

# **Evaluation of the UNICEF Child Protection Monitoring and Response System (CPMRS) in Thailand**

Volume II - Appendices  
Final Report



Final, May 2013



## Appendices

Appendix I Evaluation Schedule	1
Appendix II Terms of Reference	3
Appendix III Evaluation Matrix	15
Appendix IV Documents Reviewed	21
Appendix V Evaluation Respondents	27
Appendix VI Sample Interview Protocols	31
Appendix VII Questionnaire: Service Providers	45
Appendix VIII Case Stories	49
Appendix IX Reconstructed Results Framework	51
Appendix X Participating Tambon by Province and CPMRS Component during 2008-2011	59
Appendix XI List of participating TAO by province, district, and year	70
Appendix XII : TAO Case Manager Job Description	84



## Appendix I Evaluation Schedule

Phase	Sub activities	Schedule
Inception Phase	Inception Visit to Thailand Document Review Draft Inception Report Revised Report	September-November 2012
Data Collection	Bangkok	November 2012 - March 2013
	Suphanburi	November 22-24 2012
	Ubon	January 22-25, 2013
	Trang	February 7-9, 2013
	Ranong	December 6-8, 2012
Data analysis		November 2012 - March 2013
Reporting	Draft Report Briefing to UNICEF	April 2013
	Final Report	May 2013



## Appendix II Terms of Reference

### Terms of Reference

#### Evaluation of the Child Protection Monitoring and Response System in Thailand

##### 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Thailand is a country with a well-established child protection institutional framework which includes laws and regulations to protect children from violence, abuse, exploitation and neglect. However, there are gaps between comprehensive legislation and regulations with the existing organizational infrastructure and human capacity to ensure full implementation of the law and monitoring of its enforcement.

Under the current system, collective and overlapping responsibilities for child protection are spread across ministries, departments and agencies, with a lack of effective coordination, monitoring and coordination mechanisms. At the same time, fragmented services are delivered by both state and non-state actors at various administrative or geographic levels, which includes sub-district, district, provincial and national levels. The lack of coordination and clear division of roles and responsibilities between child protection service providers, and between child protection and other social sectors, means that opportunities are lost to provide children with a continuum of care and protection, including during natural disasters and other emergencies. This problem has been further exacerbated by the fact that the majority of child protection interventions has focused on short-term solutions and has primarily been organized around addressing specific issues related to children in specific situations, such as: street-based children, trafficked children and children in conflict with the law.

In addition, the absence of effective systems for detecting, responding and monitoring of child protection issues makes it difficult to guide delivery of protection services to those children most in need; and to identify trends / overall situation and resources needed for child protection. Without child protection related data, prevention and response plans cannot be developed. Existing government information systems only cover children whose births are registered and those in school - but no information is routinely gathered on children who are victims of violations or offences or at particular risk of violence, abuse, exploitation and/or neglect. As regards child protection intervention and response, government services are limited – they are present at the provincial level only, and hardly organized at the *tambon* (sub-district) and community levels despite the national decentralization process that started over a decade ago. And these pose a challenge for embracing an equity-focused approach to child protection.

The tsunami of 2004, affected six provinces in the south of the country and increased risks for children in those affected areas. The emergency triggered and highlighted shortcomings of the overall national child protection system while putting to the forefront the need for a national child protection monitoring and response system (CPMRS) that could;

1. Provide direction and guidance to the overall prevention on, response to and monitoring of protection within an overall system and framework of child protection;
2. Increase public – and especially community – awareness of children’s rights to protection, the degree to which these rights are not being fulfilled, and what local actions can be taken to fulfill them;
3. Track the types and magnitude of child protection issues at local (community, *tambon*), provincial, and national levels on a regular basis, including during emergency situations; and

4. Provide adequate response mechanisms from community to provincial, and ultimately national levels for identifying children in need of special protection and delivering suitable, relevant and adequate child protection services as early as possible, if not, immediately.

#### Child Protection Monitoring and Response System (CPMRS)

To respond to this need, the Royal Thailand Government (RTG) collaborated with UNICEF and other partners to develop a model for a comprehensive child protection monitoring and response system (CPMRS). It was agreed to begin the development of this model in the tsunami affected provinces. The model included;

- a) The child protection monitoring system (CPMS): A database that generated information about all children in a sub-district, which was designed to be an “early warning” system to identify children at risk. A participatory process was used to determine which indicators appeared most useful for identifying such risk.
- b) The child protection response system (CPRS):
  - This focused on ensuring that a case manager, either a social work professional or a para-professional, is working at the *tambon* level. The principal duties of the **case manager** were to monitor the circumstances of children listed as “at risk” and to link them to appropriate services. With supervision arranged from the Office of Women’s Affairs (MSDHS), this structure was labelled a “**New Family Development Center**” (NFDC), to link to – and distinguish it from - the existing “Family Development Centers” (established by the Royal Thai Government in 2004 to meet family needs in the community, including establishing networks of community volunteers). A Management Working Group consisting of sub-district *Tambon* Administrative Office (TAO) officials and the case manager was to provide the necessary services through the centre, and to establish a community network of concerned individuals to contribute to the development of prevention strategies and collect information to input to the database.
  - **The One- Stop Crisis Center (OSCC)**, as part of the response system, was established by the Ministry of Public Health in hospitals in several parts of the country to assist women and children victims of violence. Based in hospitals, both at the tertiary and community levels, the centre is staffed not only with medical doctors and nurses, but also representatives from the police department, the office of attorney, GO/NGO emergency home, and social workers from the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security. An OSCC usually assumes multifunctional roles i.e. as a call centre to receive reported cases of violence against women and children, a coordinating centre with other units, e.g. police station, the courts. In 2006, Ministry of Public Health with the support of UNICEF expanded OSCCs to district level hospitals through capacity building including the establishment of a data collection system and effective networking among multi-disciplinary teams outside the hospital.
  - To strengthen the response system especially the inter-ministerial coordination, a **Manual of Protocol and Procedures for Preventing and Responding to Children at Risks of Abuse, Neglect, Violence and Exploitation (CP manual)** was developed and implemented in Krabi, Phangnga, Ranong and Phuket in 2008 before it was approved by the National Child Protection Committee and expanded to four more provinces namely Satun, Trang, Ubonrachthani and Lampoon.

## 2. RATIONALE FOR EVALUATION

Acknowledging above-mentioned shortfalls, there is now a growing interest in Thailand to reframe and strengthen child protection work by looking more broadly at the deficits in protection facing all children, and addressing the causes for these gaps in prevention and response in a coordinated and holistic manner. Moreover, the experiences and gains in the child protection monitoring and response system, which started

in the tsunami areas, have evolved and are currently contributing to the national thinking towards the development of an integrated and holistic child protection system.

This evaluation will provide invaluable inputs to support the strengthening of current systems towards a comprehensive and more holistic national child protection system. The work already carried out in the CPMRS during 2006 to 2011 is expected to provide valuable lessons and models for the Royal Thai Government (RTG) on its potential incorporation into the holistic national child protection system.

### **3. PURPOSE**

The evaluation is aimed at informing the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS) and other relevant ministries such as the Ministry of Public Health (MoPH) on the effectiveness and efficiency of the existing child protection system, including their structures and mechanisms. It will also provide inputs to relevant actors on the existing monitoring system, and how this is linked to and coordinated with response system in place. It is expected that the evaluation will influence the decision of the RTG to consider the application/integration/ expansion of the CPMRS either as-is or with modification, into a new holistic child protection system. Evaluation findings will also be used for wider advocacy for a stronger national child protection system and to refine and/or validate the current CPMRS approach. The evaluation will be led by the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security under the National Child Protection Committee.

### **4. OBJECTIVES**

The objectives are:

- Examine the extent to which the structures and mechanisms of the child protection system are aligned with the child protection legal framework;
- Determine whether the current child protection monitoring system is efficient, effective and covers all children of Thailand;
- Determine the actual and potential contribution of CPMRS to the national child protection system;
- Determine the extent to which the CPMRS has met its objectives;
- Determine the relevance, efficiency and sustainability of the CPMRS as an approach to strengthen the child protection system in Thailand.
- Provide practical recommendations for the strengthening of the existing national child protection system, refinement of the CPMRS approach, or one similar to it, and for the scaling up of such an approach to the national level. The recommendations will be elaborated through a discussion and description on how the monitoring of and response to child protection supports the holistic child protection system and binds into an integrated one. The recommendations will comprise the critical steps into the establishment of national and provincial monitoring and response systems on child protection and implications into the child protection system.

### **5. SCOPE AND FOCUS**

The evaluation will include:

- a) A mapping and analysis of the overall child protection system in Thailand. which will include: the current principles and functioning of the national child protection system, including norms, laws, process, structures, services, budget allocations, monitoring and evaluation; levels of compliance with existing laws and structures and identify the gaps, barriers and bottlenecks; inter-sectoral linkages within the national child protection system, including social development, justice, education, health, labour, interior, finance and planning, issues of capacity and equity. Particular

emphasis will be put in the capacity of the system to reach the most vulnerable population including the non-Thai groups.

- b) An in-depth evaluation of the CPMRS to be done at the sub-district TAO/Municipal, provincial and national levels covering the period from 2006 - 2011. The evaluation of the CPMRS will be underpinned by a participatory approach with key stakeholders engaged at these levels including technical staff of the Ministry of Interior (MOI), Ministry of Public Health (MoPH), MSDHS and other relevant ministries. The Mahidol University, Thammasat University and staff from the ministries at the provincial and local levels, volunteers, community and religious leaders, case managers and committee of NFDC and Reception Home for Children staff and OSCC Staff. Parents and children are important key stakeholders.

The evaluation will cover a range of provinces as it is feasible. In addition, the number and location of sampled sub-districts will be identified by the steering committee, while taking into consideration the different time and implementation phases of the project and other relevant factors.

### **Evaluation Questions**

The Evaluation shall be focused on four main criteria: Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness and Sustainability. An additional criteria on Cross Cutting Concerns is also included. However, to an extent possible, the evaluation will also analyze some evidence or indication of possible impact. Below are a set of guiding questions to be responded to by the evaluation. However, the consultant(s) may propose additional questions or sub-questions, and over the course of the evaluation additional information that adds substance to the key questions will be collected and is to be included in the final evaluation report.

#### **Relevance**

- Is the overall child protection system in line with international conventions and with national priorities?
- Is the existing child protection system (including prevention, response and recovery) relevant to the situation and issues concerning the protection of children in the country?
- Is the appropriate government management structure in place to achieve the results?
- Do stakeholders have the necessary mandates and accountabilities for child protection?
- Is the national child protection system appropriate for the effective implementation of the CPMRS and other child protection initiatives? Which are the main barriers (bottlenecks), and gaps as well as the enabling factors? What can be recommended to improve the national protection system in Thailand in general and to mainstream an equity-focused approach in particular?
- Are project objectives and expected results in line with national and local priorities in child protection, in particular the Child Protection Act and the priorities of TAOs, MSDHS and the National Child Protection Committee, as well as international standards for child protection?
- In what ways and to what extent has the CPMRS responded to child protection priorities of children at particular risk or victims of violence, abuse, exploitation and/or neglect?
- Is there another or similar system currently in place? If so, how is this linked to the CPMRS?

#### **Effectiveness**

- To what extent has the existing child protection system, providing quality services, especially but not limited to prevention, delivery of services and monitoring system, for all children in Thailand
- To what extent has the existing coordination mechanisms for the child protection system functioning and effectively used by the relevant stakeholders

- To what extent, if any, has the CPMRS contributed to the national protection system in Thailand?
- In what ways have and to what extent has the CPMS database contributed toward changes in levels of knowledge and awareness on child protection at sub-national and national levels?
- In what ways has the CPMRS contributed to the follow-up and response of child protection cases?
- How satisfied were the users of these structures and mechanisms, particularly those of the CPMS database with the information they received through the system?
- In what ways and to what extent has the CPMS database linked to the child protection response system?
- Were there any unexpected (either positive or negative) outcomes of the CPMRS that had not been planned for? If so, which ones?

### **Efficiency**

- How much is allocated for child protection system within the relevant ministries concerned? How much is actually received and how much is used, for whom and for what?
- To what extent has the CPMRS been cost-effective? To what extent has the availability and use of resources enabled or constrained the performance of the CPMRS?
- Were there other resources made available apart from UNICEF?

### **Sustainability**

- What would be the human, financial and technical resource implication(s) to strengthen the existing child protection system?
- Are there indicators that show ownership of the government to the CPMRS, including project activities, project priorities, strategic developments and budget allocation?
- To what extent has the project contributed to the generation of sub-national and national capacity, such that it will be sustainable if UNICEF funding ceases?
- What were the major factors that influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability?

### **Cross-Cutting Concerns**

- In what ways and to what extent has the overall child protection system and CPMRS, in particular, integrated gender and other areas of disaggregation into the design and implementation of its interventions?
- In what ways and to what extent has the existing child protection system and the CPMRS, in particular integrated an equity- focuses approach into the design and implementation of its interventions?

## **6. EVALUATION PROCESSES AND METHODS**

Five specific methods are suggested to address the evaluation questions and objectives outlined above; they are listed below. If the consultant(s) selected for the evaluation feel that other methods are critical to the success of this evaluation, those should be detailed in the proposal with an explanation of the added value these methods will bring to the final product. The initial broad outline of data collection methods could also take into consideration sampling approaches, including area and population to be represented, procedures to be used and (if applicable) sampling size per objective and corresponding evaluation questions.

A list of relevant (inter)national instruments and policies on human rights, in particular child rights, equity and gender equality will guide the evaluation process. In addition, stakeholders should be identified and consulted when planning the evaluation (key issues, method, timing, responsibilities) and should be kept

informed throughout the evaluation process. The evaluation approach will also consider learning and participation opportunities (e.g. workshops debriefing, participation in the field visits) to ensure that key stakeholders are fully integrated into the evaluation learning process.

#### **i. Document Review**

- a) Comprehensive desk review of the overall national child protection system and framework, including norms, laws, process, structures, services, budget allocations, monitoring and evaluation; levels of compliance with existing laws and structures and identify the gaps, barriers and bottlenecks; inter-sectoral linkages within the national child protection system, including social development, justice, education, health, labour, interior, finance and planning including issues of capacity and equity.
- b) Desk review of existing project information including concept note, proposals, quarterly narrative and financial reports, along with CPMRS tools, CPMS database, and TAO plans developed as a result of the project. In addition, the evaluation of the UNICEF response to the tsunami - which includes an evaluation of the piloted CPRMS - will be available as well as relevant national and international legal instruments and policy guidelines.

#### **ii. Interviews with Key Informants**

Guiding questions will be developed for interviews with key informants including but not limited to the members of the reference group, staff of the Institute of Nutrition, Mahidol University; UNICEF program staff; key government officials at national and sub-national levels; social workers; Child Protection focal points; relevant non-government partners; and others which may be identified as critical to the national mapping and analysis and CPMRS.

#### **iii. Focus Groups with TAO and Provincial representatives and beneficiaries of CPMRS**

Focus groups will enhance the understanding gained during key informant interviews and provide an additional method to cross-reference information. Direct and indirect impact of the CPMRS project on beneficiaries will be documented through the focus group discussions. The beneficiaries will include parents, children, community members and those who are using data from CPMRS.

#### **iv. Case Examples**

Case examples will be used to illustrate the effectiveness and the potential impact of the project, in particular specific cases that will demonstrate where CPMRS has helped to direct appropriate assistance to children in need of protection, influenced local planning and impacted on resource allocation. Case examples (minimum 3) may cover both positive and negative results. The selection of these case examples will be based on an agreed criteria set at the beginning of the evaluation with the steering committee to be confirmed by the reference group.

#### **v. Comparison Study**

A number of sub-district TAOs without CPMRS will be selected and interviewed to assess their performance on child protection. The results will be compared with those TAOs with CPMRS (having CPMS, case managers and CP manual). The comparison process will help identify areas where the project has contributed to the prevention, monitoring and response to child protection at the sub-district level in the context of the overall national child protection system. The area only either CPMS or CPRS (case manager) is functioning should also be selected for comparison. Similar processes will be conducted at the provincial level where Provincial Social Development and Human Security Office or Provincial Child Protection Committee without CPMRS in the nearby provinces will be selected and interviewed for result comparison.

