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Comparative analysis of the CBCPMs in Plan Asia: Terms of Reference

1. Background and purpose

Plan is an international child-centred development organisation. Plan’s vision is of a world in which all children realise their full potential in societies that respect people’s rights and dignity. Plan works in 66 countries across the world; in 48 developing countries across Africa, Asia and the Americas, supported by fundraising in 21 countries and four regional offices as well as Plan International headquarters in the UK.

Child-centred community development (CCCD) is Plan’s child rights approach, in which children, families and communities are active and leading participants in their own development. This approach recognises the intrinsic link between poverty and rights, where poverty is both a cause and consequence of the denial of rights.

Plan has identified eight thematic impact areas in which it can effectively contribute to the realisation of child rights by applying its CCCD approach and one of these areas is child protection. More recently, child protection received additional attention as one of the two global priorities for Plan, the other being education. This analysis aims to contribute towards regional and global learning on Plan’s emerging focus on CBCPMs, setting the groundwork for a more comprehensive evaluation of their effectiveness and impact.

For more information visit www.plan-international.org

2. Increasing focus on child protection

Over the last decade, momentum has been steadily increasing to recognise the importance of child abuse as a phenomenon of concern, and to direct actions towards both preventing and responding to violations of children’s rights to freedom from violence and harm. This emphasis has occurred at different levels over the last decade, stemming largely from the UNGA Special Session on Children (2002), UNSG Study on Violence against Children (2006) and, more recently, The Third World Congress against Sexual Exploitation of Children and Adolescents (2008). In addition, the renewed focus on protecting children is further influenced by broader social policy initiatives and agendas. A growing body of research is providing compelling evidence on the detrimental and often long-term impact of child abuse and violence, not just on the individual but also on the socio-economic development of countries.

At a global level, commitments have been made by governments to undertake wide-ranging measures and to create and strengthen integrated systems to prevent,
address and combat violence against children in its numerous forms. Simultaneously, at national and regional levels organisations and communities, including children themselves, have joined efforts to the end abuse and harm that children are exposed to in different settings.

Plan International has assumed an active role in providing support, and continues to contribute to the international processes which are shaping and influencing the emerging global child protection agenda. This includes setting in motion processes to prevent, respond to and reduce actions, attitudes and traditions which are harmful and hinder the realisation of children’s rights to protection, and the attainment of their full potential and optimal development. This is being achieved through a firm commitment to the values and principles enshrined in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, that are mirrored in Plan’s CCCD approach.

3. Scope and levels of child protection in Plan International

Plan has been implementing child protection programming for many years, however, as compared to work in other sectors such as health or water and sanitation, child protection programming is a relatively new agenda in a number of countries. Within Plan, comprehensive efforts have been undertaken in creating internal mechanisms for providing safer environments for children in all organisational settings. At the same time supporting and sustaining external interventions tackling both the immediate and root causes, and effects, of violence against children.

A set of institutional child protection policies were rolled out in 2002 and expanded on in 2006. The policies made child protection part of organisational accountability and they were rolled out with extensive training of staff and partners. In terms of programme strategies, Plan’s programme framework in 2009 defined child protection as a key impact area for country programming, as well as a broader policy issue for national and international action. Building on these and on Plan’s subsequent Programme Guide from 2010, a more detailed strategic framework guiding Plan’s work in the area is now being developed.

Since 2006, at the country, regional and global level, Plan has invested significantly in child protection and has designed and implemented key campaigns, such as Universal Birth Registration and ‘Learn Without Fear’, as part of its integrated approach and policy work. Over the period from 2007-2009 Plan spent EUR 14 million on protection programme work including the two campaigns, and spending indicates an upward trend in all four regions Plan is operating in. Global reviews have also found child protection to be an area of significant progression within Plan. The reviews find evidence of a shift towards a more comprehensive understanding of child protection; a more strategic transformational approach, as well as increasing engagement with duty bearers, a focus of legal and judicial frameworks, and as a precondition for lasting change.
For Plan International, child protection encompasses the work and activities we undertake to prevent and respond to all forms of abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence against children through our rights-based CCCD approach, contributing to the realisation of children’s right to protection. Plan’s child protection work incorporates our work on child protection in emergencies (CPiE), child protection programming referred to as child protection in development (CPiD) and our policy to safeguard children, ‘Say Yes! to keeping children safe’.

Specific child protection programmes and strategies encompass:
- Strengthening child protection systems, focusing particularly on community-based protection mechanisms;
- Building the capacity of parents, communities and professionals to provide protection;
- Developing children’s resilience and their capacity to participate in their own protection; and
- Integrated advocacy to strengthen legal frameworks and access to basic and specialist services.

As a community-based organisation with multi-level involvement that spans national, regional and global arenas, one of the key areas of Plan’s child protection interventions revolves around CBCPMs. Increasing efforts are channelled into establishing and sustaining a variety of local mechanisms, reflecting a specific child rights-based situation analysis, aimed at creating a protective network, environments expected to ensure the protection of all children, and contribute towards strengthening national child protection systems.

4. Overall objective
The overall objective of this comparative analysis is to increase learning of various structural and functional aspects of the existing CBCPMs in Plan Asia, and provide a comprehensive report on their potential for, and increased, impact and sustainability.

5. Specific objectives
- To provide a broad mapping of the scale and coverage of CBCPMs supported by Plan Country Offices across the Asia region;
- To document various models and approaches in establishing, supporting and promoting child protection mechanisms, including defining roles and responsibilities of various actors and processes supporting their functionality;
- To document common roles, responsibilities and key activities of these CBCPMs;
- To analyse identified achievements and gaps in CBCPMs in different operational contexts, including crisis/emergency, early recovery and longer-term development;
- To provide a broad overview of lessons learned on key components and processes contributing towards effective child protection and sustainable community-based mechanisms; and
To inform the second phase field-based evaluation of the effectiveness and impact of these mechanisms for the unhindered development of children and the realisation of their full potentials.

6. Specific focus
The comparative analysis will have a two-pronged specific focus on involvement of the civil society, including grass-roots CBOs in the CBCPMs, and children's involvement and role in their own protection within these entities.

7. Scope and limitations
The analysis will cover all the country programmes in Plan Asia, with leading coordination from Plan Asia Regional Office (ARO). Despite the intention to document and analyse examples of the emerging good practices, the exercise will not evaluate or measure their effectiveness, scalability, sustainability or impact at this stage.

As it will be inappropriate to draw definitive conclusions about the levels of their functionality, the findings, lessons learned and recommendations of the comparative analysis should be regarded as provisional. In phase two, the focus will shift to assessing and evaluating the impact, and the findings from this exercise will be referred to as a starting platform and information base.

8. Process and proposed stages
The analysis should be carried out in two phases:

I. Data collection:
   a) desk study of available information and mapping out of the existing CBCPMs.
   b) field visits in two to four countries (according to need and identified information gaps), comprising literature study, interviews of key informants, (focus) group discussions etc. All relevant stakeholders will be involved.

II. Analysis and synthesis:
   a) comparative analysis of the existing models and report writing.

9. Consultant/expert agency
The consultant should demonstrate the following expertise and skills:
- Demonstrate technical expertise on child protection, system building approach and CBCPMs in particular;
- Relevant working experience in Asian countries and thorough knowledge of the regional context and trends;
- Demonstrate experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis;
- Experience in analysis of learning strategies or programmes;
• Sound organisational human resource capacities and financial liability;
• Good communications, analytical skills and a high proficiency in written and spoken English; and
• Working or consultancy experience with Plan International or other child rights-based organisations.

10. Selection and award criteria
The following selection criteria will be applied to the selection process:

10.1 Economic and financial capacity
Proof of financial and economic standing must be furnished.

10.2 Professional capacity
Proof of enrolment in a professional or trade register in the country of establishment should be provided.

10.3 Technical capacity
The demonstrated track record of similar successful engagements should be provided.

11. Accountabilities and respective roles:
The Consultant will be responsible for:
• Further development of the analysis methodology;
• Development and testing of data collection tools based on the defined selection criteria;
• Systematic and rigorous implementation of data collection methods planned;
• Data processing;
• Quantitative and qualitative analysis; and
• Preparation of draft and final report.

Plan ARO will be responsible for:
• Identifying and contracting the consultant;
• Initial communication and ongoing coordination with the COs;
• Reviewing and approval of data collection tools;
• Assistance in accessing Plan International documentation and monitoring data; and
• Approval of the final report.
12. Activities, tasks, deliverables and timeframe

Key steps in the process of comparative analysis

(italics = work by consultants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Internal preparatory phase</th>
<th>To be completed by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing TOR for the comparative analysis</td>
<td>Early Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final agreement on recruitment process and criteria for selection of consultants</td>
<td>Early Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection and recruitment of consultants:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invite proposals and expression of interest from potential consultants/expert agencies</td>
<td>03/10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of proposal, final selection and contract development</td>
<td>03/11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalise contractual arrangements and service agreements</td>
<td>15/11/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Preparatory phase with consultants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial briefings and provision of key Plan documentation and child protection policies</td>
<td>Early Dec 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional: Initial meeting (or Skype call) with consultants and reference group to ensure common understanding and agree on detailed workplan</td>
<td>Early Dec 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Analysis: desk review and initial findings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of final analytical framework for the exercise</td>
<td>End Jan 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review of internal and external documentation</td>
<td>Feb-Mar 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final development of field work methodology and tools</td>
<td>Mid Mar 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term meeting to share initial findings from desk review and finalise process for field visits (incl. selection of countries and methodologies)</td>
<td>Mid Mar 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim report</td>
<td>End Mar 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Field work</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final confirmation and preparation of countries to be visited</td>
<td>End Mar 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data gathering on case study countries</td>
<td>Mid Apr 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work in countries</td>
<td>Apr-May 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Reporting and completion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country reports – initial draft reports prepared and cleared with countries</td>
<td>End Jun 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation review of findings based on draft conclusions from desk review and field work, review meeting between consultants and ARO</td>
<td>Early Jul 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional consultations with Plan informants to complete/confirm findings</td>
<td>Early Jul 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission on draft consolidated report and country reports</td>
<td>End Jun 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and feedback on draft reports</td>
<td>Early Aug 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalisation and approval of consolidated and country reports</td>
<td>15/08/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of key findings to ARO RD and MT</td>
<td>End Aug 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post festum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal review of process (incl. feedback from COs)</td>
<td>Aug 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review meeting with consultants</td>
<td>Aug 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Dissemination and follow up</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report processing: preparation of communications version/child friendly report</td>
<td>Sep 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated dissemination to key internal and external audiences</td>
<td>Sep 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Payment

Payments under the contract shall be made in accordance with the following scheme:
A pre-financing payment equal to 50 percent of total fees shall be made after signature of the contract and upon receipt of a relevant invoice. Payment of the balance shall be made after approval of the final report and upon receipt of a relevant invoice.

