Making a powerful move at the right time together with the appropriate partners

Track record of ICS’ involvement in the roll out of a functional Child Protection System in Busia County, West Kenya

Report of a project evaluation
commissioned by
ICS Creating Change
funded by The Ministry of Foreign Affairs/MFSII

8\textsuperscript{th} August 2014
by
Gerard Verbeek
Information about Commissioning and Implementing Agencies:

ICS
Smallepad 32
3811 MG Amersfoort
The Netherlands
Contact person: Eric Roetman (Planning, Monitoring and Evaluations)
Tel. Office: + 31 33 303 02 50
Mobile: +31 (0)6 34 93 28 64
E-mail: Eric.Roetman@ics.nl
Skype: eric.roetman
Website: www.ics.nl

ICS-regional office Kenya
Gold Rock Park, Mombasa Road next to Tuffsteel complex
P.O Box 13892-00800,
Nairobi, Kenya
Contact person: Beatrice Ogutu (Regional Programme Manager, Child Protection)
Tel. Office: +254 (20) 2063015/17/18
Office mobile + 254 731682596/682598
Mobile: + 254 733790335
Fax: +254 (20) 2063013
E-mail: beatrice.ogutu@icsafrica.org
Skype: Beatrice ogutu ICS

Information about evaluator:
Gerard Verbeek holds a Master of Arts in Development Sociology of the Institute of Social Studies The Hague, and a Master of Science in Civil Engineering/Hydraulics at the Technical University Delft. He has extensive evaluation experience as consultant since 1997 for different international NGO’s, among them Dutch Red Cross, ICCO, Tear, ZOA Refugee Care and Prisma Union. He worked several years in Yemen as geo-hydrologist and in Angola as long-term internal consultant in capacity building, programme design and institutional development.

SYNERGO advice, training & research
Margrietlaan 53
6713 PL Ede
The Netherlands
Tel: +31 318 504 199
Mobile: +31 6 512 88 229
E-mail: gerard@SynergoConsult.org
Linkedin: http://nl.linkedin.com/in/gerardverbeek

Acknowledgements of the author
I would like to thank all the informants who graciously gave their time for interviews and openly shared their thoughts and insights. Particular thanks go to the ICS team in Nairobi and Busia for their logistical support and their interest in the purpose of the evaluation. Evaluations like this require time and energy in an otherwise already full daily routine of those being consulted. What stands out is admiration for the commitment of all involved in a course that is complex and in many ways challenging. Kwa neri tuonane!
Table of contents

DEFINITION OF TERMS & ACRONYMS ................................................................. 2

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .................................................................................... 4

EVALUATION BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE .................................................. 9
  1.1 General background of ICS Child protection systems work in Busia County ....... 9
  1.2 Programme purpose and development .......................................................... 9
  1.3 Partner organisations involved .................................................................... 10
  1.4 Purpose of evaluation .................................................................................. 10
  1.5 Scope of the evaluation ................................................................................ 10

EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS ................................................... 11
  2.1 Operationalization of Evaluation Purpose and Questions .............................. 11
      Development of questionnaire ...................................................................... 11
      Data collection methods ................................................................................ 11
      Triangulation .................................................................................................. 12
  2.2 Limitations and alterations .......................................................................... 13

CHILD PROTECTION IN BUSIA COUNTY: CONTEXT AND NEEDS .................. 14
  3.1 Busia County Statistics .............................................................................. 14
      Human Development Index .......................................................................... 15
      Education Institutions ................................................................................... 15
  3.2 The international and regional framework on child protection in Kenya ......... 15
  3.3 The Busia county framework: ad hoc, informal and no coordination ............. 16
  3.4 The Busia county challenges ....................................................................... 16

CHILD PROTECTION PROGRAMME DESCRIPTION AND RESULTS .................. 18
  4.1 Start an initial intervention logic .................................................................... 18
  4.2 Plans and results in 2012: agreement to roll out a CPS in Busia County ........ 18
  4.3 Plans and results in 2013, early 2014: guidelines finalized, CP-structure under ... 20
  4.4 Main challenges/concerns in Child Protection .............................................. 22
  4.5 Reporting and monitoring practices .............................................................. 23

DIALOGUE AND DISSENT: ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS .................................. 24
  5.1 Expertise and effectiveness .......................................................................... 24
      To do the right thing at the right time with the appropriate partners ............. 24
      Bottom-up lobby approach: an integral and inclusive lobby and advocacy approach. 25
      Main achievements ....................................................................................... 26
      Physical infrastructure and resource allocation .............................................. 27
  5.2 Flexibility and learning capacity ................................................................... 27
  5.3 Transparency, accountability and support .................................................... 28
  5.4 Inclusiveness .................................................................................................. 29
  5.5 Sustainability ................................................................................................. 29
  5.6 Added value of the organisation/consortium ............................................... 30
      Perspective and comments of the government about approach of ICS ............ 31

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ................................................... 33
  6.1 Conclusions ................................................................................................. 33
  6.2 Recommendations for lobby and advocacy .................................................. 35
  6.3 Recommendations for adjusting the CP-programme ................................... 37
      On accountability, learning and monitoring ................................................. 37
      On the content and human resources of the programme .............................. 38

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE ................................................................. 40

ANNEX 2: RESOURCE DOCUMENTS ............................................................. 44

ANNEX 3: RESOURCE PERSONS ................................................................. 46
Definition of terms & acronyms

**AAC**
Area Advisory Council. The Children’s Act 2001 establishes AAC at various levels, to coordinate and monitor child protection activities at various administrative levels right from the county, sub county or district, to the locational level. The membership of AACS include various government departments (education, health, children services, civil registration, justice, police), NGOs, private sector etc. Coordinated by County Children’s Coordinator.

**ACRWC**
African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child

**ADR**
Alternative Dispute Resolution

**ANNPPCAN**
African Network for Prevention and Protection Against Child Abuse

**APHIA Plus**
AIDS Population and Health Integrated Assistance - people driven, local leadership, universal access, sustainability. CSO founded and funded by USAid

**CAAC**
County Area Advisory Council

**CB(I), CBP**
Capacity Building (Intervention), Plan

**CBO**
Community Based Organisation

**CCPP**
County Child Protection Plan

**CIMS**
Child Information Management System

**CLAN**
Children’s Legal Action Network (partner in CPS): community based legal protection and pro-bono support [www.clan.or.ke](http://www.clan.or.ke)

**CLK**
Childline Kenya (partner in CPS) [www.childlinekenya.co.ke](http://www.childlinekenya.co.ke)

**CPC**
Child Protection Centre, to be built in Busia Town, one-stop centre of the Dep. of Children Services

**CPLC**
Child Protection Legal Centre, at CLAN-office Busia, for case reporting and (legal) response

**CPN**
Child Protection Network, consisting of about 25 CSOs active in Busia county in child protection.

**CPS**
Child Protection System

**CPR**
Child Protection Rings, composed of trained members from organized groups and formal governments departments at community level. Act as watchdogs for child cases

**CPU**
Child Protection Unit

Child Protection Working Group, technical subcommittee of the county AAC, consisting of Government officials (County Children’s Coordinator = head, County Director of education, the police boss) KAACR, CLAN, ICS and Aphia Plus. Meets quarterly to provide technical advice and to plan and review progress towards the development of a CPS in the county.

**CRC**
Child Rights Club, loosely organised bodies of children at village schools promoting child rights

**CSO**
Civil Society Organisation = organisations such as development non-governmental organisations, community groups, women’s organisations, faith based organisations, trade unions, self-help groups, social movements, coalitions and advocacy groups

**DAAC**
District Area Advisory Council (old term, replaced by Sub-county AAC)
Definitions of Key Terms

**Child:** An individual who has not attained the age of eighteen years (The Constitution of Kenya, 2010).

**Child Protection:** These are measures and structures that prevent and respond to abuse, neglect, exploitation and violence affecting children. (Save the Children International, 2011).

**Child Protection System:** A set of laws, policies, regulations and services, capacities, monitoring, and oversight needed across all social sectors, especially, social welfare, education, health, security, and justice to prevent and respond to protection related risks (UNICEF, 2010).

**Child Protection Framework:** A framework for child protection system defines the key components, the institutions involved and how they are regulated and coordinated, both horizontally and vertically.

---

1 Source: The framework for the National CPS for Kenya, 2011

Synergo Project Evaluation Child Protection System - ICS Busia County Kenya
This report presents the main findings and recommendations of an evaluation of the Establishment of a functional Child Protection System in Busia County, Kenya. The evaluation was commissioned by ICS and funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs/MSFII. The assignment was conducted in July 2014 by Gerard Verbeek, senior development consultant of Synergo. He takes responsibility for the overall design, implementation and presentation of the results of the evaluation.

Objectives and process of the evaluation

ICS has been investing in Child Protection Services in Busia County since 2007. The international move to a more systems approach to child protection has motivated ICS to organize the implementation of the Kenya National Framework for Child Protection in one county, Busia, as an action learning start for the national roll out.

The evaluation had two objectives. At the moment, ICS aims to enter into a strategic partnership with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the Netherlands for the period of 2016-2020 and has to prove its track record in lobbying and advocacy in the area of child protection. The evaluation will also provide ICS with feedback to refine its lobbying and advocacy strategies for child protection system strengthening in Kenya.

The objectives of the evaluation have been achieved completely. The approach and methodology proved to be adequate to collect sufficient and reliable data from programme documents and from a diverse group of resource people. Almost all resource people who were supposed to be interviewed were present and agreed to participate.

The evaluation questions as formulated in the ToR were instrumental in obtaining relevant and reliable information. The results provide ample information with respect to the objectives mentioned above.

Conclusions

1. ICS has a longstanding and outstanding experience in lobby and advocacy on child protection issues in Kenya. The track record as presented in this report is a proof of that, showing crucial achievements in policy making and enabling protection and prevention activities in a turbulent context. Critical in this lobby and advocacy approach was ICS’ ability to enter the scene at the right moment, to identify the relevant people to work with, and to position itself vis-à-vis the government in a constructive and not competitive manner, as a complementing and facilitating partner. In short: to do the right thing at the right time with the appropriate partners.

2. ICS’ lobby and advocacy programme is also characterised by its bottom-up approach. This has been has been very effective. It created ownership at each level, active participation in AACs, and claim-making potential that contributed to policy reform and improved service delivery. It implied high investments in establishing CP-facilities at county, sub-county and locational level, and capacity building through training and infrastructural improvements.

3. ICS’ track record in lobby and advocacy includes important achievements that constitute the building blocks for the roll out of a functional CPS-system in Busia County and the other 47 counties in Kenya. This was achieved through a consortium in which ICS operated in close cooperation with national partners and the Department of Children Services (DCS). These building blocks include:
The issuing of the *County Child Protection System Guidelines* in Busia County, Kenya. It contains a holistic approach for child protection in which a set of core mandates and duties are established.

The establishment of *clear and functional working relationships between civil society and government, and between governmental levels*. The consortium was influential in the implementation of new policies and the issuing of new county bills through meetings with and information to County Assembly.

The facilitation in developing the *Child Protection Information Management System*. The information from the system should provide a holistic picture of the child rights and child protection situation in the county to duly inform planning, programming, lobby and advocacy priorities.

The development of *case management and referral protocol guidelines* that are currently being piloted by Childline Kenya. The guidelines are to give guidance to all actors involved in the child protection system on how they can collaboratively assess, plan, facilitate, coordinate care, monitor and evaluate services that meet the needs of individuals who get into contact with the system.

The establishment a *national telephone helpline* 116. On a daily basis, 2000-3000 children dial 116 to ask for information or advice, or to report e.g. cases of abuse.

The consortium of ICS, CLAN, KAACR, Childline Kenya and REEP had a notable added value in the area of ‘lobbying and advocacy’ and service delivery. Instances of duplication or undue competition were not found. Partners expressed their appreciation of each other’s contribution to the intervention. The capacity assessment using the 5C-model and the subsequent linking and learning agenda contributed significantly to transparency and trust between partners, and to improvement of policies and practices of the consortium and of each individual partner.

Partners including the Department of Children Services approve of and are content about the primary role of ICS in coordination, facilitation, supervising and M&E. The DSC reaps the fruits of the ICS’ approach: strengthened human resources and infrastructure, more visibility and effectiveness, having contributed to and being equipped with important policy documents. In short: the DCS is now at the centre of coordinating the child protection initiatives at policy and service delivery level.

With respect to ICS’ future role, government officials consider the CPS-guidelines as a young document. ICS is seen as a crucial player in making it work in Busia County. ICS should continue to assist in putting up the structures at all levels in Busia County and then assist in cascading it to other counties.

