

## Terms of Reference (ToR) – October 2021

### Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Background and rationale.....	3
3. Description of the Programme.....	4
4. Purpose and objectives of the evaluation.....	6
5. Scope.....	6
5.1 Evaluation questions .....	7
5.1.1 Relevance .....	7
5.1.2 Effectiveness.....	7
5.1.3 Efficiency.....	8
5.1.4 Coherence.....	8
5.1.5 Sustainability .....	8
6. Evaluation methodology .....	9
6.1 Approach.....	9
6.2 Data collection methods.....	9
6.3 Data analysis.....	9
6.4 Methodological limitations.....	10
7. Ethical considerations.....	10
8. Evaluation management structure.....	11
9. Quality assurance .....	11
10. Timeframe .....	12
11. Payment schedule and deliverables .....	13
12. Qualification requirements .....	13
13. Requirements for technical and financial proposals .....	14
13.1 Content of the technical proposal .....	15
13.2 Content of the financial proposal .....	16
14. Assessment of proposals.....	17
14.1 Technical Criteria .....	17
14.2 Financial Criteria .....	18
Annex 1. Theory of Change and Logical Frame.....	19
Annex 2. Country specific interventions planned, Inception Phase .....	36

## List of Tables

Table 1: Elements of evaluation scope .....	7
Table 2: Indicative timeline .....	12
Table 3: Payment schedule .....	13
Table 4: Illustrative allocation of level of effort across phases (workdays) .....	14
Table 5: Technical evaluation criteria .....	17

## 1. Introduction

The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) Evaluation Office located in New York Headquarters (HQ) provides global leadership and oversight of the evaluation function in the organization. As such, it manages independent, corporate evaluations and evaluation syntheses, provides technical assistance and quality assurance for evaluations commissioned at the decentralized level (country and regional offices, as well as other divisions in HQ offices), develops evaluation methods, and reports to the UNICEF Executive Board.<sup>1</sup>

UNICEF’S Evaluation Office is commissioning an evaluation to examine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and coherence of a programme to protect children affected by migration in Southeast, South and Central Asia. The evaluation is scheduled for implementation in 2022. This document outlines the scope of the evaluation, methodological options and operational modalities for a team of evaluators who will be conducting the evaluation under the guidance of the UNICEF Evaluation Office.

## 2. Background and rationale

Two out of five international child migrants were born in Asia – more than any other region in the world<sup>2</sup>. While migration can benefit children and families, it can also place children in situation of risk. This is particularly the case where children are moving away from safe and legal pathways, and are thus vulnerable to exploitation by smugglers and traffickers; where migrating children are denied access to basic services and to legal recognition by host governments; and where children’s rights are violated in the context of repressive responses to immigration and control. Children left behind by migrating parents may also find themselves in circumstances of inadequate care and protection. Children outside of their country of origin are too frequently excluded from national child protection systems.<sup>3</sup>

With the support of the European Union, UNICEF embarked on its first cross-regional programme to support children affected by migration. “Protecting children affected by migration in Southeast, South and Central Asia” (2018-2022) (the programme) aims to ensure that the rights of all children affected by migration are protected, respected and fulfilled, through improved child protection service delivery and enabling environments, against the background of UNICEF’s Strategic Plan 2018-2021, six-point policy agenda on migration, UNICEF’s Global Programme Framework on Children on the Move and in the spirit of the EU Communication on The Protection of Children in Migration (EU/COM2017/211). The eight countries of this programme: Bangladesh, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Tajikistan, Thailand and Uzbekistan; span across three UNICEF regions: EAPRO, ECARO and ROSA. Activities are implemented also at regional level in EAPRO and ECARO; ROSA plays an oversight role and provides technical support to the Bangladesh Country Office.

The proposal was framed taking into account the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants of 2016<sup>4</sup> and the UNICEF Global Programme Framework on Children on the Move. UNICEF had significant input

---

<sup>1</sup> United Nations Children’s Fund, <<https://www.unicef.org/evaluation>>, accessed 10 December 2020.

<sup>2</sup> United Nations Children’s Fund, *Uprooted - The Growing Crisis for Refugee and Migrant Children*, New York, September 2016

<sup>3</sup> United Nations Children’s Fund, “Protecting children affected by migration in Southeast, South and Central Asia” - Annex 1 Description of the Action, n/a.

<sup>4</sup> UN Doc. A/71/L.1, 13 September 2016. The NY Declaration took note of the report of the Secretary-General, entitled “In safety and dignity: addressing large movements of refugees and migrants” (A/70/59), prepared pursuant to General Assembly decision 70/539 of 22 December 2015; the World Humanitarian Summit, held in Istanbul, Turkey, on 23 and 24 May 2016; the high-level meeting on global responsibility-sharing through pathways for admission of Syrian refugees, convened by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on 30 March 2016; the conference on “Supporting Syria and the Region”, held in London on 4 February 2016; the pledging conference on Somali refugees, held in Brussels on 21 October 2015; regional initiatives such as the Bali Process on People Smuggling, Trafficking in Persons and Related Transnational Crime; the European Union-Horn of Africa Migration Route Initiative and the African Union-Horn of Africa Initiative on Human Trafficking and Smuggling of Migrants (the Khartoum Process); the Rabat Process, the Valletta Action Plan and the Brazil Declaration and Plan of Action.

into the New York Declaration as it was being drafted and developed six policy asks on migration and displacement:

1. Protect child refugees and migrants, particularly unaccompanied children, from exploitation and violence;
2. End the detention of children seeking refugee status or migrating;
3. Keep families together as the best way to protect children and give children legal status;
4. All refugee and migrant children keep learning and have access to health and other quality services;
5. Press for action on the underlying causes of large-scale movements of refugees and migrants;
6. Promote measures to combat xenophobia, discrimination and marginalization in countries and areas of transit and destination.

The Action addresses and includes the first four of these 'asks', adapting them to the local context.

UNICEF commissioned an evaluability assessment<sup>5</sup> and the European Union conducted a Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM)<sup>6</sup> action, each resulting in a report published in 2020. Both documents provide important information about the programme status at the time and about its evaluability, and they served to guide the development of these Terms of Reference (ToR).

### 3. Description of the Programme

The programme to be evaluated span across three UNICEF regions, East Asia and Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO), Europe and Central Asia Regional Office (ECARO) and the Regional Office for South Asia (ROSA). Countries included in the programme are Bangladesh, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Tajikistan, Thailand and Uzbekistan. Regional activities are implemented only by EAPRO and ECARO, while ROSA plays an oversight role and provides technical support to the Bangladesh Country Office. The programme started in December 2017 and runs until June 2022, with a budget of €12,715,657.

The overall objective is *“that children affected by migration are effectively protected and their rights are being progressively realized.”* In order to achieve this, the programme has been designed to fulfil three specific objectives:

- (1) Child protection systems, including alternatives to detention, are inclusive of children affected by migration, including those trafficked;
- (2) Children affected by migration, including those trafficked, benefit from an enhanced enabling environment (policies and procedures) that provide better access to child protection systems;
- (3) Relevant international, regional and national bodies recognize the rights of children affected by migration, including those trafficked.

The programme's main targets are the actors which the programme intends to support and/or influence: the governments, civil society organizations (CSOs) and to a lesser extent, the private sector. The

---

<sup>5</sup> The evaluability assessment objective was to determine the evaluability of the Action as currently represented through global and country-level results and to confirm or adjust expectations about the scope of the programme, its results, and what is realistically achievable within its timeframe and budget. Publication: United Nation Children's Fund, *Evaluability Assessment of the "Protecting children affected by migration in Southeast, South, and Central Asia" programme*, UNICEF, March 2020.

<sup>6</sup> The ROM is the external and independent monitoring system of the European Union DG DEVCO and DG NEAR. Publication: European Union, ROM Projects and Programmes of project C-392759, *Protecting children affected by migration in Southeast, South, and Central Asia*, DEVCO B 03, November 2020.

Programme will engage key government entities, including Ministries with portfolios of social welfare, home affairs, justice, education and health. Target groups also include CSOs that provide services to children affected by migration and advocate for their rights, as well as national human rights / child rights monitoring bodies.

The final beneficiaries are children affected by migration and their families in targeted countries and regions, including:

- Children who are migrating or are forcibly displaced within their own country;
- Children who are migrating or are forcibly displaced across borders, including asylum seekers;
- Children migrating on their own or with caretakers;
- Children left behind by migrating parents; and
- Children whether they move in an undocumented or documented manner, including those whose movement involved smuggling or trafficking networks.<sup>7</sup>

The programme's overall and specific objectives were formulated in a broad way in order to accommodate the different needs of a diverse target group. Country offices have focused on the unique needs that are most relevant in their country context, and the activities vary from country to country. Further information can be found in the programme document, including the results framework, in Annex 1.