14. Child protection

Throughout the process, compliance with Plan’s Child Protection Policy and standards must be assured.
II Analytical framework for the comparative analysis of Plan Asia’s CBCPMs

Stage one: Data collection through a desk review of available information and undertaking a mapping of existing CBCPMs across Asia

Stage two: Data collection and participatory analysis through field visits in four to six countries (according to need and information needs) using child/user-friendly participatory tools, interviews, focus group discussions and observation with all relevant stakeholders.

Stage three: Analysis and synthesis: comparative analysis of existing models and report writing

Specific focus:

- Involvement of the civil society in the CBCPMs
- Children’s involvement and role in their own protection within these entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed research mechanism</th>
<th>Key steps</th>
<th>Research themes</th>
<th>Detailed research questions</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage one: Data collection through a desk review of available information and undertaking a mapping of existing CBCPMs across Asia</td>
<td>Desk analysis of Plan documents</td>
<td>Finalise mapping tool. Receive documents. Organise data into mapping tool. Adapt Wessells tool, and re-format into excel.</td>
<td>Number and scope of CBCPMs</td>
<td>Number of CBCPMs established and/or supported by Plan International in Asian countries. Geographic overview of the CBCPMs coverage per country, ratio in rural/urban/peri-urban/IDP camp. Are there examples of the establishment of CBCPMs in emergency situations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping tool (to be completed by consultants and sent to COs child protection focal points to validate and update)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Country teams have up to date records of the number and types of CBCPMs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optional Mapping tool/ Stories of Most Significant Change Tool a sample of CBCPMs/children’s groups/NGO partners. Adapted version of Wessells standardised matrix (2009).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology
### Field research:
Participatory research processes and tools with children and adults including:
- **time line** to identify key achievements and challenges faced over time in CBCP.
- **venn mapping of CBCPs** and their links to other structures enabling referral and support.
- **response pathways** exploring how child protection risks/concerns are identified through CBCPMs and what happens next.
- **body mapping (before and after)** to explore the outcomes of CBP on girls’ and boys’ lives, and/or on parents, caregivers or community members etc.
- **stories of most significant change/challenge** (through drawings, stories, songs, drama) to explore and illustrate positive changes in children’s lives and/or in communities, how and why they are significant.
- **‘H’ assessments to explore the strengths, weaknesses and suggestions to improve CBP from community/child perspectives.**

### Structural aspects of CBCPMs
- What are the different structures of/for CBCPMs established by Plan in different countries?
- How are the CBCPMs established?
- What are the comparative roles played by Plan and local NGO staff in different countries in CBCPMs?
- Are CBCPMs based on existing traditional structures or processes? Or are they newly introduced?
- How are different groups represented and how do they participate? Are marginalised women, men, girls and boys, ethnic groups, people/children with disability (P/CWD) included and involved in CBCPMs? If so, how?
- What are the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders? (local officials, elders, teachers, religious leaders, women, men, girls, boys etc.)
- Are there any other child protection structures established by the govt. and other agencies? If yes, how are Plan supported CBCPMs coordinating with them?

### Functional aspects of CBCPMs
- What is the goal/aim of CBCPMs? Has the goal/aim changed over time?
- What are the main principles or beliefs guiding the interventions of CBCPMs?
- Do CBCPMs have Terms of Reference?
- Do CBCPMs sign child protection policies, and are they explained and acceptable to local culture?
- What are the key activities undertaken as part of CBP? How are these prioritised?
- Which are the main protection concerns/risks being addressed by CBCPMs? Which are easiest/hardest to address?
- How were child protection concerns identified and responded to before CBCPMs? What has changed as a result of establishing CBCPMs?
- To what degree does CBPCM focus on prevention, monitoring, response and/or reintegration?
- Are CBCPMs identifying, reaching and responding to the most marginalised children?
- To what extent are they enhancing non-discrimination and gender equality?
- To what extent do CBCPMs strengthen positive traditional beliefs and practices on child protection and care, and work to transform negative traditional beliefs or practices?

### Case management
- To what extent is child protection case management undertaken and documented through CBCPMs?
- Are there any efforts made for mapping stakeholders and their services?
- To what extent have referral and support mechanisms been established? Are they linked to existing government ones?
- Within the broader child protection system who has responsibility for case management?
- What are the processes of developing staff’s capacity on case management? (case workers, social workers?)
- What are the main benefits and challenges of undertaking case management in different contexts?

---

### Stage two: Data collection and participatory analysis through field visits in four to six countries (according to need and information needs) using child/user-friendly participatory tools, interviews, focus group discussions and observation with all relevant stakeholders.

**Objective:** 2. To document various models and approaches in establishing, supporting and promoting such child protection mechanisms, including defining roles and responsibilities of various actors and processes supporting their functionality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed research mechanism</th>
<th>Key steps</th>
<th>Research themes</th>
<th>Detailed research questions</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field research:</strong></td>
<td>Develop field research tools including introduction, updated ethical guidelines etc.</td>
<td><strong>Structural aspects of CBCPMs</strong></td>
<td>What are the different structures of/for CBCPMs established by Plan in different countries?</td>
<td>Child protection focal points have time to validate and address gaps in the mapping tool which will initially be completed by the consultants. The time frame can be negotiated. Also time needed for focal points to share information requests with communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory research</td>
<td>Develop field work schedule for eight day field visits (to be applied flexibly as per different country context possibilities).</td>
<td><strong>Functional aspects of CBCPMs</strong></td>
<td>What is the goal/aim of CBCPMs? Has the goal/aim changed over time?</td>
<td>(Note: Generous time frames will be given for gathering information from communities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>processes and tools with</td>
<td>Develop formats for field study country reports for consistency among ICPREC consultants.</td>
<td><strong>Case management</strong></td>
<td>To what extent is child protection case management undertaken and documented through CBCPMs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children and adults</td>
<td>Arrange any necessary translation of field research tools.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Are there any efforts made for mapping stakeholders and their services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including:</td>
<td>Identify and agree on countries for field studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent have referral and support mechanisms been established? Are they linked to existing government ones?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>time line</em> to identify</td>
<td>Identify criteria for a selection of diverse communities to visit.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Within the broader child protection system who has responsibility for case management?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key achievements and</td>
<td>Advance planning with child protection focal point to set up field visits to communities and discussions/activities with key stakeholders; and to arrange any necessary translation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>What are the processes of developing staff’s capacity on case management? (case workers, social workers?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges faced over time</td>
<td>Core group monthly discussion and ICPREC team discussions for ongoing reflection and discussion of ethical concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td>What are the main benefits and challenges of undertaking case management in different contexts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in CBCP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field visits are planned in consultation with concerned stakeholders (children, community members, staff etc) to ensure meetings at times that suit them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>venn mapping of CBCPs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and their links to other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structures enabling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referral and support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>response pathways</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exploring how child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection risks/concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are identified through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCPMs and what happens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>body mapping (before and</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after) to explore the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outcomes of CBP on girls’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and boys’ lives, and/or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on parents, caregivers or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**stories of most</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant change/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenge** (through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drawings, stories, songs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>songs, drama) to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explore and illustrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive changes in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children’s lives and/or in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities, how and why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they are significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘H’ assessments</strong> to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explore the strengths,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weaknesses and suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to improve CBP from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community/child perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed research mechanism</td>
<td>Key steps</td>
<td>Research themes</td>
<td>Detailed research questions</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linkages with civil society and government</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To what extent do government laws, policies, strategies or plans support CBCPMs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How do the CBCPMs fit into/contribute to government child protection policies and programmes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are links between CBCPMs and (a stronger) national child protection system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do the CBCPMs link in with any telephone helplines? If so, how?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do the CBCPMs coordinate with/work with local child protection agencies, and local police? How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are links of CBCPMs with health and education systems? At local level?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How can government (local, district and national authorities) be strengthened to take more responsibility?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are there any process/approach followed to develop/enhance the capacity of child protection related govt. agencies at local level?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children’s participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What is the scope and quality of children’s participation in CBCPMs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How are children involved in CBCPMs? Do children have their own groups? Are children’s representatives included in the child protection committees/structures?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To what extent are the most marginalised children actively involved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the processes/approaches of enhancing capacity of children/children’s clubs for empowering them to engage in child protection?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the main achievements and challenges of children’s participation in child protection in different operational contexts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the balance of responsibility on community members/children as volunteers for CBP realistic? Appropriate? Sustainable? Are members compensated for their contribution?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective:** 3. To analyse identified achievements and gaps of CBCPMs in different operational contexts, including crisis/emergency, early recovery and longer-term development.