Long term financial sustainability is a challenge that needs to be dealt with in a coordinated and integral manner. ICS plays an inspirational and facilitating role in making resource allocation practical and visible in strategic governmental documents. ICS is also a broker between national and county interests through its carefully established and well maintained network of policy makers and governors. Other, especially governmental institutions pull the strings, though. Feeding these institutions with know-how, ideas, facts and contacts remains an important lobby and advocacy task of ICS.

Project documentation and reporting was found wanting. The MSF2 and the Wellspring project proposal cover different periods and complement each other to a certain extent. The intervention logics in both proposals were not fully and logically developed into a Theory of Change. Reports did not always follow logically the proposals in terms of activities and output.
9.  To date, monitoring of the CP-programme has been done only at output level. It did not include outcomes, or the assessment of assumptions and pre-conditions. As a consequence, the partially developed Theory of Change could not be assessed.

**Recommendations for lobby and advocacy, addressed at the ICS-consortium**

1. **INVEST IN GETTING THE CPS-FRAMEWORK AND -GUIDELINES IN EVERYBODY’S MIND**

   CPS documents should not only be on everybody’s desk, but in everybody’s mind. It should become working documents that guide practices and question policies. This can be facilitated through targeted training sessions and user-friendly communication to stakeholders at all levels.

2. **INCREASE QUALITY AND COVERAGE OF CP-SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE**

   The roll out of the CPS in Busia County is by far not finished. Policies that would facilitate and anchor this roll out in society are still in need to be influenced, from the grassroots up to the higher levels. More AACs need to be established. To date only 6 out of the foreseen 30 voluntary children officers have been appointed. These officers can only function if other elements of the system are in place as well, such as Child Protection Units at police-stations at sub-county level and CP Rescue Centres at community level.

   Currently, the Busia County Child Protection Information Management System is being established and the Case Management and Referral Protocol Guidelines are being piloted. Priority should be given to get this system and guidelines up and running, in terms of procedures, manpower, software, hardware and maintenance. CPIM-system statistics will - among other things - inform lobby-activities and local leaders, policy makers and politicians about number and content of cases throughout the county. The statistics should also be analysed to detect trends and discover their causes. This, in turn, will inform the Theory of Change and its underlying problem analysis.

3. **CREATE SYNERGY BETWEEN COUNTIES AND BETWEEN COUNTY AND NATIONAL LEVEL**

   Advocacy should also be directed at creating synergy between counties and between county and national level. The consortium should prepare themselves and others to (assist in the) roll out the CPS in other (neighbouring) counties.

4. **SPECIFY CAPACITY BUILDING AND FACILITATE EXCHANGE PROGRAMMES**

   The position and functioning of the County Department of Children Services of Busia County is crucial for the roll out of a functional CPS. Following its participative and from the grassroots-up approach, the role of ICS will be to continue to support and facilitate the DCS to take full responsibility of the system. The linking and learning agenda should therefore focus more on strengthening this department and AACs at all levels: county, sub-county, locational. Exchange visits to other counties and similar infrastructures can broaden the vision, improve synchronisation and avoid duplication.

5. **ESTABLISH MODEL-SCHOOL IN EACH SUB-COUNTY TO PROMOTE PREVENTION**

   The bottom-up lobby approach can be strengthened by focussing on schools. At schools, the interests of children, parents, teachers, curriculum developers and local leaders meet and interact. In each sub-county, a school should be identified to become a model in CP-issues. From these model schools, other schools will be equipped with training and material about CP.
6. **INTRODUCE CP-ISSUES IN NATIONAL CURRICULA FOR POLICE, TEACHERS AND RELIGIOUS LEADERS**

The introduction of and training in CP-issues to policemen, teachers and religious leaders should become an integral part of the respective curricula. Training on the job will bear more fruit if functionaries have been introduced to the issues at stake through regular education. It also contributes to the continuity of CP-issues as these are anchored in the normal practice of police, teachers and religious leaders. This lobby-aspect should be done in close cooperation with the National DCS and the respective line ministries.

7. **BROADEN INCOME BASE, PREPARE FOR LONG TERM FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY**

Longer term financial sustainability should be a major lobby-concern. ICS and partners should capacitate the DCS in fundraising through networking and introduction to other partners/funders. In the framework of Corporate Social Responsibility Policies and PPP, businesses might be interested in financing CP activities. The consortium should follow up on influencing budget committees of the county government assembly and ministry and on community empowerment with strategies that raise the voice of the common man to be heard in matters of budgeting.

**Recommendations for adjusting the CP-programme, addressed at ICS**

8. **UPGRADE M&E-SYSTEM AND PRACTICES**

To date, monitoring of the CP-programme has been done on output level. The M&E system should be capacitated the DCS in fundraising through networking and introduction to other partners/funders. In the framework of Corporate Social Responsibility Policies and PPP, businesses might be interested in financing CP activities. The consortium should follow up on influencing budget committees of the county government assembly and ministry and on community empowerment with strategies that raise the voice of the common man to be heard in matters of budgeting.

9. **INVEST IN LEARNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH DESIGNING A THEORY OF CHANGE**

Designing and assessing a Theory of Change for Child Protection is a powerful exercise for critical learning and improving accountability. In order to monitor and evaluate the effect of the intervention as accurate as possible, it is essential that the ToC demonstrates that the intervention activities resulted in or contributed to changes in policy, structures, processes and people’s lives. The present ToC is not sufficiently designed for this purpose as not all building blocks required to bring about lasting change are fully formulated or assessed.

10. **REMAIN CRITICAL ABOUT THE POSITION OF ICS VIS-À-VIS THE GOVERNMENT**

ICS has been able to establish solid and effective relationships with the government at national and especially at county level. As a result, the government invited ICS and partners to move into the one-stop-shop CPC for children. This move will have mutual benefits: reduce costs, facilitate networking and communication. Notwithstanding the important benefits, ICS should be aware of not becoming too close and getting a vested interest in what CPC is doing. After all, *ICS is a NON-governmental organisation*. Its primary aim is not following and implementing government policies, but to constructively complement and where necessary critically influence these polices, in favour of children.
The best way of doing this is by continuing to work as a consortium including the DCS, with emphasis on the tow lobby and advocacy approaches as pursued so far.

11. **Strengthen Lobby and Advocacy Through Emphasizing Skillful Parenting**

One of the strengths of the ICS’ approach is in being on the ground, close to the primary stakeholders: the bottom-up lobby that empowers people and communities. Through trainings and forums, people were empowered and became vocal on CP-issues. This contributed to a lobby and advocacy practice that is firmly rooted at grassroots level. Skillful parenting and civic education contribute to this empowerment, and also in combating ignorance and poverty through income creation schemes. ICS’ bottom-up strategy will benefit from an increased emphasis on these cutting edge activities. Continue to empower the community also by shifting from a needs based approach to a rights based approach, enable community members to solve their own problems by addressing it to the existing government structures.

12. **Strengthen (L)AACs and Motivate Volunteers, The Backbone of the System**

At all levels, in (L)AACs and CPRs, volunteers are involved in the day-to-day running of the CPS: paralegals, counsellors, parent educators, (assistant) chiefs, children officers. Finances do not permit that all these people get paid. It is of paramount importance that the volunteers remain motivated and equipped for their job. This can be achieved through:

- Increase visibility through bicycles, T-shirts, materials. This brings about respect from the ground and can result in leadership positions in the local community.
- Enhance their mobility to reach out to the child: motorbikes, phones, money for airtime and transport.
- Monitor, assess and empower them through training on prevailing issues and gaps and through exchange visits to similar interventions in other areas in the country.
- Assist in upgrading office facilities of LAACs for meetings and consultations about cases, with basic furniture and stationary.
1. Evaluation background and purpose

1.1 General background of ICS Child protection systems work in Busia County

Child protection as an area of development work has grown rapidly over the last decade. The main focus has however, been a series of individual protection problems such as child trafficking, child labour, care needs of HIV/AIDS orphans, physical & humiliating punishment, family reunification, and sexual abuse among others. This focus on different issues has contributed greatly to the protection of children and much has been learnt about what makes good child protection work. However, dissatisfaction with some of the negative consequences of these fragmented approaches to child protection led to the emergence of interest in child protection systems approach.

The overall purpose of any child protection system is to promote the wellbeing of children through prevention of and response to violence, discrimination, abuse and exploitation. The increasing interest in reframing child protection work by looking more broadly at the deficits in protection facing all children, and addressing the structural or root causes for these gaps in prevention and response is now being slowly accepted nationally in Kenya and is being piloted with ICS support in Busia County. ICS does this work in partnership with government stakeholders and civil society actors. Child protection systems strengthening work started in 2012 in Busia County.

1.2 Programme purpose and development

CPS Project goal: Promoting the wellbeing of children, through prevention of child rights violations and ensuring that when this occurs, prompt and co-ordinated action is taken; and ensuring that all actions taken and decisions made are in the best interest of the child

Project objectives:
1. Implementation of the National Child Protection Framework in Busia County
2. Children, their parents/caregivers and community members make active and critical use of an effective and quality child protection system in 30 locations of Busia County by 2017. The 30 locations will be spread in 4 sub counties (Teso South, Busia, Butula and Samia)

Pillars of child protection systems work
- Government departments to be in the lead at all levels in coordinating efforts of actors in child protection
- The system should be able to serve all categories of children
- Main emphasis shall be on programmes and actions that aim at preventing abuse and neglect
- Government is responsible for providing sustainable services and ensuring availability of skilled personnel at all levels
- Guidelines, standards and regulations should be developed to guide practice and ensure quality among actors
- Children and youth should be meaningfully involved because they are actors in their own protection

---

2 Source: ToR Annex 1
3 Source: ToR Annex 1
CPS work in Busia has seen significant amount of progress in the last two years. This include a) the uptake of CPS guidelines by the Department of Children Services at a national guideline that will inform child protection systems work in all the 47 counties in Kenya, b) the inclusion of child protection systems work in the 5 year Busia County strategic plan c) the revival of the county area advisory council and 2 sub county AACs d) the inclusion of parenting as a prevention strategy in the child protection systems work.

1.3 Partner organisations involved

Within the roll out of the CPS in Busia County, ICS works together with the Government of Kenya, through the Department of Children Services (DCS) and with 5 national CSOs - Children’s Legal Action Network (CLAN), the Advancement of Children rights (KAACR) and Childline Kenya, Rural Economic Empowerment Programme (REEP) and Aphia Plus. ICS collaborates intensively with the three national partners mentioned first - CLAN, KAACR and Childline Kenya - because of their roles as influencers of national policy and practice. Their branches in Busia County are funded by the CPS-programme.

1.4 Purpose of evaluation

ICS aims to enter into a strategic partnership with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the Netherlands for the period of 2016-2020. In this context, ICS has to prove its track record in lobbying and advocacy in the area of child protection. Therefore ICS has commissioned an evaluation on its work on CPS strengthening in Busia County, covering the years 2012-2014. The evaluation will also provide ICS with feedback to refine its lobbying and advocacy strategies for child protection system strengthening in Kenya for the years 2014-2016.

The evaluation objectives have been defined as follows:

1. Enable ICS to build a track record in lobbying and advocacy for child protection systems through an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Child Protection Strengthening Program in Busia County in influencing (sub-)national policies and practices on child protection.

2. Provide ICS with recommendations to adjust or refine its strategy in lobbying and advocacy for child protection system in Busia County and national level in Kenya.

These objectives have been operationalised by the six evaluation questions mentioned in the ToR.

1.5 Scope of the evaluation

The scope of the evaluation will cover the outcomes of the entire CPS Strengthening Program in Busia County, which is funded with MFSII funding and co-financed by another donor for the period of 2012-2014. The evaluation includes the work of ICS-partners and therefore will be involved in it as actors. Finally, the evaluation will focus on the complete range of stakeholders engaged in child protection system work.

The audience of the results of the evaluation consists of the ICS Africa team, ICS HQ and the main donor agency.

For names of organizations and institutions, reference is made to the list of acronyms in the previous section.
2. Evaluation Methods and Limitations

The methodology as described in the ToR has been followed to a large extent, with some alterations. Below follows further clarification as well as some limitations.

2.1 Operationalization of Evaluation Purpose and Questions

Development of questionnaire

The evaluation objectives were assessed by a set of 6 interview questions, see ToR in Annex 1. These questions constituted the core of a questionnaire. Depending on the function of the resource persons, aspects of this questionnaire were highlighted and treated in more depth than other aspects.