#### Country selection

The inception report of the programme informs about the decision to select the countries: “[...] to limit the number of countries and to focus on migrant flows that included both source and receiving countries (in the same migration route or corridor). It was therefore decided to include Myanmar (source country), Thailand (receiving country) and Malaysia (receiving country). For Central Asia, it was decided to include Tajikistan (source country), Kyrgyzstan (source country) and Kazakhstan (receiving country). Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan have the largest migrant labour flows out of the country, a high number of left behind children (and families) and a significant dependence upon remittances from those who have migrated. It was thought essential to include Kazakhstan not only because of its position as a receiving country (though not to the same extent as Thailand and Malaysia) but also because of its leadership role within the region. The view was taken that if there was to be raised awareness and regional (cross-border) collaboration on the issue of children affected by migration, it was essential that Kazakhstan should be included. Finally, in addition to having a large outward migrant flow out, Uzbekistan was included at the suggestion of the EU; it was considered a priority country given its new political openness and willingness to engage on regional issues. Finally, Bangladesh was added to the Action at DEVCO's request late in the proposal development stage, largely due to the emergence of the Rohingya crisis as an issue of global concern”.<sup>8</sup> In the Annex 2, details are provided about the specific adaptations of the programme planned at the beginning of the programme in each country.

---

<sup>7</sup> United Nation Children's Fund, “Protecting children affected by migration in Southeast, South and Central Asia” - Annex 1 Description of the Action, n/a.

<sup>8</sup> United Nations Children's Fund, Inception report of the “Protecting children affected by migration in Southeast, South, and Central Asia” programme, UNICEF, January 2019: p.12

## 4. Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

The evaluation purpose is to provide the EU, UNICEF, donors, government counterparts and implementing partners with a stronger understanding of how different programme approaches can contribute to building the capacity of the child protection system to respond to the needs of children affected by migration.<sup>9</sup>

The evaluation will also **contribute to UNICEF's accountability for its performance and results**. It should determine whether and to what extent UNICEF's approaches are on track to achieve its specific and overall objectives, and to identify explanations where this is not found to be the case

The evaluation will aim to provide credible evidence to inform and guide decision-making processes and future programming, in particular of the EU, UNICEF and stakeholders. The more specific objectives are to:

1. Examine the relevance and appropriateness of UNICEF approach and interventions.
2. Assess the performance to date of UNICEF's programmes in strengthening national capacity and mechanisms to protect children affected by migration.
3. Assess how well UNICEF has adapted to external circumstances, and in particular to the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) crisis;
4. Assess the extent to which UNICEF applied a cost-effective approach to building the capacity of the child protection system to address the needs of children affected by migration
5. Assess the coherence and sustainability of UNICEF' work and its synergy with the work of local, national and international actors, including for (child protection) systems strengthening.
6. Provide forward looking lessons and recommendations regarding UNICEF's leadership and advocacy, strategies and methodologies, and partnerships for strengthening national capacity and mechanisms.

The primary audiences for the evaluation are the EU and UNICEF sections at every level responsible for all strategic, design, implementation, coordination, and monitoring-evaluation-learning aspects of programmes targeting children affected by migration (e.g. child protection, health). The secondary audience for the evaluation is the following:

- The governments
- Partners involved in child protection/migration (e.g. the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the International Committee of the Red Cross (CRC), the International Detention Coalition (IDC) and Save the Children);
- Donor agencies;
- Rights holders, primarily in communities and institutions where UNICEF has intervened and might intervene in the future.

## 5. Scope

The evaluation will examine UNICEF's efforts to strengthen protection for children affected by migration in Southeast, South and Central Asia. The timeframe under consideration will cover the programme from initiation to completion with the evaluation running concurrent to the programme's final six months.

---

<sup>9</sup> The evaluation is seen as an important strategic opportunity to strengthen programme approaches in a growing area of concern for children. Stakeholders from UNICEF, the EU and governments across all three regions expressed a strong interest in a learning-oriented evaluation the programme Evaluability Assessment consultations:United Nations Children's Fund, Evaluability Assessment of the "Protecting children affected by migration in Southeast, South, and Central Asia" programme, UNICEF, March 2020.

Table 1: Elements of evaluation scope

<b>Geographic</b>	All locations where the programme is being implemented.  <b>Country Offices:</b> South East Asia: Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand, South Asia: Bangladesh Central Asia: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan  <b>Regional Offices:</b> EAPRO and ECARO
<b>Temporal</b>	January – September 2022 (the evaluation will occur in parallel to the final 6 months of the programme)
<b>Component</b>	All programme components

5.1 Evaluation questions

The proposed main areas of inquiry for the evaluation are organized around four of the five Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) criteria, namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, sustainability and added-value.<sup>10</sup> The initial set of criteria and questions were developed based on a review of previous evaluations, the project evaluability assessment and the results-oriented monitoring (ROM). Inputs from the European Union programme manager, UNICEF staff at headquarters, regional and country levels were also taken into account.

5.1.1 Relevance

*The extent to which UNICEF's programme is aligned with the needs and priorities of affected populations and key stakeholders and adapts as needed.*

- To what extent was the programme aligned with regional<sup>11</sup> and country-level needs and priorities?
- To what extent and in what manner did the programme prioritize equity and the needs of the most vulnerable groups?
- During implementation, what efforts were taken to ensure that the programme remained relevant to/adapted as needed to the needs of rights-holders?
  - How well was the programme able to adapt to external circumstances (e.g. COVID-19 pandemic, military takeover in Myanmar)
- To what extent was the evidence generation component pertinent and added value to existing research pieces? How did it inform programming?

5.1.2 Effectiveness

*The extent to which UNICEF programme achieved its intended results and contributed to key outcomes.*

- To what extent and how did the programme components achieve expected progress within the expected timeframe?
- To what degree has the programme contributed to / strengthened the capacity of national child protection systems to protect children affected by migration effectively?
  - How and to what extent have the activities of the programme resulted in children accessing social services and child protection services?

<sup>10</sup> The Evaluability Assessment of the programme recommended to not include the impact criterion because, apart from it adopting a formative approach, the evaluation would face serious challenges in gathering the necessary data to assess impact

<sup>11</sup> Including of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

- How and to what extent have government attitudes and practices with respect to the challenges faced by children affected by migration changed and how has this manifested?
- How did the monitoring system across countries contribute to effectiveness? Is it built with/inter-operable with government systems or is it standalone?
- What have been the main hindering and facilitating factors that constrained or hindered the programme?

#### 5.1.3 Efficiency

- To what extent has UNICEF applied a cost-effective approach to building the capacity of the child protection system to address the needs of children affected by migration?
- (How) have resources been used to complement existing capacities and achieve results?
- To what extent has the availability of resources enabled or constrained interventions implemented by country offices?

#### 5.1.4 Coherence

*The extent to which UNICEF designs, implements and monitors the programme in coherence and coordination with other actors and utilizes its comparative advantage.*

- How did intervention draw from, expanded on and complemented existing programmes and partnerships<sup>12</sup>?
- To what extent was UNICEF programme aligned with activities, approaches and responses of partners at the regional and country levels?
- What has UNICEF's role and position been at the regional and country level on protecting children affected by migration and how well aligned were these to UNICEF's comparative advantage? To what extent did this include a leadership or coordination role?
- How well have gender, vulnerabilities (disability, ethnic minorities, risk of statelessness) and age been integrated into the programme implementation?
- To what extent has UNICEF's work been informed by evidence available externally or generate?

#### 5.1.5 Sustainability

*The extent to which the benefits of the programme goes beyond the intervention period.*

- To what extent has the Action succeeded in placing children affected by migration on the agenda of national governments and regional governance bodies?
- To what extent are the results of the programme, and in particular of the the systems-strengthening work, sustainable and resilient to risk?
- How likely are those results to continue once programme resources cease? Why?

---

<sup>12</sup> Including but not limited to: the EU-funded GloAct project, the Coordinated Mekong Ministerial Initiative against Human Trafficking, the work of the International Organization for Migration in promoting humane and orderly migration; and the work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, notably within the framework of the coalition on Every Child's Right to a Nationality, and its global strategy to end the detention of asylum seeking children.

## 6. Evaluation methodology

### 6.1 Approach

The evaluation approach will be **participatory**, attempting to capture the programme's main targets (the governments, CSOs and to a lesser extent, the private sector), using appropriate consultative evaluation approaches. How the evaluation will capture the voices of the right-holders will be studied during the inception period, and due consideration will be given from the angle of accountability to affected populations.

The evaluation design will apply a theory-based approach, considering both the assumptions inherent in the change pathway on a country specific basis as well as the overarching assumptions from the global logic model. As per the evaluability assessment recommendations, it should also draw upon outcome harvesting techniques, which identify changes and work backwards to explain whether and how programming interventions may have contributed to those changes.

### 6.2 Data collection methods

The evaluation will use a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to answer the proposed evaluation questions. *Quantitative data* will help to unpack and assess UNICEF's operations and associated trends in outputs and likely outcomes, especially at national and sub-national levels. These include surveys and secondary data analysis. *Qualitative data* will provide the evaluation with insight into direct and indirect roles that UNICEF plays in targeted countries in supporting children affected by migration and key influencing factors in varied contexts and from differing perspectives. Where possible, the evaluation will seek to gather the perspectives of rights holders, including children and youth. The proposed methods are detailed below and will be finalized during the inception period. An evaluation matrix will map each method to the relevant evaluation question.