**Stage three: Analysis and synthesis: comparative analysis of existing models and report writing**

<p>| ICPREC monthly team discussions. Core group monthly discussions. | Lessons learned, achievements and gaps | • What are the most significant lessons learned regarding the establishment and strengthening of CBCPMs in diverse contexts in Asia? |            |
|                                                               |                                      | • What are the most significant achievements and challenges of CBCPMs in different operational contexts? |            |
|                                                               |                                      | • What ethical challenges are faced when implementing CBCPMs and how can they be minimised and overcome? |            |
|                                                               |                                      | • What are the comparative strengths and weaknesses of different CBCPMs/structures/ways of working? |            |
|                                                               |                                      | • At local levels, what are CBCPMs achievements/what have they significantly contributed to? What are the gaps? |            |
|                                                               |                                      | • Idem at district level. |            |
|                                                               |                                      | • Idem at national level. |            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed research mechanism</th>
<th>Key steps</th>
<th>Research themes</th>
<th>Detailed research questions</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Have CBCP members been trained and if so, what kind of training or capacity building?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the process of capacity development of community people and key stakeholders in the community? (including local govt. bodies)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the key lessons learned in key components and key processes for developing effective, sustainable CBCPMs in different operational contexts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Are there additional considerations when developing or strengthening CBCPMs in emergencies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective: 4. To provide a broad overview of lessons learned on key components and processes contributing towards effective child protection and sustainable community-based mechanisms.

| Sustainability and scale up |          |                | • What processes/systems are in place to sustain the CBCPMs? |             |
|                            |          |                | • How the community people, key stakeholders and govt. authorities view about the CBCPMs? |             |
|                            |          |                | • What challenges do CBCPMs face, which hamper sustainability? |             |
|                            |          |                | • Are community contributions (if any) to the functioning of the CBCPM standardised or different per community? |             |
|                            |          |                | • What are the costs associated with mobilising and sustaining CBCPMs? |             |
|                            |          |                | • To what extent have pilot models of CBCPM been scaled up in different operational contexts? |             |
|                            |          |                | • What are the factors associated with scaling up CBCP groups to cover the whole (or large parts of the) country? |             |
|                            |          |                | • Have CBCPMs developed functional relationships with relevant govt. agencies? Recognition? Ownership? |             |
|                            |          |                | • What kind of advocacy initiatives are needed to support scale up and sustainability? |             |

Objective: 5. To inform the second phase field-based evaluation of the effectiveness and impact of these mechanisms for unhindered development of children and realisation of their full potentials.

- Comparative analysis.
- Review of relevant findings from the global thematic evaluation on child protection; and analysis of significant findings from current inter-agency work on CBCPMs.
- Core group monthly discussions.
- E-discussion with key stakeholders from Plan and their partners.
- Presentation and dialogue at end of study.

| M&E systems and processes |          |                | • What M&E systems and processes are currently being used to monitor, evaluate and learn from CBCPMs? What are their strengths and weaknesses? |             |
|                          |          |                | • What are the processes/approaches of sharing the outcome of M&E with the authorities and the key stakeholders at community and district levels? |             |
|                          |          |                | • Are there any system of using the information generated and recommendation made by the M&E for further planning and strengthening child protection work? |             |
|                          |          |                | • Are there any practices of engaging children and other community members in M&E processes? Are there any child friendly tools? Are there any processes for developing capacity of children and other community members for their meaningful participation in the M&E process? Are there any processes of reporting children’s findings separately in the M&E report? |             |
|                          |          |                | • To what extent is Plan able to obtain quality evidence to show how CBCPMs contribute positively to children’s lives? |             |
|                          |          |                | • What are key considerations in developing effective M&E processes and systems on CBCPMs? |             |
III Updated typology of approaches to engaging with communities

This typology builds upon and adapts the matrix developed by Behnam, N., Agencies, Communities, and Children: A report of the Interagency Learning Initiative: Engaging communities for children’s well-being. Washington, DC: USAID Displaced Children and Orphans Fund. Available online: http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/humanitarian_assistance/the_funds/pubs/comaction.html. Note: An earlier version of this matrix was also used by Mike Wessells in the inter-agency study on community-based child protection mechanisms.¹

Category 1
Direct implementation by agency: the agency is a service provider, and community members are beneficiaries.

Category 2
Community involvement in agency initiative: the agency is a promoter of its own initiative, a planner and a trainer, and community members are volunteers and beneficiaries.

Category 3
Community-owned and managed activities mobilised by external agency: the agency is a catalyst, capacity builder, a facilitator of linkages, and a funder after community ownership has developed. The community members are analysts, planners, implementers, assessors and also beneficiaries.

Category 4
Community-owned and managed activities initiated from within the community: the agency is a capacity builder and funder, and community members are analysts, planners, implementers, assessors, and also beneficiaries.

Category 5
Builds upon local government structures and community involvement mobilised by external agency: the agency is a catalyst, capacity builder, a facilitator of linkages, and an intermediate funder until government funding can be secured to ensure sustainability. The community members and local government are analysts, planners, implementers, assessors and also beneficiaries.

### Category 1. Direct implementation by agency.

**Process of initiation:**
- Agency submits proposal to funder and secures funding.
- Contract is negotiated for delivery of specific services to targeted beneficiaries to be carried out by the agency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Community role</th>
<th>Implementation method</th>
<th>Specific activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Informed of activities and generally some approval given. May play oversight or coordination role.</td>
<td>Paid staff of a funded agency implement specific activities for targeted beneficiaries within the community. Residents may be hired as staff, but agency oversees implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category 2. Community involvement in agency initiative.

**Process of initiation:**
- As category and, in addition, the agency persuades specific community members to carry out specific activities with agency training and support.
- Agency enlists, trains, and supports community volunteers to carry out specific activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Community role</th>
<th>Implementation method</th>
<th>Specific activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoter of an initiative Planner Trainer</td>
<td>Volunteers Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Informed of activities. Govt. ministry may take over support role when the agency leaves. The agency may engage in training and capacity building in appropriate government ministry to promote sustainability.</td>
<td>A funded agency supports community volunteers to carry out specific activities for targeted beneficiaries (priorities set by external agency, perhaps in consultation with the community). Residents may be hired as staff, but the agency oversees implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category 3. Community owned and managed activities mobilised by external agency.*

**Process of initiation:**
Mobilised by an external agency with the goal of fostering community ownership and independent management. Agency enables the community to analyse its own situation, identify priorities for who and what to focus on, and to develop/implement a plan of action based on its priorities. Agency builds capacity of the community or designated members to independently manage activities. External funding may follow but does not lead the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Community role</th>
<th>Implementation method</th>
<th>Specific activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst* Capacity builder</td>
<td>Analyssts Planners Implementers Assessors (Above roles may initially be supported by the agency working in partnership with community) Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Any of the above are possible.</td>
<td>Community members carry out and manage activities they have planned (this may be initially supported by an agency, with agency involvement phasing out over time). Agency helps build the capacity of community to independently manage activities. Agency may provide resources (tools, mentorship, support of planning process) as it works in partnership with community. Agency may help link the community to external sources of information and support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Resource base**
- Continuity

**Continuity**
- Depends on funding and continuity of funding.

**External funding**
- Agency expertise.

**Possible use of community resources (e.g., land, expertise, facilities).**
- External agency may or may not provide volunteers with financial or material incentives.
- Possible government roles.

---

**If community activities progress to established CBO/NGO level, external funding may be provided.**

**Determined by community:**
- Concern about problems addressed.
- Availability of local resources.
- Sense of ownership and responsibility for the response.
- Capacity to manage activities independently.

---

**Lessons for Protection**

- Sense of ownership.
- Concern about problems addressed.
- Availability of local resources.
- Sense of ownership and responsibility for the response.
- Capacity to manage activities independently.
### Category 4. Community owned and managed activities initiated from within the community.**

**Process of initiation:**
Catalysed (mobilised) from within the community by one or more community members. Community analyses its own situation, identifies priorities for who and what to focus on, develops and initiates a plan of action in response to these priorities. External funding and support for capacity building may follow, but does not lead the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Builder</th>
<th>Analysts</th>
<th>Planners</th>
<th>Implementers</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Assessors</th>
<th>Community role</th>
<th>Government role</th>
<th>Implementation method</th>
<th>Specific activities</th>
<th>Resource base</th>
<th>Continuity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency role</td>
<td>Community role</td>
<td>Government role</td>
<td>Implementation method</td>
<td>Specific activities</td>
<td>Resource base</td>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community members carry out and manage the activities they have planned.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Activities are adapted as community sees the need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Agency may help link community to external sources of information and support.</strong></td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Any of the above roles are possible.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Builder</strong></td>
<td><strong>Determined from the onset by the participating community members.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funder</strong></td>
<td><strong>Same as above</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category 5. Community owned and managed activities initiated from within the community.