Data collection methods

The methods for data collection were qualitative by nature. Information was collected using the following tools:

- Desk review: secondary resource documents were consulted, partly before and partly during the course of the evaluation, notably internal project documents. For a list of resources, see Annex 2.
- One-to-one interviews: 26 people were consulted at national, county and sub-county level. See table below showing resource entities.
- Focus group discussion: prior to departure a workshop/debriefing session was held with a presentation of the preliminary findings and conclusions, followed by an open conversation. Four national ICS-Kenya staff members participated in this meeting.

A number of stakeholders was identified by ICS, and out of these groups, individuals were selected/invited by ICS-staff as resource entities for this evaluation. The evaluator had a critical look at these choices and a few amendments were made. During the course of the interviews, the planning was amended once again as not all persons envisaged to be interviewed were available, and for the sake of time.

The following table presents the main entities and stakeholders that were interviewed. For a complete list of resource people, see Annex 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder/ internal:</th>
<th>Resource entity:</th>
<th>Data collection through ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICS Africa</td>
<td>Regional Programme Manager, Child Protection, Mrs. Beatrice Ogutu</td>
<td>Briefing at ICS office Amersfoort; interview and debriefing at Nairobi; assistance in planning of interviews, email correspondence, documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS Kenya</td>
<td>Child Protection Officer West Kenya Mr. Festus Chikani</td>
<td>Interview, informal conversations, assistance in planning of interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS Kenya</td>
<td>Three national CP officers</td>
<td>Workshop/debriefing prior to departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS Netherlands</td>
<td>PME-coordinator Mr Eric Roetman</td>
<td>Briefing at ICS Office Amersfoort, telephone contact about assignment, documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICS Netherlands</td>
<td>Two CP-officers</td>
<td>Briefing at ICS Office Amersfoort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The length of each interview varied between 30-50 minutes. Most of the interviews were tape recorded for the convenience of the evaluator. Before the interview started, the purpose of the evaluation was explained and why the person was asked to participate. It was emphasised that the interviews were anonymous and the identity of persons who were quoted would not be disclosed. The interviews in Busia County took place in private without the presence of an ICS-staff member.

**Triangulation**

Data collection has been carried out through the methodology as described above. Various stakeholder groups have been involved, i.e. representatives of ICS-staff and consortium partners, of other CSOs and governmental institutions at national and county level. It focussed on output-level as no reports or other organised data were available on results on outcome level. Outcome-level M&E is scheduled for the second half of 2014 and following years. This will include measuring indicators on changes in lives and behaviour of stakeholder groups like children, parents and teachers. It was agreed prior to the field work that these stakeholders were not included in the data collection for this evaluation. As a consequence, the perspective of these stakeholders could not be cross-checked with the perspective of the stakeholders as presented in this report.
Within the groups of stakeholders that were involved and notwithstanding their diverse nature, there was a great deal of uniformity and conformity about the track record of ICS and its consortium. No instances of major disagreements or dissatisfaction about the pursued policies and practices were found.

2.2 Limitations and alterations

Some of the documents of importance became available late. This influenced the quality of the preparation and the interviews.

Initially, it was foreseen to start interviewing people at national level in Nairobi. Due to the possibility of political unrest in Nairobi on the day the field work was supposed to start, the consultant travelled directly to Busia County after arrival in Nairobi. This change in programme was considered later on as positive, because the interviews at national level could be better focussed and more in depth after the evaluator was well informed in the county. It was a disadvantage, though, that that the regional CP programme manager could only be interviewed at the end of the visit.

The current CP-coordinator in Busia started his job three months before the evaluation was held. This was not ideal. Although the officer had acquainted himself remarkably quick with the programme and stakeholders, he could not give detailed information about the previous years from his own experience.

Finally, the ToR stipulated that the evaluation would focus on the complete range of stakeholders engaged in child protection system work. However, the focus of the evaluation was to be on lobby and advocacy towards governmental structures. Therefore, the ToR did not stipulate interviews to be held with stakeholder groups like children, parents, school teachers and boards, village elders. The total time allocated for field work reflected the limited scope of the actual data collection.
### 3. Child Protection in Busia County: context and needs

ICS has been investing in Child Protection Services in Busia County since 2007. The international move to a more systems approach to child protection has motivated ICS to organize the implementation of the Kenya National Framework for Child Protection in one county, Busia, as an action learning start for the national roll out.

A baseline survey about child protection in Kenya (and Tanzania) was carried out in 2011 that fed the underlying analysis and interventions of the programme. The main characteristics of the baseline research are summarized in sections 3.2 through 3.4. This chapter starts with the administrative division of Busia County and some statistics.

#### 3.1 Busia County Statistics

Busia is one of the 47 counties of Kenya and it is situated at the extreme western region of the country. Part of Lake Victoria is in the County on the South East and borders the Lake with the Republic of Uganda to the west.

Busia County covers an area of 1,694.5 km². Following the promulgation of the new Constitution in 2010, Busia County is divided into seven administrative Sub-Counties namely Teso North, Teso South, Matayos (Busia Township) and Nambale (together Busia), Butula, Funyula (of the Samia people) and Budalangi (of the Bunyala people). These sub-counties are further divided into 35 electoral wards. The ICS CPS programme is covering all sub-counties in Busia County.

The 2012 population of Busia was estimated to be 816,452. By the year 2017, the population is estimated to have grown to a total of 953,337. The following tables depict population distribution patterns among the Sub-Counties in the County and Population Projection for selected age groups (under 18 years).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-County</th>
<th>2012 (Projection)</th>
<th>2017 (Projection)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Density</td>
<td>Total Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(persons/Km²)</td>
<td>(persons/Km²)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matayos</td>
<td>122,197 623</td>
<td>142,684 728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso North</td>
<td>129,442 541</td>
<td>151,144 579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso South</td>
<td>151,435 505</td>
<td>176,825 589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nambale</td>
<td>103,861 437</td>
<td>121,274 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butula</td>
<td>133,748 541</td>
<td>156,172 632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funyula</td>
<td>102,613 387</td>
<td>119,817 452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budalangi</td>
<td>73,226 389</td>
<td>85,503 454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>816,452 480</td>
<td>953,337 560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Population Distribution & Density

---

6 From north to south.
Human Development Index

The County’s life expectancy is 47 years compared to national average of 56 years. The infant mortality in the county is estimated at 65/1000 against a national average of 74/1000. The primary school Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) was 81 per cent of all the children aged between 6 and 13 years in 2012. Total enrolment in secondary school was 20 per cent of the secondary school going age of between 14-17 years. The low enrolment rates can be attributed to poverty, inadequate physical infrastructure and poor retention, poor performance at primary levels, and low transition rates from primary to secondary. Busia County poverty level is at 64.2 per cent compared to national poverty level of 45.9 per cent.

The HIV and AIDS prevalence rate in the County was estimated at 7.4 per cent (KDHS 2009) in 2012 against a national average of 6.4 per cent.

Education Institutions

The county has 459 Early Childhood Development Centres, 450 Primary schools and 105 Secondary schools, 17 Youth Polytechnics and 3 University constituent colleges. The three university constituent colleges are located in Busia town, Nambale market and at Alupe Sub-County hospital in Teso South. Adult learning and continuous education centres are being rejuvenated with at least five such facilities established in every Sub-county. There are also privately owned educational institutions at all levels that complement the public ones.

3.2 The international and regional framework on child protection in Kenya


---

8 Entry into force 2 September 1990, in accordance with Article 49. Available at www.ohchr.org/english/law/pdf/crc/pdf
9 See for a list the ICS baseline CP report, par. 1.2.1
establishes the Area Advisory Councils at various levels, coordinate and monitor children’s activities and initiatives at various levels.

Despite the solid foundation, a key challenge in addressing children’s issues lay in the harmonization, enforcement, monitoring and evaluation of all the provisions of the existing laws. A report of the mapping and assessment of Kenya’s child protection system \(^{10}\)

‘confirmed that despite the critical role played in child protection by specific line government ministries (..), there is no statutory guidance as to what their roles are in child protection. There is also no official accountability or linkage among ministries with a stake in children issues. (...) Membership and participation in the NCCS and AACs is not defined for the most critical members. (...) It is noted that there is an over-emphasis on institutionalization of children, inadequate skills and shortage of children officers, and lack of reliable data on children.’

For the CPS to become effective and functional at county level, guidelines had to be developed. These guidelines, in turn, should be based on a framework that would address the key challenge posted by the fragmented existing laws on a national level. In November 2011, the National Child Protection Framework (NCPF) was finalized and adopted by the NCCS. The NCPF provides a national reference for a CPS in Kenya and defines the roles and functions of all stakeholders in child protection. The framework constitutes a solid and timely foundation for county specific CPS Guidelines.

3.3 The Busia county framework: ad hoc, informal and no coordination

There were several players in Kenya that dealt with child protection both at the national and local level. These include the family, community, the police, schools, churches, hospitals, village leaders/chiefs, local opinion leaders, CBOs, Voluntary Children Officers, Children’s Officers, and Area Advisory Councils. However, their intervention was in most cases ad hoc at best as there are no generally acceptable clear guidelines especially on what ought to be done by any officer or individual who is faced with a matter relating to child protection. Further, the referrals were often informal and there are no clear records and/or documentation. There is also no coordination between local community structures and formal government structures.

More specifically on Busia County, the baseline report (p. 27) notes that:

‘there are several organisations that implement child protection programmes. But they all face different challenges key among them being lack of resources and training on child rights. More specifically, the judiciary which commits children to institutions is faced with the problem of few rehabilitation institutions and rescue centres thus affecting their ability to provide proper child protection interventions. The police have established Child Protection Unit in Busia Police Station but they are incomplete. Some police officers have received training but they have not undergone refresher courses on child rights. Medical officers working in hospitals, health centres and dispensaries also lack training on child rights and responsibilities, the Children Act, Sexual Offences Act and Evidence Act.’

3.4 The Busia county challenges

The baseline survey also assessed the challenges and needs with respect to child protection at grassroots level. The major challenges that organizations face in child protection were found to be ignorance, fear, poverty, insecurity, culture and illiteracy.

As a representative example of data collection results, the figure below shows the challenges that caregivers/parents and children face when accessing available services at

\(^{10}\) Done by the NCCS and UNICEF in 2009.
the start of the programme (Baseline report page. 37, data collection by KAACR through Focus Group Discussions (FDG) in one sub-county).

The trend in the results of this research, was confirmed by the evaluation. Out of the above mentioned challenges for accessing available services, the following three were mentioned most:
- poverty, no money for school fees, especially secondary school
- poor parenting, and therefore skilful parenting was mentioned a priority by many including the minister;
- ignorance at village level, cultural habits to settle cases between them. People hide behind cultural practices and cults, or blame religion/the devil

The people interviewed indicated as the main categories of violations of child rights in Busia County:
- Parental neglect. 70% of the cases are (partly) caused by parental neglect. This is not yet considered a cause of child abuse by the existing laws. Lobby efforts should therefore include creating by-laws at county level to address this aspect.
- Child labour, at lake in fisheries, farming/ox ploughing, quarries/stone cracking, children from Uganda, prostitution
- Child abuse and defilement
- Early marriages
- Drop out of schools/lack of education because the child is an orphan or is with one parent.
4. Child Protection Programme description and results

In this chapter the Child Protection programme is described in terms of plans and results. The data have been derived from secondary resources, mainly programme documents. It covers the period 2011 till early 2014 (see Annex 2).

4.1 Start an initial intervention logic

The Child Protection Programme of ICS-Africa started in 2011 in Busia County in Western Kenya. Within this programme, ICS works together with 3 national T4C partners in Kenya - CLAN, KAACR and Childline Kenya. In consultation with these and some other implementing partners including REEP, ICS developed programme logic for the years 2011-2015. The table below depicts the thematic areas, as well as the objective and the result areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic areas 2011-2015</th>
<th>Result oriented objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Families have the capacity to adequate care and protection for their children and young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quality child care and protection systems at community, district and national level are available to and accessed by children, young people and their families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Governments take responsibility by providing a conducive environment for the care and protection of children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objective of the programme is to strengthen civil society to ensure that “children are protected through well-functioning child protection mechanisms which include families, communities and government taking responsibility to provide adequate care and protection for children”.

The first year 2011 was characterized by:
- joint planning sessions to refocus strategic directions and refine partner proposals;
- baseline research to establish pre-operation conditions for indicators and to participate in development of the PME-tools;
- Identification of areas of organizational strengthening through capacity assessment using the 5C-model, resulting in a linking & learning agenda.