- *Desk review*: a comprehensive review of supply data, human resources data, financial data, performance monitoring data, progress reports, strategic documents, and review. The review will also examine previous relevant evaluations and management responses and the extent to which recommendation actions were implemented, as part of the Phase I assessment.
- *Key informant interviews*: semi-structured interviews (purposive sampling) conducted remotely or in-person with internal and external stakeholders at the global, regional and country level, including UNICEF staff, EU Delegations, UN partners, regional partners (e.g. ASEAN), national partners, donors, and non-UN partners. Interviews will allow for in-depth examination of perceptions, relationships and context
- *Online surveys* of UNICEF staff and key external stakeholders including partner agencies, governments and civil society. Other forms of remote data collection will be employed as appropriate

### 6.3 Data analysis

Data analysis will proceed with consolidation of information drawn from each method through use of an evidence matrix which also serves for triangulation. Triangulation both across and within categories of data sources will be a key analytical technique for this evaluation – for example, the results of the online surveys will be compared and triangulated with the opinions and experiences relayed by key informants in the field case studies. UNICEF welcomes the use of diverse and innovative evaluation methods and this will be considered in the selection of evaluation proposals. Qualitative Comparative Analysis or process tracing, for instance, could be considered. This said, the following methods of data analysis and synthesis are encouraged to be used:

Expected areas of analysis include:

- Descriptive analysis to identify the contexts, interventions and characteristics of programming.
- Content analysis of documents to identify common trends, themes and patterns in documents, interviews and focus group discussions, using coding and other qualitative analysis methods.
- Quantitative analysis of closed-ended online survey questions and secondary data sources, including descriptive and inferential statistics. Detailed analysis of performance monitoring data.

Each component analyzed will be synthesized to form the evaluation findings and conclusions. The inception report will detail the analysis plan for each method as well as the overall approach to the triangulation and synthesis. A validation step will be included, using the consultation methods that will be feasible at the time of the inception. At the very least, the validation will be done via consultation the Evaluation Reference Group.

#### 6.4 Methodological limitations

There are several limitations expected for this evaluation, which are described below. Mitigation strategies are to be discussed and detailed in the evaluation inception paper.

- Limitation to travel/remote data collection: the COVID-19 pandemic has necessitated a new way of working, with heavier reliance on remote data collection. This has limited the ability to obtain community-level perspectives, and also prevents evaluation teams from conducting direct observation at the national and sub-national level. The use of local teams is strongly encouraged, including the evaluation capacity in case study countries, as a mitigation strategy, if travel restrictions remain in place during the data collection period. Use of innovative remote monitoring methods will also be expected.

### 7. Ethical considerations

Consistent with [United Nations Evaluation Group \(UNEG\) norms and standards](#), the [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#) and [UNEG Code of Conduct](#) and the [UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation and Data Collection and Analysis](#), the evaluation will ensure:

- Respect for rights of individuals and institutions: The evaluation team will accord informants the opportunity to participate voluntarily while maintaining their anonymity, and to make an independent decision to participate without pressure or fear of penalty (informed consent/assent). Also, interviewers will assure respondents that information would be confidential, and that reports would be written such that responses/contributions would not be traced back to them. Interview notes and any recordings will be accessible to the team members only.
- Respect for cultural identities and sensitivities: Variances in ethnicities, culture, religious beliefs, gender, disability, age will be respected. As a result, evaluation processes will be mindful of cultural settings, developmental status and evolving capacities/ages of children and other stakeholders, and the needs of the respondents and rights-holders that programmes are supposed to serve.
- Professional responsibilities and obligations of evaluators: The evaluation team will exercise independent judgement and operate in an impartial and unbiased manner. During data collection, any sensitive issues and concerns will be addressed through the appropriate mechanisms and referral pathways. A protection protocol will be in place for each setting where data collection involves children and community members.

The evaluation inception report and data collection tools will undergo ethical review. If deemed necessary, ethical approval will be sought from the UNICEF Institutional Review Board or designated subsidiary prior to implementation. The possibility of seeking in-country approval by the competent national authorities will

be studied. The evaluation team will be required to adhere to UNICEF protocols on management of personal and financial data as well as the [general terms and conditions of contract](#).

## 8. Evaluation management structure

The evaluation will be managed by the Evaluation Office, UNICEF New York HQ. The Evaluation Office is responsible for the quality of the evaluation and ensuring its independence.

The evaluation manager will be the primary interface between the Evaluation Office and the evaluation team. The manager role involves day-to-day support to all aspects of the evaluation process, including facilitating access to data, providing input to key methodological and strategic choices, and managing the evaluation budget. The evaluation manager may participate in key informant interviews and other activities during implementation. The evaluation manager provides a first quality review (i.e. zero draft) of all evaluation tools and deliverables presented by the evaluation team before key deliverables are shared with the Evaluation Reference Group or other stakeholders.

Staff of the UNICEF Evaluation Office are independent from UNICEF management and operations. As part of their guidance and quality assurance role, Evaluation Office will provide quality assurance on all evaluation tools and documents based on the UNEG's and UNICEF's norms, standards, ethical guidelines, processes and tools. This includes assessment of gender, equity and human rights responsiveness of the evaluation. The evaluation team will be familiarized with these and is expected to observe them during the entire evaluation process

The UNICEF Country Office programme focal points will provide support to the evaluation team, particularly in accessing data and information about the programme and context, and, organising in-country visits if travel takes place and facilitating access to key informants and those responsible for activities

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), bringing together a mix of UNICEF staff: senior and mid-level working at Programme Group of Child Protection, Migration Unit, New York; EAPRO and ECARO regional advisers, and country level staff), and the EU (project manager), will support the evaluation at key moments to ensure that the evaluation benefits from the highest level of technical knowledge and of a diversity of viewpoints. Members will provide substantive technical inputs, will facilitate access to documents and informants, and will ensure the high technical quality of the evaluation products as well as organizational learning and ownership of the exercise. The Evaluation Reference Group may play a role in implementation of management response actions. UNICEF country offices will be represented with one country office per region; the country office that represents the Europe and Central Asia region, and the country office that represents the East Asia and Pacific region, will act in the ERG on behalf of their own country office and will also be responsible to collect information and share views and represent the country offices from their respective regions.

## 9. Quality assurance

The selected firm/institution/team of consultants will conduct **quality control of all outputs (including drafts)** prior to submission to the evaluation manager.

Levels of quality assurance:

- The first level of quality assurance of all evaluation deliverables (including drafts) will be conducted by the **contractor** prior to submitting the deliverables to the review of the evaluation management group.
- The second level of quality assurance of the evaluation deliverables will be conducted by the UNICEF Evaluation Office.

- The third level of quality assurance of the evaluation report will be conducted by the evaluation reference group.

Once approved, the final evaluation report will be submitted to the UNICEF's global evaluation reports oversight system for an independent quality review before finalization. The report and the review will be made publicly available.

## 10. Timeframe

The evaluation will unfold over a seven-month period, starting in January 2022. An indicative timeline with the main stages of the evaluation appears below. An updated timeline should be presented in the inception report.

Table 2: Indicative timeline

<b>0 – Preparatory Phase</b>	
August - September 2021	Setting up governance structure for the evaluation: Evaluation Reference Group, drafting of the Terms of Reference and EoI
	1 <sup>st</sup> Evaluation Reference Group meeting – Inception meeting
	Finalization of the ToR
October – November 2021	Recruitment and selection of the evaluation team
<b>I – Inception Phase</b>	
January-February 2022	Development of evaluation framework and evaluation matrix, work plan, and use and influence plan
	Inception report
	2 <sup>nd</sup> Evaluation Reference Group meeting – Discussion of inception report
<b>II – Data Collection Phase</b>	
February-March 2022	Document review (continued); online surveys; global key informant interviews field visits with key informant interviews and field observation (if possible), focus group discussions, remote data collection
<b>III – Data Analysis Phase</b>	
April 2022	Data analysis and triangulation (using the triangulation matrix)
	Zero draft report
<b>IV – Validation and Reporting Phase</b>	
May 2022	Further analysis and drafting based on feedback from the Evaluation Reference Group
	Sharable draft evaluation report
	3 <sup>rd</sup> Evaluation Reference Group meeting – Discussion of draft report and co-creation of recommendations
June 2022	Further analysis and drafting based on feedback from the Evaluation Reference Group
	Penultimate draft report
June-July 2022	Final corrections
	Final draft evaluation report
<b>V – Dissemination, follow-up and management response phase</b>	
July 2022	Finalization of report (final revisions, annexes, copy-editing, design, etc.)
	Release for Management Response

	Final evaluation report, a master PPT and learning briefs based on the final report
August 2022	Creation of management response by UNICEF management
	Sharing of findings, conclusions and recommendations from the report in various fora: blogs, social media, conferences, regional and thematic network meetings, local events in the region, evaluation conferences, etc.
	4 <sup>th</sup> Evaluation Reference Group meeting – dissemination, use and influence of evaluation

## 11. Payment schedule and deliverables

Payment to the evaluation team will be deliverable-based, following completion of the following milestones:

Table 3: Payment schedule

Deliverable	Due Date	%
An <b>inception report</b> of no more than 20 pages (plus ample annexes) which outlines the evaluation approach and process and includes the evaluation matrix and approved instruments for ethical data collection, a use and influence plan as well as an agreed outline of the final report and annexes	14 February 2022	15
A <b>zero draft report</b> showing emerging findings and underlying evidence for theory-based analysis and thematic analyses. Includes submission of completed triangulation matrix	29 April 2022	25
A <b>shareable draft evaluation report</b> of no more than 50 pages (plus annexes) including introduction, methodology and limitations, analysis of theory of change vs. theories of action, thematic chapters, conclusions and annexes (all elements besides recommendations and executive summary)	28 May 2022	30
A <b>final evaluation report</b> of no more than 60 pages (plus annexes), including data visualizations, duly reviewed for quality, and conforming to the UNICEF publishing/ GEROS standards, a <b>master PPT</b> and <b>learning briefs</b> . Includes submission of final triangulation matrix, all raw data and live data tables/graphics	30 July 2022	30

## 12. Qualification requirements

Bidders may propose their own combination of experts to carry out the proposed work. For each category of expert, bidders are requested to provide both a daily rate and the indicative number of days required for personnel in each category. Consortia may submit bids and must supply a single point of contact for contract management.

