



Presented by

**HALCYON LOUIS
CONSULTING**

www.hlouisconsulting.com

The Fit Persons Intervention and Youth Impact within the DFID/FCDO Evaluation

Final report

November 8, 2021



Acknowledgements

A note of appreciation is hereto extended to the fit persons and implementing partner organisations for their contribution to Part 2 of the evaluation. Given their role in leading in-country fieldwork and preliminary analysis, the work of the local consultants, Ms Beatrice Masoli and Ms Joyce Mwakilambo, is highlighted for special mention. Thank you, as well, to Ms Sandra Thibeault, for document layout and formatting.



Executive Summary

Introduction

This report presents the results of Part 2 of the final evaluation of the UN General Comment project (DFID/ FCDO project) and focuses, in particular, on the impact of the Railway Children Africa (RCA) Fit Persons intervention. The purpose of the analysis has been to inform continued investment by RCA in its Fit Persons intervention. To support this objective, the scope of the analysis has been the full duration of project implementation, from 2018 to 2021, with a focus on service delivery by the implementing partners in four project cities, Arusha; Dar es Salaam; Dodoma and Mwanza.

Methodology

The technical approach to the overall evaluation was theory-based and aligned with a client-approved evaluation matrix, to structure the evaluation around the project theory of change and the logical framework. This approach was further used to identify the contribution of contextual factors towards the achievement of the expected intervention results.

Five main criteria were used to conceptualise the evaluation (relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability). Three other criteria that were pertinent to the analysis, namely, gender; lessons learned; and recommendations, were also incorporated. Further, an inclusive and participatory design was used to draw on the experience of the project stakeholders, as key informants of the effects of implementation activities and the overall impact of the intervention.

To ensure that the evaluation was responsive to the needs of the main end-users, utilisation-focused

principles were applied to design, analysis and interpretation. Purposive sampling based on a sequential approach was also used to continuously engage the most suitable data sources, to acquire accurate responses to the evaluation questions.

Main Findings

Relevance

The RCA Fit Persons intervention has been relevant for providing rescued CLWS with temporary accommodation in a nurturing household, to facilitate family reunification and child reintegration. It has also aligned with the mandate of local government to safeguard the well-being of vulnerable young persons.

Effectiveness

In addition to reunifying rescued CLWS and their families, the intervention has provided a standardised quality assurance process for child placement. Fit persons have also gained enhanced childcare capacities with wide applicability. Yet, a combination of negative views about CLWS and perceptions of unmet expectations, as entertained by some fit persons, has challenged results achievement. Future similar interventions are also at risk of being implicated by the under-exploration of CLWS drop-out from the Fit Persons intervention.

Efficiency

While implementation activities have supported results ownership at the community level, this development has been offset by negative views about CLWS. The reversal of this mindset, along with follow-up support for successful street exit by CLWS, is a work in progress.

Impact

Although there is evidence of an aversion to the life of the streets among rescued CLWS, some of the young persons have become attached to the households of the fit persons. This development was unforeseen and has created a challenge for successful family reconciliation.

Gender

At the level of the implementing partners, the gender criterion was not used to inform the pre-selection of fit persons. Conversely, gender has been prioritised by local government during the selection process. The local government authorities also have a preference for child placements that are assigned to a married couple/ fit family.

Sustainability

Given the alignment between the intervention and local government programming, there is potential for continued implementation beyond the scheduled end date. Results sustainability has been challenged, however, by inadequate follow-up and therapeutic intervention further to the reintegration of rescued CLWS into their households of origin.

Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Conclusions

By facilitating access to a nurturing household environment and support services for family reunification and household reintegration, the RCA Fit Persons intervention has made it possible for CLWS to exit the streets. As the intervention has aligned closely with local government programming, there is scope for the continuity of the intervention and the sustainability of achieved results. Given the existing challenges to results achievement, however, for example, negative community mindsets about street-connected young persons, the need to enhance future similar interventions is foreseen.

Recommendations

RCA, in collaboration with its implementing partners and/ or local government, should:

1. continue to work closely with the local government authority to support the street exit and rehabilitation of street-connected young persons using the fit persons facility (**High priority**);
2. invest further in community awareness-raising about the situation of CLWS and the fit persons facility, to support the creation of 'community allies' through an emergent sense of ownership for the rehabilitation of street-connected young persons (**High priority**);
3. continue to engage communities in the pre-selection of fit persons to support community ownership of the effective resolution of the situation of street-connected young persons (**High priority**);
4. revisit their approach to managing the fit persons facility to ensure timely maintenance support for CLWS accommodation, including financial support for emergent issues (**High priority**);
5. re-visit the assessment process for child placement and the development of individualised care plans to ensure the adequacy of the placement timeline and the completeness of the therapeutic intervention (**High priority**); and
6. conduct a detailed enquiry into the reason(s) for CLWS drop-out of the Fit Persons intervention, to rectify possible implementation gaps in future similar interventions (**High priority**).

Lessons learned

- If the needs of rescued CLWS are inadequately assessed prior to child placement, the resultant individualised care plan will not provide the level of support that is needed to address the factors that contributed to street entry, and the unique effects of the streets on each child.
- Although the fit persons have had significant interface with young persons, including those from vulnerable groups, they still require targeted sensitisation to better support young persons to overcome the challenges they face.
- A willingness by fit persons to volunteer their services, to facilitate street exit by CLWS, does not negate their need for timely support to address the anticipated and unforeseen costs of child placement.



Acronyms

CSO	Civil Society Organisation
COVID-19	Coronavirus 2019
CLWS	Children Living and Working on the Street
CYLWS	Children and Youth Living and Working on the Street
DFID	Department for International Development
DSWO	District Social Welfare Officer
FCDO	Foreign Commonwealth and Development Office
LGA	Local Government Authority
OECD - DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
RC	Railway Children
RCA	Railway Children Africa
ToR	Terms of Reference
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund



Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	2
Executive Summary.....	3
Acronyms	6
1. Introduction	9
1.1 Overview	9
1.2 Assignment purpose.....	9
1.3 Specific objectives	9
1.4 Scope.....	10
1.5 Structure of the report.....	10
2. Methodology, Limitations and Mitigation measures.....	11
2.1 Technical approach	11
2.2 Implementation and analysis	11
2.3 Limitations and mitigation measures.....	12
3. The Fit Persons Intervention	13
3.1 Background	13
3.2 Description	13
3.3 The implementing partners.....	14
4. Main Findings.....	15
4.1 Overview	15
4.2 Relevance	15
4.3 Effectiveness	16
4.4 Efficiency	21
4.5 Impact	23
4.6 Gender.....	24
4.7 Sustainability.....	25
5. Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons learned.....	27
5.1 Conclusions	27
5.1.1 Relevance	27
5.1.2 Effectiveness.....	27
5.1.3 Efficiency.....	27
5.1.4 Impact.....	28
5.1.5 Gender.....	28
5.1.6 Sustainability	28
5.2 Recommendations	28
5.3 Lessons learned	30

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 Summary intervention statistics, 2020 - 2021.....	20
---	----

List of Appendices

Appendix I: Terms of Reference	31
Appendix II: Implementation Partnership.....	35
Appendix III: Methodology.....	36
Appendix IV: Evaluation Criteria	43
Appendix V: Evaluation Matrix.....	44
Appendix VI: List of Documents Reviewed.....	58
Appendix VII: Key Informants Consulted	62
Appendix VIII: Data Generation Protocols	69
Appendix IX: Map of Findings.....	75



I. Introduction

I.1 Overview

This report presents the results of Part 2 of the final evaluation of the UN¹ General Comment project (DFID/ FCDO project)², as commissioned by Railway Children Africa (RCA) to Halcyon Louis Consulting in May 2021. It focuses, in particular, on the impact of the Fit Persons intervention following the donor-funded project implementation period. The analysis responds to the specifications of the terms of reference (ToR),³ which were outlined in a separate consultancy agreement between Halcyon Louis Consulting and RCA, dated May 26, 2021.

Part 2 of the evaluation has complied with the child protection policies that have been established by RCA, as well as by its implementing partner organisations. By extension, the overall evaluation has adhered to the Safeguarding Policies of RCA and the implementing partner organisations, and standard OECD-DAC⁴ policy.

I.2 Assignment purpose

The purpose of Part 2 of the evaluation has been to inform continued investment by RCA in its Fit Persons intervention and its Community Care project. In support of this process, the analysis of the Fit Persons intervention has aimed to identify best practices and lessons learned from project implementation. The results of the analysis have further been used to develop forward-looking recommendations to enhance the work of RCA and the implementing partner organisations, as well as agencies that are involved in similar work.