**Process of initiation:**
Mobilised by external agency with the goal of fostering local government ownership and independent management. Agency enables community and local government to analyse its own situation, identify priorities for who and what to focus on, and to develop/implement a plan of action based on its priorities. Agency builds capacity of the community and/or local government designated members to independently manage activities. Agency may provide initial funding but advocates for national and local governments to allocate budget for sustainability of CBCPMs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>In collaboration with local government officials, community members are:</th>
<th>Local or higher level government authorise and support community-based protection groups/ initiatives.</th>
<th>Agency advocates with the government (central and local government) to support CBCPMs.</th>
<th>Government responsibility to support community-based CPGs (often as part of broader child protection system developments).</th>
<th>Government responsibility to support community-based CPGs (often as part of broader child protection system developments).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity builder</td>
<td><strong>Analysts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Planners</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td><strong>Assessors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency may facilitate the building of local government and community linkages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency may provide initial funding.</td>
<td><strong>Determined by local government and community, but may also be influenced by agency.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agency may provide initial funding and technical capacity building expertise on child protection.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agency may provide training and technical capacity building expertise on child protection.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mobilisation of community and local government resources (e.g., land, expertise, facilities).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Agency may provide initial funding and technical capacity building expertise on child protection.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria for selection of countries to be visited during field research

Green countries are ‘regional core countries’ proposed by Plan Asia Regional Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
<th>East Timor</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
<th>Laos</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>Sri Lanka</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core countries in the regional project</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two field visits undertaken in South Asia and two visits in the East Asia region</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one country will have child protection in emergency programming as a result of either natural disasters and/or conflict and instability</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>(during Maoist conflict)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(floods)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one country with a CBCP programme in its early stages of development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two countries where the CBCPM programme is more developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one country where the government actively supports CBCPM and links them to higher level child protection systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one country with active grassroots organisations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one country where children’s groups are actively engaged in/co-operate with the CBCPMs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one country that is Islamic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to explore urban as well as rural CBCPMs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two countries where civil society is limited</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least two countries with active civil society</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other possible criteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT countries who have been part of recent evaluations on CBCPM</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stakeholders involved in CBCPM studies in the Asia region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Summary of people involved</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Age range of child</th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangladesh</strong></td>
<td>Committee members at local level, number and age undefined by Plan Bangladesh.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cambodia</strong></td>
<td>Members of commune and village FPNs, village leaders, parents, youth, child club members, Plan staff, and government officials (local, district, provincial and central level).</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31-51</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>China</strong></td>
<td>Teachers and school children where Plan has established child participatory groups.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7-4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Timor</strong></td>
<td>Community members (parents, women, men, girls and boys); village chiefs; teachers; child youth parliament member; government officials concerned with child protection and justice (national and district); Commissioner NCRC; civil society organisations (Esparansa, District Lautem; FTM, Dili); ombudsman and Plan staff.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong></td>
<td>Members (women and men) of child protection committees/child protection groups/self help groups; village representatives; child group/ Bal Panchayat/children’s media group members (girls and boys); women’s group members; youth group members and Plan staff.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27-32</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indonesia</strong></td>
<td>Plan child protection focal point.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laos</strong></td>
<td>Plan child protection focal point.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepal</strong></td>
<td>Members of village CPC, para-legal committee, Better Life Options Group, women’s/mother’s group, vigilance/surveillance group, youth clubs, children’s clubs (including working children’s club); teachers and members of SMC; staff of local government officials (VDC and municipality); staff of CBOs and NGOs and Child Helpline 1098; government officials (local and district level); staff of Plan Nepal and its partner organisations.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>53-123</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pakistan</strong></td>
<td>Members of CBO/future CPCs, and members (and non-member children) of village level children’s forums (girls and boys) in rural and urban settings; interviews with district and national level government officials, NGOs (Bedari, PODA and Sahil) and Plan staff.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28-28</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philippines</strong></td>
<td>Government social workers and local government officials involved in barangay CPCs; women and CPU members (social workers, police, doctors); members of family watch groups; members of MOVE; parents; children’s organisation members; and Plan staff.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sri Lanka</strong></td>
<td>Community volunteers; members of children’s groups; members of divisional CPCs (child rights promotion officers, medical officers, probation officers, police, health workers); and Plan staff.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thailand</strong></td>
<td>Children’s group members; female and male community members; NGO directors and staff; government staff, and Plan staff.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vietnam</strong></td>
<td>Commune child protection board members (local officials and members of mass organisations); village collaborators; children’s core group members; government officials (local, district, provincial and central level). Staff members from child funds and Plan staff.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-discussion</strong></td>
<td>21 Plan staff and civil society partners participated in an e-discussion on critical issues concerning CBCPMs from August 17-20th 2012.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia Regional Office (ARO)</strong></td>
<td>Regional child rights and protection adviser and regional coordinator on child protection.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>362</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>202-314</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total numbers exclude numbers from Bangladesh, which ICPREC will include when it receives this data from Plan Bangladesh.*
Community consultation with CBCPM members

FGDs with CBCPMS using a) Time Line incorporating Response Pathway Analysis and (if time allows) b) ‘H’ Assessment

Note: It is hoped that at least 6-15 members of a CBCPM (ideally equal numbers of women and men) will be interested in, and have time to be part of the consultation about their CBCP work. Wherever possible it will be appreciated if diverse members can be involved – women, men, local officials, teachers, religious leaders, community leaders/elders, marginalised people, children’s representatives etc. The consultation will take just over two hours (up to three hours if they have time). It is crucial that their participation is informed and voluntary. Arrangements should be made for the discussions to take place in a quiet place with minimum disturbance. Their views will remain confidential and anonymous.2

Draft schedule (21/4 – 3 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (mins)</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 – 120</td>
<td>Time line incorporating response pathway questions considering responses before and after CBCPMs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 45</td>
<td>If time ‘H’ assessment of CBCPMs and/or stories of most significant change/challenge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Materials needed: Flipchart paper, tape, non-permanent markers, Post-it Notes (two colours), stickers (three colours).

Introduction: We appreciate the time given by your CBCP group members today. Plan Asia is conducting a comparative analysis of the CBCPMs that their offices support across the Asia region. We are here to learn more about your CBCPGs (adapt name according to context) and any links that you have with other groups or committees, authorities, CBOs, local leadership). In today’s discussion we will use a timeline activity and group discussions to explore the history of your CPG, its purpose, the kinds of activities you are doing, the training you have had, how protection concerns are responded to in your community, key successes in protecting children, and key challenges faced over time. If we have time, we also have an ‘H’ assessment for you to explore the overall strengths, weaknesses and suggestions to improve CBCPMs.

2 Unless any significant child protection concerns are raised that require follow up by Plan’s Country Office to ensure action in their best interests.
In addition we plan to facilitate discussions and activities with representatives of children and young people to better understand what changes the CBCPM is making to the lives of children in your community.

The findings of the learning in different countries will be used by Plan to improve efforts to strengthen communities’ efforts to protect children.

All views will be respected during these discussions and will remain anonymous. We encourage each of you to be open and honest so that we may collectively identify the strengths of your CPG, as well as the weaknesses and challenges, in order to identify lessons learned for effective scale up in the future.

We would also like to ask permission to take photos. We will only use positive image photos in the report. Do you agree to photos being taken?

*Introductions* of people in the group discussion – name, role.

**PART A**

*Time line activity and focus group discussion incorporating pathway analysis discussion (90-120 minutes)*

Time line of the CBCPM is a useful tool to gain an overview of the CBCP project. It can provide a simple illustration of the history of the work, capturing key training, different phases of work, how protection concerns are responded to in your community, successes and challenges over time.

*Identifying the history and main activities of CBCPMs:*

- **Draw a horizontal line along the length of flipcharts (2-3 stuck together).**
- **Using time as a reference point enables the CBCPM members to identify when their CBCPM was formed and to mark this on the time line.**
- How and when was your child protection committee/group established? Please describe if, and how, it built upon on any existing committee or structure, or if it was newly established?
- **On the time line, record key activities undertaken by the CBCPM.**

*Purpose, roles and responsibilities:*

- What is the purpose of the CBCPM? Has the purpose been clear from the beginning or has it changed over time?
- What are the main roles and responsibilities of your group members?
- How have you informed other community members – women, men, girls and boys; and/or other groups or committees in the village about the roles and responsibilities of your CBCPM?
Membership:
- How many members are there in your CBCPM? How were they selected?
- Have there been any changes in membership over time?
- Are women and men from some of the poorest households members of the CBCPMs? Why?
- Are children or young people involved as members in the CBCPM? Please describe why? (or as invitees and/or observers)
- What value do the local officials and/or local religious elders have for the CBCPM? How do they collaborate and/or support the CBCPM?

Meetings:
- How often do you meet? And where?
- What proportion of members usually join the meetings?
- What are the main agenda issues discussed in these meetings? How is the agenda of the meeting decided?
- What are follow up mechanisms for the decisions made?

Capacity building and support:
- On the time line, please identify any training and/or other key support that you have received on child rights or child protection from Plan and its partners since your CBCPM was established.
- How relevant, timely and effective was the training/support?
- To what extent do you feel you have been able to put the training into practice? Please give some examples.
- What kind of support/supervision and monitoring has taken place since the training to guide the realisation of the training’s goals and subjects?
- What kind of supervision and monitoring do you think would help ensure effective implementation of trainings?

Local beliefs and traditions:
- Can you share some examples of local beliefs, customs and traditional practices that are positive for the protection of children? To what extent is your CBCPM supporting these types of positive traditional practices?
- What are traditional ways of supporting vulnerable children in your community? Does CBCPM support these traditions? If so, how?
- Can you share some examples of local customs and practices that are harmful to the welfare of children? To what extent is the CBCPM helping to change these practices? Please describe how.
- What are your views about disciplining children? How prevalent is the beating of children in the community? Have there been any changes in behaviour or attitudes since forming the CBCPMs?
CBCPMs and awareness-raising on child protection:
- Can you describe what kind of awareness-raising on child rights and/or child protection (including existing national laws) your CBCPM or your NGO partner has undertaken?
- What proportion of the community has been reached through awareness-raising?
- How effective/ineffective do you feel the awareness-raising has been? Why?
- Which villagers (women, men, girls, boys, older or younger generation) have been most/least influenced by the awareness-raising? Why?

CBCPMs and children’s participation:
- Can you describe ways that girls and boys are actively involved in the CBCPM or in efforts to prevent or respond to child protection concerns in your village? Record significant developments in children’s participation on the time line.
- What are the main benefits and/or challenges of involving children?

Protection issues, response pathway, and the difference CBCPMs make:
- What are the main protection concerns facing girls and boys of different ages and backgrounds in your community? (place on Post-its across the top of the time line flipchart)
- We would like you to identify three of these protection issues that we can use to explore the ‘response pathway’ – who do children/adults tell and what happens next? This will help us better understand how your community identifies and responds to children’s protection needs, with or without the CBCPM.
- Which are the three common child protection issues faced by girls and boys of different ages in your community? Let’s explore each one – one at a time on Post-its on a separate flipchart.

