC services, Childsafe and CM. To date, there has been no harmonization of the database. This is due to (a) ongoing drafting/updating of MOSVY M&E systems, (b) improving capacity of 3PC partners to collect consistent data across the network, (c) current MoSVY databases are focused on Drowning Death Assessment, Information on Children in Residential Care and Social Security; while 3PC partners contribute to these databases via reports, these databases do not thoroughly capture the broader Child Protection services and outcomes of partners, (d) ongoing discussions but no decisions between between MOSVY and FI about harmonizing data and (e) despite being scheduled as a priority for FI in Q7, Q8 and Q9 deadlines were impacted by staff changes at FI. Discussion between FI and MOSVY recommended in Q9 and both parties

		🟥						appear to prioritize this activity, although MOSVY interviewees are are currently redrafting or updating their systems in 2014. For example, 3PC partners are looking at ways to improve data collection on outreach, potentially via an electronic tool.
	1.3 FI/UNICEF Establish a database and compile data collected by CSOs, including production of a baseline report against key results - composed of quantitative and qualitative data.		*	*	*	*		Baseline report was completed in August 2012, but is not fully based on the original idea due to the lack of harmonization with MOSVY. Due to IT and staff capacity, it was decided KM, MT and MS would pilot the database before rolling out to all 9 CSOs. In March 2013, 3PC developed guidelines and conducted meetings and training with partners. The database is currently being used to mixed reaction from the pilot CSOs due to many small but important adjustments based on feedback from what has now been a 12-month pilot period. 3PC are now developing new forms, based on MS forms, to provide consistency for all CSOs to monitor CM. KMR is scheduled to begin using the database in Q10, however there are no plans at this stage to roll out to remaining CSOs, partly because 3PC want to ensure the database is ready and also due to staff/IT capacity issues at some CSOs.
	1.4 FI/UNICEF/CSOs Conduct thematic researches/surveys throughout the project and disseminate findings.		🟩	🟩	🟩			Year 1: 1 KAP survey on CP (across 5 provinces); 2 KAP surveys on CP and child rights (one in Siem Reap, one in Phnom Penh); Cambodian Street Children Profile. Year 2/3: Impact of Family Reintegration (underway at time of report); CPiE survey to inform CPiE Guidelines.
	1.5 FI/UNICEF/MOSVY Develop advocacy strategies using data collected and researches/surveys in order to support the design of National policies and projects.			🟩	🟩	🟩		UNICEF and FI collaborate ahead of key meetings with government to raise advocacy issues, for example feedback from FI on draft legislation where UNICEF is on the drafting committee. Much of this work has focused on contributing to the development of the Alternative Care Policy and continued contribution to the Foster Care Subcommittee.

Result 2	2.1 FI to carry out initial assessment of capacity building needs and develop adequate training plan for each CSO.	🟩🟩⬜⬜⬜⬜	Training plans created for each CSO. Plans are being successfully followed, training is occurring and feedback on training is very positive. There has also been ongoing monitoring with updating of training plans where requested or required.
Quality services to prevent and respond to child protection violations including emergencies preparedness and response directly benefit to 32 000 vulnerable children and their families in five provinces and efficient referral systems are enhanced among CSOs.	2.2 FI develop Standards of Practices (SoPs) in the form of guide books or manuals, share with CSOs (and DOSVY) and use for capacity building.	⬜🟥🟩🟩🟥⬜	Year 1: Vocational Training guidebook was written however this has not been widely disseminated, only shared with MS and KM for review and is currently being edited to make it shorter and easier to use. Year 2/3: Database guidelines developed and shared via training with MS, MT and KM; CPiE Guidelines developed and shared only via email. Real capacity building has not yet occurred due to FI staff shortages/changes and updates to the CPiE training; Case Study guidelines developed and shared with PPS, KMR, OEC, KMSR, and LAC.
	2.3 FI provides ongoing capacity building and technical support with the input of partners' specialists to ensure the delivery of quality services.	⬜🟩🟩🟩🟩⬜	There has been a high volume of capacity building and technical support throughout the program. Examples of specialists include FI Social Work Technical Advisor delivering IPSS training to partners; LAC provide training to CCWC and partners on The Rights of Children in Conflict with the Law; MS provides Toolbox (NFE) and Life Skill training to partners; FI provide training and advice on drug, social work, finance, M&E, HBP, micro enterprise; FI provide technical support on Alternative Care policy.
	2.4 CSOs A minimum of 9 CSOs in 5 provinces deliver accessible holistic and quality services for vulnerable children and families, including early recovery services in the context of emergencies.	🟩🟩🟩🟩🟩⬜	This is occurring throughout the program, as shown in the indicator logic. It is worth noting that while partners usually provide relief services during and after annual floods, these services were escalated in Battambang in 2012 after major flooding. In 2013 DT, KMR, KM and MS provided targeted early recovery services to 206 families, including 669 children, with funding from Deutche Bank.