## 7. TRANSPARENT BENCHMARKS AND COMPARISONS

For all comparisons, and in all discussions of the key questions, the consultants shall use clear and transparent criteria as to what constitutes a standard met and what is to be considered as a not met standard. The benchmarks must be clearly described and convincing that they are both valid and reliable. In the final report, both must be accompanied by practical recommendations for promoting good standards and improving those that have not yet been met. The evaluation should emphasize constructive recommendations and avoid subjective, critical impressions. Where possible, the evaluation should utilize both qualitative and quantitative indicators.

## 8. ETHICAL ISSUES

The evaluation covers information that is sensitive and confidential, while the consultant(s) may also have direct contact with children as informants. To this end, the consultants should adhere to the Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN System. Full compliance with all its provisions will be required.

In addition, the consultant(s) may have access to data on specific child protection cases in which case the confidentiality of the individuals concerned and the case details must be respected and maintained. Within the consultants' reports, individuals involved in child protection cases should not be identifiable directly or indirectly. Care should be taken when reporting statements or interviews. When in doubt, it is recommended to feedback to the informant and ask them to confirm their statements.

All informants will be offered the option of confidentiality, for all methods used. Dissemination or exposure of results and of any interim products must follow the rules agreed upon in the contract. In general, unauthorized disclosure is prohibited. Any sensitive issues or concerns should be raised with the evaluation management team as soon as they are identified.

## 9. FINAL OUTPUTS

**Written documents to be submitted to the steering committee, should be in hard and soft copy in Thai and English languages.**

**Inception report:** Detailed evaluation methodology including timeframe, key questions, the stakeholders to be involved and results of desk review. This shall be submitted within the first two weeks of the evaluation and be presented to the steering committee and reference group for review and feedback, and its subsequent approval

**Presentation of initial findings to key stakeholders:** A meeting of key stakeholders shall be convened by the steering committee i.e., members of the reference group, implementing partners, senior government officials, amongst others. Included will be a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the evaluation process and initial findings, and an accompanying document of standalone speaking points. Further findings gathered during the meeting shall be integrated into the final report.

**Final evaluation report:** The report of about 50-60 pages, should be well structured, logical, clear and complete. It should comply with UNICEF's reporting standards and should mainly include:

- *Title page and opening pages* to provide key basic information;
- *Executive Summary: of 5-7 pages*
- *Object of Evaluation:* Presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation
- *Evaluation Objectives, Purpose(s) and Scope and Evaluation Methodology:* Presents transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve evaluation purposes.

- *Context*
  - In depth- mapping and analysis of the overall national child protection system and framework
  - UN and UNICEF context
  - CPMRS context
- *Findings:* Should respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report
- *Conclusions and Lessons Learned:* Present reasonable judgments based on findings and substantiated by evidence and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation
- *Recommendations:* Recommendations should be relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation, are supported by evidence and conclusions, and were developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders
- *Gender and Human Rights, including child rights:* The report is expected to illustrate the extent to which the design and implementation of the object, the assessment of results and the evaluation process incorporates a gender equality perspective and human rights based approach, including child rights
- *Annexes:* Should be aimed at increasing credibility of the report and should include among others, the TOR; work schedule; evaluation tools; list of places visited; records of interviews and focus group discussions. The final evaluation report should be presented in a way that makes the information accessible to the intended audience and comprehensible. Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis, be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear.

The in-depth national child protection analysis should be written in a stand-alone and extractable way as this section is expected to be used for various other purposes beyond this evaluation.

## 10. LOCATION

The desk review will be done partly in Bangkok and partly home based. The meetings with the steering committee and the reference group, relevant national level stakeholders will take place in Bangkok. Other meetings, data collection processes will take place at provincial and sub-district levels (to be identified).

## 11. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS /RESPONSIBILITIES

A steering committee composed of representatives from the key stakeholders at the national level - members of the steering committee shall be identified at a later stage - will be established to act as a sounding board, facilitate and review the work of the evaluation. In addition, this group will be tasked with facilitating the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up actions. In addition, a reference group composed of selected provincial and/or *tambon* level representatives (to be selected at a later date by the MSDHS) shall also be established to validate and verify facts and experiences as they become part of the findings of the evaluation. More importantly, the group shall provide inputs in terms of realities on the ground and feedback on the general findings and recommendations. Below are the detailed roles and responsibilities of the concerned committees, agencies/organizations:

## **Ministry of Social Development and Human Security**

### ***Steering Committee and Reference Group***

- The Steering Committee shall provide recommendations on the overall scope and content of the evaluation and as well as recommendations for the selection of consultants
- The steering committee, in consultation with the reference group shall provide information, guidance and working steps in the entire process including coordinating with field counterparts/partners to facilitate the evaluation.
- The steering committee together with the reference group shall coordinate and provide timely feedback and input on draft versions of the report.
- The steering committee, in coordination with the reference group shall provide feedback to the evaluation results and decide on the optimal utilization of the evaluation results

### **Consultants**

- In close collaboration with the evaluation manager and steering committee, the selected consultants will have the overall responsibility for organizing and conducting the evaluation, to include: review of the existing documentation and proposing the evaluation methodology and data collection tools; manage the process of interviews, focus group discussions, review of the national system and the project documents to ensure that sufficient information is gathered to make an informed assessment in line with the evaluation's objectives; provide qualitative and quantitative data analysis and recommendations including the presentation of evaluation report/findings
- The selected consultants will present progress updates to the Steering Committee and Reference Group periodically.
- The selected consultants will present the preliminary findings to key stakeholders for their comments and suggestions, prior to finalization of the report. The meeting will be facilitated by UNICEF and MSDHS.
- Throughout the evaluation process, the consultant(s) will be responsible for ensuring the quality of the data collected as well as ensuring that all data collection activities are in compliance with ethical and safety standards applicable to researching, documenting and evaluating programmes.
- The selected consultants will be responsible for their own travel, accommodation, equipment to be used throughout the evaluation, including workspace.
- Local consultant(s) shall be recruited to facilitate data collection in the field and to facilitate continuity in specific phases of the evaluation.
- The selected consultants will provide a multi-disciplinary evaluation team consisting of international experts and Thai experts. One of the international experts shall be selected to work as the Team Leader. The Team Leader shall be responsible for the operational management and smooth and efficient conduct of work by the members of his/her team.

### **UNICEF**

- The evaluation contract shall be signed between UNICEF and the selected consultants
- The chief of the Child Protection section shall act as the Evaluation Manager; to manage the conduct of the evaluation throughout its duration, overseeing the day-to-day progress of the evaluation
- The Evaluation Manager shall liaise with the Steering Committee, the reference group and the consultant; to ensure that meetings and field visits are smoothly facilitated and conducted

- The Evaluation Manager shall ensure that decisions and agreements are implemented and are carried out throughout the evaluation
- The Evaluation Manager shall oversee, supervise the contract of the consultants and ensure the implementation according to the TOR.
- The Child Protection section, shall provide the necessary technical assistance and financial support in the conduct of the evaluation
- The Social Policy and M&E section shall monitor the evaluation process and implementation of the evaluation on UNICEF behalf ensuring that the evaluation is undertaken in accordance with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation.

## 12. PROPOSED TIMEFRAME

The estimated period of evaluation is going to be conducted within a maximum of six (6) months

No.	Activities	Time frame ( estimate )
1.	Preparatory Phase - Desk review - Design of methodology - Preparation of field visits - Development of data collection tools - Submission of inception report - Presentation and discussions with the steering committee / reference group/other key stakeholders	1.5 months
2.	Data Collection Phase - Field visits - Consultation meetings, interviews, focus group discussions etc.	2 months
3.	Analysis Phase - National Child Protection System - CPMRS Quantitative and qualitative analysis of data	1.5 -2 months
4.	Reporting Phase - Presentation of preliminary findings to UNICEF and key stakeholders - Submission of draft report - Submission of final report	1.5 month

## 13. QUALIFICATIONS

The evaluation will be conducted by an institution, will the following background and qualifications:

The institution must have a good track record and extensive experience in planning and conducting evaluations, particularly in the field of child protection.

The team of consultants should meet the following specific requirements:

- Knowledge and demonstrated experience in child protection;
- Strong statistical and analytical, quantitative and qualitative research skills;

- Demonstrated experience in managing and implementing evaluations, including with multiple stakeholders and in various cultural/religious contexts;
- Knowledge of evaluation norms, standards and approaches (especially UNEG norms and standards);
- Firm understanding of human rights-based approaches to programming, including gender and equity considerations;
- Adaptability and flexibility, client orientation, proven ethical practice, initiative, concern for accuracy and quality;
- Adequate understanding of local and cultural issues
- Understanding and ability to analyze crosscutting thematic issues
- Excellent knowledge of computer management and applications;
- Excellent English communication and report writing skills.



## Appendix III Evaluation Matrix<sup>12</sup>

Issue	Main Questions	Sub Questions	Sources of Data	Methods of data analysis	Comments
<b>CPMRS Program Context</b>	<b>Global Context:</b>	What have been the key trends, lessons in Child protection over the period 2007-2012? What are the implications for UNICEF's past or potential future support for the CPMRS in Thailand?	Scientific and grey literature, UNICEF policy documents, Government policy documents Key experts	Literature review Semi-structured interviews	Primary responsibility <sup>3</sup> : Universalia and Child Frontiers
<b>CPMRS Program Context</b>	<b>UN and UNICEF context:</b> How have the UN and UNICEF contexts affected UNICEF's support of the CPMRS in Thailand? How are those contexts expected to change in the near future?	What were the key changes in the UN and UNICEF contexts over the period 2007-2012 that have had positive/negative effects on UNICEF's support for the CPMRS in Thailand? What are the anticipated changes in the UN and UNICEF contexts over the next few years, and what are the anticipated effects on UNICEF's future support of the CPMRS in Thailand?	UNICEF documents Key UNICEF staff	Document review Semi-structured interviews	Primary responsibility: Universalia
<b>CPMRS Program Context</b>	<b>RTG context:</b> What are the characteristics of the Thai context that have an effect on the country's child protection system in general and on the CPMRS more specifically? What are the anticipated key changes in the Thai context over the next few years (political, social, economic, technological social etc) and what are their likely effects on RTG support for CPMRS?	What are the economic, political, social, religious and development contexts in which the system has been developed? What are the historical, conceptual and ideological foundations and influences on the system? What is the legal context for child protection in Thailand? In what ways has the child protection system developed in the period 2007-2012? Who or what are the main drivers of the current national child protection agenda? What are the processes for policy development and resource allocations in child protection? What is the government's overall approach to child protection service delivery, and what does it see as its role and responsibilities in terms of child protection?	Documents Key experts, UNICEF staff and staff from child protection agencies	Document review Semi-structured interviews	Primary responsibility: Child Frontiers

<sup>1</sup> This evaluation matrix includes the main evaluation questions and sub-questions. Additional sub-questions may be developed in the course of the study

<sup>2</sup> Questions marked with an "\*" could not be answered due to a lack of information at the time of writing.

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that "Primary responsibility" does **not** imply **sole** responsibility. For each of these sections, some components will be carried out by one or the other evaluation partner.

Issue	Main Questions	Sub Questions	Sources of Data	Methods of data analysis	Comments
<p><b>UNICEF support for CPMRS (2006-2011): Performance</b></p>	<p>What formal systems components have been established to prevent and respond to violence, abuse and exploitation of children?</p> <p>In general, what is the reach and coverage of the system?</p> <p>Do services cover all communities without discrimination or access barriers?</p> <p>Relevance: Does the CPMRS function in a way that is integrated within the wider formal system, as well as congruent with informal protection practices?</p> <p>To what extent are these mechanisms perceived as helpful and meaningful? Is it perceived as providing a good outcome?</p> <p>Does the CPMRS support and/or complement the strategic programme objectives of UNICEF TCO with regards to child protection and/or other focus areas?</p> <p>Is the CPMRS aligned with the strategic objectives of the RTG in terms of the development of the national child protection system?</p>	<p>Do services tend to focus exclusively on individuals, families, communities and in what ways?</p> <p>Are there any formal mechanisms for identifying families and children in difficulty? What early intervention initiatives and services are available to help these families and children?</p> <p>What types of formal services are available to children who have been victims of violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation (including welfare, justice, legal aid, health, education and other sectors)? What kinds of services are provided by the government, and by NGOs?</p> <p>In general, what is the reach and coverage of the system?</p> <p>To what extent do systems for protecting children fit within the RTG policy environment and priorities? Identified needs, operational capacities? Human and financial resources? Coordinating mechanisms in Thailand?</p> <p>To what extent are systems for protecting children fit perceived as congruent with local and cultural practices/norms in Thailand?</p> <p>What are the strategic objectives of UNICEF TCO? To what extent is CPMRS congruent with those objectives? Have any synergies been identified and utilised between the CPMRS and other projects/programmes supported by UNICEF TCO?</p>	<p>Documents</p> <p>Key experts: child protection staff at the national, provincial and sub-district level; community leaders, families; UNICEF TCO staff</p>	<p>Literature review, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions</p>	<p>Primary responsibility: Child Frontiers and Universalia</p>

Issue	Main Questions	Sub Questions	Sources of Data	Methods of data analysis	Comments
<b>UNICEF support for CPMRS (2006-2011): Performance</b>	<p>Effectiveness:</p> <p>What was the implicit theory of change and results for UNICEF's support to CPMRS over the period 2006-2011?*</p> <p>To what extent were planned results (outputs, outcomes, impacts) of UNICEF's support for CPMRS over the period 2007-2012 realised at the national, provincial and sub-district levels? *(See Appendix II for a list of these expected results)</p>	<p>What are the specific expected outputs and outcomes of the different components of the CPMRS project (see Appendix II)? *To what extent is the causal link between outputs, outcomes and results and related assumptions clearly defined and realistic?*</p> <p><b>To what extent have the CPMRS objectives and results (see Appendix II) been realized? What are the explanations for any significant variances?</b></p> <p>To what extent has the roll-out of the CPMRS been incorporated into other sector planning?</p> <p>To what extent have specialist trainings been organised for the application of the CPMRS?</p> <p>What is the general level of awareness of the CPMRS at the local level?</p> <p>How and in what circumstances is the CPMRS used?</p> <p>What is the perceived level of performance of the CPMRS at the local level?</p> <p>Were the child protection risks identified through the CPMRS effectively responded to?</p> <p>Were there any changes in incidence of reporting over the project period?</p> <p>Is the CPMRS perceived to match the protection needs and expectations of communities, families and children?</p> <p>What are the perceived benefits/impact/outcomes/by-products of the CPMRS at the local level?</p> <p>Is the CPMRS capable of finding, identifying and reaching less visible cases of risk, abuse, violence and exploitation (including in the home)?</p> <p>Is it accessible to all families and children, especially those that are from the most marginalised/vulnerable communities?</p> <p>Were the indicators used to identify vulnerable children and families appropriate?</p>	<p>Literature, documents</p> <p>Key experts: local level social welfare staff; families and community leaders</p>	<p>Document review, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions</p>	<p>Primary responsibility: Child Frontiers</p>
	<p>Were there any unanticipated results (positive or negative) for UNICEF, the RTG and others? (e.g., Mahidol University, UNICEF, civil society organisations, other provinces and sub-districts not targeted)?</p>	<p>To what extent was UNICEF support for CPMRS in Thailand efficiently designed, planned, implemented, monitored, evaluated over the period 2007-2012? What were the key strengths, areas for Improvements and lessons learned?</p> <p>To what extent were the established project committees and mechanisms for planning, monitoring and governing the project appropriate and effective in terms of timely and informed decision-making, problem solving and providing strategic guidance?</p>			
<b>UNICEF support for CPMRS (2006-2011): Performance</b>	<p>Efficiency:</p> <p>Was the CPMRS programme efficiently designed and implemented?</p>	<p>To what extent was UNICEF support for CPMRS in Thailand efficiently designed, planned, implemented, monitored, evaluated over the period 2007-2012? What were the key strengths, areas for Improvements and lessons learned?</p> <p>To what extent were the established project committees and mechanisms for planning, monitoring and governing the project appropriate and effective in terms of timely and informed decision-making, problem solving and providing strategic guidance?</p>	<p>Programme documents</p> <p>Key experts: UNICEF staff, social welfare staff at the national,</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>	<p>Primary responsibility: Universalia</p>

Issue	Main Questions	Sub Questions	Sources of Data	Methods of data analysis	Comments
<b>UNICEF support for CPMRS (2006-2011): Performance</b>	Sustainability: To what extent are the results realised to date likely to be sustained at the national, provincial and sub-district levels? To what extent did the project design include appropriate approaches to support sustainability of results at national, provincial and sub-district levels? What were the key strengths, areas for improvements and lessons learned?	To what extent were the CPMRS outputs realised in a timely manner? Within planned budgets?*	provincial and sub-district levels  Programme documents Key experts: UNICEF staff, child protection specialists, social welfare staff	Document review, semi-structured interviews	Primary responsibility: Child Frontiers
		To what extent were the appropriate resources (human/financial) allocated to the functioning of CPMRS by UNICEF, RTG, provinces, tambon, and other key partners, given its objectives?*			
		Are any staff members dedicated specifically to services for children? Specifically for children in need of special protection?			
		Is the national child protection system costed and budgeted for? How is the budget for child protection planned and decided?			
		What financial resources are available for child protection services from public sources (budgetary allocations) of: different tiers of government?			
		Is the system adequately staff resourced to support the CPMRS?			
		Is the system adequately finance resourced to support the CPMRS?			
		Are the national system and CPMRS mutually supporting, reinforcing (legal, financial, etc.)?			
		Is the CPMRS sustainable in its current form, financially and/or contextually? Have alternative sources of financing been identified to continue the CPMRS after programme end?			
		What is the contribution of CPMRS to the national child protection system/protective environment?			
<b>UNICEF support for CPMRS (2006-2011): Performance</b>	Cross-cutting concerns: To what extent has UNICEF's support for CPMRS integrated gender and other areas of disaggregation into the design,	Is there an understanding of local perceptions of child protection concerns and traditional coping mechanisms, and are these built into the CPMRS design?	Literature, documents Key experts: social welfare staff at the national,	Document review, semi-structured interviews, focus	Primary responsibility: Universalia
		To what extent is RTG commitment to the CPMRS reflected in government policy and programme documents? How is the CPMRS embedded within the national child protection framework?			
		To what extent is the national child protection framework evolved to support the CPMRS?			
		What is the purpose and function of the CPMRS within the overall system?			
		How has the CPMRS been articulated within the national services paradigm?			
		To what extent did UNICEF ensure that the CPMRS integrates gender and other areas of disaggregation?			
		To what extent has UNICEF ensured that the CPMRS has integrated an equity focus into its design, implementation and monitoring?			