4.2 Plans and results in 2012: agreement to roll out a CPS in Busia County

During the second year, the lobby and advocacy aspect of the programme evolved as a result of the strategic planning sessions with the strong engagement of the government. Critical in this lobby and advocacy approach was ICS’ ability to enter the scene at the right moment (when the government was restructuring, see section on context), to identify

---

11 It also embraced a region in Tanzania. This evaluation is limited to the part in Western Kenya.
12 Source: CPP Activity Plan 2011. Note that the objective differs from the formulation in the ToR.
13 Report set-up follows logically the activity plan lay out.
14 See T4C learning strategy Child Protection Programme for ICS Africa and local partners, Sep 2011
15 Source: Child protection annual plan 2012
16 ICS’s role is elaborated in more detail in section 5.1
the right people to work with (mobilise county and national government officials) and to position itself vis-à-vis the government in a constructive not competitive manner (as a complementing and facilitating partner).

The most important result of this cooperation was the joint agreement to roll out a functional Child Protection System in Busia County by the Department of Children Services, supported by ICS and the group of 3 key Kenyan partners and a number of service providing CSOs such as REEP.

A research on the functionality of community based CPS conducted by KAACR had concluded earlier that ‘the county faced a myriad of CP issues which require a coordinated functional system which can only be achieved through the collaborative effort of all the stakeholders working in the sector headed by the county children’s office’.

A project team with representatives of all major stakeholders was assigned to develop guidelines for the role out of this framework and to plan for the strengthening of government departments to take on their coordinating responsibility.

Actions that were considered critical for a CPS included:

- Adoption and promotion of common child protection standards, guidelines and practices in Eastern Africa. Shared standards will help in the evaluation of child wellbeing and policy changes in the countries in the region. Standards include those for paralegals, parent educators and child friendly court procedures
- Lobby the governments to employ focal persons for child protection, up to the locational level.
- Development/adaptation/adoptions of a child protection information management and monitoring framework

Partners agreed to focus on strengthening civil society actors involved in the programme through building organizational capacity and strengthening institutions, exploration of civic driven advocacy and promoting children as civic actors, and supporting mechanisms for dialogue and advocacy between different sectors of society. This would increase the turnout of partners and other CSOs in meetings/forums aimed at promoting the agenda of children in relation to the programme results areas.

The linking & learning agenda increased with the topic ‘broadening financial resource base for child protection’. It was felt that for sustainability it is vital to have not only sufficient quantity of funding, but also with quality and diversification.

Within the agreement of to develop a CPS for the county, other results during 2012 were:

- Frontline child protection services: the establishment of a Child Protection Working Group in Busia County under the chairmanship of the County Children Coordinator to spearhead the roll out of a functional CP System. The CPWG organized a training of 31 main CP actors.
  - On locality level, 21 CPRs were established in sub-counties Teso South, Bunyala and Samia. The effect of the CPRs has been: rescue children from child labour and other forms of child abuse, effective monitoring, and referral and reporting of child protection issues in the county. REEP trained 560 children on topics including child rights.
- Legal protection: increased reporting of cases. Paralegals reported 348 cases (cf. 78 in 2011). Main categories are: sexual abuse, incest, child neglect, and early marriages. Criminal cases were brought to court through referrals to CLAN. Furthermore:

---

17 CPP Africa, Annual narrative report 2012, page 18/19
18 Source: CPP Africa, Annual narrative report 2012, page 18/19
• CLAN carried out 22 case conference trainings to paralegals, 260 community members on self-representation in legal matters, and 20 court personnel on child friendly court procedures.

• Skilful Parenting: ICS and REEP trained total 350 parents/14 parents groups on the Proud2B approach. About 1000 parents were sensitized on the Proud2B approach through community debates and school outreach programmes. Baseline surveys on skilful parenting were conducted.

4.3 Plans and results in 2013, early 2014: guidelines finalized, CP-structure under construction

The change of government after the elections in the first quarter of 2013 influenced the progress of the program as it was unclear for most of the year who was going to be in charge of the Child Protection office at National level and in Busia County. ICS and partners opted to maintain working with the officers in place and involving the new structure of County government as soon as they were installed. During the course of 2013, the new governing structure in Kenya was implemented, replacing the provincial and district system by counties (47), sub-counties and locations/wards.

From June 2013 onwards, programme funding was complemented by Wellspring funding. The funding proposal contained a revised project intervention, geared to the CPS19:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal:</th>
<th>Promotion of the wellbeing of children in Busia County through prevention of child rights violations and quality child protection services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Objectives: | 1. Implementation of the National Child protection framework in Busia County  
2. Children, their parents/caregivers and community members make active and critical use of an effective and quality child protection system in 30 locations of Busia County by 2017 |
| Overall Project Intended Outcomes by 2017 for 30 locations in Busia County | 1. Key child protection actors function in a well-coordinated CP system addressing all forms of child rights violations  
2. Community members have the willingness and capacity to prevent violence against children  
3. Child Protection Services are actively and critically used by children, their families and community members (response)  
4. Best practices from the Busia implementation provide input into the nationwide roll-out of a systems approach to child protection |

ICS was selected to be one of the lead agencies to work with the deputy governor’s office to champion child protection work in the county - a good platform to include child protection systems work in the county strategic plans for sustainability.

The programme has been positively affected by the following process enablers:

• Involvement of the department of children services at national and county level from the start. ICS as the lead agency entered into a dialogue with the government and invested heavily in fostering the relations with government officials. This also pertains to the involvement and inclusion of county governments. A cooperative and fruitful validation meeting led to the CPS guidelines being finalized and adopted.

The National Director of DCS accepted the invitation to visit Busia county and stressed at that level the importance of the CPS-approach and the partnership with ICS c.s. Later in 2013, a joint exchange learning visit was held to the Child protection centre in Malindi. Representative of national, county and ICS & partners participated. In 2014, a similar visit is scheduled to the CPC in Kilifi.

19 For complete Proposal Narrative, see ICS funding proposal to Wellspring Advisors. Establishment of a Functional child protection system in Busia County, Kenya.
• Support and collaborative efforts by national and local NGOs in Busia County: CLAN, KAACR, REEP and Child line Kenya as direct implementers and ILO and APHIA as partners in development. Work plans were shared that enhance transparency and accountability, an avoided duplication
• Need and demand by families and children of quality and efficient services
• Buy in and support of other actors who have a mandate in child protection following the implementation of the NCPF in 2011.

In 2013 and the first months of 2014, the main results in relation to the programme activities coordination, prevention, response and best practices are highlighted below:

Coordination

County child protection systems guidelines finalized and used in implementation. These guidelines were adopted by the government and they bear full implementation responsibility in the 47 counties in Kenya. The Guidelines include:

- The roles and responsibilities of actors in child protection
- Child protection services
- Standards of operation in provision of child protection services
- Coordination of child protection actors and actions
- Implementation checklist for the county child protection systems guidelines

Case management system and referral guideline Childline Kenya with support from ICS conducted a needs assessment among the child protection actors with an aim of coming up with a coordination case management system and referral guideline. Case management is essential in identifying individual children and families requiring particular assistance, to adequately provide that assistance, and to inform how effective this assistance is in enabling vulnerable children and families to address their protection concerns. It also helps in preventing further harm to a child and any other children in a family who may be at risk. Together with the government, a ToR for the guideline was developed. The draft guideline was developed in 2013 and is piloted in 2014.

Establishment of County Area Advisory Council (AAC) with a child protection working group in Busia. The AAC is coordinated by County Children’s Coordinator. The CPWG provide technical input on child protection systems work and advice the AACs on key actions that need to be undertaken to realize a functional child protection system.

The CPWG held monthly meetings at the initial stages of systems strengthening work. IT assessment of all government offices to set up an information portal for child protection systems work is ongoing. During 2014, computer equipment and modems have been installed at the Sub-county departments for children services.

Strengthen the capacity of National Department of Children’s Affairs officers, AAC members and child protection service providers on systems approach to child protection. A total of 90 AAC members have been trained from three sub counties namely Teso South, Samia and Bunyala. The participants were drawn from both the government department and CSO’s.

The training made reference to the new developed county child protection systems guidelines. The areas covered during the training included: Child protection definition, goal and categories, Child protection system framework, Child protection instruments, Case management and referral system/procedure, Mapping of existing safety nets/networking, AAC guideline, objectives, function and composition. Four more sub counties AAC namely Nambale, Busia, Butula and Teso North are yet to be trained in 2014. A ToR for capacity assessment and development plan for various actors are under development.

Source: CPS project Milestones 2013.
**Prevention**

The capacity of prevention services was strengthened in various aspects, mainly through training in skillful parenting. The skillful parenting approach has proven to be an effective prevention strategy and is rolled out by other agencies like APHIA-plus with a network of over 50 CBOs in Western Kenya.

- 24 CBO representatives and community facilitators trained as parent educators to roll out parenting program.
- Skillful parenting trainings through parent peer groups. 12 Parents peer groups were trained on first 4 modules including social business initiatives/farming. The development of child protection tool kit for parents is ongoing.
- Awareness campaigns promoting parenthood - this has increased the demand for parent support and education

**Response**

The Child Protection office at county level is pursuing the instalment of a one-stop child protection centre in Busia town. It is seen as a good opportunity to have a calling place for people who have questions and can access support at Busia town level. ICS and partners are offered 5 offices that will also host the present Child Legal Protection Centre of CLAN at the ICS-office. ICS and partners will continue to advocate for and implement front line child protection services at location level.

CLAN has strengthened legal protection services by bringing on board pro-bono advocates to assist in handling children cases. A workshop for the pro-bono advocates to sensitize them on the children’s legal framework was organized in 2013. Sub-county Children’s Officers started referring many cases that had failed to be resolved in their offices to CLAN offices.

CLAN invests highly in training families in Alternative Dispute Resolution Skills (ADR) to prevent families fighting their battles out in court. To date, 7 Voluntary Children Officers (VCO) - out of the 30 envisaged by the end of 2017 - were placed at locational level. Mapping of available voluntary children officers and their capacities is ongoing.

**Best practices**

Research and documentation about best practices will be a focus area in 2014. This will enhance the roll out of the CPS nationwide by the government in a later phase.

4.4 **Main challenges/concerns in Child Protection**

To date, a number of challenges and concerns remain in relation to child (legal) protection in Busia County. The key ones are:

- Recruitment and placement of 50 Children’s Officers (*Mama Watoto*) at locational level by 2017 (now 7 placed), and to capacitate and motivate them.
- Sustainability. There is a high turnover of staff in government and CSOs. The change of government in 2017 might bring its own appointees. For CSOs the challenge is to retain people.
- Clients referred to the CLAN office sometimes come from very far areas, and therefore find it difficult to come to the office due to the costs incurred in transport. Efforts are still underway to explore mobile legal aid services as current paralegals are also few.
- Cases take long to be concluded. Lobby and advocacy for child friendly courts is necessary.
- Corruption. It demotivates family and witnesses that intend to bring forth cases. The CPS will help accountability of court officials and prosecutors.
- Lack of other support services for victims of abuse (psychosocial support).
4.5 Reporting and monitoring practices

The MSF2 and the Wellspring project proposals for establishing a functional CPS cover different periods but complement each other to a certain extent in terms of intervention logic and funding. The intervention logic in both proposals was not fully developed into a Theory of Change. Some underlying assumptions have been defined, but have not been tested. The distinction between activities, outputs and outcomes is not clear in all cases, nor have corresponding indicators been consequently formulated.

Moreover, it was found that (annual) reports did not always follow logically the proposals in terms of activities and output. Reports followed either the former or the latter proposal.

In the framework of the Child Protection Programme, monitoring has been carried out at output level. It did not include outcome level, or the assessment of assumptions and pre-conditions. An outcome assessment is scheduled for 2015.
5. Dialogue and dissent: analysis of findings

In this chapter the Child Protection programme is described in accordance with the partner selection criteria/track record of the Dialogue and Dissent application form. The findings are derived from the resource people that were interviewed, including the results of the debriefing session (see Annex 3).

5.1 Expertise and effectiveness

ICS has been investing in Child Protection Services in Busia County since 2007. The international move to a more systems approach to child protection has motivated ICS to organize the implementation of the Kenya National Framework for Child Protection in one county as an action learning start for the national roll out. A baseline survey about child protection in Kenya (and Tanzania) was carried out in 2011, that fed the underlying analysis and interventions of the programme as described in Chapter 3. The survey was carried out together with partners such as KAACR, REEP and ANPPCAN.

To be effective, ICS uses basically two approaches in lobby and advocacy. The first is finding and working together with the appropriate partners that play a key role in influencing and implementing policies. The second is the bottom-up lobby that empowers people and communities, the primary stakeholders of a CP-system. These two approaches are described below, followed by a summary of the main achievements.