I.3 Specific objectives

The specific objectives of the current analysis have been to:

1. Look at the process of fit persons from identification; screening and assessments; training; placement and then the experience and outcomes for children, as well as the follow up by the district social welfare officer (DSWO) and civil society organisations (CSOs), post placement
2. (At each stage) Evaluate how effective that was/ what worked well and what were the challenges or things they did not address adequately
 - Critique it vis-à-vis the actual guidelines/ regulation, looking at what the policy requires and how it was and is being implemented to see whether there are any incongruences
3. Determine:
 - How many children were placed with fit persons (August 2020 to February 2021)
 - How many children dropped out from the fit persons programme (August 2020 to February 2021) and for what reasons
 - How many children are placed in each family at the same time and whether there is a limit

¹ United Nations

² See Final Report, dated July 27, 2021, Evaluation of 'Advocating for the Implementation of UN General Comment to Change Lives of Tanzanian Street Children'

³ See Appendix I

⁴ Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee

- What was the referral point into the fit persons' homes (e.g. from the street; court; abuse case removed from the community; abandoned/ dropped at social welfare; others (specify))
- How long each child remained in the fit person's home before they were reintegrated back home
- How many children are still at family/ community home after final reintegration
- How children experienced their time with the fit person? What did they like the most? What bits did they like the least?
- For those back home, what has changed at home for the young person? How safe do they feel?

Source: Adapted from Consultancy Agreement, Section A.

I.4 Scope

The scope of the analysis has been the full duration of project implementation, from 2018 to 2021, with a focus on service delivery by the implementing partners in four project cities (Arusha; Dar es Salaam; Dodoma and Mwanza). In order to allow Part 2 of the evaluation to delve further into the Fit Persons intervention, additional data collection was

conducted in Mwanza. The rationale for this approach was the engagement of RCA in direct implementation in this city, through the RCA-Kivuko project, and independent implementation by Cheka Sana Tanzania, an implementing partner organisation that also operates in Mwanza.

I.5 Structure of the report

This report is structured as follows:

- Section 1 provides an overview of the assignment;
- Section 2 describes the methodological approach, its limitations and the approach to mitigation;
- Section 3 introduces the Fit Persons intervention and the RCA implementing partner organisations;
- Section 4 discusses the main findings; and
- Section 5 presents the emergent conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

A compilation of supporting information has also been appended to the report (see Appendices I to IX) to expand on its main content.



2. Methodology, Limitations and Mitigation measures

2.1 Technical approach

The technical approach to the overall evaluation was theory-based and aligned with a client-approved evaluation matrix. The theory-based approach was used to structure all evaluation activity around the project theory of change and the logical framework, to identify the contribution of contextual factors towards the achievement of the expected intervention results. With the support of the evaluation matrix, therefore, the evaluation was conceptualised under five main criteria (relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability) and incorporated other criteria that were pertinent to the analysis, namely, gender; lessons learned and recommendations.

In order to enhance the theory-based approach, an inclusive and participatory design was used to draw on the experience of the project stakeholders as key informants of the implementation experience. Utilisation-focused principles were further applied to ensure that the evaluation was conducted for and by its main end-users. This approach has served to increase the responsiveness of the evaluation to expressed end-user needs and the potential for results uptake during policy design and future programming.

Purposive sampling based on a sequential approach was used to address the anticipated diversity in data sources for the evaluation, namely documents and project stakeholders. It supported consultations with data sources that were best suited for providing accurate responses to the evaluation questions. Moreover, the use of a sequential approach allowed for the engagement of additional data sources throughout the evaluation, where required.

2.2 Implementation and analysis

Part 1 of the evaluation (May to July 2021) was implemented on a phased-basis, by an international team comprising three local and one international consultant. As such, the evaluation comprised five distinct phases: i) Inception; ii) Data generation; iii) Data analysis and results synthesis; iv) Reporting and validation; and v) Assignment management.

To enable the evaluation to delve deeper into the emergent findings from the Fit Persons intervention, additional data generation was conducted in one project city, Mwanza, during Part 2. In-country fieldwork was conducted by two local consultants, who were assigned to the RCA-Kivuko and Cheka Sana Tanzania interventions. The international consultant supported this process by engaging in remote data generation.

In addition to consulting additional project documents that were relevant for the intervention, the evaluators consulted three categories of project stakeholders, namely, the fit persons; former street-connected children who were being reunified with and reintegrated into their families; and project managers at the implementing partner organisations. The stakeholder consultations were guided by data generation protocols that were tailored to each category of stakeholder, and were conducted using in-person focus group discussions; and remote interviews. Importantly, to avoid undoing the progress that had been made in reunifying and reintegrating the young persons, data generation engaged a small sample of former street-connected young persons. To the extent possible, the discussion with the young persons was non-invasive. To comply with the child safeguarding policy of the implementation partnership, as well as standard child safeguarding policy, any young person who showed signs of distress during the discussion would

have been referred to the implementing partner for immediate follow up action.⁵

Data analysis was based on a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. The results of this process were used to inform results synthesis and report production. A list of all project partners is provided in Appendix II, followed by a detailed description of the evaluation methodology in Appendix III.

2.3 Limitations and mitigation measures

Part 2 of the evaluation was challenged by three limitations: limited resource availability; stakeholder unavailability for consultation; and the COVID-19 travel restrictions.

As a result of limited evaluation resources, with emphasis on human and financial resources and the evaluation timeframe, it was difficult for the evaluators to engage all stakeholders who had been involved in the intervention. This limitation was compounded by the competing work priorities of staff at the implementing partner organisations.

Further, as Part 2 of the evaluation was implemented after the parent project had ended, there was limited funding to reimburse the fit persons for the cost of travelling to the data generation venues. In order to mitigate these challenges, purposive sampling based on a sequential approach was used to select the most appropriate sources of data, to ensure data source reliability; results validity; and continuous data generation throughout the evaluation. A blended approach to data generation, involving in-person and remote consultations, was also used to engage the views of all relevant stakeholders.

The COVID-19 travel restrictions prevented the international consultant from travelling to Tanzania to conduct in-country fieldwork. As a mitigation measure, therefore, the international consultant engaged in remote data generation, through the use of Microsoft Teams; electronic mail; and telephone calls, to complement the work of the local consultants. As the team leader for the evaluation, the international consultant also facilitated regular team exchanges by remote communication, to quality assure the evaluation process.

⁵ None of the young persons showed any signs of distress or discomfort during the discussion.



3. The Fit Persons Intervention

3.1 Background

Children and youth living and working on the streets (CYLWS) of Tanzania face an increased risk of violence from adults and young persons, alike.⁶ In light of this context, the UN General Comment project was designed to address the main factors that can contribute strongly to street entry by vulnerable young persons. Further, the project has centred on the need to reduce violence towards street-connected young persons based on the recognition of their individual rights. Consequently, the Fit Persons intervention has aimed to provide temporary family-based care for young persons up to the age of 14 years, who have been rescued from the streets. While young persons above this age have also been placed with fit families, the focus on CLWS up to age 14 has drawn on the rationale they have weaker (or fewer) street connections and, therefore, would have a greater willingness to leave the streets.

3.2 Description

The RCA Fit Persons intervention is informed by the Tanzania Law of the Child Act (2009) and in particular, the 2016 Fit Persons Regulations.⁷ Of note, however, as of November 2021, the Fit Persons Regulations had not yet been finalised by the government. The Fit Persons intervention has involved a collaboration between RCA and the Government of Tanzania, to incorporate the government-managed Fit Persons programme into the project activities of the RCA implementation partnership. This intervention has been equally informed by the Tanzania Child Protection Regulations.

By definition, a fit person is an individual of full age, who has been assessed at the local government level to be a person of high integrity, with the capacity to provide a caring environment for a child to whom (s)he is not related (see text box). The recruitment and assessment of each fit person is led by a DSWO from the local government authority (LGA) Department of Social Welfare, following the delegation of this responsibility by the head of the department. Alternatively, the departmental head has the power to delegate this function to an agency or body that has been identified as having the appropriate capacity to complete the required task.

Definition of a fit person

A person of full age who is of high moral character and integrity and of sound mind, who is not a relative of the child, and [is] capable of looking after a child, and who has been approved by a social welfare officer as being able to provide a caring home for a child.

Source: Adapted from Tanzania Law of the Child Act 2009, paragraph 3

Although the department accepts nominations for the role of fit person from communities (e.g. from CSOs), the selection of fit persons is based on a formal application using a standard assessment form. This form is used to compile a detailed overview of the background of the applicant, including information about her/ his household; criminal liabilities; and references. The department uses the results of the application process to: i) establish a pool of fit persons to facilitate emergency and/ or

⁶ 2016 Project Evaluation Report: Community Reintegration of Children and Youth Living on the Streets of Mwanza, sub-Section 3.4.1

⁷ As of November 2021, the 2016 Fit Persons Regulations

short-term accommodation for vulnerable children, as contextually identified by the LGA; and ii) place vulnerable children in need of emergency and/ or short-term accommodation and care with appointed fit persons.

In essence, a fit person is a specialist foster parent. While foster parents usually anticipate being allowed to adopt the child(ren) under their temporary care, a fit person facilitates a short-term placement while arrangements are made for the children to be returned to the care of their families. Within the context of the UN General Comment project, the children who have been placed with fit persons are primarily street-connected young persons. There are, however, several categories of young persons who are eligible to be placed at the homes of fit persons, including :

- Children who are in conflict with the law;
- Children who live in a violent domestic environment and/ or have been victims of abuse;
- Abandoned children;
- Children who are lost;
- Runaways;
- Children who cannot be accommodated by relatives upon the sudden illness of their primary caregiver;
- Hard-to-place children, such as sibling groups;
- Etc.