A. For each of these issues let’s use post its to explore what would happen step by step:
- Child protection Issue 1, then same questions for child protection Issue 2 (and if time also explore child protection Issue 3):
  - Who could the child go to for help?
  - What would the family do?
  - What would the community do? Who would be involved? What support would actually be provided for the child and family?
  - Who would be the key decision makers about what would happen?
  - What role would be played by people/services outside the community?

B. What would be the likely outcome of the responses to the problem?
- What would likely happen to the child/perpetrator/family?
- How satisfied with this outcome would various stakeholders (child, family, community, people outside the community) be? Why?
C. What difference does CBCPM make? What other option did the child/family have?

- What difference does the CBCPM make?
- What would have happened to a similar case like this before the CBCPM (or in a neighbouring community where there is no CBCPM)?
- What other options would they have for responding to their concerns? Which would they use/not use? And why? (e.g. if not already mentioned, would they report to local authorities, to police, to a social worker?)

**CBCPM and case management:**

- Which child protection issues does your CBCPM feel most confident responding to?
- Are there any protection issues that you feel less confident about or less effective in dealing with? If so, which? Please describe.
- How many child protection cases has your CBCPM been working on in the last three months?
- Can you describe processes or steps that you follow in case management?
- Can you describe the different roles and responsibilities of CBCPM members and/or NGO staff in terms of case management? Who takes what responsibility?
- How do you maintain confidentiality when dealing with child protection cases in your community?
- How do you take into consideration a child’s own views, their gender, age, religious, ethnic, cultural factors or others to ensure a non-discriminatory approach?
- How do you ensure that decisions are made in the best interests of the child?
- What are your key achievements/successes in case management?
- What are your key challenges or constraints in case management?

**CBCPM and referrals:**

- What kinds of referrals have you made in your case work?
- Which referrals have been most/least effective and why?
- Have you mapped the processes of referrals and/or made an overview for a standardised response?

**Outcomes on children:**

- Which children have most benefitted from CBCPM activities? What is your estimate on how many girls and boys have benefited from CBCPM interventions? How?
- What changes are there in girls’ and boys’ lives as a result of the CBCPM? Please describe some of the most significant changes resulting from CBCPM interventions.
- Can you describe any ways that your CBCPM has been effective in preventing or responding to children in contact with the law, orphans, children affected by child trafficking, or child soldiers?
- Have there been any negative impacts on children or families as a result of CBCPM interventions? Please describe.
CBCPMs and networking:
- How does your CBCPM network with other committees or groups within your village/district?
- How does your CBCPM work/collaborate with government agencies at community and district levels?
- What are the benefits or challenges of networking?
- How do you think networks could be strengthened?

Sustainability and replicability:
- How do you see your CBCPM developing or evolving in the future?
- As and when Plan and its Partners would phase out support to your CBCPM, what are your plans for the future? Is your CBCPM prepared to be sustainable beyond Plan’s support?
- What, if any, support does your CBCPM need to better protect girls and boys (especially the most marginalised) in your community, and to be more effective?
- What have been your main lessons learned on how to protect girls and boys in the community?
- What are your views and suggestions about replicating and scaling up CBCPMs in different parts of the country?
- What practical advice would you give to other communities who want to establish a CBCPM?

Recommendations: (if ‘H’ is not being used)
- What recommendations do you have for strengthening the CBCPM?
- What can be done to make it easier for children to seek or access help?
- How could the help/services that children receive be improved?

PART B:
‘H’ assessment (30 minutes)
- In this part of the evaluation, a ‘H’ assessment on flipchart paper will be used to explore the overall strengths and successes of the CBCPM; the challenges and constraints faced by the CBCPM; suggestions to improve the CPG; and efforts to protect children from all forms of abuse, neglect, violence and exploitation.
- Children and young people’s representatives, as well as other community representatives (parents/caregivers, religious elders) may be involved in this part of the assessment to gain wider perspectives. It is possible that the ‘H’ assessments can be undertaken simultaneously in different stakeholder groups within one community to see similarities, as well as differences in perspectives. It can also draw upon a wide range of stakeholders to give suggestions on how to strengthen and improve the CBP work.
- As seen in the diagram below draw an ‘H’ shape on the flipchart paper. At the top of the left hand column draw a happy face. At the top of the right hand column a sad face. Below the middle ‘H’ bar draw a light-bulb to represent ‘bright ideas’.
CBCP group/committee
(village name, district, province)
Add date of assessment & the number of people involved in this ‘H’ assessment

• The ‘H’ assessment will be used by the CBCPM to explore its strengths and weaknesses as a record:
  - In the top middle part of the ‘H’ record: 1) the location of your CBCP group/committee (village, district, province); 2) the date you completed the ‘H’ Assessment; and 3) the number of people, gender and background of people involved in this ‘H’ assessment (e.g. 3 women, 3 men, 2 girls and 2 boys).
  - In the left hand column (happy face) discuss and record the strengths and successes of your CPG.
  - In the right hand column (sad face) discuss and record the weaknesses, challenges or constraints faced by the CPG. Remember to be open and honest in sharing weaknesses or challenges faced as it will help to inform programme improvements.
  - Under the light-bulb (middle lower part) discuss and record your suggestions to improve or strengthen work by the CPG to increase child protection from all forms of violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation. Think about, and include, what training or support is most needed to increase the confidence and skills of CBCPMs.

THANK ALL PARTICIPANTS and INFORM THEM ABOUT THE NEXT STAGES OF THE COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS PROCESS.

Observation: Good observation skills are crucial throughout field work and the evaluation process. Through observation we can notice:
• Which members of CBCPMs are the most/least vocal; whether women and men are both vocal and active; to which extent;
• Body language and readiness to discuss and address child protection concerns;
• Whether children are actively involved in CBCPM discussions and/or in their own child group activities;
• Whether boys and girls have confidence to speak up during field visits;
• Which children speak more or less, for example whether proportionately more boys or girls, older or younger children are active? Whether children with disabilities are involved? Which children have the most confidence;
• The degree to which parents or community members listen to children’s views; and
• Any protection concerns during our field visits – e.g. children involved in harmful work, children being beaten etc.

All these observations are crucial and can be triangulated with other data collected to inform the evaluation findings. The main evaluator will also keep a *diary* to record observations, ideas, thoughts and feelings. This diary will help identify and cross-check findings, and to record gaps in information, or ideas for new areas to explore.

**Venn diagram**
The Venn diagram can be used to show a social map of how the CBCPM links with other groups and institutions within and outside the community. It can be used to show which individuals and groups have influence on CBCPM decision making, as well as the relations between village institutions and outside forces, such as government services or development agencies.

*Materials needed:* if available, large flipchart paper, coloured paper to cut circles out of, in different sizes (at least four sizes), glue, scissors, tape, pens.

*Key steps:*
• Explain that this tool will enable the participants to identify and explore important partners/institutions (and individuals) who influence their CBCPM, and to explore social and power relations.
• Take 5-10 minutes to discuss, identify and list stakeholders who have a positive or negative influence on the CBCPM.
• Come back into a single group, let the participants share their findings to create a list of all relevant partners/institutions or individuals (e.g. local NGO, teachers, religious leaders, women’s group, youth group, local government official, police, local military commander, national government etc.).
• **Identify the importance of each partner to the CBCPM:** For each partner/institution or individual, decide how important their influence/support is to CBCPM processes. Their current influence may be positive or negative. Place the partner’s name on a large, medium, small or very small circle depending on their importance. The most important partners are each written on their own circle.
• Start building the Venn diagram: Write the CBCPM name (or what their group/committee is called) on one of the large circles and place it in the middle of a large flipchart paper.

• **Arrange partners/institutions near or far away from the CBCPM to indicate the degree of partnership between them:** Discuss and place each of the circles near or far away from the CBCPM to illustrate the degree of partnership. For example if there is a lot of collaboration between the CBCPM and the village development committee then place the circle with the village development committee close to the CBCPM circle. If the child group, youth group and women’s group work collaboratively with the CBCPM on child protection then place all three circles close to one another. Or for example if there is no partnership between the CBCPM and the local government official in supporting protection, place the circle with the local government official far away from the CBCPM.

• Discuss the Venn diagram findings: What are your main findings? Who are good allies and partners of the CBCPM for child protection initiatives?

• Discuss and record on Post-its the types of support you get from each of these stakeholders and if there are any ways to strengthen such support.

• Which people or groups have the power to make decisions concerning resources that may be used to support the child protection response?

• Are there any important influential partners/institutions in terms of child protection who the CBCPM has not formed a positive partnership with? If so, why? How can partnerships be built with such stakeholders to ensure effective and sustainable child protection responses?
Girls and boys: Community-based consultations

**Note:** It is hoped that at least 6-20 girls and boys aged 8-18 years (with a special focus on involving children from marginalised backgrounds) will have an interest in, and time to be part of the consultation, that especially children who are involved in CBCPMs and/or child clubs/groups in their community will be involved. The consultation will take approximately two hours (or ideally two and a half hours if they have time). Children will be asked to participate in activities and discussions about child protection and the role of the community-based CPG and child groups in their community (village/urban area). It is crucial that their participation is informed and voluntary, and that their parent or caregiver has agreed to their participation in this activity. Arrangements should be made for girls and boys to discuss in a quiet place with the minimum presence of other adults so that they have freedom to express their views and experiences. Furthermore, their views will remain confidential and anonymous. If in local culture, girls and boys cannot participate in consultations together, please arrange for separate girls and boys consultations.