To do the right thing at the right time with the appropriate partners

ICS has a longstanding and outstanding experience in lobby and advocacy on child protection issues, in Kenya, Tanzania and Cambodia. This is exemplified by the fact that ICS was appointed as the lead agent in the Together 4 Change coalition, the joint Dutch alliance of programmes in Kenya and Tanzania funded by MSF2. The programme is carried out by a relatively small number of staff that combines passion and endurance with knowledge and collegiality.

Critical in this lobby and advocacy approach was ICS’ ability to enter the scene at the right moment (when the government was restructuring, see Chapter 3), to identify the relevant people to work with (mobilise county and national government officials, especially those of the Department of Children Services) and to position itself vis-à-vis the government in a constructive and not competitive manner (as a complementing and facilitating partner).

Standing on its long experience of working with governments, ICS understands how governments work and how to cooperate with them. Right from the start of the intervention ICS made clear what they would bring on board. According to others, they kept their promises to the end, also because they did not promise more than they were capable of complying with. As a government official confirmed: “They do what they say. They don’t promise too much”.

ICS staff, headed by an energetic regional manager on CP, invested in building relations relationships that were based on shared values of humanity and compassion. An effective cooperation emerged on that basis. For example, government officials were willing to participate in capacity assessment meetings and to critically review their own documents like the Children’s act. ICS staff learned to be patient and respectful, and to invest in the
relevant policymakers. Vice versa are ICS and the consortium invited by policymakers to participate in policy dialogue and negotiations.

**Bottom-up lobby approach: an integral and inclusive lobby and advocacy approach**

The second approach in ICS’s strategy on lobby and advocacy is the bottom-up approach, defined as:

> The bottom-up lobby approach empowers people and communities through facilitation and capacity building preferably from the bottom up, lobby through demonstration where and when necessary to get things going, demonstrating through action and service delivery.

Parents, children, teachers, village leaders were trained and organised themselves. At the same time, ICS built strong links with local partners and networks (see section 5.6). Complementing and making use of each other’s strengths has proven to be critical in child protection.

Service delivery is important in these approaches, as it strengthens the work on main lobby and advocacy. Activities like skilful parenting and training of AAC-members and paralegals raise the awareness of stakeholders at the grassroots and make them vocal in calming change.

This approach implied high investments in establishing CP-facilities at each level, capacity building through training and infrastructural improvements. This included:

- ICS and partners train parents groups and sensitise them through community forum debates. They then become vocal in spreading the message.
- CPRs were established in 6 sub counties, in each ring 30 people were trained to develop work plans for a multiplier effect. Rings are chaired by chiefs and assistant chiefs. Members from villages go around and identify problems. These rings can develop in LAAC, like in Ward Bwiri. Reporting take place via sub-county Children’s Officer to County Children’s Officer. In each ring, a Children Officer is functioning. Each ring received a computer and modem to record, process and refer cases.
- Formation of Locational AACs, members trained by KAACR. They discuss cases and refer. LAACs work together with police stations/units in the proximity. They link vulnerable children and their parents to revolving funds, managed by county government. As soon as possible, Children’s Officers should be placed in each location (mother of children: *mama Watoto*).

**Best practice:** The bottom-up lobby approach results in a strong CP-network emerging from grassroots that facilitates prevention, reporting and follow-up of cases. The approach strengthens community demand and claim making potential for high quality service. Increased community awareness feeds the lobby-from-the-bottom-up for taking away hindrances and improving policies. Good example of increased community demand in relation to influencing policies on higher levels, is the functioning of the Locational AAC in Bwiri Ward. A divers group of people is member of LAACs, such as parents, teachers and village leaders. In Bwiri Ward, one member is also member of the Busia County Assembly. He is fed by the exchange and analysis by the LAAC of child cases and changes to be made to deal with these cases more effectively. At the same time, in the Assembly he functions as an effective change-broker. This LAAC made a memorandum to the county assembly about child labour and children’s issues that was tabled by the Bwiri Ward Member of the County Assembly.

The bottom-up lobby approach can be strengthened by **focussing on schools**. At schools, the interests of children, parents, teachers, curriculum developers and local leaders meet...
and interact. In each sub-county, a school should be identified to become a model in CP-issues, especially to promote prevention: incorporate extra lessons on CP and life skills in the curriculum, skilful parenting for parents, establish child labour free zones, maintain efficient relations with police and children officers, strengthen support programmes to help children to continue with secondary school, install WASH-facilities in school and village so that girls do not have to go far for fetching water. Child Rights Clubs and Child protection Rings are established at these schools, supported by teachers who are trained on children’s rights, prevention of abuses, responding/reporting to the chief who is the chairman of the local AAC. From these model schools, other schools will be equipped with training and material about CP.

Main achievements

The main achievement of this way of working on a national level is, obviously, the issuing of the Child Protection Systems Guidelines. The child protection system is guided by the Framework for the National Child Protection Systems in Kenya. ICS together with national partners and the Department of Children Services initiated the roll out of the child protection systems. This was based on the reasoning that creating a national and county vision for protecting children requires moving beyond piecemeal, project-based, and localized initiatives towards a more holistic approach in which a set of core mandates and duties are established.

The Child protection systems approach is part of the Kenya national plan, but ICS, the government and other partners are the first to pilot this initiative in Busia County in western Kenya for possible replication in other areas in the country. Through the programme ICS will seek active cooperation with other Child Protection actors and organisations at community, county and national level. The programme will be linked as much as possible to other initiatives on child protection in Kenya.

- To date, 1000 copies of the guidelines have been printed, published, disseminated and are being made use of by the relevant stakeholders to train the AAC’s, LAAC’s, Children Officers at the county level.

Other achievements of the ICS consortium include the following.

- Other achievements of the ICS consortium include the following. The consortium managed to establish clear and functional working relationships between civil society and government, and between governmental levels. E.g.:
  - The county AAC was established and functions adequately and effectively, also with the support of CPWG. ICS and partners are members of these bodies that are crucial in the roll out of the system guidelines.
  - The Child Protection Network was established, bringing together 25 CSOs. Recommendations of network are taken to county government level.
  - Forum brought together duty bearers from both national and county government to develop concrete steps in CPS.

The consortium was influential in the implementation of new policies and the issuing of new county bills through meetings with and information to the County Assembly. Notably the CP-bill that provides safety nets and points of reference, and stipulates clear penalties and follow up activities for children like education.

ICS in consultation with County government and local partners facilitated the development of the Child Protection Information Management System. Cumulatively, when analysed, the resulting information from the system should provide a holistic picture of the child rights and child protection situation in the county to duly inform planning, programming,

---

22 The programme largely borrows from UNICEF working paper on “adapting a systems approach to child protection”, recommendations of the UN study on violence against children and the outcomes of the 2012 Dakar conference on child protection systems.
lobby and advocacy priorities. This system will facilitate real time exchange of data between service providers, but also the speedy dissemination of results. Quality and speed of response will increase. Results will inform local leaders, policy makers and politicians about number and content of cases throughout the county. Very often the nature and seize of problems are ignored or denied. Sheer facts assist in opening eyes to the real situation and will fuel lobby-activities. The statistics should also be analysed to detect trends and their causes. This, in turn, will inform the Theory of Change and its underlying problem analysis.

In close collaboration with Childline Kenya who have worked closely with the Department of Children services, case management and referral protocol guidelines have been developed that are currently being piloted. The guidelines are to give guidance to all actors involved in the child protection system on how they can collaboratively assess, plan, facilitate, coordinate care, monitor and evaluate services that meet the needs of individuals who get into contact with the system.

Childline Kenya and ICS together with the DCS has established a 24/7 national telephone helpline 116. On a daily basis, 2000-3000 children dial 116 to ask for information or advice, or report e.g. cases of abuse. Many calls are referred to other actors in the CPS, like social workers of the DCS who then take care of the follow up.

Best practice: ICS is instrumental in making the guidelines function, in two ways. First, it established a framework for proper identification and reporting of cases in Busia county. Moreover, the guidelines function as a mirror for stakeholders themselves: what does it mean to us? It functions as a Code of Conduct and a stimulus to be good examples themselves.

Physical infrastructure and resource allocation

Resource allocation for child protection issues is another major issue the ICS and partners lobby about. A good result so far is the inclusion of CP issues in the Busia County Integrated Development Plan (2013-2017) which foresees the establishment of CPC and CP units at police stations, including a budget. The Ministry works on a steady development in children services and increase in coverage of children affairs, shown by improved infrastructure and political goodwill on CP. There is a budget for building a Child Protection Centre (CPC) for Busia County. So far, only Kakamega county has a CPC. Busia-cases are referred to this CPC.

A CPC is one-stop-shop for children. The County located 40 million Ksh in total, 8 million Ksh for the year 2014. But there is a deficit of 20 million in total. Therefore more partners should be involved. It will host various organisations, including ICS and partners (5 rooms). This will reduce own costs, facilitate networking and communication. The current Child Protection Legal Centre at the ICS-office and ran by CLAN will be included in this centre as well. At the same time, ICS should be aware of not becoming too close and getting a vested interest in what CPC is doing. After all, ICS is a NON-governmental organisation.

Best practice: ICS participated and facilitated the strategic planning session (July 2014, started in January) of the Ministry of Community Development, Sports, culture and Social services. This offered an ideal platform for discussions and policy development, including clearly defined goals, results, indicators and budget.

5.2 Flexibility and learning capacity

ICS played and still plays a major role in strengthening the capacities of the individual partners and of the consortium. This is exemplified by the T4C learning strategy document that delineated learning needs (2011, using the 5C-model). The results of the assessment
consultations constituted baseline positions on each of the capacity areas for each partner in the CPP. It was concluded that the linking & learning strategy should focus on the capability areas ‘commit and engage’, ‘carry out technical, service delivery and logistical tasks’, and ‘balance diversity and coherence’. From this, 11 learning domains and objectives were formulated.

From the budget that ICS allocates to its partners, 5% is to be spent on learning and 5% on organizational development on issues all partners agreed upon. An assessment to detect areas is done every year. Every year, the partners meet to discuss and to learn about a specific issue. Through this learning strategy ICS links partners to other stakeholders.

ICS invested heavily in M&E protocols and activities in the area of organizational strengthening (see before), and in the assessment of its programmes. Each year, output measurements take place, the results of which are used for corrective action and learning. Early 2014, an outcome assessment was carried out for its economic development programme and Skilful Parenting project. A similar outcome assessment of its CP-programme is planned for 2015. Following its participative and from the grassroots-up approach, the role of ICS in this will be to support and facilitate the Department of Children Services to carry out this important assessment. Its results will be enriched and will improve the rolling out of similar programmes in other counties.

ICS collaborates with academic institutions to improve the theoretical and communicative quality of its programmes. The University of Utrecht is involved in (baseline) research for the Skilful Parenting programme. Together with the Multimedia University in Nairobi, a documentary has been produced on fatherhood.

Last but not least, ICS keep abreast with new issues by learning through exposure with grassroots stakeholders. They facilitate and participate actively in community dialogue, e.g. by means of forums.

5.3 Transparency, accountability and support

ICS and its partners strive for maximum transparency. Transparency is seen as a necessary condition for learning and for stimulating the government to accept ownership responsibility. It implies openness, communication and accountability to stakeholders at various levels:

- financial reports are published on the website; pictures and stories are shared through social media
- partners meet at the table regularly. Each partner, including the Department of Children Services, communicates what it is doing and planning to do when and where, within the partnership agreement. The Child Legal Protection Centre ran by CLAN is located in the same building as the ICS-office, which makes exchange more easy and natural.
- During stakeholders meetings like the (L)AACs, all stakeholders meet on a regular basis. Children’s officers, police, magistrates, prosecution, teachers, CSO specialists meet and discuss cases and policy & programme progress. This way of working constitutes the basis for the success of the CPS: there is clarity about cases, everyone involved is informed about the status of cases and how and by whom it is handled.
- The Department of Children Services plans to compile a directory of all CSOs and FBOs active in the field of CP in Busia County. It will give information about what organisations are doing, their specialisations and working strategies. This directory will also function as a referral tool and will help to avoid duplication.
5.4 Inclusiveness

The CP programme centres on the wellbeing and development possibilities of children. Children are important actors in their own protection and therefore should be facilitated to act to protect themselves and their peers. The CPS is important in protecting vulnerable children and in improving their physical and socio-economic situation. This includes situations of child labour and trafficking, child abuse and neglect, and drop out from the school system due to poverty. Special attention is given to girls who are especially vulnerable in the absence of WASH-facilities.

Children do not survive in isolation, the realization of their rights and their ability to execute their responsibilities is anchored on the people and support structures around them and therefore everyone should equally be empowered to organize themselves to take action in the best interest of the child. Therefore, attention is given to parenting issues and specifically to men and fathers. Many cases of child abuse are perpetrated by men. Men are encouraged to participate in support groups in order to discuss healthy scenarios of fatherhood and to identify role models.