Street-connected young persons include children from the above-listed categories. Of note, therefore, the UN General Comment project has involved collaboration between the RCA implementing partners and the DSWOs, to support the accommodation of vulnerable young persons at the homes of fit persons. With reference to children who live and work on the streets (CLWS),⁸ the Fit Persons intervention has specifically engaged this category of young persons to rescue them from the life of the streets.

It is worth noting that there is an option to facilitate emergency and/ or short-term accommodation for a child within a residential children's home. Based on

the rationale that a family home provides a more stable and nurturing environment for the vulnerable child, however, a placement with a fit person has been cited by government (and the RCA implementing partners) as being a preferred option.

Importantly, therefore, CLWS are not only placed with individual fit persons, but with a 'fit family,' where possible. As the placements are managed by the Department of Social Welfare, the DSWO assigns each fit person to a CLWS case that has been identified by an implementing partner, although negotiation about the placement is possible based on the needs of each child.

3.3 The implementing partners

In line with the implementation of the UN General Comment project, the Fit Persons intervention has been implemented across the six project cities in Tanzania (Arusha; Dar es Salaam; Dodoma; Iringa; Mbeya; and Mwanza). The intervention in each city has been led by one of the six project implementing partner organisations (see textbox and Appendix II).

Project implementing partners

- Amani Centre
- Baba Watoto Centre
- Caritas
- Cheka Sana Tanzania
- Iringa Development of Youth Disabled and Children
- Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training

Source: *Railway Children Africa, 2021*

In Mwanza, however, RCA contributes towards the direct implementation of the Fit Persons intervention, through its RCA-Kivuko project. It shares this responsibility with Cheka Sana Tanzania, which also facilitated a Fit Persons intervention in this city.

⁸ Also referenced as Children Living and Working on the Streets



4. Main Findings

4.1 Overview

This section of the report discusses the emergent findings from the analysis of the Fit Persons intervention. The discussion aligns with the main evaluation criteria for the UN General Comment project, namely, relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; gender; and sustainability, as defined by OECD-DAC (see Appendix IV). Further, to ensure that the analysis meets the expressed needs of its end-users, the discussion has been structured around the specific lines of enquiry of the ToR (see sub-Section 1.3 of this report). The analysis within this section has a particular focus, therefore, on the effectiveness and efficiency of the intervention. Where applicable, examples of good practices have been highlighted to inform future interventions by RCA and organisations that are engaged in similar work. Data generation for the analysis has involved a review of relevant project documents and the literature, and consultations with key informants.

4.2 Relevance

The relevance of the Fit Persons intervention has been measured as the extent to which its objectives have responded to the priorities of the implementation partnership, relative to the UN General Comment Project. As the focus of the intervention has been on street connected young persons who have been rescued from the streets, the analysis of relevance has also considered the extent to which the expressed needs of the young persons have been met. Where applicable, the effect of changing circumstances, on the continued relevance of the intervention for its main stakeholders, has further been explored.

The results of the analysis have shown that **the Fit persons intervention has been contextually relevant to the process of facilitating the street exit of street-**

connected young persons in Tanzania. Specifically, the intervention has responded to the need for rescued CLWS to be accommodated in a nurturing household environment, in preparation for reunification with their families, followed by household reintegration. In line with this process, the intervention has further aligned with the local government mandate to safeguard the well-being of vulnerable young persons under its care.

Finding 1: The RCA Fit Persons intervention has been contextually relevant for providing temporary accommodation for rescued CLWS in a nurturing setting during family reunification and child reintegration.

In order to effectively address the situation of street-connected young persons in the six project cities, the RCA implementation partnership has collaborated with local government to incorporate the Fit Persons programme into its project activities. Given its responsibility for overall project management, RCA initiated this collaboration at two levels, with a focus on rescuing young persons up to the age of 14 years (see Section 3.1). At the first level, RCA has been an observer of the LGA-managed Fit Persons programme, which has been implemented by local government through the Department of Social Welfare (see Section 3.2), to safeguard the well-being of children in need of protection at the district and ward levels. RCA has contributed to the implementation process by collaborating with the department to produce an assessment form for use by the implementing partners. The form was to be used to assess each fit person, and by extension their household, to decide on the appropriateness of the setting for child placement. The first level of collaboration has, therefore, included an assessment of risk, based on the identified needs of the young person(s) for whom accommodation has been sought.

At the second level, the implementing partners have collaborated closely with the Department of Social Welfare in their respective cities, to seek temporary accommodation for children who are being rescued from the streets. During child rescue, the role of the implementing partner has involved tracing the family of each young person and preparing both parties for family reunification and child reintegration. Family reunification refers to the physical return of the rescued child to her/ his family of origin, involving 'the process of bringing together the child and family or previous care provider for the purpose of establishing or re-establishing long-term care' (Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children, 2019, p. 3)⁹. Child reintegration involves a permanent transition of a child without parental care back into her/ his biological family or another form of family-based care or community of origin (Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children, 2019, p. 3)¹⁰.

The duration of the combined reunification and reintegration process has been determined by several factors, including the domestic environment within the child's home of origin, and the willingness of the family and the child to reunite. As a result, the collaboration between each implementing partner and the Department of Social Welfare has entailed assessing the suitability of the fit person's household for child placement; assessing the social and economic needs of the rescued child, the household of origin, and the fit person's household; and facilitating psycho-therapeutic interventions for the child and his/her family throughout the placement.

Within this context, the incorporation of the Fit Persons programme into the RCA intervention has responded to the continuous influx of young persons to the streets of Tanzania's major cities (namely, the six project cities). In essence, it is difficult for all rescued young persons to be accommodated at the

residential care institutions that might exist in each city. There has also been significant global debate on the negative impact of long-term residential care on young persons, in contrast to the re-integration of each child in a protective family environment.¹¹ Most residential care institutions also cater for long-term residents, as opposed to young persons who require shorter-term accommodation for an indeterminate period, and specialist care to enable them to return home. Within the current project context, however, the exceptions are the residential care institutions that were specifically engaged by RCA as part of the larger UN General Comment project, to provide specialist care services to CYLWS. As the RCA intervention has facilitated access by rescued CLWS to the 'specialist setting' they require, to prepare for family reunification and integration, it has been contextually relevant for this purpose.

4.3 Effectiveness

As a measure of effectiveness, the analysis has examined the extent to which the intervention has met its anticipated objectives, with emphasis on the reunification of rescued CLWS with their families, and their reintegration into their household of origin. In accordance with the ToR, particular emphasis has been placed on the elements of the intervention that have worked well and those elements that need to be strengthened in future projects. Given the need for the intervention to comply with local government regulations, the analysis has also been used to consider the extent to which the intervention has followed LGA regulations for child protection and placement with fit persons.

The emergent results of the analysis have indicated that **the RCA intervention has supported the successful reunification of CLWS and their families, and has facilitated the development of a standardised process to quality assure child placement. Fit persons have also benefitted from an**

⁹ Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children, 2019. National Guidelines on Children's Reintegration with their Families [pdf]. Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children. Available at: <https://www.jamii.go.tz/uploads/publications/en1603175245-National%20Reintegration%20Guidelines.pdf> [Accessed 3 September 2021].

¹⁰ Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children, 2019. National Guidelines on Children's Reintegration with their Families [pdf]. Ministry of Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children. Available at: <https://www.jamii.go.tz/uploads/publications/en1603175245-National%20Reintegration%20Guidelines.pdf> [Accessed 3 September 2021].

¹¹ See, for example, http://handstohearts.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Global-Fact-Sheet-on-Orphanages_BetterCareNetwork.pdf; and

opportunity to enhance their childcare capacities, but at times have displayed negative views about CLWS. Notably, the challenges they have expressed about their case assignments have been linked to unmet expectations around compensation. The under-exploration of the reasons for CLWS drop-out from the intervention, by the implementation partnership, also has possible implications for future similar interventions.

Finding 2: The collaboration between the implementation partnership and local government to assign fit persons to rescued CLWS has contributed to a standardised forward-looking process for quality assuring child placement.

The RCA intervention has played a supporting yet complementary role to the LGA-managed Fit Person's programme, by maintaining the autonomy of the implementing partners to rescue CLWS from the streets. During child rescue, the RCA implementing partners collaborate with local government, to assess the needs of each young person in need of temporary accommodation and facilitate a placement at the home of a registered fit person. Notably, the Law of the Child Act mandates the Department of Social Welfare to facilitate: i) child safeguarding and welfare, including for children who are 'lost ... abandoned or ... seeking refuge' or are in conflict with the law; and ii) family reconciliation.¹² Further, as the department is responsible for the recruitment and selection of fit persons, the head of social welfare is authorised to delegate these tasks to the DSWO and/ or an external entity. In this regard, the collaboration between the department and the implementing partners has been based, in part, on delegated responsibility for the identification; selection; assessment; and supervision of fit persons. During this process, the department has also worked closely with the implementing partners. As the RCA intervention feeds into the LGA programme, however, the responsibility for compiling a register of approved fit persons and facilitating child placement has remained with the Department of Social Welfare.