	2.5 FI/UNICEF Establish and formalize a sound referral system, including access to legal aid and early recovery services in the context of emergencies, within the networks to contribute to the delivery of a continuum of care at provincial and national level.	*	*	*	*	*		Referrals occur frequently and easily between partners with overall high success in terms of outcomes for beneficiaries. However, no formal system has been established to process or monitor referrals. Some CSOs and LAs said they would like more contact after referrals were made to ensure appropriate care or follow up had taken place. Access to legal aid and emergency recovery services has been adequate with no problems reported.
	2.6 FI/CSOs FI monitors and evaluates the service throughout the programme in order to identify good practices and share lessons learnt.		✓	✓	✓	✓		Quarterly reports collate adequate information for FI and CSOs to monitor and assess services. These templates have been updated several times and now provide more consistency. Regarding the database and quarterly reports, these may need future updating if 3PC is to harmonize with MOSVY data as MOSVY is drafting new monitoring forms. Lessons learnt were shared at the three quarterly workshops and are often shared informally, for example when a topic or issue arises. CSOs regularly contact FI and each other to discuss challenges, achievements and feedback on specific issues or cases, most often via email or phone.
Result 3 Communication campaign.	Not included in review							
Result 4 CSOs actively contribute to coordination mechanisms within existing CSOs network and with the	4.1 CSOs liaise and coordinate with existing provincial and national mechanisms	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		7 of 9 CSOs have very good or strong links to local mechanisms, however, in general, these connections reduce at the provincial and national level.
	4.2 Contribute to coordination mechanisms	*	*	*	*	*		Regarding IOs and donors, this has not happened to date. Regarding CSOs, UNICEF and government, see external

Goal	Verifiable indicator				Remarks

| government to reduce overlapping risks and vulnerabilities among children and families at risk. | with key stakeholders in order to strengthen Child Protections systems building priorities and to reduce overlapping risks and vulnerabilities among children and families at risk. | | | | | networking results for details. |

2.6 PROGRESS OF PROGRAM AGAINST LOG FRAME

The following pages show how 3PC is progressing against log frame goals, outputs and indicators. All information was collated from quarterly reports and KIIs. Remarks indicate identified   constraints, facilitations or standout findings.

- Table 10 documents progress of 3PC against the broad program goal.
- Table 11 shows progress against indicators from Output 1.
- Table 12 shows progress against indicators from Output 2.

Table 10 Key finding 4 – Progress against program goal

Goal	Verifiable indicator	Base line	End target	At review	Remarks
	PS 01 Number of government policies influenced by 2014	-	2		This work is underway and it is expected that the end of the program will finalize two new strategic priorities finalized as government policy. 1-Foster Care Policy: FI is mapping and studying good practices from different NGOs who have foster care programs. Results will be discussed with CSOs (3PC and non-3PC) to validate findings prior to sharing with government for implementation in formal policy. 2-Definition of Centers: to assist with standardization, FI is drafting definitions of various types of centers to expand the scope of the Alternative Care policy. This update will mean the AC policy applies to more than just orphanages and covers any type of center where children visit or are housed.
	PS.02				Not included in review.
Strengthen CP through CSOs enhanced	**PS.03** Organizational capacity of CSOs is increased by 2014.	59%	89%		Assessment against baseline will occur in the evaluation at the completion of the program, however this review found definite improvements in organizational capacity and quality of service. CSO staff, local authorities, FI and UNICEF all agreed 3PC is contributing to the strengthening of Child