**Draft schedule (2-2.5 hours)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 mins</td>
<td>Icebreaker introductions and Finger Catch game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 mins</td>
<td>Body mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• exploring what children need protecting from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• existence and activities of CBCPMs and child groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• pathway response before and after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• changes in children before and after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>Refreshment and energiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td>If time ‘H’ assessment of CBCPMs and child groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If time drawing or drama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials needed:** Flipchart paper, tape, non-permanent markers, coloured crayons, Post-it Notes (two colours), stickers (three colours).

**Introduction:** We appreciate the time given by you today. Plan Asia is supporting us in visiting different communities and different countries in Asia to learn more from children and adults about how children can be better protected. Plan wants to learn more about how communities can protect children from different forms of abuse, violence and exploitation. We are here to learn more about how child protection concerns are identified and responded to in your community. We will use a ‘body mapping exercise’ to better understand your views about the things you need protecting from, and to better understand what changes the CPC/G (adapt word CBCPM to context) is making to the lives of children in your community. The findings will be used to improve efforts to strengthen communities’ efforts to protect children.

---

3 Unless any significant child protection concerns are raised that require follow up by Plan’s Country Office to ensure action in their best interests.
It is your choice to participate. You are encouraged to participate IF you are interested in the discussions. All views will be respected during these discussions and will remain anonymous. Only in cases where a child may be at risk, we will inform others to ensure a sensitive response in the child’s best interests. We encourage each of you to be open and honest so that we may collectively identify the protection issues most affecting girls and boys in your communities, the ways in which the CBCPM is helping to protect children, as well as any suggestions to improve the activities. All your suggestions will help us identify ways to improve this programme in the future.

We would also like to ask permission to take photos. We will only use positive image photos in the report. Do you agree to photos being taken?

**Circle icebreaker introductions** of girls and boys in the group: name, age and act out your favourite hobby.

**Finger Catch game:** In the circle place your right hand flat towards the person on your right. Place your left index finger on the hand of the person on your left. The caller counts to three, on three you have to try to save your left finger, while also trying to catch the finger of the person on your right.

**Body mapping** *(90 minutes)*

*Introductions and identifying protection issues affecting girls or boys:*

- Stick three large flipcharts together and ask for a volunteer to lie on the charts to have their body shape outlined.
- Explain that this ‘body’ represents all girls and boys in their village/ward.
- First of all we want to consider all the things that girls and boys need protecting from in their communities, homes, schools, workplace or in wider society. Think back to the finger catch game we just played to think about ‘what do children need protecting from?’. In small gender groups discuss with your friends what girls and boys of different ages and backgrounds need protecting from. Place each of these protection concerns on a Post-it.
- Ask the girls and boys groups to present their Post-its and to place them inside the body.
- Discuss whether each of these protection risks affect all children in the community and/or whether some children are more vulnerable or at risk to certain protection issues. **Make a note about which children (girls/boys, ages, background factors) are more vulnerable to certain protection concerns and why.**

**Exploring the existence of CBCPMs in addressing children’s protection concerns and pathway responses:**

- If children face any of these protection concerns what do they do? Who do they tell? What happens next?
- Is it easy or difficult to share your concerns? What happens if girls or boys do share their concerns? What happens next?
Let’s identify three common child protection issues faced by girls and boys of different ages and backgrounds in your community to explore the ‘response pathway’. Let’s explore each one – one at a time on Post-its on a separate flipchart to show who children tell, what happens next, and what is the likely outcome?

- Are these protection issues different for boys and girls? And do the responses differ for boys and girls?
- Can you tell us more about the CBCPM in your community? When did it start? Who is in it? What do they do?
- Do children have their own child clubs/group? If so, when did it start? Who is in it? What do they do? Are out-of-school children, children from different caste/ethnic groups, economic backgrounds also included? Are children with disabilities included?
- Are children able to participate in CBCP activities? If so, who? And how?
- Are children included in any community meetings or training on child rights or child protection? If so, what?
- What happened before the CBCPM was here? Who did children tell when they faced a protection issue? Was the response (solution offered, if any) different to the response following the establishment of the CBCPM?

Exploring which protection issues are addressed by CBCPMs:
- If we look at the different Post-its you made about the different protection concerns faced by girls and boys, which protection issues do they think CBCPMs address most/least?
  - Place a ‘green’ O sticker by protection issues that CBCPMs often address
  - Place a ‘yellow’ O sticker by protection issues that CBCPMs sometimes address
  - Place a ‘red’ O sticker by protection issues that CBCPMs rarely address
- Which protection issues would they most like CBCPMs to give more attention to? Why?

OUTCOMES: Now let us use the body shape to explore the outcomes on children of the CBCPMs. We will draw a line down the middle of the body. The left hand side are children in their community BEFORE the formation of the CBCPM, and the right hand side represents children AFTER the formation of the CBCPM. Where relevant, children may also want to comment on before and after changes from their own participation in CBCP initiatives.

- Encourage the children to think about any changes in girls and boys in their community as a result of CBCPM activities. We can use the body parts to facilitate discussion and to record changes BEFORE/AFTER in relation to:
  - The head: any changes in what girls and boys think about/worry about/feel happy about? Any changes in children’s knowledge? Any changes in the way adults think about girls and boys?
The eyes: any changes in the way children see themselves/their families/their communities? Any changes in the way adults see girls and boys? Any changes in the way vulnerable children are seen by their peers, their families/their communities?

The ears: any changes in what children hear? Any changes in how adults listen to girls and boys? Any changes in the way children listen to adults?

The mouth: any changes in the way children communicate or speak? Any changes in the way adults communicate or speak to children? Any changes in opportunities for children to express their views or concerns? Any changes in opportunities for children to participate in issues affecting them in their homes, schools, community or work place?

The heart: any changes in the way girls and boys feel? Any changes in the way adults feel about or care for girls and boys? Any changes in the way girls or boys from different backgrounds experience discrimination in the community?

The stomach: any changes in what children eat? Or what families eat?

The hands and arms: any changes in what activities girls and boys do? What kinds of work they do? Any changes in the way adults treat them? Any changes in the way children are beaten by adults?

The feet and legs: Any changes in where children go? In what they do? In where they feel safe?

The clothes: Any changes in what children wear?

Discuss the changes achieved, and give examples. Identify whether this is a change for a only a few children (*), some children (**), or a lot of children (***)

Can they share concrete examples.

Discuss which girls and boys have most benefitted from CBCPM activities? Which children have least benefitted? Why?

Have there been any negative outcomes for children or their families from CBCPM activities? Please describe:

Can they describe any local beliefs, customs and traditional practices that help protect children (especially the most vulnerable)? Is the CBCPM supporting these practices?

Can they describe any local customs and practices that are harmful to children? Is the CBCPM helping to change these practices?

What are children’s suggestions/recommendations to improve CBCPMs so that they are more effective in preventing and responding to abuse, violence and exploitation. Participants can go back into groups of girls and boys, give them Post-its to record their recommendations.

What practical tips would they give children in other villages about what they can do to increase prevention and protection of girls and boys from all forms of abuse, neglect, violence and exploitation?
**Note:** IF THERE IS TIME and INTEREST:

- an ‘H’ Assessment with children about the CBCPM and/or about their child/youth club/group; and/or
- the children can draw pictures to show changes in girls/boys lives in their community since the formation of the CBCPMs. Alternatively children may prefer to develop poems, songs or dramas about the impact of CBCPMs or recommendations to strengthen them. They will be encouraged to participate in the medium of their choice.

**Observation:** Good observation skills are crucial throughout field work. Through observation we can deduce:

- Whether children are included in CBCPM or child club/group discussions;
- Whether girls and boys have the confidence to speak up during field visits;
- Which children speak more or less, for example whether proportionately more boys or girls, older or younger children are active? Whether children with disabilities are involved? Which children have the most confidence;
- The degree to which parents or community members listen to children’s views; and
- Any protection concerns during our field visits – e.g. children involved in harmful work, children being beaten etc.

**Informal interviews with parents, caregivers or other community stakeholders on CBCPMs**

*Approximate time: 45 minutes*

**Introduction:** We appreciate the time given by you today. We are here to learn more about how children are protected in your community. Findings from these discussions will be used by Plan International and their partner organisations to inform and strengthen improvements in child protection work. We encourage you to share your views freely, they will remain anonymous and help us improve our efforts to care for and protect children.

**Key questions:**

**Child protection concerns and pathway response:**

- What do you feel children need to thrive and develop?
- What are the main protection concerns facing girls and boys of different ages and backgrounds in your community?
- Which group of children face the most protection concerns and why?
- If a child faces such a concern (*taking an example raised by the interviewee*) – what does the child or family do? Who do they tell? What happens next? What is the usual outcome?
- Are these protection issues different for boys and girls? And do the responses differ for boys and girls?
• Are there any other options about who a child or family member should tell? Why are these options not usually taken?
• Who do you approach if you have a concern about your own child’s or another child’s protection in the community?

**Community perception of CBCPM:**
• Can you tell us about the CBCPM in your community?
• When did it start? Who is in it? What do they do?
• What is the CBCPM doing to prevent or protect children from the protection concerns you raised? Please describe.
• What proportion of the community members do you think are aware of the CBCPM and what they do?
• How does the CBCPM inform and involve other community members in their activities?
• How easy or difficult is it to approach the CBCPM if you have a concern about a child in your community? Please describe.
• Can you describe any experiences that you or your neighbours have of interacting with the members of the CBCP group/committee?
• In your view what are the most significant/useful activities undertaken by the CBCP group/committee? Why?
• What are main strengths and weaknesses of the CBCPM?

**Addressing child protection concerns before and after CBCPMs:**
• Before the CBCPM existed, how were child protection concerns addressed in your community? Were there any formal and/or informal organisations/agencies?
• What difference does it make to have a CBCPM in your community? Please describe.
• How do people in neighbouring communities without a CBCPM prevent or respond to child protection concerns?