Issue	Main Questions	Sub Questions	Sources of Data	Methods of data analysis	Comments
<b>Future Directions</b>	implementation and monitoring of interventions? To what extent has UNICEF's support for CPMRS integrated an equity focus into the design, implementation and monitoring of interventions?	Do services cover all communities without discrimination or access barriers? Is case data disaggregated by indicators which allow for an equity-focused analysis, such as socio-economic background, ethnicity, ability, legal status?	provincial and sub-district levels; families, community leaders	group discussions	
	Lessons learned:	What have been the key operational and developmental lessons learned emerging from UNICEF's support for the CPMRS in Thailand over the period 2007-2012?	Documents Key experts: social welfare staff, child protection staff, UNICEF staff	Document review, semi-structured interviews, expert judgement from Child Frontiers and Universalialia	Primary responsibility: Universalialia and Child Frontiers
	Future UNICEF/RTG support: Under what conditions should UNICEF and the RTG support the CPMRS in Thailand in the future?	In what ways could the CPMRS be improved to function within Thailand? What are the implications for reform of the national system?	Literature, documents Key experts: social welfare staff, child protection staff, UNICEF staff	Document review, semi-structured interviews, expert judgement	Primary responsibility: Universalialia and Child Frontiers



## Appendix IV Documents Reviewed<sup>4</sup>

### Country Situation

Office of the National Economic and Development Board. (2010). Thailand Millennium Development Goals Report 2009. Bangkok, Thailand.

Office of Women's Affairs and Family Development, Ministry of Social Development and Human Security. (2011). Report on Gender-based Violence against Women and Girls (VAW/G) Indicators. Bangkok, Thailand.

Sub-Committee on the Rights of the Child, National Child and Youth Development Promotion Commission, Office of Welfare Promotion, Protection and Empowerment of Vulnerable Groups, Ministry of Social Development and Human Security. (Year unavailable). Thailand's Third and Fourth Report on the Implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Bangkok, Thailand.

UNDP Thailand. (2009). Executive Summary: Improving the local administrative structure. Bangkok, Thailand.

UNICEF internal document "IR analysis – corporal punishment. (Year unavailable).

UNICEF internal document "IR analysis –holistic child protection system. (Year unavailable).

### CPMRS

UNICEF Mid Term Review Child Protection (2009)\*

### CPMS

An Integrated Child Protection Monitoring and Responses System (CPMRS). (Year unavailable)\*.

Attig, George A. (2010). A Picture of Child Protection in Thailand's Six Tsunami-Affected Provinces Using Data from the Child Protection Monitoring System (CPMS) 2009. Salaya, Thailand: Institute of Nutrition, Mahidol University. \*

Description of TAO Case Manager Role. (Year unavailable).\*

Institute of Nutrition, Mahidol University. Quarterly Reports 2008-2011. Salaya, Thailand.\*

Institute of Nutrition, Mahidol University. Final TAO/Tesaban Selection List – CPMS 2009-2011. Salaya, Thailand.

Institute of Nutrition, Mahidol University. (2010). Proposal: Child Protection Monitoring System: Tsunami Province Expansion – 2010. Salaya, Thailand.

Institute of Nutrition, Mahidol University. (2011). Proposal: Child Protection Monitoring System 2011. Salaya, Thailand.

List of Case Managers. (2011). Excerpt from CPMS 2011: Q1 Report 2011. Institute of Nutrition, Mahidol University.

List of Integrated CPMS Indicators. (Year unavailable).

List of National Committees related to Children. (Year unavailable).

---

<sup>4</sup> Documents identified by a "\*" were a key source of information for the evaluation.

List of New TAOs in CPMRS Project. (2007).

List of TAOs. (2011). Excerpt from CPMS 2011: Q1 Report 2011. Institute of Nutrition, Mahidol University.

List of TAOs in CPMS Project 2011-2012. (2011).

List of Thailand's CPMS Indicators. (2011).

Order of National Child and Youth Development Committee. (2011). The Establishment of the Sub-Committee on Child Protection System in Thailand.

UNICEF Thailand. (2007). Annual Review: Elements of a Comprehensive Child Protection System in Thailand. Power Point presentation.

## **CPRS**

Case Manager Evaluation by Local Counterparts. (2008).

Draft Curriculum for "Case Management." (2007).

Faculty of Medicine, Khon Kaen University. (Year unavailable). CPRS Project proposal 2006-2008. Khon Kaen, Thailand.

Faculty of Medicine, Khon Kaen University. Quarterly Progress Reports 2006-2007. Khon Kaen, Thailand.

Faculty of Social Administration, Thammasat University. (2007). Case Manager Training Module Revised Proposal. Bangkok, Thailand.

Final NFDC Report. (2008).

Framework for Development of Statutory Child Protection System and Services in Ranong. (2007).

OSCC Training. (Year unavailable).

New Family Development Centre Annual Progress Report. (2009).

Progress Report for Project Component to Support the Development of Provincial Child Protection Service System, July-September 2007. (2007).

Summary of Activity in Component 2: Support the Development of Provincial Child Protection Response System. (2008).

Summary of the Evaluation Report of NFDC. (2008).\*

Talking points for NCPC. (2008).

Thompson, Guy and Nantaporn Ieumwananonthachai. (2008). Child Protection: Building a Protective Response. Presented to the Ranong Provincial Child Protection Committee.

UNICEF Thailand. (2008). Manual of Protocols and Procedures: Protecting and Responding to Children at Risk of Abuse, Neglect, Violence and Exploitation 2010. Bangkok, Thailand.

UNICEF Thailand. (2009). Review of Project Proposal: NFDC.

UNICEF Thailand. (2009). Review of Project Proposal: NFDC Phase III.

UNICEF Thailand. (2010). Review of Project Proposal: Strengthening the capacity of One Stop Crisis Center staff in southern border provinces and Mae-Sot district for the implementation of Child Protection Act 2003 and the Protection of Domestic Violence Victims Act 2007.

UNICEF Thailand and MSDHS. (2007). Piloting New Family Development Centers (NFDCs) as a Cornerstone for Community Services in Thailand.

## Information Management

UNICEF Thailand. (2011). Support in Development of Child Protection Information Management System (CPIMS). Power Point presentation.

## Issue-Specific Reports

Ager, Alastair, Anne Bernard, Kerry Richter, and Pimonpan Isarabhakdi (2009). Children and the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami: Evaluation of UNICEF's Response in Thailand, Final Report. Prepared for UNICEF Thailand.\*

Chitradab, Somphong. (2007). Assessing Local Capacity for Developing and Protecting Children and Youths.

Economic Research and Training Center, Thammasat University. (2009). Decentralization and the Budget for Social Services at the Tambon Administrative Level. Bangkok, Thailand.

Loyola University Chicago and Civitas Child Law Center (2008). Building a Protective Environment for Children in Thailand: An Assessment of Child Protection Laws and Regulations (Draft). Prepared for UNICEF Thailand.

Mapping of Child Protection in Educational Setting –Thailand Country Report. (Year unavailable).

Mongkolnchaiarunya, Jitti. (2009). Social Work Education and Profession in Thailand: Sunrise or Sunset. Paper presented at the Seoul International Social Work Conference. Seoul, South Korea.

Psychosocial Support and Children's Rights Resource Center. (2009). Capacity Analysis of the Child Protection System in the Southern-Border Provinces of Thailand (Final Draft).

Thompson, Guy. (Year unavailable). Summary of Key Findings\*.

UNICEF Thailand. (2007). Situation Analysis Report: Strengthening Alternative Care Options for Children without Parental Care in the Tsunami Affected Provinces. Bangkok, Thailand.

UNICEF Thailand. (2011). Situation Analysis of Children and Women 2011. Bangkok, Thailand.\*

## Laws

Act on Establishment of Juvenile and Family Courts and Procedure for Juvenile and Family Cases, B.E. 2534. (1991).

Act on Juvenile and Family Court and Procedure, B.E. 2553. (2010).

Act on Protection of Victims of Domestic Violence, B.E. 2550. (2007).

Anti-Trafficking Persons Act, B.E. 2551. (2008).

Begging Act. (1941). (Thai)

Cases of Appointment of Guardianship According to the Civil and Commercial Code, Sections 1585 and 1586. (Year unavailable).

Child Protection Act of 2003. (2003).

Civil Registration Act (No.2), B.E. 2551. (2008). (Thai)

Computer Crime Act. (2007).

Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, B.E. 2540, The Constituent Assembly, The Secretariat of the House of Representatives. (1997).

Constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand, B.E. 2550, The Constituent Assembly, The Secretariat of the House of Representatives. (2007).

Criminal Procedure Code. (1934). (Thai)

Criminal Procedure Code. (1956). (Thai)

Domestic Violence Act flowchart. (2007).

Extradition Act, B.E. 2472. (1929).

Immigration Act, B.E. 2522. (1979).

Kitisin, Phicheth. (2006). The Legislative Power of Thailand: the National Legislative Assembly. Bangkok, Thailand: Secretariat of the Senate.

Labour Protection Act, B.E. 2541, Legal Affairs Division, Department of Labour, Protection and Welfare. (1998).

List of Laws Related to the Recruitment and Use of Child Soldiers. (Year unavailable). (Thai)

“Ministry of Social Development and Human Security’s Regulation on the Punishment of Children 2005.” (2005, May 19). The Government Gazette, Vol. 22, Section 40.

Ministerial Regulations and Regulations Published in the Government Gazette in accordance with the Child Protection Act 2003. (2005, 2006). The Government Gazette.

Nationality Act, B.E. 2508. (1965).

Nationality Act (No. 2), B.E. 2535. (1992).

Nationality Law of Thailand. (Year unavailable).

National Strategies on Status and Rights of Individuals. (Year unavailable).

Note on Children and Thai Boxing. (Year unavailable).

Prevention and Suppression of Prostitution Act, B.E. 2539. (1996).

Thai Criminal Law Question and Answer. (Year unavailable).

UNHCR Thailand. (Year unavailable). The Legal Rights of Refugee Survivors of Sexual and Gender-Based Violence. Legal pamphlet.

Witness Protection Act. (2003). (Thai)

## Policy

Labour Protection Network Development and Promotion Group, Labour Protection Bureau, Department of Labour Protection and Welfare. (Year unavailable). National Policy and Plan to Eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labour, 2009-2014.

## Structures

Mapping the System: Bodies with Responsibility for Child Protection/Implementation of the Laws. (Year unavailable). Power Point presentation.

Organizational Structure of the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (Child protection and family support relevant functions). (Year unavailable).

## Statistics

Bureau of Health System Development. (2010). Situation of Violence Against Women and Children. Power Point presentation.

Situation of Children in Protective Services of Ministry of SDHS. (Year unavailable). Power Point presentation.



## Appendix V Evaluation Respondents

Name	Title	Organization
<b>UNICEF and UNICEF Thailand</b>		
Sirirath Chunnasart	Child Protection Officer	UNICEF Thailand
Victoria Juat	Chief, Child Protection	UNICEF Thailand
Alexander Krueger	Child Protection Specialist in UNICEF Thailand for the Tsunami response	UNICEF Thailand
Andrew Morris	Deputy Representative	UNICEF Thailand
Ada Ocampo	Regional Advisor, Evaluation	UNICEF EAPRO
<b>Other project partners</b>		
Dr. George Attig	CPMS Project Manager	Mahidol University, Institute of Nutrition
Nantaporn leumwananonthachai	Lecturer	Faculty of Social Work Administration, Thammasat University
Apinya Wechayachai	Professor	Faculty of Social Work Administration, Thammasat University
<b>Royal Thai Government</b>		
Mr. Thanakorn Chatphuti	IT Technical Specialist	Secretariat Office of the National Child Protection Office, Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
Dr. Saisuree Chutikul	Chair of the Subcommittee on Child Protection System	Office of Welfare Promotion, Protection and Empowerment of Vulnerable Groups; MSDHS
Charnna Iamsang	Deputy Director General	Department of Local Administration
Achima Kerdklao	Public Health Technical Specialist	Ministry of Public Health
Vanpa Lumjeakthes	Deputy Director	Secretariat Office of the National Child Protection Office, Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
Wattana Phaisurat	Director, Division of Technical Services and Foreign Affairs	Department of Local Administration
Wit Prasompluem	Plan and Policy Analyst, Practitioner Level, Division of Technical Services and Foreign Affairs	Department of Local Administration
Akeosot Rak-eaad	Educator, Professional Level, Bureau of Local Educational Development and Coordination	Department of Local Administration
Dr. Kattiya Rattabadilok	Focal point on the project to develop "guideline on referral and treatment of children under the minimum age of criminal responsibility"	Department of Juvenile Observation and Protection, Ministry of Justice
Wimai Srijantra	Specialist	Department of Juvenile Observation and Protection, Ministry of Justice

## Evaluation of the CPMRS in Thailand - Volume II - Appendices - Final Report

Name	Title	Organization
Mr. Aphichart Jarusiri	Director for the Justice System Development	Department of Juvenile Observation and Protection, Ministry of Justice
Dr. Charnvit Thrarathep	Deputy Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Public Health
Aoithip Tohmudlae	Focal Person of NFDC and the Case Manager Project	Office of Women Affairs and Family Development, Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
Boonploy Tulapan	Focal Person of OSCC, Technical Support Unit, Office of the Permanent Secretary,	Ministry of Public Health
Suporn Wattanajung		Secretariat Office of the National Child Protection Office, Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
Dhana Yantrakovit	Director, Bureau of Social Economic and Public Participation	Department of Local Administration
<b>National Child Protection Committee (NCPC)</b>		
Sanphasit Koomprapant	Former Director of the Centre for the Protection of Children's Rights and Member of NCPC	National Child Protection Committee
Sudarat Sereewat	Director of FACE: Fight Against Child Exploitation, member of Coordinating and Monitoring of Anti-Trafficking in Persons Performance Committee and Member of NCPC	National Child Protection Committee
Vanpa Sukkong	Director	National Child Protection Committee
Wanlop Tangkhananurak	Secretary-General of the Children Creation Foundation and Member of NCPC	National Child Protection Committee
Dr. Panpimol Wipulakorn	Director of the Rajanukul Institute and Member of NCPC	National Child Protection Committee
<b>Ranong Province</b>		
Cherdsak Champathet	Governor of Ranong	Ranong Provincial Government
Chanakarn Chum-Aksom	Community Development Assistant and Case Manager	Bang-Nam-Jeud TAO
Watcharin Maneerat	Community Development Assistant and Case Manager	Ban-Na TAO
Sasiporn Mannontharat	Social Worker of the Provincial Social Development and Human Security (PSDHS)	Ranong Provincial Government
Ratree Mungsathong	Social Worker, OSCC	Ranong Hospital
Pumipat Musika	Community Development Assistant and Case Manager	Bang-Non TAO
Chintana Noo-Rak	Secretary	Bang-Hin TAO
Piyawan Samonwit	Social Worker, OSCC	Ranong Hospital
Patcharee Sangwanwong	Community Development Officer	Ranong Provincial SDHS Office
Nongyao Sanwongsa	Community Development Officer and Case Manager	Jor Por Ror TAO