capacity, coordination with and contribution to national and sub-national protection responses.	**PS.04** Quality service capacity of CSOs is increased by 2014	59%	89%		Protection through increased capacity at CSO level.
	PS.05 Service satisfaction beneficiaries	-	70%		Assessment against baseline will occur in the evaluation at the completion of the program, however this review found high levels of satisfaction from children, young people and family members. Beneficiaries expressed satisfaction with service delivery, skill and knowledge and attitude of CSO staff. Almost all participants spoke positively and hopefully about their experiences with 3PC partners.
	PS.06 Positive attitude towards networking and coordination	-	60%		Assessment against baseline will occur in the evaluation at the completion of the program, however this review found high levels of interest and activity in networking within 3PC. Although there has been limited external networking activities specific to 3PC, all 3PC partners are motivated to increase internal and external collaborations.

Table 11 Key finding 4 – Progress against Output 1

1.Output FI **Capacity building of CSOs related to child protection services, raising awareness and advocating for child protection issues**					
Indicators		End target	At review	Target status	Remarks
1.1 Advocacy Government				Not included in review.	
1.2 Communication campaign					
1.3 Capacity building partners	1.3a Number of trainings provided	120	75	On target.	See tables below.
	1.3b Number of training participants from partners	1200	1086 (F:507)	On target.	See tables below.
	1.3c Number of technical support and monitoring visits	72	43	On target.	See tables below.
	1.3d Number of Standards of Practices developed	6	4	On target.	FI Vocational Training guidebook; 3PC Database guidebook; 3PC Child Protection in Emergency Guidelines; Case Study Guidelines
	1.3e Number of electronic reports submitted by CSOs	38	0	Need to exceed Y3 target.	Achieved to date: Case Management Database for MS, ChildSafe Database for MS, KM, and MT. FI was recently informed by MoSVY that they are undergoing a review of their system and will be updating soon.

Table 12 Key finding 4 – Progress against Output 2

2. Outputs CSOs - Service provision and networking to prevent and respond on child protection violation.						
Indicators		**End target**	**At review**	**F**	**F%**	**Target status**	**Remarks**

	Indicators	End target	At review	F	F%	Target status	Remarks
2.1 PREVENTION/AWARENESS							
2.1a	Parent groups	17	11			On target.	
2.1a	Child/youth groups	22	16			On target.	
2.1a	Childsafe groups	-	6				MS, KM, MY, DT, KMR, PPS have one group each.
2.1a	**Total groups est. and supported**	**39**	**27**			On target.	
2.1b	Parent participants	595	385	120		On target.	
2.1b	Child/youth participants	320	261	112		On target.	
2.1b	Childsafe members	885	941	212		Achieved.	Majority attributed MS and MT, followed by KM, DT.
2.1b	**Total group participants**	**2120**	**1587**	**444**	**28.0%**	Achieved.	
2.1c	**Training/workshop hosted by CSO**	**630**	**346**			Need to exceed Y3 target.	See Key Finding 2.1.2.
2.1d	Child/youth	8670	5844	2788		On target.	
2.1d	Caretaker/family	6074	3158	1071		On target.	
2.1d	Commune	2963	1478	330		Need to exceed Y3 target.	
2.1d	CCWC	122	53	23		Need to exceed Y3 target.	
2.1d	Local Authority	571	238	13		Need to exceed Y3 target.	
2.1d	**Total training participants**	**19997**	**11651**	**4261**	**36%**	Need to exceed Y3 target.	
2.1e	Commune meetings attended	904	589			Need to exceed Y3 target.	Restrictions: not always having staff capacity to attend meetings and outcomes of meetings not

							being of high relevance or use to CSO programs.
2.1f	Child/youth	6793	3063	1577		Need to exceed Y3 target.	
2.1f	Caretaker/Family	14490	13044	911		On target.	Significantly low number of women.
2.1f	Commune	3521	3280	1292		On target.	
2.1f	CCWC	2293	444	116		Need to exceed Y3 target.	Of those CSOs not working with CCWC, most are considering how to improve links with CCWC.
2.1f	Local Authorities	70	87	29		Achieved.	
2.1f	**Total in commune meetings**	**143266**	**111806**	**21918**	**9.9%**	On target.	All interviewees spoke very highly of 3PC training.