Relatedly, the approach used by the implementing partners to recruit and assess fit persons, mirrors the approach that has been advocated by the

Department of Social Welfare in the 2016 Fit Persons Regulations. Following an initial session with local government officials to introduce the Fit Persons intervention, a request for fit persons is issued by implementing partners at the community level. The request for candidates provides full details of the eligibility criteria; the application process; and contact details from which further information is accessible. In line with LGA regulations, the implementing partners also facilitate community sensitisation sessions to publicise the intervention within local communities.¹³ The approach involves an initial meeting with community leaders, followed by a subsequent session with the general community, to provide information on the expected responsibilities of fit persons; the associated government programme; and the work of the implementing partner organisation.

As part of the eligibility criteria for case assignment,¹⁴ the implementing partners also facilitate a mandatory training on a range of pertinent subjects for all recruited candidates. This training is also used to enhance the performance of fit persons during child placement. Importantly, however, each recruited fit person has to be assessed by the DSWO before case assignment, with final approval being provided by the head of social welfare. Of note, the fit persons who have participated in the training have emphasised its relevance for their role.¹⁵

Overall, the collaboration between the Department of Social Welfare and the implementing partners has been front-end intensive. Considerable emphasis has been placed on quality assuring implementation, to ensure compliance with the regulations that govern the work of the department (the Law of the Child Act; the Fit Persons Regulations; and the Child Protection Regulations), and the child safeguarding policies of the implementing partners. Although the collaboration has an in-built flexibility that allows for negotiations on child placement (see Finding 1), it has contributed towards a standardised quality assurance process. Given the replicability of the approach to quality assure short-term accommodation for CLWS, and in effect, their rehabilitation from the life of the streets, it can be considered as an example of good practice.

¹² See Law of the Child Act, paragraph 94 and 104

¹³ See Fit Persons Regulations (2016), #6

¹⁴ See Finding 3

¹⁵ See Finding 3

Specifically, in line with the Child Protection Regulations, the Fit Persons intervention has supported collaboration with local government that contributes towards: i) the safeguarding and welfare of rescued CLWS; ii) the provision of suitable accommodation for each child; iii) child maintenance; and iv) the educational achievement and health of each child.¹⁶

Finding 3: As the trainings for fit persons have supported enhanced childcare capacities among successful applicants, they have contributed towards increased potential within communities for improved parenting and respect for the rights of street-connected young persons. The intervention has been challenged, however, by the mindset and expectations of some fit persons.

As a condition of their recruitment and inclusion on the LGA register, all fit persons must participate in mandatory training (see Finding 2). Completion of the training is one criterion that has been used to inform the assignment of fit persons to CLWS cases, to provide short-term accommodation and support for family reunification and child reintegration. This training has been facilitated by the RCA implementing partners, and has been supported by the Department of Social Welfare, as required. The subjects that have been covered during the training sessions range from an overview of the implementing partner organisation, to specialised topics that align with the responsibilities of the fit person (see text box). Of note, the government training manual was used during the sessions.

In general, the fit persons have provided positive feedback on their training participation. Some participants indicated that the training has allowed them to improve their parenting skills during their interaction with rescued CLWS, as well as with their biological children. As a result, they rated the training as the most significant aspect of their fit person experience.

Examples of training topics

- Asking for help
- Behaviour management
- Implementing care plans for the child
- Rehabilitation and reintegration into the biological family
- Responsibilities of fit persons
- The challenges of looking after someone else's child
- The legal framework
- The role of the social welfare officer
- The work of the implementing partner
- Understanding the needs of children in conflict with the law

Source: Child Protection Manual – Tanzania Mainland, Participant's Handbook

Training feedback

- Skills acquired during the training helped the fit persons to easily discuss with children and also facilitated the reunification process. For instance, it is from the fit persons discussion with children [that] most of them revealed the truth about their place of origin
- We have increased [our] parenting skills. We now [are] not afraid to stay with street children. Before it was not easy because of the perception we had [about] the children

Source: Consultations with fit persons

By facilitating access to the training, the implementing partners have been complying with the 2012 Fit Persons Regulations, which specifically recommend capacity-building for fit persons to support the stability of each child placement.¹⁷ Further, the training design has included regular follow-up by the implementing partners and the DSWO during the placement, to monitor progress towards results achievement and support the resolution of emergent issues. It is of interest, therefore, that there have been several negative reports from fit persons about their child placement

¹⁶ See Child Protection Regulations 59(2)

¹⁷ See Fit Persons Regulations, #18

experience. Specifically, some fit persons have referred to unmet expectations during child placement and unforeseen challenges that arose (see text box).

Expectations of fit persons (Examples)

- Sometimes ... the children ... cause accidents [by] our neighbours but because you're the one who stays with the children all the cost is up to you; they [the implementing partner] don't even support us
- Before they give us children they should stay with them first and investigate the child so that [it] will be easy to ... know [the] weakness of [the] children
- [The] fit person should be capacitated on ... entrepreneurship skills
- The fit person should be considered, even by giving us an allowance
- They should at least give us allowance when ... the child [is] sick to give he/ him treatment
- [We need]:
 - a budget that could be used when children cause any problem to other community members
 - clothes and shoes [for the] children
 - an allowance
 - a budget that could be used when accommodating children
 - economic empowerment... to be able to accommodate many children
 - things that will motivate [us]; even if the child causes trouble we can pay for [the damage] without any complaint
- When they give us children ... they should at least cooperate with other organisations that [provide] services to children so that we can receive even food if they don't have [a] budget
- They don't support you for buying the child's school necessities

Source: *Consultations with fit persons*

While the implementing partners have acknowledged some of these challenges, they have noted that some of the stated expectations of the fit persons were unrealistic and/ or did not reflect the training they had received (see text box).

Challenges during child placement (Examples)

- We made it clear that we were not providing a salary ... but some fit persons still wanted money
- Some children went to the fit persons and were stealing, so the fit persons were unhappy and some decided not to work with [us] as they thought [we] sent the children to take their things
- Some fit persons want you to provide everything
- How they spoke of the child as a negative person, some of them [fit persons] probably accepted to be fit persons thinking there is something in return

Source: *Consultations with implementing partners*

With certainty, the expectations of the fit persons in relation to incentives and compensation raises a question about the motives for their participation. Moreover, it is worth considering whether the terms of their engagement were clearly communicated to them. As the fit persons are included on the local government register, they can be enlisted for a similar role with other agencies. The Fit Persons Regulations also indicate that each fit person is entitled to minimum support during child placement that can include, but is not limited to: i) a child maintenance allowance; ii) a fee for caring for the child; and iii) a retention fee.¹⁸ Consequently, as explored during consultations with fit persons, if one or more of these provisions are met by other agencies with which the fit persons are associated, their discontent with the RCA intervention would stem from the lack of similar compensation.

It is understandable that as the RCA intervention has been based on a limited budget, it has not been possible to compensate the fit persons financially for their services. It is not unreasonable, in consequence, for the fit persons to anticipate some financial support to address emergent issues during child accommodation. To illustrate, although a child who becomes ill can be taken to the public hospital, the fit person will still incur certain costs (e.g. the cost of

¹⁸ See Regulation #29

transportation). The question that arises, here, is whether a contingency fund was included in the project budget to meet these emergent costs.

Significantly, the fit persons intervention has allowed for built parenting capacities at the community level, which: i) support enhanced short-term care for rescued CLWS to prepare them for family reconciliation¹⁹; ii) have the potential to stem street (re)entry; and iii) can contribute towards increased respect for street-connected young persons. There is an observable gap, however, in the extent to which the intervention has facilitated increased understanding, among the fit persons, of the challenges that are likely during the accommodation of rescued CLWS. Similarly, the budget allocation for the intervention was not adequately informed by the possibility for unforeseen child placement costs, and the need for fit persons to be assisted in meeting these emergent costs.

Finding 4: While the Fit Persons intervention has had notable success in reunifying CLWS with their families, the reasons for project dropout have remained underexplored.

The essence of the Fit Persons intervention has been its support for the rehabilitation of street-connected young persons to allow for their effective reconnection with their families, including complete street exit. Indeed, the intervention was designed to provide a nurturing domestic environment in the temporary setting of the fit person’s home to facilitate this process and, therefore, allocates a maximum of three children per household. Indeed, through the combined efforts of the implementing partners and the Department of Social Welfare, the intervention has had notable success in reunifying rescued CLWS with their families and reintegrating them into their respective households. As an example, a total of 480 CLWS were placed with (referred to) fit persons between 2020 and 2021 in Mwanza (see Exhibit 1). Approximately 61 percent of these young persons (292 CLWS) were referred to the fit persons by social workers based within the implementing partner organisations in Mwanza, while the referral point for the remaining 39 percent (188 CLWS) was the Department of Social Welfare. Further, CLWS up to the age of 14 years accounted

for approximately 72 percent of the total number of referrals, (129 girls and 216 boys).