Name	Title	Organization
Wichai Sricharan	Head	Bang-Hin TAO
Pornthip Suksaran	Head of the PSDHS	Ranong Provincial Government
Kamron Wongchan-In	Community Development Assistant and Case Manager	Bang-Hin TAO
Panchamas Wongpanit	Local Tax Collection Officer and Case Manager	Had Som Pan TAO
Pranee Yen-La-Ong	Head	Ranong Reception Home for Children and Women
<b>Suphanburi Province</b>		
Sumalee Banleng	Director	Suphanburi Reception Home for Children and Family
Arphaporn Boonmee	Social Worker	Suphanburi Reception Home for Children and Family
Jaithip Chinsuwan	Head	Rai Rod TAO
Somyos Choenbamrung	Chairman, OSCC Committee	Chao Phra Ya Yommarat Hospital
Somchai Lertpongpakorn	Deputy Governor	Suphanburi Provincial Government
Preeyaporn Mangmee	Senior Administration Officer of the Provincial SDHS Office for the New Family Development Center and Case Managers	Suphanburi Provincial SDHS Office
Khun Manoch	Provincial SDHS Officer and Social Worker	Supanburi Provincial SDHS Office
Nawin Pikulthong	Head	Tup Kee Lek TAO
Naunchan Radhi	Community Development Officer of and Case Manager	Tup Kee Lek TAO
Ms. Sathita Thong-Aak	ER Nurse and Secretary Assistant, OSCC Committee	Chao Phra Ya Yommarat Hospital
Narong Sikarinporn	Head, Social Development Division	Suphanburi Provincial SDHS Office
Bannapat Tepnarong	Psychologist	Suphanburi Reception Home for Children and Family
Nalinee Tiewwattanawiwat	OBGYN and Deputy Chairman, OSCC Committee	Chao Phra Ya Yommarat Hospital
Ms. Wilai Nedhasanai	Head of Social Welfare Service and the Secretary, OSCC Committee	Chao Phra Ya Yommarat Hospital
<b>Trang Province</b>		
Manasnan Chuchit	New Family Development Center Member	Thungtoh TAO
Srihattaya Chusuwan	Head	Trang Provincial SDHS Office
Siroos Gimthieng	Community Development Officer	Bangrak TAO
Chaowalit Hankij	Assistant to the Policy Analysis and Planning Officer and Case Manager	Tha-Ngeaw TAO
Thammathas Kiyun	Head	Tha-Ngeaw TAO
Theerayut lam-Trakul	Governor	Trang Provincial Government

## Evaluation of the CPMRS in Thailand - Volume II - Appendices - Final Report

Name	Title	Organization
Saowalak Khaowdee	Community Development Officer	Koh Sukorn TAO
Pongwit Mingmueng	Community Development Officer	Na-Taum Tai TAO
Piyarat Nu-Sing	Social Worker	Trang Reception Home
Juthamas Pohthong	Assistant to the Community Development Officer	Bang-Pao TAO
Chaiyuth Saksornchai	Director	Trang Hospital
Suksiri Serirak	Social Development Officer	Trang SDHS
Thanyapat Tesnok	Assistant to the Community Development Officer	Koh Sukorn TAO
Paravee Wattasing	Head	Trang Reception Home
<b>Ubonratchathani Province</b>		
Nonthanan Amphan	Community Development Officer	Nayear Municipality
Saowalak Jirakaikosol	Head	Ubonratchathani Provincial SDHS Office
Nanaphas Kanthachan	Social Worker Specialist	Saphasitprasong Hospital
Sirilak Kunu	Social Development Specialist	Ubonratchathani Provincial SDHS Office
Waratchaya Laow-Ken	Community Development Officer	Kudyaluan TAO
Pakinee Mak-Naun	Community Development Officer	Konsai TAO
Natkanin Malasai	Head	Ubonratchathani Reception Home
Thongkam Mee-Hiri	Head	Konsai TAO
Sukritta Pak-wan	Community Development Officer	Kam-Yai Municipality
Pattamapa Pimpan	Community Development Officer	Pah-Mong TAO
Joung Polsan	Deputy Head	Konsai TAO
Peungned Sakritniran	Head of the OSCC and Psychiatric Department for Children and Adolescents	Saphasitprasong Hospital
Napa Sakuntanak	Deputy Governor	Ubonratchathani Provincial Government
Sunthorn Uttha	Social Development Specialist, responsible for the New Family Development Centers	Ubon Provincial SDHS Office
Wiparat Wangsuthisomsri	Social Worker	Ubonratchathani Reception Home

NB: In each of the four provinces, group interviews were also conducted with the following groups of respondents:

- Multi Disciplinary Team (Provincial Level)
- New Family Development Centre (Sub-district Level / TAO)
- Community Members: Mothers (Sub-district Level / TAO)
- Community Members: Fathers (Sub-district Level / TAO)
- Community Leaders (Sub-district Level / TAO)

## Appendix VI Sample Interview Protocols<sup>5</sup>

### Interview Protocol – UNICEF Thailand Country Office

Universalia Management Group, a Canadian management consulting firm and Child Frontiers, a consulting company specialised in child protection based in Malaysia, were contracted by UNICEF Thailand to conduct the evaluation of the *Child Protection Monitoring and Response System (CPMRS)*. The evaluation aims to determine the extent to which the CPMRS has met its objectives and to provide recommendations for the refinement and potential scaling up of the CPMRS approach to the national level.

Please be assured that all interviews conducted as part of the data collection process will be treated **confidentially**, and that information will only be shared in **anonymously or in aggregated** forms.

#### 1. Introduction

- Please briefly describe yourself in terms of: your current position at UNICEF Thailand and how long you have been in that position. What are your key responsibilities?
- How familiar are you with UNICEF's work in child protection in Thailand? To what extent and in what ways (if any) have you been directly involved in the CPMRS project?

#### 2. Context

- Who are the key players in Child Protection in Thailand? How does UNICEF relate to/complement them?
- During the past five years (since 2008), what have been the key developments or changes in child protection in Thailand? e.g. in terms of the policy context; legislation; implementation of services; government, donor and civil society capacity; political will; UNICEF's involvement.
- Was the CPMRS developed keeping these various issues in mind? How did (if applicable) it attempt to address any or all of these issues? What were the key challenges faced?
- What, if any, alternative or additional frameworks, concepts or ideas are influencing the national development discourse on child protection? (e.g. UN Reform agenda)
- What do you think should be the key areas of focus for UNICEF Thailand, in Child Protection for the next five years?

#### 3. Relevance

- How relevant has the CPMRS been in view of the existing priorities and strategies on child protection of a) the Thai government and b) UNICEF? Has it altered the direction of these priorities in any way? How?
- To what extent did the program complement, build on, or duplicate existing or past efforts in child protection?

---

<sup>5</sup> Questions regarding the alignment of the project with international conventions such as the CRC and CEDAW were asked only of UNICEF staff since, in the evaluation team's experience, other respondents are usually unfamiliar with these. However, when respondents appeared familiar with them, the questions were added.

- How relevant has the CPMRS been in the immediate context of creating a monitoring and response system for disaster rehabilitation? e.g. in terms of its design, accessibility and usage by the government, NGOs, communities etc.
- To what extent does the CPMRS contribute to aligning child protection services in Thailand with international conventions and agreements, such as the CRC and CEDAW?

#### **4. Effectiveness**

- In your view, what are the main results of the project at a) the national level and b) the community level? Were the expectations from the CPMRS achieved at both these levels? If not, why?
- Has the CPMRS been useful in strengthening the knowledge of the national government in terms of child protection strategies/approaches? If so, has this led to any unanticipated results (positive or negative) in the programme?
- What have been key factors supporting or hindering the work of the CPMRS? E.g. contextual factors, management related factors, chosen strategies/approaches, time etc.
- To what extent and in what ways (if applicable), did the programme involve local communities over the course of its implementation?

#### **5. Efficiency**

- What have been the most important strengths and weaknesses of the CPMRS's design, management structure and implementation processes? E.g. in staffing; interaction of national and community levels; planning; monitoring and reporting; resource management; management and dissemination of knowledge/databases etc.
- To what extent have program resources been allocated strategically to achieve the expected results? Are there examples where you feel resources could have been used more efficiently/strategically? How?

#### **6. Sustainability**

- Which results are likely to be sustained after UNICEF support ends? Which are not? Why?
- Does the national government have increased capacity to support and manage the CPMRS?
- Was there any in-built sustainability mechanism factored into the initial design of the CPMRS, both in terms of financial sustainability and functional sustainability?

#### **7. Cross-cutting Concerns**

- How well do you think the CPMRS has integrated cross-cutting issues such as cultural norms/practices, gender, equity etc. into its design and implementation? Has it omitted any such areas? If so, why?

#### **8. Lessons learned and Future Directions**

- What, if any, lessons have you learned during program implementation that may be relevant in furthering the development of child protection in Thailand? What could have been done differently and why?
- Keeping these lessons in mind, how do you think the CPMRS can be improved/changed in the future?

## Interview Protocol – Government – CPMRS Management and Operations

Universalia Management Group, a Canadian management consulting firm and Child Frontiers, a consulting company specialised in child protection based in Malaysia, were contracted by UNICEF Thailand to conduct the evaluation of the *Child Protection Monitoring and Response System (CPMRS)*. The evaluation aims to determine the extent to which the CPMRS has met its objectives and to provide recommendations for the refinement and potential scaling up of the CPMRS approach to the national level.

Please be assured that all interviews conducted as part of the data collection process for this evaluation will be treated **confidentially**, and that information will only be shared in **anonymously or in aggregated** forms.

### 1. Introduction

- Please briefly describe yourself in terms of: your current position in the CPMRS and how long you have been in that position. What are your key responsibilities in managing the CPMRS?
- How familiar are you with the work of various stakeholders in child protection in Thailand?

### 2. Context

- Who are the key players in Child Protection in Thailand? How does your work in CPMRS relate to/complement them?
- During the past five years (since 2008), what have been the key developments or changes in child protection in Thailand? e.g. in terms of the policy context; legislation; implementation of services; government, donor and civil society capacity; political will
- Was the CPMRS developed keeping these various issues in mind? How did (if applicable) it attempt to address any or all of these issues? What were the key challenges faced?
- What, if any, alternative or additional frameworks, concepts or ideas are influencing the national development discourse on child protection? (e.g. UN Reform agenda)
- What do you think should be the key areas of focus of the Thai government in Child Protection for the next five years?

### 3. Relevance

- How relevant has the CPMRS been in view of the existing priorities and strategies on child protection of the Thai government? Has it altered the direction of these priorities in any way? How?
- To what extent did the program complement, build on, or duplicate existing or past efforts in child protection initiated by the government?
- How relevant has the CPMRS been in the immediate context of creating a monitoring and response system for disaster rehabilitation? e.g. in terms of its design, accessibility and usage by the government, NGOs, communities etc.

#### **4. Effectiveness**

- In your view, what are the main results of the project at a) the national level and b) the community level? Were the expectations from the CPMRS achieved at both these levels? If not, why?
- Has the CPMRS been useful in strengthening the knowledge of the national government in terms of child protection strategies/approaches? If so, has this led to any unanticipated results (positive or negative) in the programme?
- What have been key factors supporting or hindering the work of the CPMRS? E.g. contextual factors, management related factors, chosen strategies/approaches, time etc.
- To what extent and in what ways (if applicable), did the programme involve local communities over the course of its implementation?

#### **5. Efficiency**

- What have been the most important strengths and weaknesses of the CPMRS's design, management structure and implementation processes? E.g. in staffing; interaction of national and community levels; planning; monitoring and reporting; resource management; management and dissemination of knowledge/databases etc.
- To what extent have program resources been allocated strategically to achieve the expected results? Are there examples where you feel resources could have been used more efficiently/strategically? How?

#### **6. Sustainability**

- Which results are likely to be sustained after UNICEF support ends? Which are not? Why?
- Does the national government have increased capacity to support and manage the CPMRS?
- Was there any in-built sustainability mechanism factored into the initial design of the CPMRS, both in terms of financial sustainability and functional sustainability?

#### **7. Cross-cutting Concerns**

- How well do you think the CPMRS has integrated cross-cutting issues such as cultural norms/practices, gender etc. into its design and implementation? Has it omitted any such areas?

#### **8. Lessons learned and Future Directions**

- What, if any, lessons have you learned during program implementation that may be relevant in further developing the system of child protection in Thailand? What could have been done differently and why?
- Keeping these lessons in mind, how do you think the CPMRS can be improved/changed in the future?

**Thank you for your participation.**

## Interview Protocol – Government – Child Protection Policy

Universalia Management Group, a Canadian management consulting firm and Child Frontiers, a consulting company specialised in child protection based in Malaysia, were contracted by UNICEF Thailand to conduct the evaluation of the *Child Protection Monitoring and Response System (CPMRS)*. The evaluation aims to determine the extent to which the CPMRS has met its objectives and to provide recommendations for the refinement and potential scaling up of the CPMRS approach to the national level.

Please be assured that all interviews conducted as part of the data collection process for this evaluation will be treated **confidentially**, and that information will only be shared in **anonymously or in aggregated** forms.

### 1. Introduction

- Please briefly describe yourself in terms of: your current position in the government and how long you have been in that position. What are your key responsibilities?
- How familiar are you with the work of various stakeholders in child protection in Thailand?
- Please describe your knowledge of the Child Protection Monitoring and Response System (CPMRS) in Thailand and in what capacity.

### 2. Context

- Who are the key players in Child Protection in Thailand?
- During the past five years (since 2008), what have been the key developments or changes in child protection in Thailand? e.g. in terms of the policy context; legislation; implementation of services; government, donor and civil society capacity; political will.
- Was the CPMRS developed keeping these various issues in mind? How did (if applicable) it attempt to address any or all of these issues? What were the key challenges faced? (*ask only if respondent has strong knowledge of CPMRS*)
- What, if any, alternative or additional frameworks, concepts or ideas are influencing the national development discourse on child protection? (e.g. UN Reform agenda)
- What are the key priorities of focus for the Thai government in Child Protection for the next five years? What role, if any, should UNICEF play in assisting the Thai government to address those priorities?

*(If respondent has strong knowledge of/connection to CPMRS, ask all questions in the following section. If not, then end interview at this point)*

### 3. Relevance

- How relevant has the CPMRS been in view of the existing priorities and strategies on child protection of the Thai government? Has it altered the direction of these priorities in any way? How?
- To what extent did the program complement, build on, or duplicate existing or past efforts in child protection initiated by the government?

- How relevant has the CPMRS been in the immediate context of creating a monitoring and response system for disaster rehabilitation? e.g. in terms of its design, accessibility and usage by the government, NGOs, communities etc.

#### **4. Effectiveness**

- In your view, what are the main results of the project at a) the national level and b) the community level? Were the expectations from the CPMRS achieved at both these levels? If not, why?
- Has the CPMRS been useful in strengthening the knowledge of the national government in terms of child protection strategies/approaches? If so, has this led to any unanticipated results (positive or negative) in the programme?
- What have been key factors supporting or hindering the work of the CPMRS? E.g. contextual factors, management related factors, chosen strategies/approaches, time etc.
- To what extent and in what ways (if applicable), did the programme involve local communities over the course of its implementation?

#### **5. Efficiency**

- What have been the most important strengths and weaknesses of the CPMRS's design, management structure and implementation processes? E.g. in staffing; interaction of national and community levels; planning; monitoring and reporting; resource management; management and dissemination of knowledge/databases etc.
- To what extent have program resources been allocated strategically to achieve the expected results? Are there examples where you feel resources could have been used more efficiently/strategically? How?

#### **6. Sustainability**

- Which results are likely to be sustained after UNICEF support ends? Which are not? Why?
- Does the national government have increased capacity to support and manage the CPMRS?
- Was there any in-built sustainability mechanism factored into the initial design of the CPMRS, both in terms of financial sustainability and functional sustainability?

#### **7. Cross-cutting Concerns**

- How well do you think the CPMRS has integrated cross-cutting issues such as cultural norms/practices, gender etc. into its design and implementation? Has it omitted any such areas?