It is estimated that a team of three individuals could complete the evaluation within this time frame, with in-country and back-office support. The table below includes an illustrative distribution of days across the phases.

Table 4: Illustrative allocation of level of effort across phases (workdays)

	Inception	Data collection	Analysis	Reporting/ Finalization	Total
Team Leader	10	30	25	30	<b>95</b>
Senior Expert	5	20	25	20	<b>70</b>
Mid-level Expert	5	30	25	10	<b>70</b>
In-country support (National consultants/staff) – <i>for potentially 8 COs and 2 ROs</i>	11	55	33	11	<b>110</b>
Back-office support	0	30	2	5	<b>37</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>382</b>

The evaluation will be carried out by a highly qualified, multi-disciplinary team with extensive knowledge and experience in evaluation of humanitarian and development programming. Specific experience in evaluating child protection/migration programming will be required.

The team leader should have extensive experience in leading and conducting complex global evaluations, excellent project management skills, and demonstrated experience in implementing and/or evaluating protection or migration programmes. The team leader is expected to be fully engaged and available throughout the evaluation process. At least one expert should be a migration and one a child protection expert, although it is also possible to have expertise in both under the same person, and the team should bring solid monitoring & evaluation competencies possibly in the area.

The ideal members of the evaluation team need to demonstrate complementary expertise in the areas under scrutiny, including evaluation, child protection systems strengthening, migration,<sup>13</sup> ethics, and related fields. The team needs to show a strong track record and commitment to delivering contextually relevant and nuanced evidence in support of the wider child rights agenda, and to using participatory approaches. The team is expected to be balanced in terms of gender and geographic origin (global North/South).

### 13. Requirements for technical and financial proposals

This evaluation can be awarded to a firm or institution or to a team of individual consultants working under the coordination of a team leader. Proposals will be evaluated based on a combination of technical and financial considerations including the need to meet the mandatory criteria. The technical quality of the proposals will account for 70 per cent of the final score; financial proposals will account for 30 per cent.

A panel of UNICEF specialists will review the technical proposals first; only proposals that meet the mandatory criteria and receive a minimum of 70 points during the technical evaluation will be considered further. Proposals that pass the technical stage will then receive a financial score and the two will be added together.

---

<sup>13</sup> It will be an asset having expertise in the programme areas and target groups mentioned in the chapter 3 of this document

### 13.1 Content of the technical proposal

You may build on the proposal submitted to express interest in this evaluation. The technical proposal will be in PDF format and must include at a minimum the following elements:

- A. Table of contents
- B. Request for proposals for services form (page 3 of the Request for Proposals for Services document)
- C. Presentation of the bidding institution or institutions if a consortium, including:
  - Name of the institution
  - Date and country of registration/incorporation, and location of offices or agents
  - Summary of corporate structure (detailed organogram), business areas, corporate directions, experience and values
  - Past two years' annual turnover (in US dollars)
  - Past two years' audited financial report (income statement and balance sheet)
  - Number of full-time employees and type (technical experts, administrative and logistics support staff, financial staff, etc.)
- D. Short narrative description of the bidding institution's experience and capacity in the following areas:
  - Programme evaluations
  - Multi-country evaluations or studies/research conducted in Asia
  - Migration/child protection-related assignments
  - Capacities, including the ability (if a part of the proposed methodology) to locate and manage local partners in the countries included in the list of proposed case studies.
- E. List of similar/relevant past and on-going assignments carried out by the proposer in the past 7 years. UNICEF may contact reference persons for feedback on services provided by the proposers.
- F. Full reports or preferably links to full reports listed as examples of relevant past and on-going assignments of the proposer (at least 3), on which the proposed key personnel directly and actively contributed or authored.
- G. Proposed methodology. It should minimize repeating what is stated in the ToR. There is no minimum or maximum length. If in doubt, ensure sufficient detail is provided for UNICEF to be able to judge the technical expertise. Required content is as follows:
  - Understanding of and comments on the context and rationale for the evaluation, and on UNICEF's action in the area of migration/child protection, notably based on proposers' knowledge, experience and familiarity with the available literature
  - Understanding of and comments on the evaluation scope
  - Comments on the evaluation criteria, key evaluation questions, and areas of particular interest
  - Understanding of, comments on, and in-depth analysis of the aspects of complexity, potential challenges, risks and ethical issues related to this evaluation exercise. This must include a description of the bidding institution's ethics protocols including data privacy protocols.
  - Proposed evaluation design and methodology, with a sufficient level of detail on each phase and activity of the evaluation process, including on data to be collected to answer the evaluation questions, envisaged data collection and analysis methods, the sampling methodology and

- criteria to select the final case study countries, as well as the duration of the country visits and the number and profile of evaluation team members participating AND/OR methods to conduct remote data collection in the selected case study countries. Particular attention should be paid to the issues of: management of local partners/consultants; stakeholder availability and participation; access and security constraints; mix of quantitative and qualitative data and methods; data disaggregation, accuracy and triangulation; approaches to data treatment and analysis; and quality assurance. <sup>14</sup>
- Comments and additional details/suggestions on the deliverables proposed in the ToR, if any
  - Comments and suggestions on the management arrangements described in the ToR, if any, and proposed internal management and quality assurance arrangements
  - The presence of any local consultants/researchers or others not normally full-time members of the bidding institution should be indicated, with a description of how they will be engaged, trained, supported and supervised.

H. Work plan, which will include as a minimum requirement the following:

- General work plan based on the one proposed in the ToR, with comments and proposed adjustments, if any
- Detailed timetable by activity. It must be consistent with the general work plan and the financial proposal. It must factor in sufficient time for the drafting of deliverables report, their quality assurance by the evaluation team, UNICEF and the Evaluation Reference Group, and their finalization. It should also take into account the vacation time of evaluation team members.

I. Evaluation team:

- Summary presentation of proposed experts
- Description of support staff if any
- Level of effort of proposed experts by activity. It must be consistent with the financial proposal.
- CVs of each proposed expert. For information, senior and intermediate level experts will be asked to sign a statement of exclusivity and availability prior to contract signature; however at the stage of the proposal submission, the proposed team is expected to be available for the full duration of this assignment.

## 13.2 Content of the financial proposal

The financial proposal must be fully separated from the technical proposal. The financial proposal will be submitted in both PDF and Microsoft Excel format. Costs will be formulated in US dollars and free of all taxes. It will include the following elements as a minimum requirement:

- A. Overall price proposal
- B. Budget by phase, by activity, and by cost category

As per UNICEF procurement procedures, the budget for this evaluation assignment is not disclosed.

During any travels that may be undertaken for the evaluation if COVID-19 restrictions are no longer in place, costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC): <http://icsc.un.org/>.

---

<sup>14</sup> The proposal will consider the three pillars of the accountability to affected populations (AAP) that UNICEF follows in its AAP handbook: communication and information provision, participation, and complaints and feedback mechanisms (see United Nations Children's Fund, *Accountability to Affected Populations. A handbook for UNICEF and partners*, UNICEF: Geneva, 2020).

## 14. Assessment of proposals

### 14.1 Technical Criteria

The following criteria will be used in evaluating the technical proposals:

Table 5: Technical evaluation criteria

<b>Overall Response</b>	Demonstrated understanding of the purpose, scope, requirements and deliverables of this assignment	5
	Overall structure of the proposal including conceptual framework for analysis and reporting, including clarity and completeness of the proposal	5
	Adequacy of the technical plan demonstrated through the overall concord between RFP requirements and the proposal submitted	5
	Demonstrated ability to conduct high quality evaluations in various contexts (development and Humanitarian, Low- or middle-income countries) and for UN agencies	5
	Focus, scale/size and scope of past and current evaluations/research implemented, including evaluation types.	5
	Risk assessment - recognition of the risks/peripheral problems and methods to prevent and manage risks/peripheral problems	5
	<b>Total Section 1: Overall Response</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Methodology</b>	Quality of proposed implementation plan, i.e. how to undertake and execute each stage, with proposed project schedules	10
	Quality of proposed approach and methodology for the assignment including for information collection, compilation and analysis	10
	Field office locations in programme countries and/or established partnerships with organisations based in programme countries	5
	Ability to conduct data remotely, including proposed tools and methods for doing so	5
	Demonstrated ability to conduct evidence generation activities ethically. These include description of existing in-house ethical review mechanisms/ teams and/existing partnerships with independent ethical review boards.	5
	<b>Total Section 2: Methodology</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Other Criteria</b>	Quality and relevance of the sample work provided	10
	Relevant academic qualifications, skills and years of technical experience of team members, including familiarity with UNICEF, the child rights agenda, migration/child protection, technical data fields and/or international development	15
	Oral and written communication skills of the proposed team members, including ability to facilitate and conduct meetings and ability to conduct work	5

in English, and Russian or any local languages from the countries covered (using in house or outsourced resources)	
Clear description of quality assurance mechanisms to be used by the firm/institution/team of consultants to deliver quality products under this RfP. Includes both in house or outsourced quality assurance	5
<b>Total Section 3: Other Criteria</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Total Possible Points</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Minimum qualifying required Score (Total)</b>	<b>70</b>