2.2 PROTECTION

2.2a	**Beneficiaries**						
2.2 a	Child beneficiaries	28649	20570	7135		On target.	
2.2 a	Youth beneficiaries	4785	4839	1677		Achieved.	
2.2 a	**Total beneficiaries**	29900	**25409**	**8812**	**34.6%**	On target.	
2.2a	Outreach children	22400	16122	5267		On target.	
2.2a	Outreach youth	3750	3854	1175		Achieved.	
2.2a	**Outreach total**	**26150**	**203258**	**67408**	**33%**	On target.	
2.2a	Referral children	2023	1055	367		Need to exceed Y3 target.	There are discrepancies with recording this data.
2.2a	Referral youth	45	78	22		Overachieved	
2.2a	**Referral total**	**2068**	**1133**	**389**	**34%**	Need to exceed Y3 target.	
2.2a	**Children/youth in prison**	**328**	**293**	**23**		On target.	See service summary.
2.2b	Socio economic support	518	277			Need to exceed Y3 target.	See service summary.

2.2b	Material support	90	911			Significantly overachieved.	
2.2b	Emergency/disaster support	1200	922			On target.	
2.2b	Outreach to caretakers	5100	7044			Overachieved.	
2.2b	**Total family beneficiaries**	**6908**	**9154**			Significantly overachieved.	
2.2c	DIC	3600	5521	1976		Achieved.	See service summary.
2.2c	TH	2472	1819	531		Need to exceed Y3 target.	There are discrepancies with recording this data.
2.2c	Pre school	200	445	241		Significantly overachieved.	
2.2c	Remedial class	1575	1258	545		On target.	
2.2c	VT	990	1411	323		Overachieved.	
2.2c	Diversion	175	135	36		On target.	
2.2c	**Total services to beneficiaries**	**9012**	**10589**	**3652**	**34.5%**	Overachieved.	
2.2d	Child cases opened	2960	2766			On target.	
2.2d	Family cases opened	440	502			Overachieved.	
2.2d	**Total cases opened**	**3400**	**3268**			On target.	
	Reintegration						
2.2e	School	778	983	461		Overachieved.	
2.2e	Job	265	191	68		On target.	
2.2e	Family	889	879	159		On target.	
2.2e	Foster care	96	47	9		Need to exceed Y3 target.	This is a new direction for most CSOs. Focus to date has been on staff and organizational capacity to deliver new program; identifying, supporting and monitoring foster carers and awareness raising in

							communities about family preservation.
2.2e	Others (ind. living, group house)	39	130	33		Significantly overachieved.	
2.2e	**Total beneficiaries reintegrated**	**2067**	**2230**	**730**	**32.7%**	On target.	

2.3 NETWORKING WITHIN 3PC

2.3a	**Exchange visits**	30	51			On target.	
2.3b	**Trainings provided**	5	11			On target.	
2.3.c	**Referral from 3PC partner**	-	25			On target.	
	Total networking within 3PC	35	62			On target.	