#### **8. Lessons learned and Future Directions**

- What, if any, lessons have you learned during program implementation that may be relevant in furthering the development of the child protection system in Thailand? What could have been done differently and why?
- Keeping these lessons in mind, how do you think the CPMRS can be improved/changed in the future?

**Thank you for your participation.**

## Interview Protocol – SSI: National Level Social Welfare Agencies

Universalia Management Group, a Canadian management consulting firm and Child Frontiers, a consulting company specialised in child protection based in Malaysia, were contracted by UNICEF Thailand to conduct the evaluation of the *Child Protection Monitoring and Response System (CPMRS)*. The evaluation aims to determine the extent to which the CPMRS has met its objectives and to provide recommendations for the refinement and potential scaling up of the CPMRS approach to the national level.

Please be assured that all interviews conducted as part of the data collection process for this evaluation will be treated **confidentially**, and that information will only be shared in **anonymously or in aggregated** forms.

### 1. Introduction

- What is the role of your agency in the child protection system?
- How is your agency structured / organized (organigram) at the national level?
- What formal systems components have been established to prevent and respond to violence, abuse and exploitation of children?
- Is there a national child protection system in Thailand? If so, which Ministry has lead responsibility and how is it structured?
- What are the main roles and responsibilities of your agency in relation to the CPMRS?
- What is the general level of awareness of the CPMRS at the national level? Do you feel that the CPMRS is viewed as part of the national child protection system?
- What are the perceptions about the relevance of the CPMRS? Is it perceived as helpful?
- What has been the biggest challenge in implementing the CPMRS? Why? How do you think this can be improved?
- What has been the most successful part of the CPMRS? Why?
- Is the CPMRS capable of finding, identifying and reaching less visible cases of abuse, violence and exploitation (including in the home)?
- Is it accessible to all families and children, especially those that are from the most marginalised / vulnerable communities?
- What resource gaps have you faced if any, in terms of staffing, financial resources, technical expertise in child protection etc.? How do you think these gaps can be filled?
- Did you notice anything missing in the CPMRS design that could have been useful for implementation?
- To what extent and in what ways (if applicable), did the CPMRS involve local communities over the course of its implementation?
- What do you think is required for the CPMRS to sustain its activities in your region, once UNICEF support ends (if applicable)?
- How well do you think the CPMRS has integrated [cross-cutting issues such as] cultural norms/practices, gender etc. into its design and implementation?

- What, if any, lessons have you learned during program implementation that may be relevant in furthering the scope of the CPMRS in the context of child protection in Thailand? What could have been done differently and why?

## **2. Coordination and planning**

- Are there national coordination mechanisms for child protection?
- What is the primary purpose of different coordination mechanisms?
- How do key stakeholders perceive the effectiveness of coordination between agencies?
- Is there a specific mechanism for the promotion, implementation and monitoring of the CPMRS?
- What are the processes for policy development in child protection?
- How has the roll-out of the CPMRS been incorporated into other sector planning?

## **3. Structures**

- What agency(ies) has primary responsibility for child welfare services? What the overall mandate, role and responsibilities of each agency in terms of child welfare? How are these agencies structured at the national and sub-national level to fulfill their main roles and responsibilities in relation to the prevention of and response to violence, abuse and exploitation of children?
- What are the specific mandates, roles and responsibilities assumed by other sectors / allied systems (health, education, labour, etc.) in child protection?
- In what ways have these structures been streamlined to implement the CPMRS?

## **4. Human and financial resources**

- To what extent has the program made progress against its stated objectives/results at a) the national level and b) the community level? Were the expectations from the CPMRS achieved at both these levels? If not, why?
- Is the system adequately resourced (human and financial) to support the CPMRS?
- What is the workforce of the key agency(ies) responsible for child protection at the national and sub-national levels?
- How many staff members dedicated specifically to support CPMRS services nationally?
- What are main constraints regarding human resources for the CPMRS?
- How many of these are specifically focused on providing services to children in need of protection?
- Have specialist trainings been organised for the application of the CPMRS?
- What is the annual budget available for the CPMRS in Thailand?
- What are the main constraints regarding financial resources for the CPMRS?
- Which budgeting system has the government adopted for the CPMRS? Does it use programme-based budgeting (MTEFS), allowing review of CP components in other sectors?

## 5. Services

- What is the government's overall approach to child protection service delivery through the CPMRS?
- In general, what is the reach and coverage of the system? Do services cover all communities without discrimination or access barriers?
- Are CPMRS programs and services primarily focused on particular categories of children? Is there focus on both prevention and response, and what is the “balance” between the two?
- Do services tend to focus exclusively on individuals, families or communities and in what ways?
- What formal mechanisms does the CPMRS use to identifying families and children in difficulty? What early intervention initiatives and services are available to help these families and children?
- What CPMRS services are available to children who have been victims of violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation (including welfare, justice, legal aid, health, education and other sectors)?
- What factors influence people’s decisions and choice about which parts of the child protection system (formal and informal) they use?
- Are there CPMRS standard protocols or procedures for how to deal with reported cases of child maltreatment? Who makes decisions regarding what interventions are required to protect and support a child who has been a victim of violence, abuse and exploitation?
- Is there a structured process for CPMRS assessment, case management and decision-making?
- To what extent are CPMRS mechanisms perceived as helpful and meaningful? Is it perceived as providing a good outcome?

## 6. Information management systems

- Are mechanisms in place for CPMRS monitoring and evaluation, as well as for measuring progress?
- What CPMRS information management systems are in place for child protection? Are these centralized and integrated with other national information management systems or managed separately?
- What CPMRS data is collected, and how is this data disaggregated?
- Are there mechanisms through which data and research can be used to inform policy development and service delivery planning?

## 7. Recommendations

- What do you consider to be the most important achievements of the CPMRS in the past five years for enhancing the protection of children?
- To what extent are the results realized to date likely to be sustained at the national, provincial and sub-district levels?
- To what extent was UNICEF support for CPMRS in Thailand effectively designed, planned, implemented, monitored, evaluated over the period 2007-12?
- What key challenges remain for the CPMRS?

- Please provide any key recommendations (not already mentioned) for improving the CPMRS
- What difference / impact do you think such recommendations would make?

**Thank you for your participation.**

## Interview Protocol – SSI: Provincial/Tambon Social Welfare Service Officers

Universalia Management Group, a Canadian management consulting firm and Child Frontiers, a consulting company specialised in child protection based in Malaysia, were contracted by UNICEF Thailand to conduct the evaluation of the *Child Protection Monitoring and Response System (CPMRS)*. The evaluation aims to determine the extent to which the CPMRS has met its objectives and to provide recommendations for the refinement and potential scaling up of the CPMRS approach to the national level.

Please be assured that all interviews conducted as part of the data collection process for this evaluation will be treated **confidentially**, and that information will only be shared in **anonymously or in aggregated** forms.

### **PROVINCIAL LEVEL:**

Head of OSCC, Head of Shelter Home (Baan Pak Dek) SDHS Officer responsible for NFDC, Head of SDHS

### **TAMBON LEVEL:**

Head of TAO (if knowledgeable about the CPMRS) or the person responsible for the CPM at the tambon level, Planning Officer

### **1. Introduction**

- How is the [service / department] structured / organized (organigram) at the provincial / tambon level?
- What is the scope of the [service / department] at provincial / tambon level?
- What are the [department] main roles and responsibilities in relation to the CPMRS?
- What formal system components have been established to prevent and respond to violence, abuse and exploitation of children?
- What has been your biggest challenge in implementing the CPMRS in your region? Why? How do you think this can be improved?
- What is the general level of awareness of the CPMRS at the provincial / tambon level?
- What are the perceptions about the relevance of the CPMRS? Is it perceived as helpful?
- What has been the most successful part of the CPMRS in your region? Why?
- What resource gaps have you faced if any, in terms of staffing, financial resources, technical expertise in child protection etc.? How do you think these gaps can be filled?
- Did you notice anything missing in the CPMRS design that could have been useful for implementation?

- To what extent and in what ways (if applicable), did the CPMRS programme involve local communities over the course of its implementation?
- What do you think is required for the CPMRS programme to sustain its activities in your region, once UNICEF support ends (if applicable)?
- How well do you think the CPMRS has integrated [cross-cutting issues such as] cultural norms/practices, gender etc. into its design and implementation?
- How has the CPMRS changed in the 2007 – 2012 time period? How have government child protection priorities and programs changed over this period?
- In your opinion, was UNICEF support for CPMRS in Thailand effectively designed, planned, implemented, monitored, evaluated over the period 2007-12? Why / why not?
- What, if any, lessons have you learned during program implementation that may be relevant in furthering the scope of the CPMRS in the context of child protection in Thailand? What could have been done differently and why?

## **2. Coordination and planning**

- What inter-agency coordination mechanisms exist at the local level for delivery of services?
- Are coordination mechanisms organised around specific welfare issues?
- Which agency leads these coordination mechanisms and which agencies participate?

## **3. Human and financial resources**

- Is the system adequately resourced (human and financial) to support the CPMRS?
- How many staff members in your agency are directly involved in the CPMRS?
- What are main constraints regarding human resources for the CPMRS?
- What is the annual budget available for the CPMRS? Where does this funding come from?
- What are the main constraints regarding financial resources for the CPMRS?

## **4. Services**

- To what extent are the formal services functioning at the local level in accordance with the national design? Why is this so?
- Is the CPMRS capable of finding, identifying and reaching less visible cases of abuse, violence and exploitation (including in the home)?
- To what extent do CPMRS services function effectively and efficiently?
- In general, what is the reach and coverage of the system? Do services cover all communities without discrimination or access barriers?
- In what circumstances are children removed from their families and what is the process for removing them? Who follows up on the family /child afterwards?
- Do you think CPMRS services reach and apply to all people equally?
- To what extent are formal service structures linked to informal community based practices or caring mechanisms?

## 5. Information management systems

- What child protection information management systems are in place at the local level?
- How is data that is collected used? Does this inform project activities and strategic planning?

## 6. Additional questions

- What has been your biggest challenge in implementing the CPMRS in your region? Why? How do you think this can be improved?
- What has been the most successful part of the CPMRS in your region? Why?
- What resource gaps have you faced if any, in terms of staffing, financial resources, technical expertise in child protection etc.? How do you think these gaps can be filled?
- Did you notice anything missing in the programme design that could have been useful for implementation?
- To what extent and in what ways (if applicable), did the programme involve local communities over the course of its implementation?
- What do you think is required for the programme to sustain its activities in your region, once UNICEF support ends (if applicable)?
- How well do you think the CPMRS has integrated [cross-cutting issues such as] cultural norms/practices, gender etc. into its design and implementation?
- What, if any, lessons have you learned during program implementation that may be relevant in furthering the scope of the CPMRS in the context of child protection in Thailand? What could have been done differently and why?

## 7. Recommendations

- What, if any, lessons have you learned during program implementation that may be relevant in furthering the scope of the CPMRS in the context of child protection in Thailand? What could have been done differently and why?
- To what extent are the results realized to date likely to be sustained at the national, provincial and sub-district levels?
- What key challenges remain?
- Please provide any key recommendations (not already mentioned) for improving the CPMRS in your province / tambon.

**Thank you for your participation.**

## Interview Protocol – CPMRS families and beneficiaries

Universalia Management Group, a Canadian management consulting firm and Child Frontiers, a consulting company specialised in child protection based in Malaysia, were contracted by UNICEF Thailand to conduct the evaluation of the *Child Protection Monitoring and Response System (CPMRS)*. The evaluation aims to determine the extent to which the CPMRS has met its objectives and to provide recommendations for the refinement and potential scaling up of the CPMRS approach to the national level.

Please be assured that all interviews conducted as part of the data collection process for this evaluation will be treated **confidentially**, and that information will only be shared in **anonymously or in aggregated** forms.

### 1. Introduction

- Are you aware of what the CPMRS is? If yes, how did you get to know of it?
- Were there any child protection service providers in your village/region before the CPMRS? If so, who?
- What has been the most useful service to you provided by the CPMRS? What has been the least useful? Why?
- Have you seen any difference in the way child protection services used to be provided to you before the CPMRS and the way they are now? If yes, what?
- Do you feel children are safer in your village/community now than they were before (the CPMRS programme)? If no, why?
- What improvements would you like to see in the CPMRS in the future?

**Thank you for your participation.**



## Appendix VII Questionnaire: Service Providers

The questionnaire will be distributed in hard copy at the conclusion of the group discussion with service providers. Surveys will be completed in Thai by the respondents and translated into English by the research team for data entry into the online tool for analysis.

The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete and should be returned by participants at the end of the session. Facilitators will be available to help participants with any questions they may have. The facilitator will explain the objectives of the questionnaire (below) to all participants prior to distribution.

- To collect information about individuals' work profile, experience and agency
- To document perceptions of the CPMRS and quality of services provided to families & children

1. I work for:

2. I currently work as a:

3. I have been working in this current service / program for:

- 1 year
- 2-3 years
- 4 years
- Between 5 -10 years
- Between 10 and 15 years
- More than 15 years

4. I have received specialized training to perform the child protection related tasks of my job:

- Yes
- No

5. Do those with responsibility for child protection understand their roles and responsibilities?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

6. To what extent are those with responsibility to protect children adequately trained to fulfill their roles?

- Well
- Satisfactory
- Poorly
- Not trained

7. Are services provided for children and families by the Case Manager adequately funded to function effectively?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

8. Is the Case Manager able to refer children & families to other services if needed?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

9. Are you aware of the TAO level management Working Group?
- Yes
  - No
  - I don't know
10. If so, do you think TAO level management Working Group is active / effective?
- Yes
  - No
  - I don't know
11. Do you think the Case Manager works to respond to children's welfare needs:
- Very well
  - Satisfactorily
  - Poorly
  - Not at all
12. Do all children and families have equal access to help from the Case Manager?
- Yes
  - No
  - I don't know
13. How many cases of abuse, violence, exploitation and neglect is the Case Manager able to identify and reach?
- All cases
  - Most cases
  - Some cases
  - Very few cases
  - No cases
14. In your opinion, are communities, families and children aware of the Case Manager's services?
- YES
  - NO
  - I don't know
15. Do you think communities consider the Case Manager services relevant and helpful for them?
- Yes
  - No
  - I don't know
16. If the Case Manager's services are not widely used, where else can children and families go for help?
17. In your opinion, do Case Manager services provide good outcomes for children?
- Always
  - Sometimes
  - Rarely
18. How often is information collected by the monitoring system?
- Monthly
  - Yearly
  - Never
  - I don't know

19. Do you think the information collected by the monitoring system is used effectively?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

20. Have you heard of the Child Protection Manual?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

21. If so, do you think it is being used by service providers?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

22. Do you have any recommendations for improving the Case Manager services to children and families at risk of abuse, violence and exploitation?



## Appendix VIII Case Stories

Illustrative case stories from service providers

### Case Story A

A village headman described the case of a family in his community with three children. Community members are concerned that the eldest girl is at risk of sexual abuse. The parents reportedly have substance abuse issues and will not let anyone remove the children. The children are made to steal for their parents and may be emotionally abused. Community members reported their concerns about the future of these children and referred the case to the Case Manager over a year ago. However, no service or assistance has been provided.

The Case Manager explained that when information about a case is referred, her role is to coordinate with appropriate agencies, so that children receive assistance. This particular case was reportedly referred to Children's Reception Home, but due to priority of the case and staff and resource limitations, nothing has been done.

The Case Manager added that if the parents do not want assistance, nothing can be done. A participant suggested that it would be useful if the Children's Reception Home could provide Guidelines about how cases are prioritised, as well as definitions of each type of case, so that community members can be selective in referral and have appropriate expectations of services to be provided.

### Case Story B

A girl aged eight (in 2<sup>nd</sup> grade) who was adopted by her neighbour has been allegedly raped repeatedly (at least five times) for over a year by a community member. The Case Manager learned of this through the NFDC during the CPMS data collection process – apparently everyone in the community has been aware of this situation for a long period of time but nobody has reported or addressed it. A community contact of the Case Manager is related to the family and advised the Case Manager not to take any action on the grounds that nobody in the family wants to take formal action. She specifically advised not to talk to the mother, because she will not cooperate. All of the family members reportedly know of the abuse, but they do not want outsiders involved and refuse to report.

The alleged perpetrator is an elderly man who has a family member married to a foreigner, so is reportedly wealthy. The Case Managers believe this alleged perpetrator may be abusing many children in the community. At present, he is still living there and so is the child victim – no formal action has been taken. The parents have reportedly informally negotiated with the perpetrator, who compensated the victim 20,000 baht per incident. The Case Manager says that she cannot take any further action because the family will not lodge a formal complaint.