The bottom-up lobby approach described before illustrates the inclusiveness of all important stakeholders at each level.

With respect to handicapped people, ICS is an equal opportunity employer. It does not, however, specifically encourage handicapped people to react to vacancy announcements.

5.5 Sustainability

Long term financial sustainability remains a challenge that needs to be dealt with in a coordinated and integral manner. As stated before, the realization of children’s rights and their ability to execute their responsibilities is anchored on the people and support structures around them and therefore everyone should equally be empowered to organize themselves to take action in the best interest of the child.

- The people. Consortium partners aim that child protection interventions to be civic driven and as such they will enhance learning on how to use civic driven approach in child protection programming as well as promote the concept of children as civic actors. In this approach, communities play a crucial role. Communities are responsible for driving their own change - outside organizations can only co-create with the communities and disseminate the relevant knowledge and skills that are required to facilitate them make informed decisions and take appropriate actions in the best interest of the child.

- Support structures, especially the government at locational, sub-county, county and national level. ICS and partners do not compete with the government structure, but supports and complements where necessary. Right from the start of the programme ICS did not take on the role of a funding agency that was more or less absent in the field. Nor did ICS take over initiatives by starting interventions on their own. Alternatively, it was and is fully committed to strengthen the role of the government in enhancing the wellbeing of children.

- Budget allocation. Part and parcel of this strategy is lobbying for adequate and sufficient allocation of government budget to child affairs. This line of intervention includes assistance in strategic planning sessions. This is exemplified by a consultative meeting with members of the Busia County assembly in 2013 and facilitation of the strategic planning process of the Ministry of Community development, sports, culture and social services in Kisumu in July 2014. The first resulted in the allocation of a
The second saw the translation of policy objectives into concrete indicators, activities and resources needed.

- Sustainability will also be enhanced by policy changes like the establishment of the CPC and the roll out of the CPS to other counties. The latter will also facilitate cross-border cases in the process of which resources will be shared and systems will be streamlined.

Financial sustainability is further enhanced by pulling resources together. High government officials point at the strategy of reducing costs by investing in (mobile) technology like the hardware for case management, smartphones for case reporting and referral, the child help line 116 for advise and support. These intervention lines were brought in the CP systems approach by various stakeholders.

The systems approach as described in the CP guidelines also contribute to technical and organisational sustainability. The Child Protection Centre will host governmental and civil society organisations, that will stimulate coordination and exchange of experiences, reduce duplication and reduce costs. ICS and partners are offered five offices in this building for free.

Government officials are also pursuing the possibilities of creating Public Private Partnerships, especially at county and local level. The business community is represented in the AAC, but the challenge is to increase their role and contribution with respect to improving the situation of children and sustaining the interventions.

5.6 Added value of the organisation/consortium

This programme is a joint effort among four partners; ICS, Kenya Alliance for the Advancement of Children Rights (KAACR), Children’s Legal Action Network (CLAN) and Childline Kenya together with the Government of Kenya through the Department of Children Services, National Council for Children services, and area advisory councils at all levels in the county. The rationale behind this, is stated in Activity Plan 2011:

‘Jointly a programme was made where the issues are addressed from different levels based on the expertise of different partners at different levels. The value of building on previous achievements made and lessons learnt by the different partners cannot be underscored enough and therefore the alliance will continue emphasizing on strengthening the partnerships through supporting linking and learning opportunities programmatically but also for strengthening the individual organizations for them to be sustainable so that they can carry on with their work of supporting people and their organizations to address child protection at different levels. The logic connection between various partners in the alliance is because they work at different levels and on similar themes. The partnerships will include working with others outside the alliance including working with children and their organizations and learning together on how we can promote initiatives of children as civic actors.

The partners in the programme work at different levels and with different expertise. ICS values the national level and on the ground level experience that these organizations bring to this programme. Each partner has allocated resources (staff time and finances) in addition to their programme budgets for this joint programme.

The table below summarises the expertise that each partner brings to the programme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Focus area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The government of Kenya through the department of children services</td>
<td>• Authority and legal backing to mobilize actors and ensure the child protection system in Busia is functional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commitment to and provision of staff and time for the coordination of and monitoring of quality of the system through the children’s officers and AAC structure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Children’s Legal Action Network - CLAN | • Legal protection service provision through para-legals and a child protection centre in Busia town;
• Legal education, protection and representation of children who are abused, neglected and discriminated upon
• Research and studies on the implementation of the various policies and legal framework to protect children; i.e. study on mandatory reporting and the criminalisation of neglect |
| Kenya Alliance for the Advancement of Children Rights - KAACR | • Mobilization of civil society child protection actors towards a systems approach, from the grassroots (CPR, LAAC) to national level through training and sensitization
• Advocacy in Busia county to develop community based child protection systems approach, also national lobby
• Child participation through children’s clubs |
| Childline Kenya | • Establishment of reporting and case management mechanisms for children at community and county level
• Managing a 24/7 child help line 116 |

The role of ICS in this partnership is not primarily seen as donor, but as a development partner who collaborates in bringing activities to the ground, and to identify strengths and weaknesses of the partners, and provides capacity building opportunities.

ICS therefore focuses on its coordination, facilitation, supervisory and M&E role. It leaves interventions as much as possible to the partners. ICS is involved in Skilful Parenting as this is seen as an integral part of the bottom-up lobby strategy. By giving parents better skills in expressing their rights, ICS strengthens the lobby-potential at grassroots level. REEP also is involved in skilful parenting, they work in different locations. They share experiences and learn from each other, e.g. ICS started training of fathers in fathers groups. REEP has copied this concept.

Partners spoke highly of each other and greatly value the partnership. They confirm that they complement each other. The partnership is based on transparency about activities and plans, trust and shared values. One partners said: ‘The ICS programme gave us visibility. We value the programme and what it means to us.’

_Perspective and comments of the government about approach of ICS_  
Government officials were outspoken about the programme and the consortium. All mentioned the good relationship and open communication with ICS. As the main benefits and impact from ICS and the CP-programme, interviewees mentioned:

- The Department of Children Services is more visible and vocal through the CPP, the CPS County Guidelines and information sharing. This also pertains to the AACs. After being trained and upgraded, they became more visibility in community with a clear role within the CPS. Quote: “ICS is creating change: there was never a CPS guideline or a child information management system. Now there is.”

- Support to the Busia County child information management system, for real time reporting, launched in June 2014. ICS donated a computer, modem and smart phone to each sub-county and ministry, and funded the development of software to store data about cases in a cloud. The funding, technical assistance and involvement of ICS in the Strategic Planning Session of Ministry were very much appreciated as well. Quote: “Through ICS’ involvement in the Strategic Planning, it is moving the agenda in good partnership for the future of the child”
Bottom-up lobbying. More than other organisations, ICS started at community level. Communities are better informed through training and sensitization about what can be done in their specific situation. As a result, communities started to understand and react. E.g. Child Protection Rings were established at schools and communities, that stimulated the exchange between children during holidays and through children’s assemblies. Quote: ‘They came to the grassroots level to see what is going on and to start working on issues from there’.

The celebration of African Child Day and Int. Mother’s Day was mentioned as memorable and joyful events that boosted awareness and knowledge about rights. Quote: “I am happy with what they are doing. Example: Int. Mother’s Day brought women from the grassroots to the forefront, telling the changes in their lives brought about by the programme’

**Best Practice**: As a result of the community strengthening activities, child labour free zones were established. Bwiri Ward reports, that initially 30-40% of the children were not attending schools due to labour. This was reduced to 0%. A number of drop outs after primary school at class 8 were referred to KAACR/government funds for secondary schools.

A high government official described ICS as ‘a much needed institution and important energizer. We needed an outsider to bring in energy. ICS brought in expertise and leadership. They should stay’.

Another official characterized as: ‘ICS is an organization of the people. They empowered people by employing them. One of the present Ministers, once was project manager at ICS. In the 1990-ies, ICS invested a lot in education. Now Busia is nr 1 in education. ICS planted a seed, now we enjoy the fruits’.

With respect to ICS’ future role, government officials invariably mention the following aspects. The CPS-guidelines is a young document and ICS is seen as a crucial player in making it work in Busia county: assist in putting up the structures at all levels. And then assist in cascading it to other counties.

They recommend ICS to focus on 3 roles: a) policy influencing, from the grassroots up to the higher levels, b) capacity building and institutional strengthening, and c) advocacy to create synergy between counties and between county and national level.
Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

1. The objectives of the evaluation have been achieved completely. The approach and methodology as proposed in the ToR were followed after analysis by the evaluator and proved to be adequate to collect sufficient and reliable data from programme documents and from a diverse group of resource people. The ICS-team in Kenya had prepared the logistics in such a way that nearly all resource people could be interviewed.

2. The evaluation questions as formulated in the ToR were instrumental in obtaining relevant and reliable information. The results provide ample information with respect to enable ICS to build a track record in lobbying and advocacy (first objective of the evaluation) and to provide ICS with recommendations to adjust or refine its strategy in lobbying and advocacy (second objective of the evaluation). For the former, the data have been grouped together under main headings that follow the guidelines of the ‘Dialogue and Dissent’ policy framework. For the latter, recommendations from resource people have been combined with those of the evaluator.

3. ICS has a longstanding and outstanding experience in lobby and advocacy on child protection issues in Kenya. The track record outlined in Chapter 5 is a proof of that, showing crucial achievements in policy making and enabling protection and prevention activities in a turbulent context. Critical in this lobby and advocacy approach was ICS’ ability to enter the scene at the right moment (when the government was restructuring), to identify the relevant people to work with (mobilise county and national government officials) and to position itself vis-à-vis the government in a constructive and not competitive manner (as a complementing and facilitating partner). In short: to do the right thing at the right time with the appropriate partners.

4. ICS’ lobby and advocacy programme is also characterised by its bottom-up approach. This has been been very effective. It created ownership at each level, active participation in AACs, and claim-making potential that contributed to policy reform and improved service delivery. It implied high investments in establishing CP-facilities at county, sub-county and locational level, and capacity building through training and infrastructural improvements.

5. ICS’ track record in lobby and advocacy includes important achievements that constitute the building blocks for the roll out of a functional CPS-system in Busia County and the other 47 counties in Kenya. Five are highlighted here.

   o ICS together with national partners and the DCS issued the County Child Protection System Guidelines in Busia County, Kenya. It contains a holistic approach for child protection in which a set of core mandates and duties are established. The county AAC was established and functions adequately and effectively, also with the support of the CPWG.

   o The consortium managed to establish clear and functional working relationships between civil society and government, and between governmental levels. The Child Protection Network was established, whose recommendations are taken to county...
The consortium was influential in the implementation of new policies and the issuing of new county bills through meetings with and information to County Assembly.

- ICS in consultation with County government and local partners facilitated the development of the Child Protection Information Management System. Cumulatively, when analysed, the resulting information from the system should provide a holistic picture of the child rights and child protection situation in the county to duly inform planning, programming, lobby and advocacy priorities.

- In close collaboration with Childline Kenya who have worked closely with the Department of Children services, case management and referral protocol guidelines have been developed that are currently being piloted. The guidelines are to give guidance to all actors involved in the child protection system on how they can collaboratively assess, plan, facilitate, coordinate care, monitor and evaluate services that meet the needs of individuals who get into contact with the system.

- Childline Kenya, together with ICS and the DCS has established a 24/7 national telephone helpline 116. On a daily basis, 2000-3000 children dial 116 to ask for information or advice, or report e.g. cases of abuse.

6. The consortium of ICS, CLAN, KAACR, Childline Kenya and REEP had a notable added value in the area of ‘lobbying and advocacy’ and service delivery. Instances of duplication or undue competition were not found. Partners expressed their appreciation of each other’s contribution to the intervention. One instance in miscommunication was mentioned, but all involved agreed that this was dealt with in a harmonious and professional way. The capacity assessment using the 5C-model and the subsequent linking and learning agenda contributed significantly to transparency and trust between partners, and to improvement of policies and practices of the consortium and of each individual partner.

7. Partners including the Department of Children Services approve of and are content about the primary role of ICS in coordination, facilitation, supervising and M&E. At the start of the programme, the DCS had to get used to the fact that ICS did neither purely act as a funding agency nor purely as an implementing CSO working on its own. Now the DCS reaps the fruits of the ICS’ approach: strengthened human resources and infrastructure, more visibility and effectiveness, having contributed to and being equipped with important policy documents. In short: the DCS is now at the centre of coordinating the child protection initiatives at policy and service delivery level.