2.4 NETWORKING OUTSIDE 3PC

2.4a	**Networking and topics of meetings and stakeholders who attended**	

Topic	No of events	Staff attended	Stakeholders attend.	Type of stakeholders	Location
Child Protection, includes child rights, social work, interventions)	20	42	540	NGOs, BIGC, ECPAT, Bantay Srey, LAs, Gov	PP, BTB, SR, SNK
Networking, information sharing.	14	27	350	NGOs, Police, CCWC	PP, BTB
Sangkat, municipality	9	23	190	NGOs, Gov, Private	PP, SNK, BTB
Education, including planning VT and other services, transferring students to schools	9	49	350	NGOs, Gov, schools	BTB, SNK, PP
CCWC	7	7	120	NGOs, LAs, Gov	SR, BTM
Foster care	6	8	70	NGOs, Gov	PP
3PC, UNICEF	6	18	130	3PC partners	BTB
CRC	6	6	250	NGOs	PP

	Law, justice, protection of children in prison	5	17	220	NGOs, Police, CCWC, Gov, BIGC	BTM, PP, SR, SNK
	Health	5	7	130	NGOs, Gov, LAs	PP, SR, BTB
	Border issues, migration, trafficking	5	6	170	NGOs, Gov	BTM, SR

The above list was complied from the narrative data from quarterly reports from Q5-8. Topics are listed by order or frequency of events (sessions, workshops or meetings) attended. All numbers are approximate. Locations are listed by most commonly occurring. It is difficult to map this kind of networking as events often include overlapping topics, therefore this list should be viewed as a general indication of the types of meetings being attended by 3PC members. Other topics not listed include awareness raising/advocacy (4 events), DOSVY (3 meetings, all in BTM) and capacity building (1 event).

	Indicators	End target	At review	F	F%	Target status/ Remarks
2.4b	Referred to 3PC by others		551			
2.4b	Referred to 3PC by other 3PC partner	-	25			This figure signifies whole cases transitioned from one partner to another, i.e. when a client moves to a different province and their entire case management changes from one CSO to another, rather than recording inter-CSO services such as a client from PP accessing temporary accommodation or Childsafe in SR.
2.4b	**Total referred to 3PC partner**	190	576			Significantly overachieved.
2.4c	DoSVY	-	18			Some CSOs said they are reluctant to make referrals to DOSVY due to resource limitations and assessment/response delays which mean clients often end up back with the CSO, a cycle which is not in the best interest of the child or family. This does not indicate a lack of DOSVY willingness to assist, but more a lack of resources. Two common constraints are (i) DOSVY's inability to visit clients who live far away due to no resources for transport and (ii) difficulties in communicating due to limited access to computers, phones or internet.
2.4c	NGOs	-	31			
2.4c	Others	-	10			
2.4c	**Total referred to others**	15	59			Significantly overachieved.
2.4d	**Calls to Childsafe hotline**	5300	4070			On target.

III – RECOMMENDATIONS

This review recommends that:

1. **3PC continue to operate, to enhance aid effectiveness and collaboration with the Government of Cambodia to accelerate the development of comprehensive prevention and response child protection systems.**

   a. Partners have clearly demonstrated a commitment to 3PC as displayed in the significant success of internal networking, quality of services and building organizational capacity.

   b. Although most services will continue to operate and most CSOs will continue to network, without the ongoing combination of technical advice, encouragement, coordination and funding facilitated by 3PC these activities will face reductions and/or challenges in leveraging the momentum so far achieved by the program. This is especially true about networking, as partners are committed to increasingly collaborative relationships within 3PC and now seek to apply this approach to external stakeholders, in particular government, CCWC and local authorities who are key to developing long term or sustainable CP mechanisms in Cambodia.

   c. 3PC should continue to facilitate discussion about the risks of CSOs continuing services which, in terms of long term sustainability, might be best delivered through government agencies. For example, FI, UNICEF and MoSVY should actively encourage discussions between one CSO and their provincial government about transitioning the CSO's health services from their clinic into the available government services. Together, FI, UNICEF and MoSVY have great potential to increase the national dialogue about how CSOs can better support government, rather than replace them, in long term, sustainable service provision.

   d. Decisions and/or planning for the continuation of 3PC should happen as soon as possible in order to provide assurance to partners and stakeholders, especially to one CSO who is sole-funded by 3PC. Early planning may also ensure 3PC fully realizes all of the intended outcomes of the program, such as the communications campaign, database, increased harmonization with MOSVY and maximizing the reach of the program by engaging with satellite networks.