On Children's Day, the TAO Head asked children at a public event what should be done for children in their community and a girl stood up to say that sexual abuse of children should be stopped. This was a surprising statement to come from an 8-year old child and the Case Manager identified her as the victim. The child publicly requested the TAO to take action because her family would not.

### Case Story C

A 15-year-old girl who lives with her mother and Laotian stepfather was allegedly raped repeatedly by her stepfather and is now pregnant. The NFDC members found out about the case when the girl was 3-4 months pregnant – she is now due to give birth in 1-2 months. Everyone in the community is reportedly aware that the stepfather is responsible, but nobody feels that it is appropriate to intervene or take any action. The village headman, who is also head of the NFDC, lives opposite the family and says that he

cannot do anything to help the girl. The girl has not talked about the situation to anyone and has been taken out of school. They are not sure what will happen when the baby arrives.

The Case Manager said that they have tried to meet with the girl, but nobody will talk, so she is still living with her mother and stepfather. The Case Manager learned about the case from distant community members – the family, headman, and other officials have not reported or addressed this issue. The Case Manager contacted other community leaders to ask them to speak with the Village Head about the situation – he admitted this had happened and that nothing had been done.

According to the Case Manager, the primary concern is what will happen to the family if a police report is filed. The stepfather is allegedly an illegal immigrant, so will most likely be deported – however he is the sole breadwinner and the mother is handicapped and cannot work to support herself and her daughter. The Case Managers had a group discussion about this case and as they were unable to get any information from the girl, no action has been taken. The Children's Reception Home will only take action if the mother agrees to cooperate.

### **Case Story D**

An 18-year-old disabled girl has allegedly been repeatedly raped by another community member. She lives with her elderly father, who is deaf, and is left alone while others are at work. A Community Volunteer for the elderly reported the case to the Case Manager, who went with local authorities to investigate. At first the girl didn't want to talk and said this only happened one time – they discovered that the perpetrator may also have been giving the girl money. The Case Manager consulted with the mother and asked her to report to police, but she did not. A negotiation was conducted between the family and perpetrator, who reportedly agreed to pay 40,000 baht payment with no formal record or report. The payment was not made, so the Case Manager contacted the Children's Reception Home and reported to SDHS to decide next steps. They found out later that the perpetrator ultimately paid the family 20,000 baht. The Case Manager took the girl for a health check at hospital, checked for HIV and other diseases. At the hospital, tests showed that the child could get pregnant, so they are considering giving her shots for birth control.

The Case Manager first became aware of this case 8 months ago and has been directly involved for the past two months (approximately 6 months was spent collecting information). The alleged perpetrator still lives in the community, as does the girl. The Case Manager believes that this alleged perpetrator is probably abusing other girls too. He is an influential person in the community and therefore the Case Managers state that there is nothing they can do to prevent this. The mother, family, and other people in the community will not formally report the case. Lawyers in the community are reportedly taking advantage of the mother, offering to try to force the perpetrator to pay more, for an advance fee of 10,000 baht.

The Case Manager feels that this is a very risky situation and when she became directly involved, her tires were slashed. The Case Manager has tried to work through local community mechanisms, asking community leaders (who the perpetrator may be intimidated by) to verbally warn him to ensure that the abuse / exploitation is stopped, using community law to enforce this. However, community leaders have not yet taken any action in this case. The Case Manager said that she has also been in touch with Children's Reception Home by phone, as well as submitted formal letters. The Children's Reception Home does not think it is necessary to take action at the moment.

## Appendix IX Reconstructed Results Framework<sup>6</sup>

Main objective	Specific Objectives	Components	Activities	Results	
<b>Create a model integrated child protection monitoring and response system for application at community, TAO, and provincial levels.</b>	A) To increase awareness and facilitate action planning on child protection for TAO officials, teachers, and community members, including children and youth.	1. National and Provincial Advocacy Briefing	1.1 Stakeholder briefing to be conducted by UNICEF and INMU officials at the national level with the Permanent-Secretary of the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security, as well as at the provincial level with each Governor and Provincial Social Development and Human Security officials.	a) Verbal/ Oral agreements from the national and provincial government authorities to undertake the project with the agreed upon objectives, components, and activities.	
				b) National and provincial government focal points identified in order to encourage their collaboration in the project and its expansion and sustainability.	
		2. Awareness Raising and Local Action Planning	2.1 Selection of TAOs for participation in the project.		
					2.2 TAO project briefing to gain TAO acceptance of the project, as well as to identify coordinating focal points within each TAO through which the project can be conducted.
			2.3 Child rights/protection sensitization workshops in each participating TAO to raise awareness on the concept of child protection, reduce its social sensitivity, and bring important child protection issues within communities and sub-districts to the forefront.		a) Local stakeholders have a clear understanding of children's rights (protection), and a commitment to them;
					b) Stakeholders identify what "child protection" concretely means;
c) Stakeholders design and prioritize local child protection indicators;					

<sup>6</sup> This reconstructed framework was developed by the evaluation team, based on a review of documents made available by UNICEF during the Inception Phase. It will be fine-tuned as required with input from key stakeholders during the course of the evaluation.

Main objective	Specific Objectives	Components	Activities	Results
				<p>d) Stakeholders create plans to identify major child protection issues, and identify and undertake local interventions with support authorities to strengthen child protection within their communities and TAOs.</p>
				<p>e) Stakeholders establish mechanisms to monitor the status of child protection (through the CPMS), as well as to participate in referral and case management systems (through the CPRS) to deal with critical child protection issues.</p>
				<p>f) Stakeholders begin to establish local partnerships with government agencies, NGOs, the private sector, etc. to secure ongoing assistance and facilitate sustainability.</p>
			2.4 Child rights/protection sensitization workshops for school children especially.	<p>a) Identification of important child protection issues from a children's perspective.</p>
				<p>b) Relevant indicators for inclusion in the CPMS.</p>
				<p>c) Practical student-initiated action plans for child protection activities within schools and communities.</p>

Main objective	Specific Objectives	Components	Activities	Results
	<p>B) To develop a child protection communication package for raising awareness, prevention, and providing necessary information for effective responses (e.g., printed and audio materials, “child line,” youth radio programs, Web site).</p>	<p>3. Communication for Child Protection</p>	<p>3.1 Development of a child protection communication package that uses inter-personal channels, audio-visual and mass media, printed materials, etc</p> <p>3.2 Review of existing child protection communication resources within UNICEF, INMU (i.e., those of the CHILD project), and other relevant organizations;</p>	<p>a) Awareness and understanding is increased among local stakeholders of what is meant by “child protection” and the situations that place children in unsafe situations.</p> <p>b) “Child protection” is brought to the forefront as an important issue for child, family, and community development, not simply as something that should be “hidden”.</p> <p>c) Guidance to and support for local stakeholders is provided for developing and taking actions to protect children from abuse, neglect, and exploitation.</p> <p>d) Community members have acquired knowledge on how to respond to cases of child abuse, neglect, or exploitation with regard to the project’s CPRS and child protection service delivery personnel.</p> <p>e) Children have an understanding on how to protect themselves and how to seek assistance in times of urgency.</p> <p>f) Increased likelihood of the child protection project’s success, since its communication strategy takes into account the attitudes, perceived needs, and capacities of local stakeholders that the project is designed to help.</p> <p>a) Materials that need and do not need adaptation are identified and used.</p> <p>b) Identification of gaps (missing information) in existing materials.</p>

Main objective	Specific Objectives	Components	Activities	Results
			3.3 Additional child protection messages and materials as well as channels that will communicate them will be identified, developed, pre-tested, and disseminated.	
	C) To develop, provide training, and follow-up for a child protection monitoring system (CPMS) established at the TAO level – covering all children in all communities of each participating TAO – and with links to provincial monitoring and response systems.	4. Child Protection Monitoring System (CPMS)	4.1 Establishment of a child protection monitoring system to be based at the TAO level, with data collection being done at the community level, and support for responses coming from district and provincial levels. This will be done by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.1.1 Identification of data collected by TAO and its purpose</li> <li>4.1.2 Identification major threats to child security perceived by local stakeholders;</li> <li>4.1.3 Identification of major child protection problems (initial CPMS targets) in each TAO;</li> <li>4.1.4 Identification of discrepancies between current data/indicators;</li> </ul>	a) Children in need of special protection, or those at risk due to the family or living conditions, and the nature of their situation are identified.
			4.1.5 Identification of local participatory actions needed to collect additional data; 4.1.6 Determination of best data compilation methods (and	b) A strategy created to identify and undertake effective child-centred, community, TAO, and higher level actions to respond to child protection cases (victims and those at risk).

Main objective	Specific Objectives	Components	Activities	Results
			<p>appropriate technologies) to facilitate understanding by users.</p> <p>4.1.7 Identification and conducting of training and supportive activities to create and maintain information systems at community and TAO levels;</p> <p>4.1.8 Creation of and training in using a preliminary CPMS system, including its data collection and analysis formats</p> <p>4.1.9 Promotion of CPMS as a team-building strategy and a "whole community" and "whole TAO" approach;</p> <p>4.1.10 Creation and implementation of an accountable reporting system (quantitative and qualitative) for communities and TAOs.</p>	<p>c) A functioning and effective monitoring system on the ongoing situation of child protection at community and TAOs levels is in place, in order to eliminate and prevent the causes of child protection problems.</p>
	<p>D) To establish or strengthen an integrated child protection response system (CPRS) for preventive and emergency actions at community, TAO, district, and provincial levels (including persons, procedures, legal ramifications, and accountability).</p>	<p>5. Child Protection Response System (CPRS)</p>	<p>5.1 Establishing an integrated child protection response system (CPRS) to complement the CPMS, so that child victims and those at risk have greater access to quality child protection services, including case reporting, management, and emergency mechanisms;</p>	<p>1. A roster of child protection professionals at community to provincial levels is available for response networking;</p> <p>2. A resource guide on child and family assistance is made publically available;</p> <p>3. Three multidisciplinary TAO child protection teams/networks are available for response assistance;</p> <p>4. TAO/district/provincial specific case reporting, management plans, and referral procedures are provided;</p>

Main objective	Specific Objectives	Components	Activities	Results	
				5. TAO specific case reporting, management plans, and referral procedures are provided;	
				6. Roles, responsibilities, and accountability measures and their incorporation into the provincial child protection system identified;	
				7. Temporary emergency placement measures take place and centres are accessible.	
				5.2 Establishment of a stable multidisciplinary child protection network/team, as part of or in addition to the Provincial Child Protection Committee;	
				5.3 Development or strengthening of case reporting mechanisms and a case management and referral system from TAO to district to provincial levels.	
E) To increase the capacity of social workers and para-social workers to provide effective child protection services.	6. Social Worker Capacity Building	6.1 Recruitment of trained social workers at the provincial level and para-social workers at the TAO level w to support both the CPMS and, especially, the CPRS in terms or responding to cases of abuse of individual children, as well as in providing effective rehabilitation and other child protection services.			
F) Documentation of the project process, including an evaluation of its effectiveness, for expansion and advocacy purposes.	7. Documentation, Monitoring, and Evaluation	7.1 Preparation of advocacy and process documentation (national, international);			
		7.2 Monitoring mechanisms;			

Main objective	Specific Objectives	Components	Activities	Results
			7.3 Evaluation (qualitative and quantitative) of project achievements and means of improvement in order to facilitate further expansion on a nationwide basis;	
			7.4 External evaluation.	a) Evaluation of level of awareness and action on child protection;
				b) Evaluation of Use of CPMS in monitoring and planning
				c) Evaluation of utility of CPRS, especially the effectiveness of TAO/district networks/teams and community mechanisms for prevention and response
				d) Evaluation of the improvement in the quality of child protection services, especially in terms of the effectiveness of para-social workers, social workers, hospital, etc. In stopping abuse of individual children, as well as in providing effective rehabilitation
				e) Evaluation of degree and effectiveness of linkage with Provincial Child Protection Committee
				f) Evaluation of improvement in quality of life of children, generally, and child victims
				g) Recommendations made for future expansion



## Appendix X Participating Tambon by Province and CPMRS Component during 2008-2011<sup>7</sup>

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	CPMRS Component		
			Case Manager	CPMS	CP Manual
1. Trang	1 Muang	1 Bang-Rak (บางรัก)		no	
		2 Na-Tam-Tai (นาท่ามใต้)		no	
		3 Ban-Kaon (บ้านควน)		no	
		4 Tesaban Klong Teng (เทศบาลคลองเต็ง)		x	
		5 Namputt TAO (อบต. น้ำมุด)		x	
	2 Kantang	6 Bang-pao TAO (อบต. บางเป้า)		x	
		7 Kantang-Tai TA (อบต. กันตังใต้)		x	
		8 Tesaban Kantang (เทศบาลเมืองกันตัง)		na	
		9 Wang-Wun TAO (อบต. วังวน)		x	
		10 Bang-Mak (อบต. บางหมาก)		no	
		11 Klong Chi Lom TAO (อบต. คลองชีล้อม)		x	
		12 Bor Bam Ron TAO (อบต. บ่อน้ำร้อน)		x	
		13 Koh Libong TAO (อบต. เกาะลิบง)		x	
	3 Huay Yod	14 Tesaban Huay Yod (เทศบาลตำบลห้วยยอด)		no	
		15 Tha-Ngio TAO (อบต. ท่าจิว)		x	
		16 Tung-Tho TAO (อบต. ทุ้งต้อ)		no	

<sup>7</sup> This information was drawn from Mahidol reports to UNICEF and has not been independently validated by the evaluation team. The evaluation team was unable to locate information about the Case Managers or the CP Manual at the time of finalizing this report (May 2013).

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	CPMRS Component			
			Case Manager	CPMS	CP Manual	
		17 Nong Chang Lan TAO อบต หนองช้างแล่น		x	na	
		18 Na Wong TAO อบต นาวง		x	na	
		19 Pak Kom TAO อบต ปากคอม		x	na	
		20 Pak Jam TAO อบต ปากแจ่ม		x	na	
		21 Khao Poon TAO อบต เขาปูน		x	na	
		22 Nai Tao TAO อบต ในเตา		x	na	
	4 Pa-Lien	23 Koh Sukorn TAO อบต เกาะสุกร		no	na	
	5 Wang Wiset	24 Wang Maprang Nuea TAO อบต วังมะปรางเหนือ		no	na	
		25 Tha Saba TAO อบต ท่าสะบ้า		x	na	
	6 Na Yong	26 La Mor TAO อบต ละมอ		no	na	
		27 Na Yong Nuea TAO อบต นาโยงเหนือ		x	na	
	7 Had Samran	28 Had Samran TAO อบต หาดสำราญ		x	na	
		29 Ta Se TAO อบต ตะเสะ		x	na	
		30 Bah Wee TAO อบต บ้าหวี		x	na	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>na</b>
	2. Satun	1 La-Ngu ละงู	1 Kampang TAO อบต กำแพง		no	na
			2 La-Ngu TAO เทศบาลตำบลละงู		no	na
			3 Namputt TAO อบต น้ำมุด		na	na
			4 Lam-Son TAO อบต แหลมสน		no	na
		2 Ta-Pae ท่าแพ	5 Phaera TAO อบต เปราะ		no	na
			6 Ta-Pae TAO อบต ท่าแพ		no	na

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	CPMRS Component		
			Case Manager	CPMS	CP Manual
	3 Kaun-Don ควนโดน	7 Kaun-Sataw TAO อบต ควนสะอาด		no	na
		8 Yan-Sau TAO อบต ชำนซ้อ		no	na
		9 Tha Raue TAO อบต ท่าเรือ		x	na
	4 Thung-Wah ห้วยหว้า	10 Pakae-Bohin TAO อบต ป่าแกบ่อหิน		no	na
		11 Khon-Klan TAO อบต ขอนคลาน		no	na
	5 Muang	12 Tesaban Mung Satun เทศบาลเมืองสตูล		x	na
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>na</b>
3. Phang-Nga	1. Muang	1 Bang Tuey TAO อบต บางเตย		x	na
		2 Pa Ko TAO อบต ป่ากอ		x	na
		3 Thum Nam Putt TAO อบต ถ้ำน้ำผุด		x	na
	2 Tai Muang	4 Lamkhaen TAO อบต ลำแก่น		x	na
		5 Toong-Maprao TAO อบต ห้วยมะพร้าว		x	na
		6 Bang Thong TAO อบต บางทอง		x	na
	3 Kuraburi	7 Bang-Wan TAO อบต บางวัน		x	na
		8 Kura TAO อบต คุระ		na	na
	4 Thap Phut ทับปุด	9 Kok Charoen TAO อบต โลกเจริญ		x	na
		10 Bang Reang TAO อบต บางเหรียง		x	na
	5 Koh Yao	11 Koh Yao Yai TAO อบต เกาะยาวใหญ่		x	na
		12 Pru Nai TAO อบต พรุไฉน		x	na
	6 Kapong	13 Tesaban Tha-Na เทศบาลตำบลท่านา		x	na
		14 Romanee TAO อบต รมณีชัย		x	na