8. With respect to ICS’ future role, government officials conclude the following. The CPS-guidelines is a young document and ICS is seen as a crucial player in making it work in Busia county. ICS should continue to assist in putting up the structures at all levels in Busia county and then assist in cascading it to other counties. They recommend ICS to focus on 3 roles: a) policy influencing, from the grassroots up to the higher levels, b) capacity building and institutional strengthening, and c) advocacy to create synergy between counties and between county and national level.

9. Long term financial sustainability remains a challenge that needs to be dealt with in a coordinated and integral manner. ICS plays an inspirational and facilitating role in making resource allocation practical and visible in strategic governmental documents. ICS is also a broker between national and county interest through its carefully established and well maintained network of policy makers and governors.

---

23 These recommendations have been incorporated in the following sections.
Other, especially governmental institutions pull the strings, though. Feeding these institutions with know-how, ideas, facts and contacts remains an important lobby and advocacy task of ICS.

10. Project documentation and reporting was found wanting. The MSF2 and the Wellspring project proposal for establishing a functional CPS cover different periods and complement each other to a certain extent. The intervention logics in both proposals were not fully and logically developed into a Theory of Change. Reports did not always follow logically the proposals in terms of activities and output.

11. To date, monitoring of the CP-programme has been done only at output level. It did not include outcomes, or the assessment of assumptions and pre-conditions. As a consequence, the partially developed Theory of Change could not be assessed.

6.2 Recommendations for lobby and advocacy, addressed at the ICS-consortium

This and the following section contain recommendations to adjust, refine and focus ICS’ strategy in lobbying and advocacy for child protection systems in Busia county and national level in Kenya. The division between the two sections is a bit artificial. For the main role of ICS is in lobby and advocacy. There is, however, a difference in involvement and who is being addressed.

Recommendations in this section are addressed to the Consortium of partners, including the Department of Children Services. Here the role of ICS is primarily on lobbying and advocacy: take the initiative and bring the topics to the table, assist in the analysis of topics and how they inter-relate, facilitate and advice on the division of tasks following these topics, and guide and monitor the implementation of actual initiatives.

Recommendations in the next section are primarily addressed to ICS itself, naturally within the framework of the CP-programme and always being in rapport with the consortium members. Nevertheless, here the role of ICS is to take responsibility for implementing (part of) the topics.

1. INVEST IN GETTING THE CPS-FRAMEWORK AND GUIDELINES IN EVERYBODY’S MIND

CPS documents should not only be on everybody’s desk, but in everybody’s mind. Make it working documents that guide practices and question policies. This can be facilitated through targeted training sessions and user-friendly communication to stakeholders at all levels. For example, forums can be organised for specific groups to disseminate the message of these important documents (including others like the Children’s Act 2001). The text needs to be presented in a simplified way, so that people understand what it means, what the consequences are, and what needs to be done at each level.

2. INCREASE QUALITY AND COVERAGE OF CP-SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The roll out of the CPS in Busia county is by far not finished. Policies that would facilitate and anchor this roll out in society are still in need to be influenced, from the grassroots up to the higher levels. The strategy to achieve this follows from the insights and gaps discovered of recommendation 1. In various geographical areas, at locational and sub-county level more AACs and CPRs need to be established. To date only 6 out of the foreseen 30 voluntary children officers have been appointed. These officers can only function if other elements of the system are in place as well, such as Child Protection Units at police-stations at sub-county level and CP Rescue Centres at community level. At present, only one CPU is operational, Busia town. These new centres should made child
friendly with well trained staff. For the sake of professionalization of CP work, centres should be able to attract more paid professionals and younger people.

Currently, the Busia County Child Protection Information Management System is being established and the Case Management and Referral Protocol Guidelines are being piloted. Priority should be given to get this system and guidelines up and running, in terms of procedures, manpower, software, hardware and maintenance. CPIM-system statistics will - among other things - inform lobby-activities and local leaders, policy makers and politicians about number and content of cases throughout the county. The statistics should also be analysed to detect trends and discover their causes. This, in turn, will inform the Theory of Change and its underlying problem analysis.

3. **Create Synergy between Counties and between County and National Level**

   Advocacy should also be directed at creating synergy between counties and between county and national level. The consortium should prepare themselves and others to (assist in the) roll out the CPS in other (neighbouring) counties. This includes the establishment of the Child Information Management System (see before) and the M&E-system (see below), and the inclusion of CP-issues in national curricula and line ministries (see below).

4. **Specify Capacity Building and Facilitate Exchange Programmes**

   The position and functioning of the County Department of Children Services of Busia County is crucial for the roll out of a functional CPS. The government should fully take charge of the system and its implementation. Following its participative and from the grassroots-up approach, the role of ICS in this will be to continue to support and facilitate the DCS to carry out its responsibilities. The linking and learning agenda should therefore focus more on strengthening this department and AACS at all levels: county, sub-county, locational. The country is in transition from a national to a more county based approach. A lot needs to be done to harmonize for the smooth flow of activities. In this context, exchange visits to other counties and similar infrastructures can broaden the vision, improve synchronisation and avoid duplication. Busia can learn from others about cases. Cases cut across borders and aspects. Widen the scope and look at how cases are dealt with in other counties.

5. **Establish Model-School in each Sub-County to Promote Prevention**

   The bottom-up lobby approach can be strengthened by focusing on schools. In each sub-county, a school should be identified to become a model in CP-issues, especially to promote prevention. Child Rights Clubs and Child Protection Rings are established at these schools, supported by teachers who are trained on children’s rights, prevention of abuses, responding/reporting to the chief who is the chairman of the local AAC. From these model schools, other schools will be equipped with training and material about CP.

6. **Introduce CP-Issues in National Curricula for Police, Teachers and Religious Leaders**

   The introduction of and training in CP-issues to policemen, teachers and religious leaders should become an integral part of the respective curricula. Further training on the job within a CP-programme can be more specific and bear more fruit if functionaries have been introduced to the issues at stake through regular education. It also contributes to the continuity of issues as these are anchored in the normal practice of police, teachers and religious leaders. This lobby-aspect should be done in close cooperation with the National Department of Children Services, and in consultation with the respective line ministries and national institutions.
7. **BROADEN INCOME BASE, PREPARE FOR LONG TERM FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY**

Longer term financial sustainability should be a major lobby-concern. ICS and partners should capacitate the DCS in fundraising through networking and introduction to other partners/funders, including the business community. Presently, the business community is poorly represented in AACS. Businesses should play a bigger role in combatting child labour and child trafficking. In the framework of Corporate Social Responsibility Policies and PPP, businesses like telecom provider Safaricom also might be interested in financing CP activities.

In the same vein, the consortium should follow up on influencing budget committees of the county government assembly and ministry, that decides about the resource allocation of strategic documents items. At the other end of the spectrum, community empowerment might include strategies to raise the voice of the common man to be heard in matters of budgeting. Bring in the public for ideas and priorities about resource tracking for CP and other issues.

6.3 **Recommendations for adjusting the CP-programme, addressed at ICS**

**On accountability, learning and monitoring**

8. **U**PGRADE M&E-SYSTEM AND PRACTICES

To date, monitoring of the CP-programme has been done on output level. The M&E system should be adjusted to also monitor and evaluate *outcome level*. Such an assessment is planned for 2015. The present intervention logic as presented in the Wellspring project proposal - stretching till the year 2017 - can be the basis for this. The intervention logic of this proposal should be further developed into a results framework for M&E (see figure below) by making a clear distinction between *outputs and outcomes*, and consequently adjusting and - where necessary - elaborate new *indicators* and *targets*.

This M&E-system should include *aspects of the consortium* (added value, coordination, planning, innovation, resource sharing, gaps or duplication in policies and practices) and of the learning and linking agenda. *Partnering with academia* is important to secure a sound theoretical basis and to be informed about the latest developments in the field.

Then, a monitoring plan needs to be developed with details about who will measure what, where, with what frequency, and about resources needed. Existing baseline survey results can be used to clearly describe to what extent observed changes are the result of the programme.

9. **INVEST IN LEARNING AND ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH DESIGNING A THEORY OF CHANGE**

Designing and assessing a Theory of Change for Child Protection is a powerful exercise for critical learning and improving accountability. Following on the previous recommendation it is stressed that in order to monitor and evaluate the effect of the intervention as accurate as possible, it is essential that the ToC demonstrates that the intervention...
activities resulted in or contributed to changes in policy, structures, processes and people’s lives. The present ToC is not sufficiently designed for this purpose as not all building blocks required to bring about lasting change are fully formulated or assessed. See also the improvements proposed for M&E in the previous recommendation. This learning aspect should be done together with the other partners in the consortium. Increased knowledge and new insights can be analysed together, subsequent innovations and corrective actions can be planned and implemented together.

Key stakeholders at all levels should as much as possible be involved in the design and implementation of the M&E-system, in concordance with ICS’ bottom-up lobby approach. The process needs to be clearly managed and closely monitored itself. This also calls for M&E-system being integrated in an overall capacity building programme: the challenge is not (only) teaching individuals a new instrument, but (above all) stimulating whole teams (including the consortium) to embrace a ‘new way of looking and working’.

10. **REMAIN CRITICAL ABOUT THE POSITION OF ICS VIS-À-VIS THE GOVERNMENT**

ICS has been able to establish solid and effective relationships with the government and partners move into the one-stop-shop CPC for children that is planned to be established in the coming years. This move will have mutual benefits: reduce costs, facilitate networking and communication. Notwithstanding the important benefits, ICS should be aware of not becoming too close and getting a vested interest in what CPC is doing. After all, ICS is a non-governmental organisation. Its primary aim is not following and implementing government policies, but to constructively complement and where necessary critically influence these polices, in favour of children. The best way of doing this is by continuing to work as a consortium including the DCS, with emphasis on the lobby and advocacy approaches as pursued so far.

**On the content and human resources of the programme**

11. **STRENGTHEN LOBBY AND ADVOCACY THROUGH EMPHASIZING SKILFUL PARENTING**

One of the strengths of the ICS’ approach is in being on the ground, close to the primary stakeholders: the bottom-up lobby that empowers people and communities. This has been successful because people were empowered and became vocal on CP-issues. This contributed to a lobby and advocacy practice that is firmly rooted at grassroots level. Skilful parenting and civic education contribute to this empowerment, and also in combating ignorance and poverty through income creation schemes. ICS’ bottom-up strategy will benefit from an increased emphasis on these cutting edge activities. Continue to empower the community also by shifting from a needs based approach to a rights based approach, enable community members to solve their own problems by addressing it to the existing government structures. These structures are permanent, foreign CSOs will not always be there. This in turn will enhance sustainability.

12. **STRENGTHEN (L)AACS AND MOTIVATE VOLUNTEERS, THE BACKBONE OF THE SYSTEM**

At all levels, in (L)AACs and CPRs, volunteers are involved in the day-to-day running of the CPS: paralegals, counsellors, parent educators, (assistant) chiefs, children officers. AACs and CPRs are in constant need of being strengthened and capacitated. Finances do not permit that all these people get paid. It is of paramount importance that the volunteers remain motivated and equipped for their job. This can be achieved through:

---

24 See also section 2.2 of the Dialogue and Dissent policy framework.
o Increase visibility through bicycles, T-shirts, materials. This brings about respect from the ground (by being associated with CSOs e.g.) and can result in leadership positions in local community.

o Enhance their mobility to reach out to the child: motorbikes, phones, money for airtime and transport.

o Monitor, assess and empower them through training on prevailing issues and gaps and through exchange visits (well-structured and targeted on best practices) to similar interventions in other areas in the country. Important CP-issues for training are counselling, legal aspects, referral, how to overcome the ignorance of the village population and cultural habits (settlement on abuses).

o Assist in upgrading office facilities of LAACs for meetings and consultations about cases, with basic furniture and stationary.
Annex 1:

Terms of Reference

Project Evaluation: Establishment of a functional Child Protection System in Busia County, Kenya

Organisation

Investing in Children and their Societies (ICS) is an international organization established in the 1980s currently with offices and initiatives in several countries in Africa and Asia while the head offices are in Amersfoort, Netherlands. ICS has the overall vision that people around the world are capable and willing to ensure the wellbeing of their children and to drive their own change. Furthermore, ICS has the vision that change for children in rural developing areas can only be built through an integral holistic approach. Combining social and economic build-up, investing in children directly and in their communities and care-givers, leads to sustainable change. The overall mission of ICS is to co-create social services and social enterprises in collaboration with rural communities in Africa and Asia, which together enable long lasting social and economic change, in order to ensure the wellbeing of children.