### 14.2 Financial Criteria

The following criteria will be used in evaluating the financial proposals:

- The price should be broken down for each component of the proposed work based on an estimate of time which needs to be stated.
- Bidders must complete the financial proposal form, with the daily rate of each team member
- The price proposal should include separate travel costs if field missions are able to be undertaken.
- The total amount of points allocated for the price component is 30. The maximum number of points will be allotted to the lowest price proposal that is opened and compared among those invited firms/institutions/teams of consultants which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the technical component. All other price proposals will receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest price; e.g.:

Score for price proposal X =  $(30 * \text{Price of lowest priced proposal}) / (\text{Price of proposal X})$

## Annex 1. Theory of Change and Logical Frame

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details
<b>Overall objective (Impact)</b>	<b>Children affected by migration<sup>15</sup> are effectively protected and their rights are being progressively realized.</b>	Number of children (disaggregated by age/sex) apprehended for migration-related reasons and placed in alternatives to detention that adhere to international standards.	Baseline being established in Year 1 for Myanmar, Thailand, Bangladesh and Central Asia	Targets being established in Year 1 for Myanmar, Thailand, Bangladesh and Central Asia	
		Number of children affected by migration (disaggregated by age/sex) benefiting from formal care that adhere to international standards.	Baseline being established in Year 1 for Myanmar, Thailand, Bangladesh and Central Asia	Targets being established in Year 1 for Myanmar, Thailand, Bangladesh and Central Asia	
		Number of children affected by migration (disaggregated by age/sex) benefiting from (supported) formalised kinship care that adhere to international standards.	Baseline being established in Year 1 for Myanmar, Thailand, Bangladesh and Central Asia	Targets being established in Year 1 for Myanmar, Thailand, Bangladesh and Central Asia	

<sup>15</sup> Children and adolescents who are refugees, asylum seekers, economic or social migrants or those left behind by migrating parents moving to another country. Children affected by migration include:

- Children who are migrating or are forcibly displaced within their own country;
- Children who are migrating or are forcibly displaced across borders, including asylum seekers;
- Children migrating on their own or with their caretakers;
- Children left behind by migrating parents;
- Children whether they move in an undocumented or documented manner, including those whose movement involved smuggling or trafficking networks

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details
Specific objective 1 (Outcome)	1. Child protection systems <sup>16</sup> , including alternatives to detention <sup>17</sup> , are inclusive of children affected by migration, including those trafficked (so that both child migrants and children left behind receive tailored child protection response).	1.A Number of families who received parenting services/support through UNICEF-supported programmes	0	900	<b>Baseline:</b> KYR: 0 TAJ: 0 UZB: 0 <b>Target:</b> KYR: 600 TAJ: 100 UZB: 200
		1B. Number of children affected by migration provided with child protection case management services (in line with international practice <sup>18</sup> ) (if disaggregated data by age and/or gender is available, please provide the details in	1463 (TBC)  1 baseline pending (Thailand)	TBD  2 targets pending (Thailand, Kyrgyzstan)	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: 86 <sup>19</sup> BGD: 200 THL: TBD <sup>20</sup> KAZ: 113 KYR: 925 TAJ: 139 UZB: 0 <b>Target:</b> MMR: 600 <sup>21</sup> BGD: 1000 <sup>22</sup> THL: TBD <sup>23</sup> KAZ: 200 KYR: TBD TAJ: 400 UZB: 200

<sup>16</sup> The set of laws, policies, regulations and services needed across all social sectors – especially social welfare, education, health, security and justice – to support prevention and protective responses inclusive of family strengthening”. (UNICEF Child Protection Strategy)

<sup>17</sup> “alternatives to immigration detention”: Any law, policy or practice by which persons are able to reside in the community, without being detained for migration-related reasons. (IDC, There Are Alternatives (Revised Edition), <https://idcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/There-Are-Alternatives-2015.pdf>)

<sup>18</sup> Inter-Agency Guidelines for Case Management & Child Protection, January 2014, [http://www.cpcnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CM\\_guidelines\\_ENG\\_.pdf](http://www.cpcnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CM_guidelines_ENG_.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> For Myanmar – the 2017 baseline includes internal and cross-border trafficking survivors who have received DSW case management services.

<sup>20</sup> Thailand: Currently only data on migrants (children and adults) available from OSCC. Baseline on children will be available by July 2018

<sup>21</sup> For Myanmar – the target includes internal and cross-border trafficking survivors + new beneficiary group of other cross-border migrant children

<sup>22</sup> (60% girls) including vocational training to 200 children at risk of trafficking or unsafe migration

<sup>23</sup> Thailand: cannot yet set a target for this indicator as it is not yet known how many migrant children will be affected and in need of case management

Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details	
	the comments), including for children left behind (Central Asia).				
	1C. Number of countries with guardianship practice for children affected by migration in line with international standards.	0	4	<b>Baseline:</b> KAZ: No KYR: No TAJ: No UZB: No	<b>Target:</b> KAZ: Yes KYR: Yes TAJ: Yes UZB: Yes
	1D. Number of registered unaccompanied and separated children in cross-border situations who have benefitted from a formal UNICEF-supported BIA/BID process and/or are in appropriate and protective care arrangements that are in accordance with international standards.	83  1 baseline to be obtained in 2019 (Thailand)	730 (TBC)  Target being established for THL	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: 83 <sup>24</sup> THL: TBD <sup>25</sup> KAZ: 0 KYR: 0 TAJ: 0 UZB: 0	<b>Target:</b> MMR: 500 THL: TBD KAZ: 120 KYR: 80 TAJ: 30 UZB: TBD
	1E. Number of countries offering alternatives to	0	4	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: No THL: No BGD: No KAZ: No	<b>Target:</b> MMR: Yes THL: Yes BGD: Yes KAZ: Yes

<sup>24</sup> For Myanmar – the 2017 baseline includes cross-border trafficking survivors who have been repatriated through cross-border mechanisms.

<sup>25</sup> Thailand: cannot generate a baseline for this indicator as the government does not identify and register unaccompanied children and separated children, especially if they are staying with relatives in Thailand which is the case most of the time.

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details	
		detention <sup>26 27</sup> for girls and boys affected by migration in adherence with international minimum standards <sup>28</sup> .				
<b>Expected results (Outputs)</b>	1.1. Increased capacities of authorities and/or service providers <sup>29</sup> to include children affected by migration in protection systems for children	1.1. Number of authorities and/or service providers <sup>30</sup> (disaggregated by authority) who, in the previous calendar year, completed UNICEF-supported pre- or in-service training curricula including a focus on children affected by migration	330	2720	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: 0 THL: n/a BGD: 100 KAZ: 0 KYR: 49 border guards and 181 other	<b>Target:</b> MMR: 320 <sup>31</sup> THL: 650 BGD: 1000 <sup>32</sup> KAZ: 300 KYR: 100 TAJ: 150 <sup>33</sup> UZB: 200

<sup>26</sup> “alternatives to immigration detention”: Any law, policy or practice by which persons are able to reside in the community, without being detained for migration-related reasons. (IDC, There Are Alternatives (Revised Edition), <https://idcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/There-Are-Alternatives-2015.pdf>)

<sup>27</sup> these can be government and/or CSO-provided

<sup>28</sup> CRC/CMW Joint General Comment 3 art. 32f and Joint General Comment 4 art 11, 12 and 13

<sup>29</sup> for example, social workers; border police; legal professionals; interpreters; law enforcement; judiciary; teachers; medical professionals, etc.

<sup>30</sup> for example, social workers; border police; legal professionals; interpreters; law enforcement; judiciary; teachers; medical professionals, etc. This includes public and other service providers (such as NGOs).

<sup>31</sup> For Myanmar – target calculation assumes the following rough breakdown: At least 200 staff of Anti-Trafficking in Persons Division; 120 Gov staff from Border Cooperation Against Trafficking in Persons (BICATIP mechanism) and its member agencies

<sup>32</sup> immigration police-200, special brach police-200, Child Affairs Police Officers-200 Border Guard Bangladesh-100 Probation officer-100 Social Workers-200)

<sup>33</sup> 68 CRUs+ 82 SAHUs

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details	
					CP/judiciary professionals TAJ: 0 UZB: 0	
	1.2. Increased capacities of national authorities and/or service providers <sup>34</sup> to establish/strengthen alternatives to immigration detention <sup>35</sup>	1.2. Number of authorities and/or service providers who, in the previous calendar year, completed UNICEF-supported pre- or in-service training curricula on establishing/strengthening alternatives to immigration detention <sup>36</sup>	100	2930	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: 0 THL: n/a BGD: 100 KAZ: 0 UZB: 0	<b>Target:</b> <sup>37</sup> MMR: 1530 THL: 270 <sup>38</sup> BGD: 1000 <sup>39</sup> KAZ: 30 UZB: 100
	1.3. Authorities' decisions for long-term care/status of children affected by migration are evidence-based, consider	1.3.1. Number of countries where child-friendly procedures <sup>41</sup> have been integrated into pre-or in-	1	5	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: No THL: No BGD: Yes	<b>Target:</b> MMR: Yes THL: Yes BGD: Yes

<sup>34</sup> for example, social workers; border police; legal professionals; interpreters; law enforcement; judiciary; teachers; medical professionals, etc.