**Awareness-raising by CBCPM:**
• Have you been part of any awareness-raising (activities) organised by the CBCPM or partner organisation? Please describe.
• How appropriate was the awareness-raising to your local context?
• How effective/ineffective was the awareness-raising? Can you describe any personal changes in practices or attitudes, or any changes among community members as a result of the awareness-raising?
• What proportion of the community do you feel have changed practices or attitudes as a result of the awareness-raising? Please share examples.
• Which people have not been reached or changed through the awareness-raising? Why?
Disciplining children:
- How are children disciplined in your community?
- How prevalent is the beating (or any other type of physical punishment) of children in the community? And in school?
- Have there been any changes in behaviour or attitudes to beating children since the CBCPM was formed? Please describe.
- Has any training on positive disciplining been provided at home and in school?

Local practices:
- Can you share any examples of local beliefs, customs and traditional practices that are positive for the protection of children?
- Is the CBCPM supporting these types of positive traditional practices?
- What are traditional ways of supporting vulnerable children in your community?
- Does CBCPM support these traditions?
- Can you share any examples of local customs and practices that are harmful to children?
- Is the CBCPM helping to change these practices?

Listening to children:
- What are your views about listening to children and encouraging their expression and participation (particularly in relation to protect them from any sorts of harms)?
- Are children able to participate in CBCPMs or any other CCBP activities? If so, who? And how?
- Is there any example of representatives of children participating in CBCPMs as members/invitees/observers? What is the value of children’s participation in such structures (CBCPMs)?
- What are your views about the benefits or challenges of encouraging children’s expression and participation?

Increasing child protection:
- Do you have any suggestions about what can be done to better protect girls and boys in your community?
- Do you have any suggestions to strengthen the role and effectiveness of the CBCPM?
- What are your views about the value of CBCPMs and whether they should be formed in other villages?
Semi structured interviews and/or FGDs with government officials or social workers involved in CBCPMs at national and/or local (district and community) level

Introduction: We appreciate the time given to meet with us today to share your views about the CBCPMs that Plan supports. We are here to learn more about your views on how CBCPMs are protecting girls and boys, and how they can be strengthened, made more sustainable and scaled up. Findings from these discussions will be used by Plan International and their partner organisations to inform and strengthen improvements in child protection work. We encourage you to share your views freely, they will remain anonymous and will help us improve our efforts to care for and protect children.

All views will be respected and will remain anonymous. We encourage you to be open and honest so that we may identify lessons learned and strategic approaches for effective scale up in the future.

Key informant interview and/or FGD (60-90 minutes)
All views will be respected and will remain anonymous. We encourage each of you to be open and honest so that we may collectively identify the strengths of the CBCPMs, as well as the weaknesses and challenges, in order to effectively identify lessons learned for future developments.

Introduction – name and role of each discussion partner

Contextual background:
• What do you see as the main protection concerns facing girls and boys of different ages and backgrounds?
• What – in your view – are positive steps being taken by the government, INGOs, national NGOs, CBOs or communities to address these concerns and what are the major issues that are insufficiently dealt with on national and local levels?

Legal and policy framework:
• Can you describe legal and policy developments which support CBCPMs and/or their linkages with more formal child protection systems at higher levels?
• Is there a process to improve legislation and policy for child protection?

Coordination and planning:
• To what extent do you think agencies involved in child protection (government, INGOs including Plan, NGOs and CBOs) are linked and coordinated at different levels?
• To what extent do the formal coordination mechanisms link to community-based mechanisms?
• Are there any groups or key individuals within communities who could be better linked/integrated into service delivery to promote child protection?
• What makes the existing national coordination mechanisms for child protection effective/ineffective?
• How effective is inter-ministerial coordination with other sectors (health, education, justice, social protection etc) to better support child protection? How can it be improved? Do you see a role for Plan International or other NGOs in this process?
• How are child protection planning processes linked to other national processes, such as poverty reduction strategy planning or decentralisation processes?

Capacity building:
• What training have government officials and/or social workers received on child protection and in specific, CBCPMs? From whom?
• How effective has it been? How has the training been applied in practice?

CBCPMs and their protection response:
• What is your understanding of CBCPMs?
• Which protection issues do you think CBCPMs can confidently and effectively respond to?
• Are there any protection issues which you think CBCPMs are less confident or effective in responding to? If so, why?
• What factors do you feel influence whether CBCPMs are working well/less well?
• What are the most significant successes of CBCPMs? Please share some examples.
• Can you describe the different roles and responsibilities of local government officials and/or government social workers/case workers/child rights officers in helping to resolve child protection cases that are identified in communities?
• Is there a referral system to follow up on protection issues in the district you work in? And if so, how effective is it?
• Are the CBCPMs linked to this referral system? And if so, does this referral system work well? What are the challenges?

Children’s participation:
• What are your views concerning children’s roles and participation in CBCPMs?
• What do you see as the main benefits or challenges of children’s participation?
• What opportunities may there be for children to influence policy or practice developments in the future?

Human and financial resources:
• Do you think that your office/department has appropriate staff (number and qualifications) to carry out your department's (or organisation in the case of UNICEF/NGO etc) mandate on child protection at a State/divisional, district and community level? What are the main constraints regarding human resources in the child protection sector?
Do you think the currently available government budget and resources for child protection services are adequate to carry out your mandate? Please explain and provide examples.

**Sustainability, scale up and replicability?**

- What factors influence the sustainability of CBPMs?
- To what extent do you feel that the CBPMs can be replicated and scaled up across the country?
- What recommendations do you have to strengthen child protection mechanisms and systems at community, provincial/State or national level?
- Do you have any specific recommendations in terms of: laws and policies; planning; coordination; services; or resources?
- Do you have any other recommendations for Plan to consider with regards to the effective use of resources and strengthening of CBPMs?

**Key informant interviews and/or FGDs with other agencies**

Regarding their perspectives of Plan’s strategic and practical work on CBPMs and broader strategy and plans to strengthen child protection systems

**Introduction:** We appreciate the time given to meet with us today to share your views about the CBPMs that Plan supports. We are here to learn more about your views on how CBPMs are protecting girls and boys, and how they can be strengthened, made more sustainable and scaled up. Findings from these discussions will be used by Plan International and their partner organisations to inform and strengthen improvements in child protection work. We encourage you to share your views freely, they will remain anonymous and will help us improve our efforts to care for and protect children.

Recognising your organisation as a key child protection agency working in (insert country), this interview seeks to learn more about (insert country).

All views will be respected and will remain anonymous. We encourage you to be open and honest so that we may identify lessons learned and strategic approaches for effective scale up in the future.

**Key informant interview and/or FGD (60-90 mins)**

**Relative strengths and weaknesses of Plan’s strategy on CBPM and child protection system strengthening**

- What are your views on the relative strengths and weaknesses of Plan’s strategy and practical work on strengthening CBPMs and strengthening child protection systems at different levels?
• What type of collaboration do your agencies have on child protection system building and strengthening? Does your agency interact directly with the CBCPM’s supported by Plan?
• Which protection concerns do you feel are currently being effectively addressed through the CBCPMs?
• Are there any protection concerns affecting girls or boys that are being less well addressed through the CBCPMs? Why?
• What do you feel is needed to strengthen the links between CBCPMs and higher level formal child protection mechanisms and systems at sub-national and national levels?

Contextual background:
• What do you see as the main protection concerns facing girls and boys of different ages and backgrounds? Which groups are most at risk?
• What – in your view – are positive steps being taken to address these concerns by the government, by Plan, your agency or other agencies, and what are the major issues that are insufficiently dealt with on national and local levels? Why?

Legal and policy framework:
• Can you describe the (if any) legal and policy developments which support CBCPMs and/or their linkages with more formal child protection systems at higher levels?

Coordination and planning:
• To what extent do you think the agencies involved in child protection (government, UN, NGO and CBO) are well-linked and coordinated at different levels?
• To what extent does Plan proactively coordinate with other agencies working on child protection system strengthening? How?
• To what extent do the formal coordination mechanisms on child protection link to community-based mechanisms?
• Are there any groups or key individuals within communities who could be better linked/integrated into service delivery to promote child protection?
• What makes the existing national coordination mechanisms for child protection effective/ineffective?
• How effective is inter-ministerial coordination with other sectors (health, education, justice, social protection etc) to better support child protection? How can it be improved? Do you see any role for NGOs in improving this coordination?
• How are child protection planning processes linked to other national processes, such as poverty reduction strategy planning or decentralisation processes?
**Capacity building:**
- What training have government officials and/or social workers received on child protection, specifically CBCPMs? From whom?
- How effective has it been? How has the training been applied in practice?
- What in your view are the capacity training needs for government staff collaborating with CBCPMs?

**CBCPMs and their protection response:**
- What is your understanding of CBCPMs?
- Which protection issues do you think CBCPMs can confidently and effectively respond to?
- Are there any protection issues which you think CBCPMs are less confident or effective in responding to? If so, why?
- What factors do you think need to be taken into consideration by NGOs when forming effective and inclusive CBCPMs that can respond sensitively to child protection concerns in their villages?
- What are the most significant successes of CBCPMs? Please share some examples.
- What is the minimum level of awareness-raising or training that needs to be provided to CBCPMs to enable them to understand their roles and responsibilities and start to function?
- Can you describe the different roles and responsibilities of local government officials and/or social workers in helping to resolve child protection cases that are identified in communities?
- Is there a referral system to follow up on protection issues in the district you work in? And if so, how effective is it in terms of assistance to victims and retribution for the perpetrator?
- Are the CBCPMs linked to this referral system? And if so, how effective/ineffective are CBCPMs in making and following up on relevant referrals? What are the challenges?
- What are the main constraints faced by CBCPMs in case management?