	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total (%)
No. of CLWS referred to fit persons by implementing partners	196 (69)	96 (49)	292 (61)
No. of CLWS referred to fit persons by Department of Social Welfare	87 (31)	101 (51)	188 (39)
Total number of referrals	283	197	480
No. of intervention dropouts aged 6-9	2 (5)	1 (25)	3 (7)
No. of intervention dropouts aged 10-14	38 (95)	3 (75)	41 (93)
Total no. of dropouts	40	4	44
No. of reintegrated young persons still living at home	25 (89)	6 (100)	31 (91)
No. of reintegrated young persons who returned to the streets	3 (11)	0	3 (9)
Total no. of reintegrated young persons	28	6	34

Exhibit 1 Summary intervention statistics, 2020 - 2021

As of June 2021, 11 rescued CLWS (6 girls aged 7 to 13 and 5 boys aged 7 to 10) were in residence at the homes of fit persons pending their reunification with their families and reintegration into their homes. In addition, 34 young persons (6 girls and 28 boys) were reintegrated into their families of origin within the Mwanza area. Of these 34 young persons, 91 percent (6 girls and 25 boys) were still living with their families following reintegration, as of June 2011. The remaining three young persons (three boys, who

¹⁹ Family reconciliation, in the current context, refers to family reunification and child reintegration.

represented 9 percent of the reintegrated young persons) had returned to the streets. Of further interest, approximately nine percent of the total number of CLWS referrals (four girls and 40 boys) dropped out of the intervention. While this figure might appear to be low, it is significant insofar as it represents young persons who have likely returned to the streets. In this regard, it is concerning that the underlying reasons for the dropout were shared by the fit persons and not by the young persons themselves. Moreover, a formal assessment to acquire the views of the young persons has not been initiated through the implementation partnership, and the Department of Social Welfare has noted a reluctance of the young persons to indicate the reasons for their actions. Given that the aim of the intervention has been to rescue CLWS from the streets, the lack of an explanation for CLWS dropout, as supported by a thorough exploration of this issue, presents a challenge for future programming. Specifically, there is a lack of clarity on which programming areas need to be revised and/ or enhanced to achieve the intended intervention result and prevent future dropouts from subsequent interventions.

4.4 Efficiency

As a measure of efficiency, the analysis of the intervention explored resource use relative to the delivery of expected results. The primary focus has been on the extent to which results were delivered economically, including within the designated timeframe. Consequently, the results of the analysis have shown that **the intervention has created potential for a sense of results ownership at the community level, although this has conflicted with negative views about CLWS, as harboured by some community members. A change of community mindsets, combined with the facilitation of adequate post-placement follow-up support for rescued CLWS, is a work in progress.**

Finding 5: While the engagement of communities in the nomination of fit persons can lead towards community ownership of family reconciliation efforts, a general change in community mindsets about CLWS remains a work in process.

In the effort to secure temporary accommodation for rescued CLWS, the implementing partners have relied on the support of communities to identify

suitable candidates for the role of fit person. Further to providing an initial overview of the intervention at the ward level (see Finding 2), communities have been sensitised on the nature of the intervention and the specific responsibilities of each fit person. Community sensitisation has involved in-person sessions at community meetings, as well as the circulation of posters at the typical venues for regular community gatherings, such as, places of worship. While the outreach to each community mobilised persons with an interest in becoming fit persons, it also informed the agenda of general community meetings, resulting in the nominations for the position.

On the one hand, as the nominations were in response to a request from the implementing partners, they presented as an automated response to a request for assistance. On the other hand, as the nominations were mutually discussed and agreed upon by communities, they contributed to a participatory approach to community-level decision-making. The joint nomination of fit persons further reflected a community-based approach to the situation of CLWS, in that the nomination were made by and for each community. As this approach supports community ownership of the results of the intervention, the engagement of communities in the nomination of fit persons can be considered as an example of good practice.

Community members were nominated for pre-selection as fit persons, as they displayed a general capacity to nurture young persons, including vulnerable young persons. Yet, consultations with some fit persons revealed a general negativity towards street-connected young persons, including the rescued cases under their care.

“We have learned how to live with stubborn children like these ones. They are thieves. They are immoral... We have learned how to talk to them until they change”

Source: *Consultations with fit persons*

The RCA intervention has invested in built capacities among fit persons, to enable them to better understand the situation of CLWS and recognise the rights of this category of young persons. Of note,

however, this investment has not necessarily led to changed mindsets among fit persons and, by extension, the general community.

Finding 6: Although the average length of child placement has been informed by the unique situational needs of each rescued child, post-placement follow-up support to facilitate successful family reconciliation for CLWS has been less than adequate.

In line with Child Protection Regulation 22, children who are under the care of the LGA and require short-term placements must be accommodated in an appropriate environment, namely, one that meets their individual needs. Within the context of the Fit Persons intervention, each placement is further informed by the skills of the fit person to whom the child is assigned and the household environment in which the child will be accommodated. Of necessity, therefore, the case assignment and child placement is determined by a range of contextual factors that include, but are not limited to: the age and gender of the child; the length of time (s)he has spent on the streets; the presence of children within the household of the fit person; the medical condition of the child; and behavioural issues displayed by the child, as well as by other children within the fit person's household.

Notably, the LGA estimate for the average length of the child placement ranges from one week to six months. As CLWS have faced different challenges in their households of origin and during their time on the streets, however, the main criteria for determining the actual length of child placement are the unique needs and circumstances of each child. For the RCA-Kivuko project, for example, while the average length of child placement has been 24 days, placements have ranged from one to twelve weeks in duration. Importantly, therefore, in addition to the mandatory trainings for fit persons that precede child placement (see Finding 2), as a condition of their case assignment fit persons are encouraged to 'attend the regular reviews of the care plan' for each rescued CLWS.²⁰ Of note, the care plan for each child outlines the support that is to be provided during the placement, and 'could include regular visits from a social welfare officer; counselling; support from a

[non-governmental organisation]; etc.'²¹ Moreover, the needs assessment that is conducted by each implementing partner before case assignment (see Finding 2) has been used to identify the specific needs of all relevant parties during child placement (namely, the rescued CLWS; the fit person's household; and the child's original household) to address identified support needs.

Importantly, consultations with fit persons have indicated that regular follow-up has been conducted by the implementing partners, through in-person visits and telephone communication. The implementing partners have used this interaction to monitor the progress of the rescued child, and assist with emergent issues that arise. It is of interest, therefore, that the intervention has not provided adequate evidence of post-placement follow-up, in particular, at the level of the rescued child's household of origin. To illustrate, consultations with rescued CLWS have highlighted at least one domestic environment that has remained unchanged following the intervention (see text box).

Interviewer:

Have things improved between you and your family?

Rescued CLWS:

No, our grandmother is still drinking alcohol excessively.

Source: Consultation with rescued CLWS

Conceivably, the implication of this situation is a possible return to the streets by the rescued child(ren) if the domestic situation worsens. This begs the question of whether the intervention has been worthwhile, and/ or whether sufficient time was allocated for the child placement, including contextual intervention.

Finding 7: The late provision of material supplies during CLWS placement, in some instances, has counteracted the success of the Fit Persons intervention in establishing a care plan to address the needs of each rescued child.

²⁰ Child Protection Manual – Tanzania Mainland, Participant's Handbook, p. 19.

²¹ Child Protection Manual – Tanzania Mainland, Participant's Handbook, p. 19.

To ensure that the efforts to rescue CLWS are tailored to the needs of each child, a joint assessment of needs is conducted by the implementing partners in collaboration with the Department of Social Welfare (see Finding 6). Although the assessment is conducted at three levels (needs of the rescued child; needs of the fit person's household; needs of the child's household of origin), it is structured around the rescued CLWS. The assessment is used to inform child placement, as well as family reunification and child reintegration, and responds to Fit Persons Regulation 29 and 31 (see text box). Of importance, the cited regulations also align with the national Child Protection Regulations,²² which emphasise the need for the LGA to: i) facilitate accommodation that is safe and adequate for children in need of protection; and ii) provide maintenance for child upkeep.

Regulations governing CLWS maintenance

Fit Persons Regulation 29:

The LGA shall ensure that a child in its care or under a place of safety is provided with adequate accommodation and shall maintain the child

Fit Persons Regulation 31:

Maintenance includes:

- Food; clothing; toiletries and cleaning products
- Health and education costs
- Travel costs
- *General wear and tear*

Source: *Child Protection Manual – Tanzania Mainland, Participant's Handbook*

While child maintenance can take the format of a financial allowance to each fit person, it can be (and has been) complemented by material provisions for the upkeep of each rescued child. Fit persons have, therefore, received foodstuffs; school supplies; bedding; etc., to support the accommodation of rescued CLWS. In some cases, however, there has been a significant delay in the provision of child maintenance, to the extent that fit persons have received material provisions at the end of the child placement (see text box).