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	CPMRS Component		
			Case Manager	CPMS	CP Manual
	7 Thakua Pah	15 Bang Nai Si TAO อมต บางนาขสี		x	na
		16 Bangsai TAO อมต บางไทร		x	na
	8 Thakua Toong	17 Tha Yuu TAO อมต ท่าอยู่		x	na
		18 Kra-Som TAO อมต กระโสม		x	na
		19 Klong Kiean TAO อมต คลองเคียน		x	na
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>19</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>na</b>
4 Phuket	1 Kra-Tu	1 Tesaban Kra-Tu เทศบาลเมืองกระทุ้		no	na
	2 Muang	2 Tesaban Ratchada เทศบาลตำบลรัษฎา		no	na
		3 Tesaban Kra-Ron เทศบาลตำบลกระรน		no	na
	3 Tha-Lang	4 Choeng-Thalae TAO อมต เขิงทะเล		x	na
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>na</b>
5 Krabi	1 Muang	1. Khao-Khram TAO อมต เขากราม		x	na
		2 Sai Thai TAO อมต สไไทย		x	na
		3 Nong Thale TAO อมต หนองทะเล		x	na
		4 Khao Thong TAO อมต เขาทอง		x	na
	2 Koh Lanta	5 Koh Klang TAO อมต เกาะกลาง		x	na
		6 Saladan TAO อมต ศาลาด่าน		no	na
		7 Koh Lanta Yai TAO อมต เกาะลันตาใหญ่		x	na
		8 Klong Yang TAO อมต คลองยาง		no	na

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	CPMRS Component			
			Case Manager	CPMS	CP Manual	
	3 Tam Thap ลำทับ	9 Din Udom TAO อมต ดินอุดม		x	na	
		10 Thung Sai Thong TAO อมต ทุ่งไทรทอง		x	na	
	4 Nua Klong	11 Nuea Klong TAO อมต เหนือคลอง		x	na	
		12 Huay Yoong TAO อมต ห้วยยูง		no	na	
		13 Taling Chan TAO อมต คลั่งชัน		x	na	
		14 Klong Kamao TAO อมต คลองขมม่า		x	na	
		15 Klong Kanan TAO อมต คลองขนาน		x	na	
		16 Koh Sriboya TAO อมต ศรีบอยา		x	na	
	5 Klong Thom	17 Klong Phon TAO อมต คลองพน		x	na	
		18 Huai Nam Khao TAO อมต ห้วยน้ำข้าว		x	na	
		19 Khlong Thom Nuea TAO อมต คลองท่อมเหนือ		x	na	
	6 Plai Phraya	20 Kao Khen TAO อมต เขาเขน		no	na	
	7 Ao Leuk	21 Ao Luek Tai TAO อมต อ่าวลึกใต้		x	na	
		22 Ao Luek Noi TAO อมต อ่าวลึกน้อย		x	na	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>22</b>		<b>18</b>	<b>na</b>
	6 Ranong	1 Mueng	1 Had Som Pan TAO อมต หาดส้มแป้น		x	na
			2 Bang Non TAO อมต บางนอน		x	na
			3 Sai Daeng TAO อมต ทรายแดง		x	na
			4 Tesaban Ratchagrood เทศบาลตำบลราชกรูด		x	na
			5 Ngao TAO อมต หงาว		x	na
			6 Tesaban Ngao เทศบาลตำบลหงาว		x	na

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	CPMRS Component		
			Case Manager	CPMS	CP Manual
		7 Tesaban Paknam Ta-Ruea เทศบาลตำบลปากน้ำท่าเรือ		x	na
		8 Tesaban Paknam เทศบาลตำบลปากน้ำ		x	na
		9 Tesaban Banglin เทศบาลตำบลบางริน		x	na
		10 Koh Payam TAO อบต เกาะพยาม		x	na
		11 Tesaban Mueng Ranong เทศบาลเมืองระนอง		x	na
	2 Kapur กระเปอร์	12 Banghin TAO อบต บางหิน		x	na
		13 Muang Kluang TAO อบต ม่วงกลวง		x	na
		14 Ban-Na TAO อบต บ้านนา		x	na
		15 Kapur TAO อบต กระเปอร์		x	na
		16 Tesaban Kapur เทศบาลตำบลกระเปอร์		x	na
	3 Kraburi	17 Jor Por Ror TAO อบต จปร		x	na
		18 Tesaban Nam Jeud เทศบาลตำบลน้ำจืด		x	na
		19 Nam Jeud TAO อบต น้ำจืด		x	na
		20 NamJeud Noi TAO อบต น้ำจืดน้อย		x	na
		21 Mamu TAO อบต มะมู		x	na
		22 Bang Yai TAO อบต บางใหญ่		x	na
		23 Lam Liang TAO อบต ลำเลียง		x	na
		24 Pak Jan TAO อบต ปากจั่น		x	na
	4 Kuksamran	25 Naka TAO อบต นาคา		x	na
		26 Kam Puan TAO อบต กำปวน		x	na

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	CPMRS Component		
			Case Manager	CPMS	CP Manual
	5 La-Un ละอุ่น	27 Bang Kaew TAO อบต บางแก้ว		x	na
		28 Tesaban La-Un เทศบาลตำบลละอุ่น		x	na
		29 La-Un Nuea TAO อบต ละอุ่นเหนือ		x	na
		30 Bangpra Nuea TAO อบต บางพระเหนือ		x	na
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>na</b>
7 SongKla	1 Satingpra สทิงพระ	1 Tha-Hin TAO อบต ท่าหิน		no	na
		2 Cha Ting Phra TAO อบต จะทิ้งพระ		no	na
	2 Singh Nakorn	3 Cha-Lae TAO อบต ชะแล้		no	na
		4 Ram Daeng TAO อบต รำแดง		x	na
	3 Rattaphum	5 Tesaban Kampangpet เทศบาลตำบลกำแพงเพชร		no	na
		6 Kuan-Ru TAO อบต ควนรู		no	na
		7 Khuha Tai TAO อบต คูหาใต้		x	na
	4 Sadao	8 Tesaban Prig TAO เทศบาลตำบลปริก		x	na
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>na</b>
8 Ubol Ratchathani	1 Mueng	1 Kham Yai TAO อบต ขามใหญ่		no	na
	2 Na Yia นาเข็ช	2 Na Yia TAO อบต นาเข็ช		no	na
	3 Trakarn Peudphon ตระการพืชผล	3 Konsai TAO อบต คอนสาย		no	na
		4 Kud Nayaun TAO อบต กุดนาขวน		no	na
	4 Bunatrik บูนขริก	5 Bao Ngam TAO อบต บัวงาม		no	na
	5 Sri Mueng Mai	6 Nam Thaeng TAO อบต นามแท่ง		x	na
		7 Nalern TAO อบต นาเลน		x	na

Evaluation of the CPMRS in Thailand - Volume II - Appendices - Final Report

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	CPMRS Component		
			Case Manager	CPMS	CP Manual
		8 Na Pho Klang TAO อบต นาโพธิ์กลาง		x	na
	6 Det Udom	9 Tesaban Pon Ngam เทศบาลตำบลโพนงาม		x	na
	7 Muang Samsip	10 Nong Muang TAO อบต หงษ์เมือง		x	na
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>na</b>
9 Payao	1 Muang	1 Tesaban Ban Tam เทศบาลตำบลบ้านต้า		no	na
		2 Tesaban San Pah Mueng เทศบาลตำบลสันป่าม่วง		no	na
	2. Chiang Kam	3 Tesaban Sansai เทศบาลตำบลสันทราย		no	na
	3 Dok Kam Tai ดอกคำใต้	4 San Koang TAO อบต สันโค้ง		no	na
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>no</b>	<b>na</b>
10 Suphanburi	1 Mung	1 Thap Ti Lek TAO อบต ทับตีเหล็ก		x	na
		2 Tesaban Mung Suphanburi เทศบาลเมืองสุพรรณบุรี		x	na
		3 Tesaban Tha Sadet เทศบาลตำบลท่าเสด็จ		x	na
		4 Tesaban Pho Phraya เทศบาลโพธิ์พระยา		x	na
		5 Sanm Khli TAO อบต สนมคลี		x	na
		6 Don Phon Thong อบต ดอนโพนทอง		x	na
		7 Tesaban Suan Taeng เทศบาลตำบลสวนแตง		x	na
		8 Suan Taeng TAO อบต สวนแตง		x	na
		9 Sala Khao TAO อบต ศาลาขาว		x	na
	2 Bang Pla Ma	10 Wat Dao TAO อบต วัดดาว		x	na
		11 Chorakhe Yai TAO อบต จระเข้ใหญ่		x	na
		12 Tesaban Bang Pla Ma เทศบาลตำบลบางปลาแม่		x	na
		13 Krishana TAO อบต กฤษณา		x	na

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	CPMRS Component		
			Case Manager	CPMS	CP Manual
		14 Makham Lom TAO อบต มะขามล้ม		x	na
		15 Wat Bot TAO อบต วัดโบสถ์		x	na
		16 Tesaban Takha เทศบาลตำบลตะค่า		x	na
		17 Tesaban Ban Laem Pattana เทศบาลตำบลแหลมพัฒนา		x	na
	3 U-Thong	18 Don Makluea TAO อบต ดอนมะเกลือ		x	na
		19 Don Kha TAO อบต ดอนคา		x	na
		20 Tesaban Thao U-Thong เทศบาลตำบลท้าวสุททอง		x	na
		21 Phlap-Phla Chai TAO อบต พลับพลายไชย		x	na
	4 Sri Pachan	22 Wang Nam Sap TAO อบต วังน้ำซับ		x	na
		23 Wang Wah TAO อบต วังหว้า		x	na
		24 Tesaban Plai Na เทศบาลตำบลปลายนา		x	na
	5 Doem Bang Nang Buad เดิมบางนางบัว	25 Khok Chang TAO อบต โลกช้าง		x	na
		26 Yang Non TAO อบต ยางนอน		x	na
		27 Tesaban Nang Buad เทศบาลตำบลนางบัว		x	na
		28 Tessaban Bo Kru เทศบาลบ่อครุ		x	na
		29 Tesaban Doem Bang เทศบาลเดิมบาง		x	na
		30 Tesaban Khao Din เทศบาลเขาดิน		x	na
	6 Song Phi Nong สองพี่น้อง	31 Ban Kum TAO อบต บ้านกุ่ม		x	na
		32 Nong Boh TAO อบต หนองบ่อ		x	na
		33 Si Samran TAO อบต ศรีสำราญ		x	na
		34 Thung Khok TAO อบต ทุ่งคอก		x	na

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	CPMRS Component		
			Case Manager	CPMS	CP Manual
		35 Bang Ta Then TAO อมต บางตาเถร		x	na
	7 Sam Chuk	36 Wang Luek TAO อมต วังลึก		x	na
	8 Dan Chang	37 Dan Chang TAO อมต ด่านช้าง		x	na
		38 Huai Khamin TAO อมต ห้วยขมิ้น		x	na
	9 Nong Ya Sai	39 Chaeng Ngam TAO อมต แจงงาม		x	na
		40 Tesaban Nong Ya Sai เทศบาลหนองหญ้าไซ		x	na
		41 Nong Ya Sai อมต หนองหญ้าไซ		x	na
		42 Thap Luang TAO อมต ท้าหลวง		x	na
		43 Nong Pho TAO อมต หนองโพธิ์		x	na
		44 Nong Kham TAO อมต หนองขาม		x	na
	10 Don Chedi	45 Sa Krachom TAO อมต สระกระโจม		x	na
		46 Rai Rot TAO อมต ไร่รถ		x	na
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>46</b>		<b>46</b>	<b>na</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>185</b>		<b>143</b>	<b>na</b>

**Number of participating TAOs by CPMRS Component during 2008-2011**

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	CPMRS Component		
			Case Manager	CPMS	CP Manual
1. Trang	7	30		20	NA
2. Satun	5	12		2	NA
3. Phang Nga	8	19		18	NA
4. Phuket	3	4		1	NA
5. Krabi	7	22		18	NA
6. Ranong	5	30		30	NA
7. Songkla	4	8		3	NA
8. Ubol Ratchathani	7	10		5	NA
9. Prayao	3	4		no	NA
10. Suphanburi	10	46		46	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>185</b>		<b>143</b>	NA

NA = data not available at the time of finalizing this report (May 2013)

No = No CPMS implemented

## Appendix XI List of participating TAO by province, district, and year

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
1. Trang	1 Muang	1 Bang-Rak (บางรัก)		x		
		2 Na-Tam-Tai (นาท่ามใต้)			x	
		3 Ban-Kaon (บ้านควน)			x	
		4 Tesaban Klong Teng (เทศบาลคลองเต็ง)		x		
		5 Namputt TAO (อบต. น้ำพุด)				x
	2 Kantang	6 Bang-pao TAO (อบต. บางเป้า)		x		
		7 Kantang-Tai TA (อบต. กันตังใต้)		x		
		8 Tesaban Kantang (เทศบาลกันตัง)			x	
		9 Wang-Wun TAO (อบต. วังวน)	x			
		10 Bang-Mak (อบต. บางหมาก)	x			
		11 Klong Chi Lom TAO (อบต. คลองชีล้อม)				x
		12 Bor Bam Ron TAO (อบต. บ่อน้ำร้อน)				x
		13 Koh Libong TAO (อบต. เกาะลิบง)				x
	3 Huay Yod	14 Tesaban Huay Yod (เทศบาลตำบลห้วยยอด)		x		

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation				
			2008				
		15 Tha-Ngio TAO อมต ท่าจั่ว		x			
		16 Tung-Tho TAO อมต หุ้งค้อ		x			
		17 Nong Chang Lan TAO อมต หนองช้างแล่น				x	
		18 Na Wong TAO อมต นาวง				x	
		19 Pak Kom TAO อมต ปากคอม				x	
		20 Pak Jam TAO อมต ปากแจ่ม				x	
		21 Khao Poon TAO อมต เขาปูน				x	
		22 Nai Tao TAO อมต ในเตา				x	
	4 Pa-Lien	23 Koh Sukorn TAO อมต เกาะสุกร			x		
	5 Wang Wiset	24 Wang Maprang Nuea TAO อมต วังมะปรางเหนือ			x		
		25 Tha Saba TAO อมต ท่าสะบ้า				x	
	6 Na Yong	26 La Mor TAO อมต ละมอ			x		
		27 Na Yong Nuea TAO อมต นาโขงเหนือ		x			
	7 Had Samran	28 Had Samran TAO อมต หาดสำราญ				x	
		29 Ta Se TAO อมต ตะเสะ				x	
		30 Bah Wee TAO อมต บ้าหวี				x	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
2. Satun	1 La-Ngu ละงู	1 Kampang TAO อบต กำแพง	x			
		2 La-Ngu TAO เทศบาลตำบลละงู	x			
		3 Namputt TAO อบต น้ำผุด	x			
		4 Lam-Son TAO อบต แหลมสน		x		
	2 Ta-Pae ท่าแพ	5 Phaera TAO อบต แประ		x		
		6 Ta-Pae TAO อบต ท่าแพ		x		
	3 Kaun-Don ควนโดน	7 Kaun-Sataw TAO อบต ควนสะอาด		x		
		8 Yan-Sau TAO อบต ย่านซ้อ			x	
		9 Tha Raue TAO อบต ท่าเรือ		x		
	4 Thung-Wah ทุ่งหว้า	10 Pakae-Bohin TAO อบต ป่าแกบ่อหิน			x	
		11 Khon-Klan TAO อบต ขอนคลาน			x	
	5 Muang	12 Tesaban Mung Satun เทศบาลเมืองสตูล		x		
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	
3. Phang-Nga	1. Muang	1 Bang Tuey TAO อบต บางเตย			x	
		2 Pa Ko TAO อบต ป่ากอ		x		
		3 Thum Nam Putt TAO อบต ถ้ำน้ำผุด				x