2. **3PC increase efforts for external networking, in particular to utilize satellite networks.**

   a. 3PC members are in a good position to leverage existing relationships and interest in 3PC training, capacity building, expertise and information sharing.

   b. FI should continue the network mapping currently underway and cross-check with 3PC partners to identify gaps or duplications. This task should also take into account existing capacities of 3PC partners to facilitate or support collaborations with external stakeholders.

   c. Actively promoting and raising awareness of 3PC may require increased staff resources; should be documented in a plan or strategy with allocated timelines and responsible parties, and should consider targeting specific audiences. Regarding the 'brand' of the network, 3PC may consider developing and/or sharing 3PC communications materials with partners.

3. **3PC increase internal communications and professional learning.**

    a. FI should recommence facilitating the quarterly meetings.

    b. FI should facilitate more professional learning and sharing via an online data storage system (e.g. drop box or Google docs) for all partners to share and access each others' policies, guidelines, SoPs, IEC, reports, research or survey results, M&E tools and other relevant documents. This would also be an ideal place to share policies, articles, reports and research from local and international CP sectors.

4. **3PC increase collaboration with government.**

    a. Partners clearly understand the importance of long term, sustainable systems for CP and are committed to continued building of coordinated approaches and services with MoSVY and other relevant government departments.

    b. As a partnership program, 3PC presents opportunities for CSOs to play a greater role in building capacity of government staff through regular updating and information sharing (via reporting or meetings), training, on-the-job shadowing or collaborative field work. This might also include joint field visits between MoSVY, DoSVY, FI and UNICEF.

    c. MoSVY should disseminate and raise awareness of its 2014-18 Strategy Plan with 3PC members, to facilitate harmonization and ensure partners are adhering to government guidelines.

    d. 3PC and MoSVY should increase direct 3PC communications. FI should share quarterly reports and other key documents to provide regular updates on the program. MoSVY should inform 3PC about updates to policies, monitoring forms or other relevant activities. Furthermore, it may be helpful to determine who is the chief point of contact at each key partner organization to increase consistency and accountability with communications.

5. **Key partners commit necessary time and resources to completing the database project.**

    a. MoSVY and FI should increase collaborations to harmonize data collection systems for the effective roll out of the national database and any other relevant M&E.

    b. FI should update all 3PC partners about the current status of the database project to decrease confusion.

6. **3PC management team and key partners consider all suggestions and ideas outlined in 'Areas for improvement' throughout this document.**

IV – APPENDIX

Table 4 List of audience interviewed

	KMR		OEC		PPS		DT		LAC		MT		MS		SKO		KM		CSO total	UNICEF		FI		MOSVY		Total	Total female
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F		M	F	M	F	M	F		
FGD children and young people	10	10	2	3	6	8	10	10	8		4	4	6	4	0	0	9	13	**107**							107	0
KII family		9		8	1	3		8		5	1	5	2	8		10		3	**63**							63	52
FGD local authority	4	1	3	2	5	2	4		5		3	3	7		2	3	3	3	**51**							51	59
Questionnaire local authority	3	1	3	2	5	2	4		5		3	3	6		2	3	2	3	***49**							*49	14
KII DOSVY	1			1	1		0		1			1	1	1	0				**7**							7	14
KII manager/director		1	1			1	1	1	1		1	1		2	1	1	2		**14**			1	1			16	3
KII key staff		2	2		2	1	1	2	1		3			2	1	1		2	**20**	1	1	1		2		25	7
KII zone officer																				1						1	
Total audience no	14	23	8	14	14	13	15	21	15	5	9	14	15	15	3	14	13	19	262	1	1	2	1	2		**270**	83
Notes	• Local authority questionnaires are not included in total audience figures as FGD participants completed questionnaires. • No children/young people FGDs were conducted at SKO as beneficiaries are too young. • Responses from Family KIIs and FGDs with children and young people from OEC were excluded from analysis for the review as participants had no interaction with OEC for the relevant services and were unable to provide substantial information. • Two former FI 3PC managers were contacted to clarify specific events or procedures, but have not been included in the audience total as these were not formal interviews.																										