<sup>35</sup> "alternative to immigration detention": Any law, policy or practice by which persons are able to reside in the community, without being detained for migration-related reasons. (IDC, There Are Alternatives (Revised Edition), <https://idcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/There-Are-Alternatives-2015.pdf>)

<sup>36</sup> "alternatives to immigration detention": Any law, policy or practice by which persons are able to reside in the community, without being detained for migration-related reasons. (IDC, There Are Alternatives (Revised Edition), <https://idcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/There-Are-Alternatives-2015.pdf>)

<sup>37</sup> In Central Asia, trainings under 1.1. will include alternatives to immigration detention when/where relevant.

<sup>38</sup> 250 service providers, 20 authorities

<sup>39</sup> immigration police-200, special brach police-200, Child Affairs Police Officers-400 Border Guard Bangladesh-100 and Probation Officer-100

<sup>41</sup> Inter-Agency Guidelines for Case Management & Child Protection, January 2014, [http://www.cpcnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CM\\_guidelines\\_ENG\\_.pdf](http://www.cpcnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CM_guidelines_ENG_.pdf) .

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details	
	the individual case and focus on the best interests of the child (in line with international practice) <sup>40</sup> .	service training curricula of migration and/or law enforcement personnel			KAZ: No KYR: No	KAZ: Yes KYR: Yes
		1.3.2. Number of countries where child protection/Social Work authorities/professionals are involved in migration procedures	0 (TBC)	2 (TBC)	<b>Baseline:</b> <sup>42</sup> MMR: TBD THL: TBD BGD: TBD KAZ: 0 KYR: 0	<b>Target:</b> <sup>43</sup> MMR: TBD THL: TBD BGD: TBD KAZ: Yes KYR: Yes

<sup>40</sup> Inter-Agency Guidelines for Case Management & Child Protection, January 2014, [http://www.cpcnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CM\\_guidelines\\_ENG\\_.pdf](http://www.cpcnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CM_guidelines_ENG_.pdf) .

<sup>42</sup> It is currently being determined whether Myanmar, Thailand and Bangladesh will use this indicator.

<sup>43</sup> As above.

**Bottlenecks  
to be  
addressed**

**Summarized Bottlenecks**

**Legislation/Policy:**

- National laws on specialised social services not including children affected by migration as recipients of services
- Lack of policies and procedures on child protection in immigration services which leads to lack of child protection procedures/lack of child-friendly procedures
- Absence of policy and procedures on alternatives to detention for migrant children
- Lack of explicit policy and procedures on child protection etc. for children affected by migration
- Protection services mainly tailored to child victims of trafficking and not inclusive of irregular migrants and unaccompanied children

**Management/Coordination:**

- Weak system of cooperation and coordination between key governmental, non-governmental and private sectors which are directly or indirectly involved in the provision of services to children affected by migration and their families

**Supply:**

- Social workers are overloaded in case work and have limited qualifications/experience (are not sufficiently and regularly trained on child protection issues specific to children on the move in different contexts/ Weak and low capacitated child protection case management services), hence service provision not adapted to the specific needs of children affected by migration
- Lack of widespread family support services such as foster care, kinship care or guardianship and alternative to institutional care, which means that institutional care is often seen as the only recourse immediately available to children.
- Immigration services may not include child protection procedures and are not child-friendly, due to lack of knowledge (among Immigration Bureau Law enforcement staff) as well as due to inadequate policies and procedures on child protection.
- Insufficient reach of available national protection systems and services in non-government controlled areas.

**Demand:**

- Lack of knowledge among parents of migrant children of entitlements and support to access services for migrant children.

**Quality:**

- Insufficient quality of protection services for children on the move (shelter, case management, access to justice) with Government not exercising sufficient oversight

**Activities as  
per DoA**

- 1.1.1. Integrate specific needs of children affected by migration, including those trafficked, into the training curriculum of social service workers
- 1.1.2. Establish alternative care system and reintegration models for children affected by migration
- 1.2.1. Define which alternatives may be most applicable for each country, based on evidence
- 1.2.2. Provide technical support to governments based on best-practice ATDs, such as group homes, foster care systems and guardianship
- 1.3.1. Document legal and procedural gaps and review job descriptions and training curricula of immigration, border and law enforcement agents
- 1.3.2. Engage with authorities to address identified gaps and provide technical support to revise job descriptions and training curricula to establish child-friendly immigration systems

1.3.3. Advocate for systematic involvement of child protection authorities or where these are absent, a specialist with child protection expertise, in migration systems and procedures

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details	
<b>Specific objective (Outcome)</b> 2	<b>2. Children affected by migration, including those trafficked, benefit from an enhanced enabling environment (policies and procedures) that provide better access to child protection systems<sup>44</sup></b>	2A. Number of countries that have mechanisms in place advocated by UNICEF for cross-border information sharing, including family tracing and reunification.	1	7	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: partial THL: partial BGD: Yes KAZ: No KYR: No TAJ: No UZB: No	<b>Target:</b> MMR: Yes THL: Yes BGD: Yes KAZ: Yes KYR: Yes TAJ: Yes UZB: Yes
<b>Expected results (Output)</b>	2.1. Increased number of national policies and services in the countries guarantee access of all children affected by migration to national social welfare, child protection, education, health	2.1.1. Number of children affected by migration who accessed basic education services supported by UNICEF <sup>45</sup> .	3500 (TBC)	7725 (TBC)	<b>Baseline:</b> THL: 0 (Academic Year 2017) BGD: 3500 including internal and cross border migration (TBC)	<b>Target:</b> <sup>46</sup> THL: 725 <sup>47</sup> BGD: 7000 including internal and cross border migration

<sup>44</sup> The set of laws, policies, regulations and services needed across all social sectors – especially social welfare, education, health, security and justice – to support prevention and protective responses inclusive of family strengthening”. (UNICEF Child Protection Strategy)

<sup>45</sup> UNICEF has a direct role in delivery of the service through technical support such as training, supply or funding. Results from UNICEF reach at the subnational level or specific sites should be considered. Policy advocacy should NOT be considered in the estimation of children/people reached through ‘UNICEF support’.

<sup>46</sup> In Central Asia, education services will not be supported by UNICEF under this project (hence, no attribution target), but access to education for children affected by migration will be promoted at policy level and supported at the individual level through Child Protection referrals and services.

<sup>47</sup> of the 725 children, 250 children will receive support for 3 years of schooling, 300 students for 2 years, and 175 for 1 year)

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details	
	and legal aid services, including children left behind.					
		2.1.2. Number of children affected by migration (disaggregated by age/sex) who received protective services <sup>48</sup> through UNICEF-supported <sup>49</sup> programmes. <sup>50</sup>	286	2060	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: 86 <sup>51</sup> BGD: 200 KAZ: 0 KYR: 0 TAJ: 0 UZB: 0	<b>Target:</b> MMR: 750 <sup>52</sup> BGD: 600 KAZ: 30 KYR: 105 TAJ: 375 UZB: 200
		2.1.3. Number of children affected by migration reached	2000	25,300	<b>Baseline:</b> THL: 2000	<b>Target:</b> <sup>54</sup> THL: 25,000 <sup>55</sup>

<sup>48</sup> This includes psycho-social support, legal aid, referral to child protection case management and reintegration services for children who have been returned to their home country.

<sup>49</sup> UNICEF has a direct role in delivery of the service through technical support such as training, supply or funding. Results from UNICEF reach at the subnational level or specific sites should be considered. Policy advocacy should NOT be considered in the estimation of children/people reached through 'UNICEF support'.

<sup>50</sup> This indicator is aligned with on-going NYHQ indicators work, the guidance for which is currently under development.

<sup>51</sup> For Myanmar – the 2017 baseline includes internal and cross-border trafficking survivors who have received reintegration and related protection services (case management and other).

<sup>52</sup> For Myanmar – the target includes internal and cross-border trafficking survivors + new beneficiary group of other cross-border migrant children who have received reintegration and related protection services (case management and other) & other migrant children (internal or cross-border) who have received legal aid/access to justice service

<sup>54</sup> In Central Asia, access to health services will not be supported by UNICEF under this project (hence, no attribution target), but access to health for children affected by migration will be promoted at policy level and supported at the individual level through Child Protection referrals and services

<sup>55</sup> Number of M-Fund contributors who have benefitted from either outpatient consultation or inpatient admission between 2018 and 2021 cumulatively

December 2018: 7,500

December 2019: 16,000

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details	
		directly through health services supported by UNICEF <sup>53</sup> .			BGD: 0	BGD: 300
	2.2. Increased number of policies and procedures to end child immigration detention <sup>56</sup> are in place in the countries.	2.2.1. Number of UNICEF-supported reviews of national legislation and procedures undertaken aimed at reducing child immigration detention <sup>57</sup> .	0	4	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: 0 THL: 0 BGD: 0 KAZ: 0	<b>Target:</b> MMR: 1 THL: 1 BGD: 1 KAZ: 1
		2.2.2. Number of UNICEF-supported initiatives with national and/or international bodies advocating <sup>58</sup> for the end	1	6	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: 0 THL: n/a BGD: 1-RRRI task force and bilateral meeting with India and Bangladesh	<b>Target:</b> MMR: 3 THL: n/a <sup>60</sup> BGD: 2 consultations and bilateral/regional meetings

December 2020: 25,000

The insurance model is based on the assumption that every enrolled beneficiary will receive medical services at least once a year.