"I received support to look after each child after six months when the children left

After two months when the children left they [the implementing partner] gave me a mattress, two cover sheets and a mosquito net"

Source: *Consultations with fit persons*

In this scenario, the emergent issue has been the untimely receipt of the anticipated support for maintaining rescued CLWS. The timing of the delivery has supported the replenishment of the personal resources that were used by fit persons to facilitate child upkeep. Replenishment does not, however, negate the possible financial challenges to the fit person's household during the placement. As a result, the late delivery of child maintenance has counteracted the success of the intervention in establishing a care plan to ensure that the unique needs of each rescued child are effectively addressed.

4.5 Impact

In order to determine the impact of the intervention, the analysis explored the emergent effects of implementation. The intention was to identify effects that were anticipated, as well as unforeseen, irrespective of whether they could be considered as positive or negative. In this regard, the analysis has indicated that **the intervention has contributed to an aversion to the life of the streets among rescued young persons. Yet, some CLWS have become attached to the households of the fit persons, posing a challenge to their reintegration into their family homes.**

Finding 8: While there has been an increasing aversion to the streets among rescued CLWS, progress towards family reunification and reintegration has been challenged by an emergent attachment by some of the young persons towards the households of the fit persons.

The RCA Fit Persons intervention has had some measure of success in facilitating the reunification of rescued CLWS with their families, followed by a reintegration into their household of origin. As of

²² See Child Protection Regulations 59(2)

June 2021, for example, a total of 35 children (6 girls and 29 boys) between the ages of 9 and 15 years had been reunified with their families and were living in Mwanza. An additional 11 rescued CLWS in this city (6 girls and 5 boys) were also being accommodated at the homes of fit persons during this period.

Consultations with a small sample of rescued children²³ revealed that the RCA intervention contributed to their street exit (see text box). The young persons did not only voice an unwillingness to return to the streets, but indicated that CLWS are at high risk of being abused and lack access to productive opportunities. Further, they recommended measures that could be taken by persons in authority, to prevent street entry and support street exit by other young persons (see text box). Of note, one child expressed an interest in returning to her family home to be with her mother, based on the rationale that the fit person was “neither my mother nor a relative.”²⁴ Moreover, while police round-ups have been described by CLWS and implementing partners as being traumatic, this practice was recommended by the rescued CLWS, insinuating the urgent need to discourage street entry and support street exit.

Recommendations by rescued CLWS

Children who are still on the streets should:

- return home [because] they will end up being killed during the night
- accept to be sent to fit persons
- stop telling lies and be reunified

Those who have been reunified should not come back on the streets.

There is need for:

- awareness creation to ... parents, especially on parenting skills and communication skills
- education to children and their parents or guardians on child rights and educational punishment
- round ups all the time by police officers and teachers

Source: Consultations with rescued CLWS

Interestingly, in addition to an expressed appreciation for their placement (“...the life there is so nice;” “I love the place²⁵”), in some instances rescued CLWS have grown attached to the households of the fit persons. While this development reflects the effectiveness of the Fit Persons intervention, it defeats the objective of facilitating family reconciliation. The noted attachment further indicates that the intervention at the level of the child’s household of origin has not been sufficient to address the factors that contributed towards street entry. Similarly, a child’s return to a fit person’s home points to a placement that was too short to allow for the anticipated family reunification and child reintegration.

4.6 Gender

The gender criterion was measured as the extent to which the intervention was able to facilitate gender equality. This has entailed identifying evidence of the elimination of all discrimination on the basis of sex. Of note, however, although gender is non-binary,²⁶ the definition of gender that has been used in the analysis confirms with the definition that has been used during project implementation (the male-female binary). Relatedly, the analysis has shown that **the pre-selection of fit persons by the implementing partners has been independent of gender. At the level of local government, however, gender has been prioritised during the selection process, along with a preference for child placements within a nuclear family setting.**

Finding 9: Although gender has not been the main criterion for the selection of fit persons by the implementing partners, it has been prioritised during LGA child placement.

For the RCA intervention, the main criterion for the selection of fit persons has been a capacity to provide a nurturing environment for rescued CLWS, to support effective family reunification and child reintegration (see sub-Section 3.2). Nominations and/ or applications have been accepted from both male and female candidates who meet this criterion, on the understanding that final selection and case assignment would be determined by the results of a

²³ Two of the children had been reintegrated into their families and three of the children were staying with fit persons.

²⁴ Statement by rescued CLWS (girl) aged 11 years

²⁵ Statements by rescued CLWS (boy and girl, aged 13 and 14, respectively)

²⁶ Kennelly, I., Merz, S., and Lorber, J. 2001. What is gender? *American Sociological Review*, 66(4), p.598.

household assessment. Successful candidates have also included persons who are married, and those who are single. Of interest, however, the Fit Persons Regulations specify a preference for a 'husband and wife' or 'a single woman,' each of whom must be ordinarily resident in the country.²⁷ Moreover, in the event of the death of the wife within a fit person household, the husband must undergo a mandatory assessment by the Department of Social Welfare, to determine whether he should retain responsibility for the placement, pending his interest in doing so.

The indirectly stated preference for 'a fit family' mirrors the approach that has been advocated by the Government of Tanzania. Based on its collaboration with UNICEF in 2013, Government developed a Fit Family Programme as a core service within its child protection system. By 2015, fit persons schemes were developed at the level of the LGAs, in collaboration with UNICEF, to deinstitutionalise the foster care system. In effect, fit persons are specialist foster parents (see sub-Section 3.2). Yet, the emphasis that has been placed on the contribution of 'the wife', as well as on the 'single woman,' reflects a perception, albeit a stereotypical one, that females are the best caregivers. Indeed, given the alignment of the RCA intervention with the Fit Persons programme, the implementing partners inherited the governmental approach to candidate selection. By issuing requests for community nominations of eligible candidates, however, the implementing partners have contributed to some diversity in the nominations. To illustrate, although they represent a small proportion of the total number of fit persons, men accounted for 15 percent of the fit persons who were engaged by the RCA intervention in Mwanza (46 out of 302 fit persons). This does not negate the possibility, however, that the male fit persons were part of a fit persons family.

4.7 Sustainability

The sustainability criterion was measured as the likelihood for a continuation of project benefits beyond the implementation timeframe, with a focus on the potential for results sustainability, as well as the continuation of project activities. Consequently, the results of the analysis have shown that **there is potential for the RCA intervention to continue**

beyond its end date, given its alignment with the LGA Fit Persons programme. In contrast, results sustainability has been challenged by inadequate follow up and therapeutic intervention subsequent to the reintegration of rescued CLWS into their households of origin.

Finding 10: The alignment of the RCA intervention with the LGA-managed Fit Persons programme has created the potential for project continuity beyond the funded timescale. The potential for results sustainability is being challenged, however, by inadequate follow-up and therapeutic intervention after child reintegration.

As the RCA Fit Persons intervention has been but one component of a donor-funded project, it has had a limited implementation timeframe. Given its alignment with the LGA Fit Persons programme, however, the intervention has adhered to local government requirements, in particular, the regulations that govern child protection, and those that regulate the appointment and management of fit persons.

To the extent that the RCA intervention has integrated LGA programming into its project activities, it has created an opportunity for ongoing collaboration with local government beyond the project end date, to address the situation of CLWS. Specifically, based on its register of eligible fit persons, the LGA programme is a resource for acquiring temporary accommodation for rescued CLWS (see Finding 2). Further, the programme facilitates the continuous monitoring of each rescued child during a supervised placement at the home of a fit person, through an individualised care plan. In essence, local government, through the Department of Social Welfare, has been mandated to safeguard the wellbeing of all children under its care, including children identified by CSOs as being in need of special protection.²⁸

Notwithstanding the potential for the continuation of project activities, at issue is the extent to which a similar development can be foreseen in the area of results sustainability. With certainty, the main objective of the RCA intervention is permanent street exit by rescued young persons through family

²⁷ See Fit Persons Regulations, #5

²⁸ See the Law of the Child Act, paragraph 94

reunification and child reintegration. The current analysis has found, however, that there have been instances of possible street re-entry by rescued CLWS, as they dropped out of the intervention (see Finding 4). There has also been evidence of unaddressed grievances within the households of origin of rescued CLWS.

On the one hand, the reason why some young persons dropped out of the intervention has remained underexplored by the implementation partnership. On the other hand, the analysis has provided at least one example of rescued children being reintegrated into a family in which domestic grievances had not been fully addressed (see Finding 6). Notably, the Fit Persons intervention, including the individualised care plan for each rescued child, is designed to establish the conditions that are required to successfully reintegrate the child into her/ his household following family reunification. The preparatory process includes an assessment of needs at the level of the household of origin, which equally

entails addressing the factors that contributed towards street entry, with the aim of resolution. Yet, an unchanged domestic environment implies two distinct but interrelated situations: i) the timeframe for therapeutic intervention was insufficient, leading to a continuation of the factors that contributed to street entry by young persons; and/or ii) there has been inadequate follow up with the household after child reintegration, to further support the permanent transition of the child into the family. In both situations there is an increased likelihood for street re-entry by rescued children, which contradicts the purpose of the Fit Persons intervention. It is to be noted, however, that the capacity for continued therapeutic intervention and follow-up support post-reintegration has been dependent on the availability of project funding to the implementing partnership.



5. Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons learned

5.1 Conclusions

By facilitating access to a nurturing household environment and support services to enable street-connected young persons to prepare for family reunification and household reintegration, the RCA Fit Persons intervention has made it possible for CLWS to exit the life of the streets. Given the close alignment of the intervention with local government programming, there is potential for ongoing collaboration between the implementing partners and local government. Equally, there is an opportunity for registered fit persons to continue to offer services that can be used to rehabilitate CLWS and other vulnerable young persons. Moreover, insofar as efforts have been made to actively engage communities in the pre-selection of fit persons, there has been scope for generating a sense of community ownership for the intervention and its anticipated results. Notably, the collaboration between the implementation partnership and local government, as well as the active engagement of communities in the pre-selection of fit persons, are examples of good practice that have been generated through the intervention.

Indeed, the stronger aspects of the intervention have included the expressed interest of nominated candidates in its main objective; their experience in engaging with vulnerable young persons; and the quality assurance of the family reconciliation process. As results achievement has been challenged by several factors, however, including negative community mindsets about street-connected young persons, the need to enhance future similar interventions is foreseen.

A summary of the emergent conclusions of the analysis are presented below in line with the main evaluation criteria.

5.1.1 Relevance

The RCA Fit Persons intervention has been directly responsive to the need to provide temporary accommodation for rescued CLWS in a nurturing domestic environment, and has been informed by the LGA mandate to safeguard the well-being of vulnerable young persons (**Linked to Finding #1**).

5.1.2 Effectiveness

In addition to its success in reunifying rescued CLWS and their families, the intervention has contributed to a standardised quality assurance process for child placement. Fit persons have also gained enhanced childcare capacities that are applicable beyond their assigned responsibilities. Results achievement has been challenged, however, by negative views about CLWS, as displayed by some fit persons, and their perception of unmet compensation expectations. The under-exploration of the reason for CLWS drop-out from the intervention also has implications for future similar interventions (**Linked to Finding #2; #3 and #4**).

5.1.3 Efficiency

The implementation process has supported the creation of a sense of ownership at the community level for the results of the intervention. This development has, at times, been offset by the negative views that community members have harboured about CLWS. The reversal of this mindset is a work in progress, as too is the facilitation of

follow-up support for successful street exit by rescued CLWS (**Linked to Finding #5; #6 and #7**).

5.1.4 Impact

As an emergent positive impact of the intervention, rescued young persons have developed an aversion to the life of the streets. A growing attachment by some young persons towards the households of the fit persons, however, was not foreseen and has, therefore, created a challenge for successful family reconciliation (**Linked to Finding #8**).

5.1.5 Gender

While the pre-selection of fit persons by the implementing partners has been independent of gender, the gender criterion has been prioritised by local government during the selection process. In line with the initial specifications of the Fit Persons programme, the local government authorities also have a preference for child placements that are assigned to a married couple/ fit family (**Linked to Finding #9**).

5.1.6 Sustainability

Based on its alignment with local government programming, there is potential for the RCA intervention to continue beyond its scheduled end date. Results sustainability has been challenged, however, by inadequate follow-up and therapeutic intervention further to child reintegration (**Linked to Finding #10**).

5.2 Recommendations

This sub-Section of the report presents the recommendations that have emerged from the results of the analysis. As the parent project of the Fit Persons intervention has ended, strategic and operational recommendations are outlined to inform future interventions by RCA; the implementing partners; and organisations that are engaged in similar work. It follows, therefore, that the recommendations do not include a timeframe for implementation and are not assigned to individual actors.

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the implementing partners should continue to work closely with the local government authority to

support the street exit and rehabilitation of street-connected young persons using the fit persons facility (**Related to All Findings; High priority**).

Rationale: The Fit Persons intervention has benefitted from an ongoing collaboration between the implementing partners and the local government authorities, through the Department of Social Welfare. Access to the LGA register of fit persons has allowed the implementing to partners to facilitate voluntary street exit by CLWS, by providing temporary accommodation and specialist care within a nurturing domestic setting. On account of their collaboration with local government, the implementing partners have benefitted from a standardised quality assurance process to safeguard the well-being of the rescued young persons in line with national law, and LGA regulations for child protection and the regulation of the fit persons facility. In the interest of direct intervention into the situation of street-connected young persons, therefore, it is worthwhile for the implementing partners to engage in continued collaboration with local government to support street exit by CLWS, as a core requirement for successful family reconciliation.

Recommendation 2: The implementing partners should invest further in community awareness-raising about the situation of CLWS and the fit persons facility, to support the creation of 'community allies' through an emergent sense of ownership for the rehabilitation of street-connected young persons (**Related to Findings #1; #3 and #5; High priority**).

Rationale: In spite of its success in securing a nurturing environment for the rehabilitation of CLWS, the Fit Persons intervention has been challenged by the negative mindset of some community members towards street-connected young persons. Of interest, negative perceptions about CLWS have also been expressed by fit persons, which contradicts their assigned responsibility, to support the rehabilitation of rescued CLWS. To ensure increased community support and encouragement for street exit by CLWS, there is need for a greater contextual understanding of the situation of street-connected young persons at the community-level. By facilitating increased understanding within communities, the implementing partners would be investing in the

creation of community allies who take ownership of family reunification and child reintegration efforts to ensure that they materialise as anticipated.

Recommendation 3: The implementing partners should continue to engage communities in the pre-selection of fit persons to support community ownership of the effective resolution of the situation of street-connected young persons **(Related to Findings #1; #3 and #5; High priority)**.

Rationale: The pre-selection of fit persons through agreed community-level nominations, was conducted through a participatory process that engaged entire communities. Nominated candidates were identified based on their record of interaction with young persons, including CLWS and young persons from other vulnerable groups. By engaging entire communities in the deliberations, the Fit Persons intervention created an opportunity for community members to better understand the nature of the intervention, as well as take ownership of the implementation process and the anticipated results for their community. To complement awareness-raising on the situation of street-connected young persons at the community-level, it would be worthwhile for the implementing partners to continue to engage entire communities in the efforts at resolution. This approach has the advantage of supporting input by communities to ensure that their stated needs are met.

Recommendation 4: It is recommended that the implementing partners should revisit their approach to managing the fit persons facility to ensure timely maintenance support for CLWS accommodation, including financial support for emergent issues **(Related to Finding #7; High priority)**.

Rationale: In accordance with the regulations for child protection and fit persons (Child Protection Regulation 59(2) and Fit Persons Regulation 29), each child under the care of the LGA, including at the homes of fit persons, is entitled to maintenance. This maintenance can take the form of financial and/ or material support. Although the intervention has facilitated access by fit persons to maintenance for child upkeep, some fit persons have expressed concern that it has not been timely. Further, the upkeep of rescued CLWS has included unforeseen costs that have been met by fit persons themselves in some instances. To allow the fit persons to better

support the needs of the children under their care, it is recommended that the implementing partners should re-visit their approach to managing child maintenance to ensure timely disbursement.

Recommendation 5: The implementing partners should collaborate with the Department of Social Welfare to re-visit the assessment process for child placement and the development of individualised care plans to ensure the adequacy of the placement timeline and the completeness of the therapeutic intervention **(Related to Findings #6; #8 and #10; High priority)**.

Rationale: A major role of the Department of Social Welfare relative to the intervention has been the matching of rescued CLWS with suitable fit persons, through child placement and case assignment, respectively. In order to meet the unique needs of each child during the preparation for family reconciliation, an individualised care plan is developed and monitored for the duration of the placement. Yet, there have been situations in which the child has dropped out of the intervention; has cited unchanged domestic circumstances; and/ or has grown attached to the household of the fit person. Each emergent situation points to an underestimation of resource requirements during the placement, with emphasis on the allocated timeframe; therapeutic support; and post-placement monitoring, for effective family reunification and child reintegration. It is recommended, therefore, that the implementing partners and the Department of Social Welfare should collaboratively re-visit the approach for developing and implementing care plans, to ensure that future similar interventions attain and sustain expected results.

Recommendation 6: RCA, in collaboration with the implementing partners and the Department of Social Welfare, should conduct a detailed enquiry into the reason for CLWS drop-out of the Fit Persons intervention, to rectify possible implementation gaps in future similar interventions **(Related to Findings #1; and #4; High priority)**.

Rationale: While there has been evidence of successful family reunification and child integration for rescued CLWS, there have been instances in which the young persons have dropped out of the intervention. The reason for their action is unclear, and have been underexplored. Although some fit

persons have expressed their opinions on the issue, the views of the young persons have remained largely unacquired. To stem a similar occurrence in future similar interventions, as well as enhance the areas of the programming that require attention, it is highly recommended that the implementing partners should collaborate with the Department of Social Welfare, to conduct an enquiry into the reasons for CLWS drop out from the intervention.