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation				
			2008	2009	2010	2011	
	2 Tai Muang	4 Lamkhaen TAO อบต ลำแก่น	x				
		5 Toong-Maprao TAO อบต ทุงมะพร้าว		x			
		6 Bang Thong TAO อบต บางทอง			x		
	3 Kuraburi	7 Bang-Wan TAO อบต บางวัน	x				
		8 Kura TAO อบต กูระ	x				
	4 Thap Phut ตำบล	9 Kok Charoen TAO อบต โลกเจริญ			x		
		10 Bang Reang TAO อบต บางเหริขง				x	
	5 Koh Yao	11 Koh Yao Yai TAO อบต เกาะยาวใหญ่				x	
		12 Pru Nai TAO อบต พรุไฉ				x	
	6 Kapong	13 Tesaban Tha-Na เทศบาลตำบลท่านา				x	
		14 Romanee TAO อบต รณณีชัย		x			
	7 Thakua Pah	15 Bang Nai Si TAO อบต บางนาฮี		x			
		16 Bangsai TAO อบต บางไทร		x			
	8 Thakua Toong	17 Tha Yuu TAO อบต ท่าอู่				x	
		18 Kra-Som TAO อบต กระโสม				x	
		19 Klong Kiean TAO อบต คลองเคียน				x	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
4 Phuket	1 Kra-Tu	1 Tesaban Kra-Tu เทศบาลเมืองกระทุ้	x			
	2 Muang	2 Tesaban Ratchada เทศบาลตำบลรัชฎา	x			
		3 Tesaban Kra-Ron เทศบาลตำบลกระรน			x	
	3 Tha-Lang	4 Choeng-Thalae TAO อมต เชียงทะเล		x		
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	
5 Krabi	1 Muang	1. Khao-Khram TAO อมต เขาคราม	x			
		2 Sai Thai TAO อมต ใต้ไทย			x	
		3 Nong Thale TAO อมต นหนองทะเล			x	
		4 Khao Thong TAO อมต เขาทอง				x
	2 Koh Lanta	5 Koh Klang TAO อมต เกาะกลาง	x			
		6 Saladan TAO อมต ศาลาด่าน		x		
		7 Koh Lanta Yai TAO อมต เกาะลันตาใหญ่		x		
		8 Klong Yang TAO อมต คลองยาง			x	
	3 Tam Thap ลำทับ	9 Din Udom TAO อมต ดินอุดม		x		
		10 Thung Sai Thong TAO อมต ทุ่งไทรทอง				x
	4 Nua Klong	11 Nuea Klong TAO อมต เหนือคลอง		x		
		12 Huay Yoong TAO อมต ห้วยยูง		x		

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
		13 Taling Chan TAO อมต ดิ่งชัน		x		
		14 Klong Kamao TAO อมต คลองเขม้				x
		15 Klong Kanan TAO อมต คลองขนาน				x
		16 Koh Sriboya TAO อมต ศรีบอยา		x		
	5 Klong Thom	17 Klong Phon TAO อมต คลองพน			x	
		18 Huai Nam Khao TAO อมต ห้วยน้ำขาว				x
		19 Khlong Thom Nuea TAO อมต คลองท่อมเหนือ				x
	6 Plai Phraya	20 Kao Khen TAO อมต เขาเขน			x	
	7 Ao Leuk	21 Ao Luek Tai TAO อมต อ่าวลึกใต้				x
		22 Ao Luek Noi TAO อมต อ่าวลึกน้อย				x
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>
6 Ranong	1 Mueng	1 Had Som Pan TAO อมต หาดส้มแป้น	x			
		2 Bang Non TAO อมต บางนอน		x		
		3 Sai Daeng TAO อมต ทราชแดง			x	
		4 Tesaban Ratchagrood เทศบาลตำบลราชกรูด				x
		5 Ngao TAO อมต หงาว				x

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
		6 Tesaban Ngao เทศบาลตำบลหงาว				x
		7 Tesaban Paknam Ta-Ruea เทศบาลตำบลปากน้ำท่าเรือ				x
		8 Tesaban Paknam เทศบาลตำบลปากน้ำ				x
		9 Tesaban Banglin เทศบาลตำบลบางรีน				x
		10 Koh Payam TAO อมต เกาะพยาม				x
		11 Tesaban Mueng Ranong เทศบาลเมืองระนอง				x
	2 Kapur เกาะเปอร๋	12 Banghin TAO อมต บางหิน	x			
		13 Muang Kluang TAO อมต ม่วงกลวง	x			
		14 Ban-Na TAO อมต บ้านนา			x	
		15 Kapur TAO อมต เกาะเปอร๋		x		
		16 Tesaban Kapur เทศบาลตำบลเกาะเปอร๋				x
	3 Kraburi	17 Jor Por Ror TAO อมต จปร		x		
		18 Tesaban Nam Jeud เทศบาลตำบลน้ำเจ็ด			x	
		19 Nam Jeud TAO อมต น้ำเจ็ด		x		
		20 NamJeud Noi TAO อมตน้ำเจ็ดน้อย		x		
		21 Mamu TAO อมต มะมู				x

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
		22 Bang Yai TAO อบต บางใหญ่				x
		23 Lam Liang TAO อบต ลำเลียง				x
		24 Pak Jan TAO อบต ปากจั่น				x
	4 Kuksamran	25 Naka TAO อบต นาคา		x		
		26 Kam Puan TAO อบต กำพวน		x		
	5 La-Un ละอุ่น	27 Bang Kaew TAO อบต บางแก้ว				x
		28 Tesaban La-Un เทศบาลตำบลละอุ่น				x
		29 La-Un Nuea TAO อบต ละอุ่นเหนือ				x
		30 Bangpra Nuea TAO อบต บางพระเหนือ				x
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>
7 SongKla	1 Satingpra สทิงพระ	1 Tha-Hin TAO อบต ท่าหิน			x	
		2 Cha Ting Phra TAO อบต จะตั้งพระ			x	
	2 Singh Nakorn	3 Cha-Lae TAO อบต ชะแล้			x	
		4 Ram Daeng TAO อบต รำแดง				x
	3 Rattaphum	5 Tesaban Kampangpet เทศบาลตำบลกำแพงเพชร			x	
		6 Kuan-Ru TAO อบต ควนรู			x	

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
		7 Khuha Tai TAO อมต อุหาใต้				x
	4 Sadao	8 Tesaban Prig TAO เทศบาลตำบลปรัก				x
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>			<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
8 Ubol Ratchathani	1 Mueng	1 Kham Yai TAO อมต ขามใหญ่			x	
	2 Na Yia นาฮี	2 Na Yia TAO อมต นาฮี			x	
	3 Trakarn Peudphon ตระการพืชผล	3 Konsai TAO อมต คอนสาย			x	
		4 Kud Nayaun TAO อมต กุดนาขาน			x	
	4 Bunatrik บุญขริภ	5 Bao Ngam TAO อมต บัวงาม			x	
	5 Sri Mueng Mai	6 Nam Thaeng TAO อมต นามแท่ง				x
		7 Nalern TAO อมต นาเลิน				x
		8 Na Pho Klang TAO อมต นาโพธิ์กลาง				x
	6 Det Udom	9 Tesaban Pon Ngam เทศบาลตำบลโปนงาม				x
	7 Muang Samsip	10 Nong Muang TAO อมต หนองเมือง				x
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>			<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
9 Payao	1 Muang	1 Tesaban Ban Tam เทศบาลตำบลบ้านต้า			x	
		2 Tesaban San Pah Mueng เทศบาลตำบลสันป่าม่วง			x	
	2. Chiang Kam	3 Tesaban Sansai เทศบาลตำบลสันทราย			x	
	3 Dok Kam Tai ดอกคำใต้	4 San Koang TAO อมต สันโค้ง			x	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>			<b>4</b>	
10 Suphanburi	1 Mung	1 Thap Ti Lek TAO อมต ทับตีเหล็ก			x	
		2 Tesaban Mung Suphanburi เทศบาลเมืองสุพรรณบุรี				x
		3 Tesaban Tha Sadet เทศบาลตำบลท่าเสด็จ				x
		4 Tesaban Pho Phraya เทศบาลโพธิ์พระยา				x
		5 Sanm Khli TAO อมต สนมคลี				x
		6 Don Phon Thong อมต ดอนโพ้นทอง				x
		7 Tesaban Suan Taeng เทศบาลตำบลสวนแตง				x
		8 Suan Taeng TAO อมต สวนแตง				x
		9 Sala Khao TAO อมต ศาลาขาว				x
	2 Bang Pla Ma	10 Wat Dao TAO อมต วัดดาว				x
		11 Chorakhe Yai TAO อมต จระเข้ใหญ่				x

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
		12 Tesaban Bang Pla Ma เทศบาลตำบลบางปลาเ้า				X
		13 Krishana TAO อบต. กฤษณา				X
		14 Makham Lom TAO อบต. มะขามลุ่ม				X
		15 Wat Bot TAO อบต. วัดโบสถ์				X
		16 Tesaban Takha เทศบาลตำบลตะค่า				X
		17 Tesaban Ban Laem Pattana เทศบาลตำบลแหลมพัฒนา				X
	3 U-Thong	18 Don Makluea TAO อบต. ดอนมะเกลือ				X
		19 Don Kha TAO อบต. ดอนคา				X
		20 Tesaban Thao U-Thong เทศบาลตำบลท้าวอู่ทอง				X
		21 Phlap-Phla Chai TAO อบต. พลับพลาไชย				X
	4 Sri Pachan	22 Wang Nam Sap TAO อบต. วังน้ำซับ				X
		23 Wang Wah TAO อบต. วังหว้า				X
		24 Tesaban Plai Na เทศบาลตำบลปลาชานา				X
	5 Doem Bang Nang Buad เดิมบางนางบวช	25 Khok Chang TAO อบต. โขกช้าง				X
		26 Yang Non TAO อบต. ยางนอน				X

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
		27 Tesaban Nang Buad เทศบาลตำบลนางบัวช				X
		28 Teseban Bo Kru เทศบาลบ่อครุ				X
		29 Tesaban Doem Bang เทศบาลเดิมบาง				X
		30 Tesaban Khao Din เทศบาลเขาดิน				X
	6 Song Phi Nong สองพี่น้อง	31 Ban Kum TAO อบต บ้านกุ่ม				X
		32 Nong Boh TAO อบต หนองบ่อ				X
		33 Si Samran TAO อบต ศรีสำราญ				X
		34 Thung Khok TAO อบต ทุ่งคอก				X
		35 Bang Ta Then TAO อบต บางตาเถร				X
	7 Sam Chuk	36 Wang Luek TAO อบต วังลึก				X
	8 Dan Chang	37 Dan Chang TAO อบต ด่านช้าง				X
		38 Huai Khamin TAO อบต ห้วยขมิ้น				X
	9 Nong Ya Sai	39 Chaeng Ngam TAO อบต แจงงาม				X
		40 Tesaban Nong Ya Sai เทศบาลหนองหญ้าไซ				X
		41 Nong Ya Sai อบต หนองหญ้าไซ				X
		42 Thap Luang TAO อบต ทัพหลวง				X

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
		43 Nong Pho TAO อบต หนงโพธิ์				x
		44 Nong Kham TAO อบต หนงขาม				x
	10 Don Chedi	45 Sa Krachom TAO อบต สระกระโจม				x
		46 Rai Rot TAO อบต ไร่รอด			x	
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>46</b>			<b>2</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>99</b>

**Number of participating TAO by province, district and year**

Province	District	Tambon/Teseban	Year of participation			
			2008	2009	2010	2011
1. Trang	7	30	2	8	6	14
2. Satun	5	12	3	6	3	0
3. Phang Nga	8	19	3	5	3	8
4. Phuket	3	4	2	1	1	0
5. Krabi	7	22	2	7	5	8
6. Ranong	5	30	3	7	3	17
7. Songkla	4	8	0	0	5	3
8. Ubol Ratchathani	7	10	0	0	5	5
9. Prayao	3	4	0	0	4	0
10. Suphanburi	10	46	0	0	2	44
<b>Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>99</b>

## Appendix XII : TAO Case Manager Job Description

### **(Social services to children and families)**

The CASE MANAGER<sup>8</sup> is assigned to the TAO and is responsible for coordinating and providing services in favour of children and families. The Case Manager is part of the Local Administration and contributes in developing and adopting better strategies and approaches in order to address major risk and vulnerability factors for children and youth. Specific responsibilities include:

- Function as the focal point for children issues at the Tambon level; working with other TAO officials and all relevant professionals of other services at the TAO level and relevant community based organizations and volunteers.
- Responsible for the proper functioning of the child protection monitoring system and the analysis of the data
- Responsible for the promotion of suitable TAO planning and budget allocation for preventing and addressing child protection violations in the communities.

Specifically related to service provision to children in need of protection and their families, the case manager to be effective needs to perform each of the following functions:

- Client families/groups/communities needs assessment and outreach

*[This is basically knowing the issues that the client group faces and the formal/informal service providers. It include: sound understanding of needs of the client population; understanding of community service culture; degree of access to services; availability and gaps in services; analysis whether services are client centered (respect clients rights); comprehensive list of all the services available to the client group (including information on their regulations, admission criteria, location, type of service, key personnel, intervention strategies, working hours, standards of service).*

- Child assessment (multidimensional, including the family and the surrounding community)

*[The phase of assessment must be respecting principles of privacy, confidentiality and dignity! The information collected during the assessment should include the following areas of the client: biographical information, personal details/history, medical and physical, service usage, emotional, social, transport and environment, financial status, support system, legal status, possible client long term goals, discharge potential]*

- Service planning and resource identification (establishing a relationship with the child/family and developing positive relationship with service providers)

*[Incremental and phased approach starting from concrete needs that might be felt most urgent by the child/family, problem solving, and strength based approach bringing the client to give the direction and use his/her own resources entirely.*

*The case manager needs to know in details the spectrum of services available and accessible to the clients, and their cost.*

*The case plan should be agreed with the client and should be Sustainable Measurable Achievable Relevant Time bound (SMART).*

---

<sup>8</sup> The CASE MANAGER is the human link between the 'client' (child-family) and the system and the only service provider concerned with and responsible for the whole client.

*The plan could be discussed in a case review meeting within a multidisciplinary team, but the case manager has to keep the final responsibility for the case]*

- Linking the child/family to services

*[This is the central function of Case Manager since children and people in vulnerable situation find difficult to make service connections. The referral could happen through, telephone, letter, case record sharing, organizing/attending case conferences, pre-trial site visits; basically the CM facilitates the contact between client and services encouraging services to receive the client. Protocols and procedures for the referral process are essential encompassing clauses to resolve conflicts]<sup>9</sup>*

- Case Plan implementation and coordination (making sure the child/family receives the services needed in an appropriate and timely manner)

*[CM knows the client and its environment, the services, the individual provider, and must use this information to have control over the systems to make sure that accountability mechanisms are in place. Demonstrate that the client is not alone and has not been abandoned. There is a need for a formal agreement between case managers and service providers.]*

- **Monitoring service delivery**

*[It is the regular and periodical review of progress with client and service providers. It is the most difficult function of case manager since might be perceived as an intruder or a nuisance by all the actors. Major difficulties come from: challenges by professionals; disagreement over the needs of the client and the strategies to be adopted; divergent professional cultures. These challenges are reduced with increased communication: contracts –roles and responsibilities- among different agencies; develop monitoring schedule; use statistical information... take into account client's perception and degree of satisfaction]<sup>10</sup>*

- **Advocate for cases in order to empower the child/family and their needs and interest, and advocates for the system improvement addressing deficiencies in service programs and systems through lobbying and negotiations.**
- **Evaluating whether the services provided have been meeting the changing needs of the child/family, and determining if there is a need for continuing, changing or terminating them.**

*[Closure needs to be properly documented, with justifications and indications for the reason of termination and or for referral to other support services. It should also document potential vulnerability and risk to children's/family safety, and identify potential remedial plans]*

- **Responsible for creating and maintaining case records with case files including all relevant documentation.**
- **Update and manage the Child protection database in connection with the child Protection System at the provincial level (where applicable)**
- **Coordinate and supervise the delivery of financial incentives and 'social welfare assistance measures' to vulnerable children and families.**

The Case manager will be the promoter of networks and community based initiatives for the prevention of harmful circumstances to children and for addressing risk factors and vulnerabilities.

---

<sup>9</sup> CM needs to be persuasive, friendly, good negotiator.

<sup>10</sup> CM needs to have authority and legitimacy in order to be able to intervene on behalf of the client.