<sup>53</sup> UNICEF has a direct role in delivery of the service through technical support such as training, supply or funding. Results from UNICEF reach at the subnational level or specific sites should be considered. Policy advocacy should NOT be considered in the estimation of children/people reached through 'UNICEF support'.

<sup>56</sup> "immigration detention": the deprivation of liberty for migration-related reasons (International Detention Coalition)

<sup>57</sup> "immigration detention": the deprivation of liberty for migration-related reasons (International Detention Coalition)

<sup>58</sup> Advocacy is the deliberate process, based on demonstrated evidence, to directly and indirectly influence decision makers, stakeholders and relevant audiences to support and implement actions that contribute to the fulfilment of children's and women's rights. (UNICEF Advocacy Toolkit: A guide to influencing decisions that improve children's lives, 2010)

<sup>60</sup> n/a for THL as the government has already publicly committed to end child immigration detention. No advocacy needed, only technical assistance.

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details	
		of child immigration-related detention <sup>59</sup> .			KAZ: 0	KAZ: 1
	2.3. Policies and procedures are in place to facilitate birth registration of children affected by migration and to address childhood statelessness	2.3. Number of UNICEF-supported advocacy <sup>61</sup> initiatives on addressing legal and policy gaps that put children on the move <sup>62</sup> at the risk of statelessness.	0	7	<b>Baseline:</b> THL: 0 BGD: 0 KAZ: 0 KYR: 0 TAJ: 0 UZB: 0	<b>Target:</b> THL: 1 BGD: 2 KAZ: 1 KYR: 1 TAJ: 1 UZB: 1
	2.4. Mechanisms for cross-border information sharing on case management <sup>63</sup> , including family tracing and reunification and adhering to	2.4.1 Number of children (disaggregated by age/sex/type of care, if available) registered for tracing with the support of UNICEF.	300	1100	<b>Baseline:</b> BGD: 300 KAZ: 0 KYR: 0	<b>Target:</b> BGD: 1000 KAZ: 50 KYR: 50
		2.4.2. Number of children (disaggregated by age/sex if available) that have been	283	1140	<b>Baseline:</b>	<b>Target:</b>

<sup>59</sup> “alternatives to immigration detention”: Any law, policy or practice by which persons are able to reside in the community, without being detained for migration-related reasons. (IDC, There Are Alternatives (Revised Edition), <https://idcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/There-Are-Alternatives-2015.pdf>)

<sup>61</sup> Advocacy is the deliberate process, based on demonstrated evidence, to directly and indirectly influence decision makers, stakeholders and relevant audiences to support and implement actions that contribute to the fulfilment of children’s and women’s rights. (UNICEF Advocacy Toolkit: A guide to influencing decisions that improve children’s lives, 2010)

<sup>62</sup> This includes refugees, asylum seekers, IDPs, and international migrants – those who are currently transiting/moving, and those in protracted displacement.

<sup>63</sup> The process of helping individual children and families through direct social-work type support, and information management. (Inter-Agency Guidelines for Case Management & Child Protection, January 2014, [http://www.cpcnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CM\\_guidelines\\_ENG\\_.pdf](http://www.cpcnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CM_guidelines_ENG_.pdf).)

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details	
	international standards <sup>64</sup> are established	reunified with their family with the support of UNICEF.			MMR: 83 <sup>65</sup> BGD: 200 KAZ: 0 KYR: 0	MMR: 500 <sup>66</sup> BGD: 600 KAZ: 20 KYR: 20
		2.4.3. Number of countries where an analysis of gaps and opportunities on cross-border information sharing took place as a result of UNICEF-supported activities.	0	7	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: No THL: n/a BGD: No KAZ: No KYR: No TAJ: No UZB: No	<b>Target:</b> <sup>67</sup> MMR: Yes THL: Yes BGD: Yes KAZ: Yes KYR: Yes TAJ: Yes UZB: Yes
		2.4.4. Number of UNICEF-supported advocacy <sup>68</sup> initiatives on the establishment	1	8	<b>Baseline:</b> MMR: 0 THL: n/a <sup>71</sup>	<b>Target:</b> MMR: 3 THL: n/a

<sup>64</sup> Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Action, Child Protection Working Group, 2012 – Standard 13, <http://cpwg.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2014/03/CP-Minimum-Standards-English-2013.pdf>; Inter-Agency Guidelines for Case Management & Child Protection, January 2014, [http://www.cpcnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CM\\_guidelines\\_ENG\\_.pdf](http://www.cpcnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/CM_guidelines_ENG_.pdf).

<sup>65</sup> 18 male & 65 female; For Myanmar – the 2017 baseline includes cross-border trafficking survivors who have been repatriated (and reunified/placed into alternative care options) through cross-border mechanisms.

<sup>66</sup> For Myanmar – the target includes cross-border trafficking survivors + new beneficiary group of other cross-border migrant children who have been repatriated (and reunified/placed into alternative care options) through cross-border mechanisms.

<sup>67</sup> Both gap analysis and advocacy on cross-border information will also be supported through sub-regional activities with various levels of country-based engagement from Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

<sup>68</sup> Advocacy is the deliberate process, based on demonstrated evidence, to directly and indirectly influence decision makers, stakeholders and relevant audiences to support and implement actions that contribute to the fulfilment of children’s and women’s rights. (UNICEF Advocacy Toolkit: A guide to influencing decisions that improve children’s lives, 2010)

<sup>71</sup> Thai government is already interested in doing cross-border MoU and procedure, so no advocacy needed, only technical advice.

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details	
		of cross-border information and referral/reunification processes of unaccompanied <sup>69</sup> and separated <sup>70</sup> children.			BGD: 1 <sup>72</sup> KAZ: 0 KYR: n/a TAJ: 0	BGD: 2 <sup>73</sup> KAZ: 1 KYR: 1 TAJ: 1
<b>Bottlenecks to be addressed</b>	<p><b>Summarized Bottlenecks</b></p> <p><b>Legislation/Policy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of policies and alternative procedures to prevent the detention of children for migration-related reasons</li> <li>- Insufficient legal provisions (nationality and migration law) to address childhood statelessness; bottlenecks in procedures to prevent statelessness</li> <li>- Existing in-country and cross-border response by law enforcement and social welfare systems mainly tailored to child victims of trafficking, and not inclusive of unaccompanied children and irregular migrants</li> <li>- Data and statistics not well disaggregated</li> <li>- Limited research on the effects of labour migration on children, families and communities</li> </ul> <p><b>Management/Coordination:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Absence of cross-border case management / Insufficient cross-border information sharing on children's reunification</li> </ul> <p><b>Supply:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to adequately staffed services, facilities and information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Limited access of children affected by migration to health, education, legal aid services</li> <li>o In the area of education, lack of resources at school level to support enrolment and learning of migrant children who don't speak the national language(s) fluently can pose a significant barrier</li> </ul> </li> </ul>					

<sup>69</sup> “Unaccompanied children” are children who have been separated from both parents and relatives and are not being cared for by an adult who, by law or custom, is responsible for doing so.

<sup>70</sup> “Separated children” are those separated from both parents, or from their previous legal or customary primary care-giver, but not necessarily from their relatives. These may therefore include children accompanied by adult family members other than their parents.

<sup>72</sup> 1 RRRRI task force-India (West Bengla and Maharastra) and Bangladesh

<sup>73</sup> Similar Task force in other countries in South Asia/other states of India

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ lack of skill and lack of logistic and financial allocation to law enforcing agency members and other key actors to implement law and policies</li> </ul>			<p><b>Demand:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Financial access: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ in the area of education, indirect costs preventing migrant children from accessing education can include: transportation, uniform, learning materials and school contributions</li> <li>○ mandatory contribution costs in public health can prevent migrant children’s access to the healthcare system</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Social and cultural practices and beliefs:</b> lack of parents’ knowledge of their children’s right to education or the educational assistance programmes available; lack of understanding of the importance of birth registration or of how to complete the entire registration process; discrimination at local level</p>
<i>Activities as per DoA</i>					<p>2.1. Support authorities to identify gaps in access to health, education and birth registration services, based on evidence</p> <p>2.1.2. Support government and other stakeholders in strengthening access to basic services for children affected by migration</p> <p>2.2.1. Engage with governments bilaterally to advocate for policy frameworks on ending child immigration detention</p> <p>2.2.2. Support relevant coalitions, campaigns and partners to advocate for policy frameworks on ending child immigration detention</p> <p>2.2.3. Provide technical support to strengthen law and procedures to prevent child immigration detention</p> <p>2.3.1. Jointly with or in complement of UNHCR, advocate with and provide technical advice to governments on addressing legal and policy gaps that put children on the move at the risk of statelessness.</p> <p>2.3.2. Identify and address context-specific legal, social, information or financial barriers to registration faced by migrant families</p> <p>2.3.3 Identify bottlenecks in guardianship registration with Central Asian authorities to address these</p> <p>2.4.1. Analyse gaps and opportunities on cross-border information sharing</p> <p>2.4.2. Advocate to authorities to allow establishment of cross-border information and referral/reunification processes of unaccompanied and separated children</p> <p>2.4.3. Provide technical support to authorities and/or service providers, including on technological solutions such as Primero,<sup>74</sup> where none exist</p>

<sup>74</sup> See: [www.primero.org](http://www.primero.org)

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details
<b>Specific objective 3 (Outcome)</b>	<b>3. Relevant international, regional and national bodies recognize the rights of children affected by migration, including those trafficked</b>	3A. Number of international <sup>75</sup> or regional bodies <sup>76</sup> issuing specific recommendations on the rights of children affected by migration in the programme countries.	1 <sup>77</sup>	7	At least one substantial statement or report by an international or regional body on one of the project countries with UNICEF input.
		3B. Regional child protection network on case management and cross border collaboration on children affected by migration established (1. None; 2. Network established but not operational; 3. Network established and operational)	None	Central Asia: Established and operational  Southeast Asia: Established	
<b>Expected results (Output)</b>	3.1. Rights and protection of migrant children are prioritized in the workplan of key ASEAN intergovernmental bodies	3.1.1. Regional intergovernmental commitment, advocated by UNICEF, made in ASEAN recognizing the rights of children affected by migration.	No	Yes	

<sup>75</sup> UN Human Rights Bodies etc. (CRC, CMW, SR Sale, SR Slavery etc.)