ICS creates prosperous futures for children in rural Africa and Asia through investing in social business and child protection in a holistic approach, based on civic driven change. In child protection, ICS focuses on child protection systems and Skilful Parenting. The child protection programme has made significant strides in supporting national and local organizations in Western Kenya to strengthen their child protection initiatives over the last 5 years.

Background Information and Rationale

In 2012, ICS together with 3 national partners - Children’s Legal Action Network (CLAN), the Advancement of Children rights (KAACR) and Childline Kenya - and the Government of Kenya, through the Department of Children Services, initiated the roll out of the child protection system in Busia County, Kenya. This program was based on the reasoning that creating a national or county vision for protecting children requires moving beyond piecemeal, project-based, and localized initiatives towards a more holistic approach in which a set of core mandates and duties are established. Lobbing and advocacy was a significant component of the Program:

1) Work together with the government to influence their attitudes, thoughts and actions on how to organize child protection using a systems approach;
2) Establish the child protection system in Busia County as a best practice in implementing the National Child Protection Framework in Kenya.
3) Partner with local and national organizations - KAACR, CLAN, CLK, REEP - to embrace a system approach to child protection and support them to influence national and county government representatives, especially the department of children services.

However, results in terms of lobbying and advocacy to influence child protection policies and practices in Kenya were never measured or reported.

At the moment, ICS aims to enter into a strategic partnership with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the Netherlands for the period of 2016-2020 and has to prove its track record in lobbying and advocacy in the area of child protection. Therefore ICS has commissioned an evaluation on its work on child protection system strengthening in Busia County, Kenya. The evaluation will also provide ICS with feedback to refine its lobbying and advocacy strategies for child protection system strengthening in Kenya.
The deadline of 1 September 2014 for the Ministry’s application requires this evaluation to be conducted in the short term.

See Attachments 1, 2 and 3 for more information about the program, the Ministry’s policy framework “Dialogue and Dissent”, and guidelines for building the track record.

Objective of the Evaluation & Evaluation Questions

Objectives

1. Enable ICS to build a track record in lobbying and advocacy for child protection systems through an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Child Protection Strengthening Program in Busia County in influencing (sub-)national policies and practices on child protection.

2. Provide ICS with recommendations to adjust or refine its strategy in lobbying and advocacy for child protection system in Busia County and national level in Kenya.

Evaluation questions:

1. Up to what degree did ICS and its partners set up an effective child protection system in Busia county; what changes were made at the service delivery level and to what extend are changes sustainable?

2. How do ICS and partners collaborate with relevant governmental and civil society actors to coordinate child protection and at national, county and sub-county level?

3. What are the capacity and strategies of ICS and partners to gain the attention of relevant influential policymakers in child protection at national and sub-national level?

4. How did ICS and partners retain government attention? How was this attention used to shape the opinions, actions and knowledge of key actors?

5. To what extent did the Kenyan Government - especially the Department of Children Services - change its policy and/or policy implementation due to the work of ICS and its partners in Busia County?

6. How can ICS and its partners improve the program and/or their partnership to become more effective in influencing child protection policies and practices at sub-national and national level?

Scope of the Evaluation

The scope of the evaluation will cover the outcomes of the entire Child Protection System Strengthening Program in Busia County, which is funded with MFSII funding and co-financed by another donor for the period of 2012-2014. ICS collaborates with 3 national partners - CLAN, KAACR and Childline Kenya - because of their roles as influencers of national policy and practice. The work of these partners is within the scope of the evaluation and partners will be part of the actors to be. Finally, the evaluation will focus on the complete range of stakeholders engaged in child protection system work.

The audience of the results of the evaluation consists of the ICS Africa team, ICS HQ and main donor agency.

Approach and Methodology

The evaluation will be conducted in three steps:

Step 1. Review relevant documents provided by ICS:

- Minutes of meetings held at national and county level
- TORs developed for particular assignments /visits/ working groups
• Letters of invitation to and by Government
• Emails from stakeholders and government
• Participant lists from validation and planning meetings
• Networks created
• Guidelines developed
• County strategic plan

Step 2. Interviews with key officials and leaders on sub county, county and national level as indicated in Table 1.

Step 3. Facilitate 1-day workshop with ICS staff in Nairobi to address evaluation questions and discuss preliminary findings of document review and interviews.

Table 1. Key stakeholders to be interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National level (Nairobi)</th>
<th>Department of children services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Director, Ahmed Hussein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Field services coordinator - Careen Ogoti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nairobi County children coordinator - Maurice Tsuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Government actors</td>
<td>• Raphael Owako - Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>• CLAN- Gilbert Kyayoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• KAACR - Tim Ekesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CLK - Former director, Irene Nyamu and Martha Sunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ANNPCAN regional - child protection coordinator -Cornell Ogutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant CPS guidelines</td>
<td>• Gilbert Onyango</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Busia County            | Minister Community development, sports, culture and social services- Hon. Matinde Mchuma and Personal secretary Vincent Ngala |
|                        | • Acting Chief of Staff- Busia County Government - Mr. Okeya |
|                        | • Director, gender and persons with disability- Mr. Morris Ngolean |
|                        | • Directorate of public prosecution/State Counsel - Benjamin Kelwon |
|                        | • County children coordinator - Mr Maungu |
|                        | • DCO- Busia/ Matayos- Jane Nkatha |
|                        | • DCO - Samia- Judith Muyuka |
|                        | • DCO - Teso south - Patrick Awino |
|                        | • Provincial administration- Sylvester Ouma |
|                        | • AAC Members Matayos |
|                        | • Police department- to confirm name |
|                        | • County Child protection working group- AAC |

CSOs
• REEP- Mary Makhokha
• CLAN - Gilbert Kyayoni
• KAACR- John Oduor
• Aphia plus - Bramwel Siku
• ICS staff
Deliverables and Schedule

The evaluator is expected to submit the following products:

- Work plan for the interviews with clear instructions for and in close cooperation with the ICS Africa team to prepare for the evaluation;
- Draft report with preliminary findings for ICS Africa and Netherlands to review;
- Final evaluation report in English to ICS HQ. Key concepts used in this report should be in line with the explanation of the policy framework “Dialogue and Dissent” of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, see Attachment 3. ICS HQ will be responsible for further distribution.

The ICS Africa team is expected:

- to provide additional documents if requested by consultant
- to make arrangements for accommodation and transport in Kenya for the consultant
- to contact the persons to be interviewed
- to make arrangements for the workshop prior to departure and to send the invitations
- to make one senior staff member available throughout the preparation and field work phase for consultation and planning

All documents and data acquired during interviews are confidential and solely used for the purpose of the evaluation. Interview partners will not be quoted in the report without their permission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 23 June</td>
<td>Start preparation phase of evaluation: desk study and work plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 7 July</td>
<td>Start evaluation/field work in Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 8 July</td>
<td>Travel to Kisumu/Busia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 17 July</td>
<td>Return to Nairobi (evening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 18 July</td>
<td>1/2-day workshop with ICS staff in Nairobi to discuss preliminary findings of document review and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 4 August, 8 am</td>
<td>Submit draft report to ICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 6 August 10 pm</td>
<td>ICS provides comments on report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 8 August</td>
<td>Submit final report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Resource Documents

- Minutes of meetings held at national and county level
  - 1st Meeting held on 24th July 2012 at ICS Regional Office
  - Meeting on Child Protection Initiative in Busia County on 15th October 2012
  - Meeting in Busia on 29th October 2012
  - CPS 1st stakeholders meeting at County level (3 days), Busia, October 2012
  - National Validation Meeting County Child Protection Guideline - Report and agenda, Boma Hotel, 4th July 2013
  - CPS Stakeholders Meeting (2 days), Itoya Hotel, 16-17 January 2014

- Reports, plans and proposals
  - T4C Child Protection Baseline April-May 2011
  - T4C Learning Strategy CP Programme for ICS Africa and Local Partners Sept 2011
  - Child Protection Programme
    - Activity Plan 2011
    - Annual Report 2011
    - Annual Plan 2012
    - Annual narrative report 2012
    - T4C Protection Programme Annual Plan 2013
    - Child Protection and Skilful Parenting Programme, Annual report 2013
    - Child Protection Systems Project Busia County, Milestones 2013
    - ICS Africa Child Protection narrative plans 2014 (MFS funding)
    - Child Protection Activity Budget Overview 2014
    - Child Protection Systems Project Western Kenya, 2014 and 2015 plans

- TORs developed for particular assignments /visits/ working groups
  - ToR for development of child protection systems guidelines for counties, March 2013

- Guidelines developed
  - The framework for the National Child Protection System for Kenya, 2011
  - The Development of Guidelines for the Roll Out of the CPS in Busia County, Consultancy Report, Gilbert O. Onyango, March 2013
  - County Child Protection Systems Guidelines, date ????, Republic of Kenya
  - Case Management and Referral Protocol Guidelines Draft 3 Childline Kenya

- Skilful Parenting Tools
• Other resource documents
  o Busia County - Wikipedia, the free encyclopaedia
  o A Systems Approach to Child Protection, PLAN EU office
  o A questionnaire for assessing the readiness of countries, provinces/states/districts, and communities to implement evidence-based child maltreatment prevention programmes on a large scale, WHO
  o What are the key questions for audit of child protection systems and decision-making, Sheila Fish, Social Care Institute for Excellence, November 2009
  o Global Monitoring for Child Protection, UNICEF
  o Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development - Minimum Service Standards for Quality Improvement of Orphans and Vulnerable Children Programmes, Kenya 2012
### Annex 3: Resource persons

At Busia County:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICS staff Busia</strong></td>
<td>Child Protection Officer West Kenya</td>
<td>Mr. Festus Chikani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Government</strong></td>
<td>Minister of Community development, sports, culture and social services</td>
<td>Hon. Mrs. Matinde Mchuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Secretary of Minister</td>
<td>Mr. Vincent Ngala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Officer of the Governor, Chief Officer</td>
<td>Mr. Ezekiel Otieno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dep. Community Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Assembly of Busia, Deputy Speaker</td>
<td>Hon. Oboyere Ote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Busia County Assembly, Bwiri Ward</td>
<td>Hon. Wilberforce Sande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief in Bwiri Ward in sub-county Samia/Chief (1h drive)</td>
<td>Sylvester K. Ouma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Government</strong></td>
<td>Department of Children Services</td>
<td>Mr. Aston Maungo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busia County children coordinator/AAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Children Services</td>
<td>Mr. Harun Kiptuisang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Busia Probation County Director/AAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dep. Children Services Busia Social services, gender and persons with disability County Director / AAC</td>
<td>Mr. Maurice Ngolean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCO = District Children Officer</strong></td>
<td>Sub County Teso South (45 min drive) Deputy Children Officer / AAC</td>
<td>Mrs. Joy Alumase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub County Bunyala Children Officer / AAC</td>
<td>Mr. Ben Mulunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Department</strong></td>
<td>CP Unit - Busia Gender &amp; Children Desk /AAC</td>
<td>Mrs. Mary Boke (no tape recording)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Advisory Council - AAC members, county level</strong></td>
<td>Judiciary - Children Magistrate</td>
<td>Mrs. Christobel Irene Agutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Labour - County Labour officer</td>
<td>Mr. Kephas Odhiambo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directorate of public prosecution - State Council</td>
<td>Mr. Benjamin Kelwon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman of Civil Society Organisation, Busia County (30 members)-Child Rights Network</td>
<td>Mr. Joseph Otieno, also Coordinator of Family Life Education Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Busia County / Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSOs</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Makhokha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN Legal Officer Busia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gilbert Kyayoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAACR Regional Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>John Oduor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHIA plus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bramwel Siku</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Members of County Child Protection Working Group

**In Nairobi:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government National Level/Nairobi:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of children services</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Ahmed Hussein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nairobi County children coordinator</td>
<td>Maurice Tsuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ICS staff Nairobi:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Programme Manager, CP</td>
<td>Regional Programme Manager, CP</td>
<td>Beatrice Ogutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Officer CP</td>
<td>Christine Omitto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M&amp;E officer</td>
<td>Jared Ogedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA CP</td>
<td>Caroline Opondo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSOs National Level/Nairobi:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN</td>
<td>CLAN</td>
<td>Gilbert Kyayoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAACR</td>
<td>KAACR</td>
<td>Tim Ekesa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLK – director</td>
<td>CLK – director</td>
<td>Martha Sunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLK – executive director</td>
<td>CLK – executive director</td>
<td>Mercy Chege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLK – Outreach Coordinator</td>
<td>CLK – Outreach Coordinator</td>
<td>Pauline Wambui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANPPCCAN regional – child protection</td>
<td>ANPPCCAN regional – child protection</td>
<td>Cornell Ogutu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>