**Children’s participation:**
- What are your views concerning children’s participation and the role of children in CBCPMs in (insert country)? What are the constraints that hamper children’s participation?
- What opportunities will there be for children to influence policy or practice developments in the future?
- How can quality child groups and partnerships between children and adults be strengthened and scaled up by Plan and other agencies?
Human and financial resources:

- Do you think that the relevant government departments have appropriate staff (number and qualifications) to carry out their mandate on child protection at a State/sub-state level? What are the main constraints regarding human resources in the child protection sector?
- Do you think the currently available government budget and resources for child protection services are adequate to carry out their mandate? Please explain and provide examples.

Sustainability, scale up and replicability?

- What factors influence the sustainability of CBCPMs?
- How sustainable are CBCPMs supported by Plan and/or your agency? What factors influence their sustainability?
- To what extent do you feel that the CBCPMs can be replicated and scaled up across the country? What strategies could be used?
- What recommendations do you have to strengthen child protection mechanisms and systems at community, district, provincial and national levels?
- Do you have any specific recommendations in terms of: laws and policies; planning; coordination; services; or resources?
- Do you have any other recommendations for Plan to consider with regards to the effective use of resources and strengthening of CBCPMs?

Monitoring and evaluation:

- How effective is Plan International in monitoring and evaluating child protection outcomes?
- How can Plan International and other child protection agencies improve their M&E systems to demonstrate positive impact in terms of child protection as well as challenges?
- What role can Plan play in catalysing and supporting the government and NGOs to develop and implement effective data collection, M&E systems on child protection issues affecting girls and boys of different ages?

Recommendations: Do you have any other recommendations for Plan International to increase the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact or sustainability of its efforts to strengthen CBCPMs?
Ethical issues which will be considered and applied during the Plan study and field work on CBCP include:

- **Principles of child rights**: The evaluation will be conducted in a manner which ensures respect for children’s rights to participation, non-discrimination and action in their best interests.

- **Ensure effective communication and coordination** – systems are in place between Plan, their partners, and communities to ensure timely sharing of information about planned field visits to enable informed voluntary participation of key stakeholders (grass-root CBOs, children and young people, parents/caregivers, community members, NGO staff, government officials etc).

- **Timing of the evaluation** – Field visit planning is needed that responds to both the constraints and opportunities in the time available by different stakeholders (girls, boys, women and men in communities; officials etc) to meet during these field visits. Appropriate methods and efficient use of time are needed to make use of the field visit time slots with different stakeholders. Wherever possible, meetings with children and young people should be arranged at times that do not interfere with children’s school work, especially exam periods; or with other work responsibilities. Extra efforts should be made to find time to meet with children’s representatives from marginalised groups (e.g. working children, children from vulnerable households).

- **Informed consent** – participation by different stakeholders, including children must be both relevant and voluntary. All stakeholders must be given clear information about the purpose of the field visits. Participants must be aware of their rights – for example, to withdraw from the study activities at any time. It is also important to gain consent, understanding and acceptance from parents/caregivers and the wider community. Wherever necessary, permission from children’s teachers or employers may also be needed. However, it is better to avoid situations where children miss school or loose earnings due to their participation.

---

Avoiding harm to participants – the consultants are responsible for making sure the study is conducted in a manner that will do no harm to children or adults. Consultants are responsible for protecting all participants from any potential emotional or physical harm that might occur as a result of their involvement in the study and to protect their rights and interests. In many parts of Asia, girls and boys are not expected to speak up or express their views in front of adults. Thus, to support children’s informed, safe and meaningful participation in the study it will be important that information is shared in advance with NGOs and community groups to encourage space for girls and boys to meet with the consultant to share their views (with a minimum number of adults present). Information about the field visits should be shared with children and their parents/caregivers to gain their informed consent.

Harm can arise from methods that cause participants to recall distressing experiences or feelings. Participants will not be asked to talk about personal experiences of violence or abuse, but rather about general protection issues affecting girls and boys in their community. The consultants will avoid asking insensitive questions or probing for information when it is clear that participants would prefer not to answer. Discussions may be stopped if they become distressing or upsetting to participants. Before the field visits begin, the consultants working with Plan ARO and/or country team personnel will agree on what actions will be taken, in accordance with agency child protection procedures, should a child disclose abuse (actual or potential). Similarly, the team will agree upon a procedure to ensure that distress is immediately recognised and mitigated, and that appropriate support is found for ensuring the comfort and wellbeing of the child.

Child Protection Code of Conduct will be followed to ensure that behaviour with children is always respectful and protective. As discussed above, Plan’s Child Protection Policy’s formal procedures will be followed in cases of disclosure of significant protection concerns by girls or boys during the study.

Confidentiality – as a general rule confidentiality must be maintained at all times and participants’ identities must be protected. All participants should be informed as part of the introductory explanation that their answers will be kept confidential. Their answers will be summarised in the analysis, but respondents will not be identified by name. Wherever possible, interviews and group discussion will be conducted in a quiet, private setting without interruptions. All information collected will be anonymous. However, in contexts where children or adults have shared positive experiences regarding their collective experiences as a community protection group, the consultant should discuss with them whether they want their real community name to be include, or whether anonymity is
maintained. Furthermore, as per the child protection procedures, confidentiality must never replace the need to protect children – appropriate action must be taken if participants disclose abuse or risks of significant harm.

✓ Minimise power imbalance, and conduct the evaluation in a non-discriminatory and inclusive way which allows the voices of the most marginalised girls, boys, women and men to be heard. An ethical approach acknowledges power differences between adults and children, and among adults, and ensures respect and appreciation for the contributions of all adults, young people and children, whatever their age, ability, background etc. It requires awareness and consideration of the local and national sociocultural, religious and political context. While recognising traditional hierarchies in countries in Asia (based on age, gender and other factors) that make it harder for some women, men, girls or boys to speak up, extra efforts will be made to reach and listen to the views of girls and boys, out-of-school working children, children with disabilities, children of lower castes, children or families affected by HIV/AIDS, as well as women and men from the poorest sectors of communities. Participatory methods are being used which encourage more stakeholders to express their views and experiences in a less threatening manner during group discussions. Furthermore, as described earlier, special efforts will be made to meet separately with children and young people, including opportunities for some separate discussions in girls and boys groups. Adults (community protection group members, local leaders, parents/caregivers) will be encouraged to understand the importance of providing space for children to express their own views.

✓ Trust building, respect for different perspectives and openness in sharing: It is beneficial that the field visit process enables different stakeholders to express themselves freely, without fear of negative repercussions, if they share challenges or weaknesses in the programme. Thus, trust building and creating a safe, open atmosphere where everyone’s views are respected is integral to the process. Clear introductions at the outset of each discussion will emphasise the importance of openness and honesty, so that we may identify the lessons learned for effective and sustainable scale up of the CBCP programme. The study may also help to identify and build upon strengths, including traditional values and practices which enhance the protection and care of children in their families and communities.

✓ Wider accountability – this includes providing feedback on results and findings to children, communities, partners, and other stakeholders who participate, acknowledging their strengths and responding to and acting upon their concerns. A user-friendly summary report (translated into local languages) will be important to ensure accountability to children, communities and other stakeholders.
**WHAT?**

Plan International is a non-governmental organisation promoting child rights including children’s right to protection from all forms of abuse, neglect, violence and exploitation. In the Asia region Plan is supporting a study to find out more about the ways communities are protecting girls and boys. Someone will be visiting your country to meet with women, men, girls and boys to listen to your views and experiences about what is being done in your community to protect children.

**WHY?**

- Plan would like to learn more about the different ways that adults and children can work together in communities to better protect children.
- We want to learn about the strengths, achievements, and challenges of community groups or committees that are working to improve child protection in different places – in villages and towns in different settings.
- We want to better understand the different roles and responsibilities that different people are playing – women, men, girls, boys, teachers, government officials, as well as the role of civil society organisations.
- We want to better understand how the child protection committees or groups, involve children, and how they work with child groups or clubs.
- We also want to better understand how the community child protection groups collaborate with local officials, government and other agencies working in your local district, province or at national level.
- We want to use the learning to strengthen and sustain community-based child protection and national child protection work so that more children can voice their protection concerns and be protected from all forms of abuse, neglect, violence and exploitation.

**WHERE?**

The Plan Asia study is taking place in 13 countries (Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Laos, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor-Leste, and Vietnam). Consultants will visit five of these countries to find out even more from children and adults. These five countries include: Cambodia, Nepal, Pakistan, Timor-Leste and Vietnam. Across these four countries we hope to meet with adults, children and young people who are involved in community-based child protection work in both urban and rural communities.
WHEN?
The consultants will visit each of the five countries between mid April and early June. They will visit each country for eight days, and during their visit they hope to spend one day in your community. We hope that some adults and children will have two to three hours to be able to meet to share your experiences and ideas.

In some countries we also hope to be able to invite some women, men, girls and boys representatives to join a one day workshop on community-based child protection. If children and adults are invited from your community, we hope that you will be able to identify some community members – girls, boys, women and men who are actively involved in child protection activities to attend.

WHO?
In each community the consultants are interested in meeting with women, men, girls and boys of different ages and backgrounds who are involved in community-based child protection work. *When meeting with children and young people all efforts will be made to make the meetings safe, interesting, and fun to be part of.*

HOW?
The consultants hope to visit some communities to meet with groups of women, men and children who are part of community-based child protection groups. They are also interested in meeting separately with groups of children (especially the most vulnerable children) who are part of child groups or child clubs in their community. During our community meetings we will use some participatory activities to explore your views about what children need protecting from; how children are being protected; and the roles of adults and children in protecting children in communities.

We also hope to be able to organise a one-day workshop in some countries so that representatives of women, men, girls and boys from a few communities can come together to share your experiences and ideas. For this workshop we will also use interesting participatory activities and group discussions to encourage everyone to express themselves.

*If you have any other questions please ask one of the Plan staff who will be able to share your questions with the consultants who will be visiting your country.*