<sup>76</sup> ASEAN, OSCE, Almaty Process, Council of Europe, European Network of Ombudspersons for Children etc.

<sup>77</sup> CRC concluding observations on Tajikistan CRC/C/TJK/CO/3-5, 24.c and 41.

Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details
	3.1.2. Number of ASEAN bodies that, supported by UNICEF, completed workplans to strengthen children on the move.	0	2	
3.2. Regional child protection actors exchange cross border experiences on case management for children affected by migration	3.2.1. Number of boys and girls (disaggregated by age) on the move who receive UNICEF-supported reintegration support outside of targeted countries in South-East Asia	TBD	TBD	
	3.2.2. Number of child protection actors from Central Asia and Southeast Asia who, through UNICEF's support, exchanged experiences on the application of case management standards for children affected by migration.	0	200 <sup>78</sup>	Central Asia: 100  Southeast Asia: 100
3.3. International, regional and national bodies have necessary data and evidence to develop and implement policies that guarantee the rights and protection of all children affected by migration	3.3.1. Number of UNICEF-supported regional studies completed, analysing the situation of children affected by migration in Southeast Asia and Central Asia.	0	2	Central Asia: 1 Situation Analysis  Southeast Asia: 1 Situation Analysis
	3.3.2. Number of UNICEF-supported policy proposals presented in international or regional bodies <sup>79</sup> to guarantee	0	2	Central Asia: 1  Southeast Asia: 1

<sup>78</sup> These targeted child protection actors will be multipliers (trainers, decision-makers, etc.) potentially reaching several hundred others.

<sup>79</sup> ASEAN, OSCE

	Logic and intervention	Indicators	Baseline	Target by end project	Details
		the rights of children affected by migration			
<b>Bottlenecks to be addressed</b>	<p><b>Bottleneck 1:</b> Migration is high on the agenda of many regional and international bodies, but Central Asia is not, and is perceived as being within Russia’s sphere of influence and therefore not under much scrutiny. It will be one of the project’s achievements to put Central Asia back on the global and Eurasia children &amp; migration map/agenda.</p> <p><b>Bottleneck 2:</b> Administrative CP data disaggregated by migration status, and administrative migration data collected and disaggregated by age and sex below 18 is scarce, and there are sensitivities to collecting primary data among/about undocumented migrants, which the project will navigate through, with UNICEF’s comparative advantage of being untrusted by key governmental counterparts to ethically collect and use such information.</p> <p><b>Bottleneck 3:</b> Processes within ASEAN taking time due to the need for political momentum to first be established, which in turn can delay progress.</p>				
<b>Activities as per DoA</b>	<p>3.1.1. Engage with relevant national, regional and international agencies to advocate for ending child immigration detention</p> <p>3.1.2. Through ASEAN, senior officials of social welfare departments agree on mechanisms for protection and access to services for children on the move</p> <p>3.1.3. ASEAN social work consortium incorporates case management for children on the move in standardized social work curriculum</p> <p>3.1.4. ASEAN Commission for the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children and/or ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights implements a regional cooperation project on the right to nationality for women and children in ASEAN member States.</p> <p>3.2.1. Capacity building of regional immigration officials, social workers and civil society organizations on best interest determination, case management and cross-border protocols for children on the move</p> <p>3.3.1. Situation analysis of children on the move in Southeast Asia</p> <p>3.3.2. Situation analysis of children affected by migration in Central Asia</p>				

## Annex 2. Country specific interventions planned, Inception Phase

The information of this Annex is an extract from the Inception Report of the Action.<sup>80</sup> Some of the specific interventions and activities being implemented by each of the eight participating country offices were set out below in order to illustrate the type of work being done in each country. They were based largely on the duration action plans submitted by each country office to accompany the inception report to the EU.

**Myanmar's programme** is designed to address two particular protection risks: cross-border migration and trafficking of children from Myanmar and detention of internal migrant children, particularly Muslim children from Rhakine State, for migration related offences. Activities under the first area include advocacy, technical assistance and capacity building to expand existing protection services beyond children who have been trafficked to cover all children on the move, as well as improving cross border coordination mechanisms (e.g. with the Thai government). Activities under the second area include supporting the development of diversion mechanisms, providing technical assistance to promote increased use of alternatives to detention and a decrease in the unnecessary use of detention, and providing legal aid support to stateless Muslim children in conflict with the law.

**Bangladesh's programme interventions** include: a review of training curricula of relevant government authorities and support to integrate content on addressing the specific needs of children affected by migration; work to strengthen rehabilitation and reintegration support for children affected by migration or trafficking; delivering training to relevant government authorities on alternatives to detention; working with government and non-government partners to promote access to health, education and birth registration for children affected by migration; conducting a legal and policy review to identify any gaps which place cross-border migrant children at risk of statelessness; analysis of gaps and opportunities in bilateral and multilateral cross-border information sharing, and advocacy to promote a mechanism for cross border information sharing.

**Thailand's programme interventions** include: programming to support schools where migrant children are enrolled to promote their access to education; working with private-sector companies to ensure migrant workers' children are enrolled; providing migrant families with low cost healthcare schemes; conducting an assessment of the child protection system, with a particular focus on how the system addresses cases of migrant children to inform the development of guidance for child protection authorities on handling cross-border cases; supporting authorities to develop cross-border mechanisms for coordination and cooperation in cases of migrant children; and promoting the development and use of children friendly procedures within the immigration system.

**Uzbekistan's programme interventions** include: the development and implementation of re-integration programmes for girls affected by migration and placed in closed institutions; conducting a study on the situation of children from migrant families across four regions, targeting 1000 families, in order to identify gaps in the child protection system; supporting the provision of social work case management support and service referrals to migrant families identified through the study; formulating policy recommendations to make the child protection system more inclusive of families affected by migration, including Guardianship and Trusteeship registration, based on the outcomes of the study and presenting these to stakeholders during a National Round Table/CP Forum; arranging a study visit to a Central Asian country for government

---

<sup>80</sup> United Nations Children's Fund, Inception report of the "Protecting children affected by migration in Southeast, South, and Central Asia" programme, UNICEF, January 2019: Ch.2.

and NGOs to exchange experience on social work case management; developing policy recommendations on cross-border information sharing.

**Tajikistan's programme interventions** include: providing guidance to para-social workers in 5 districts on identifying, supporting and referring children negatively affected by migration; building the capacity of frontline staff from government and NGOs on providing parenting skills and family/emotional/psychosocial counselling; promoting the use of existing case management to prevent placements into institutional care and seek appropriate alternative family-based care options; providing 60 informal kinship carers in two districts with parental skills and psychosocial guidance to prevent children under their care from being placed in institutions; advocating to bring the Law on Civil Registration in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other human rights instruments to ensure birth registration for every child born on the territory of Tajikistan; collaborating with the Child Rights Ombudsperson to monitor cross-border cases to ensure that family reunification is undertaken in the best interests of the child.

**Kyrgyzstan's programme interventions** include: the provision of technical support to amendments to and implementation of legislation on formal kinship/guardianship care; providing support to civil society organisations to promote their engagement in implementation and monitoring of formal kinship and guardianship care; developing model plans for reintegration and supporting training activities for children affected by migration (including children returning from conflict zones); undertaking advocacy aimed to promote the involvement of child protection authorities in migration systems and procedures; conducting a gap analysis on migrants' access to basic services, including birth registration; identifying and addressing barriers to registration faced by internal migrant families; advocating for the establishment of mechanisms for cross-border information sharing on case management, including family tracing and reunification of unaccompanied and separated children affected by migration, in coordination with Kazakhstan.

**Kazakhstan's programme** includes: reviewing and testing the training curricular on social work and needs of children affected by migration, and delivering an inter-sectorial cross-country capacity building workshop for (at least 50) immigration officials, social workers and civil society organisation on best interests determination, case management and cross-border protocols for children on the move; conducting consultations with national and local authorities and NGOs and providing technical expertise on alternative care models and model reintegration plans for children affected by migration; conducting a case study on the situation of internal and external migrant UASC in Kazakhstan, including service providers' capacity to provide alternatives to detention; developing and testing working protocols on child-friendly procedures for migration services and guardianship authorities; assessing and improving the physical environment in migration cross-border points and offices, and developing child-friendly specifications for equipping migration and law-enforcement offices; assisting national authorities to improve data collection and disaggregation on children affected by migration.