5.3 Lessons learned

The main lessons that have emerged from the analysis are:

1. **If the needs of rescued CLWS are inadequately assessed prior to child placement, the resultant individualised care plan will not provide the level of support that is needed to address the factors that contributed to street entry, and the unique effects of the streets on each child.** The development of care plans, including progress monitoring and therapeutic support for each rescued child, has not necessarily resolved the domestic and/ or psycho-social situations that have underpinned individual street connection.
2. **Although the fit persons have had significant interface with young persons, including those from vulnerable groups, they still require targeted sensitisation to better support young persons to overcome the challenges they face.** As fit persons are not immune to the effects of the contextual environment, they still require ongoing sensitisation on the situation of CLWS, to ensure that they provide unbiased support for the rehabilitation of their case assignments.
3. **A willingness by fit persons to volunteer their services, to facilitate street exit by CLWS, does not negate their need for timely support to address the anticipated and unforeseen costs of child placement.** While fit persons might understand that their services are unsalaried, it is not unrealistic for them to anticipate the timely provision of supplies for the upkeep of their child cases, as well as financial support to address emergent issues during child placement.



Appendix I: Terms of Reference

CONSULTANCY AGREEMENT FOR GENERATING SEPARATE REPORTS ON FIT PERSONS, COMMUNITY CARE PROJECT AND YOUTH IMPACT WITHIN THE DFID/FCDO PROJECT EVALUATION

Introduction:

In addition to the already signed consultancy agreement ... for the FCDO project Evaluation. RCA has requested ... separate reports focusing on the Fit Persons, and Community Care Interventions. These reports will help to inform RCA continued investments in these interventions.

Specifically, the focus on these areas will be:-

A. Fit Persons Intervention:

The fit persons intervention has been implemented in all the six cities, to provide alternative temporary family-based care for children rescued from the streets. Under this fit persons intervention the consultant will be expected to:

- To look at the process of Fit Persons from identification, screening and assessments, training, placement and then the experience and outcomes for children as well as the follow up by the DSWO and CSOs post placement.
- At each stage to evaluate how effective that was/what worked well and what were the challenges or things they didn't address adequately. It would be important for her to critique it vis a vis the actual guidelines/regulation so looking at what the policy require and how it was and is being implemented to see whether there are any incongruences.
- How many children were placed into fit persons (Aug 2020 to February 2021)
- How many children dropped out from fit persons in the period above– for what reasons?
- How many children are placed in each family at the same time, is there a limit?
- What was the referral point in to fit persons?
 - From the street
 - Courts
 - Abuse case removed from community.
 - Abandoned/dropped at social welfare?
 - Others (Specify)
- How long was each child in the fit persons home before they were reintegrated back home.
- How many children are still at family/community home after final reintegration ?

- How did children experience their time with the fit persons? What did they like the most? What bits did they like the least?

And for those back at home

- What has changed at home for the young person? How safe do they feel?

B. Community Care Project (Community Champions)

Community care project is designed to create a network of community champions at main entry points and hotspot areas to provide support, first step in the referral pathway for lone street children arriving in the streets. The Champions are selected due to their voluntary nature of helping children living and working on streets on their localities or place of work. In collaboration with CSOs across the six big cities in Tanzania, the project identified and capacitated community members to act as champions of children on the street. The community champions are expected to implement the following key activities:

- Provide support to children living and working on streets once they arrive in cities i.e. listen to them and link with support networks.
- Connect them to our social workers once a child enters the street for the first time.
- Create community awareness on the issues facing children living and working on streets to promote change in attitudes towards street connected children.
- Seek out organizations/individuals who can offer support and receive referrals from the network.

The consultant will be expected to:

- Assess the impact the community care project has made in the surrounding communities- In changing community perception on street connected children, CYLWS violence.
- Evaluate the community care project contribution in the project through CYLWS identification, linkages, and support.
- Evaluate level, relevance, and impact of support the project has provided to the community champions- trainings, coaching, supportive supervision, and coordination meeting (Look into material support vs community champions expectations)
- Assess the impact that community care project has made to children, having people they can trust, improved relationship between children and community members, assess the overall children's perception.

The expected deliverables are:-

4. Separate reports on each of the interventions outlined above covering the focus areas to include best practices, lessons learned, and recommendations.

1. ...DURATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT

Given that these components are part of the FCDO project evaluation, some aspects of the data collection will happen within the same period. Two members of the consultancy team will return to the field in July 2021, however, for a period of three days to delve deeper into the specific issues that are being addressed on the Fit persons and Community care interventions. The final reports will be submitted in mid-September, 2021.

1. PROFESSIONAL FEES, PAYMENTS AND EXPENSES

The total fee for this assignment ... includes fees and field expenses.

The consultant will invoice RCA for 50% of the fees on signing this contract, 50% upon submission of the final reports.

2. CONFIDENTIALITY

The engagement will be carried out confidentially. The consultant will neither use, nor appear to use, information acquired during this engagement without the written approval of RCA. The consultant will have to abide by Child Protection Policy of RCA and any of our partner organizations.

3. SAFEGUARDING POLICY

The consultant will abide by the Safeguarding Policy of Railway Children and the partner organizations. Railway Children's Safeguarding Policy is attached as Appendix A and consultants should read and sign the Statement of Commitment, returning it to Railway Children with the signed contract.

4. IN CASE OF BREACH IN CONSULTANCY AGREEMENT

In the circumstances wherein, the consulting organization does not deliver as per the mutually agreed terms and conditions as stated and agreed in this document, Railway Children reserves the right to take appropriate actions in line with the extent of the breach of contract as described below:

Nature of breach Proposed RC action

- If any /many of the assignment objectives remain unaddressed.
- If the consultant has done anything which could reasonably bring Railway Children into disrepute the payment may be withheld and or immediate suspension of the assignment
- It is to be noted that all the communications on the identified breach of contacts shall be strictly in line with professional standards. A decision would be made by logically analyzing the situations and circumstances under which the breach was committed.

5. INSURANCE

The Consultant shall ensure that they have comprehensive health insurance for the duration of the assignment and that the insurance is valid for all activities undertaken during this assignment.

The consultant will be liable for any loss, liability or costs (including reasonable legal costs) incurred by or claimed against Railway Children Africa as a result of any action taken whilst on this assignment that is in breach of RCA's behavioural protocols and or contravenes the law of the land.

6. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

- a. All Intellectual Property Rights arising from or in relation to the Engagement will belong to Railway Children Africa, absolutely.
- b. The Consultant hereby grants the Railway Children Africa a non-exclusive, perpetual, irrevocable, sub-licensable and transferable license of those Intellectual Property Rights owned by or licensed to

the Consultant and used by the Consultant in performing any or all of the Services for the Charity to enjoy the full benefit of this agreement.

7. STATUS

- c. The relationship of the Consultant to the Charity will be that of independent contractor and nothing in this agreement shall render[his/her]an employee, worker, agent or partner of the Charity.

This agreement constitutes a contract for the provision of services and not a contract of employment and accordingly the Consultant shall be fully responsible for and shall indemnify the Charity for and in respect of:

- i. any income tax, National Insurance and Social Security contributions and any other liability, deduction, contribution, assessment or claim arising from or made in connection with the performance of the Services, where such recovery is not prohibited by law. The Consultant shall further indemnify the Charity against all reasonable costs, expenses and any penalty, fine or interest incurred or payable by the Charity in connection with or in consequence of any such liability, deduction, contribution, assessment or claim; and
 - ii. any liability arising from any employment-related claim or any claim based on worker status (including reasonable costs and expenses) brought by the Consultant against the Charity arising out of or in connection with the provision of the Services.
- d. The Charity may at its option satisfy such indemnity (in whole or in part) by way of deduction from any payments due to the Consultant.

Appendix II: Implementation Partnership

	Organisation/ Agency	Location	Role
1.	Amani Centre for Street Children	Arusha, Tanzania	Implementing Partner
2.	Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth	Dar es Salaam, Tanzania	Implementing Partner
3.	Caritas	Mbeya, Tanzania	Implementing Partner
4.	Cheka Sana Tanzania	Mwanza, Tanzania	Implementing Partner
5.	Community for Children's Rights	Arusha, Tanzania	Advocacy Partner
6.	Consortium for Street Children	London, United Kingdom	Advocacy Partner
7.	Iringa Development of Youth Disabled and Children Care (IDYDC)	Iringa, Tanzania	Implementing Partner
8.	Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training (KISEDET)	Dodoma, Tanzania	Implementing Partner
9.	Railway Children	Cheshire, United Kingdom	Grant-holder
10.	Railway Children Africa	Dar es Salaam and Mwanza, Tanzania	Implementing Partner Project Management
11.	Tanganyika Law Society	Dar es Salaam and Mwanza, Tanzania	Advocacy Partner
12.	Tanzania Child Rights Forum	Dar es Salaam, Tanzania	Advocacy Partner

Appendix III: Methodology

Technical Approach and Methods

In response to the specifications of the ToR, this evaluation was theory-based and was executed using a client-approved evaluation matrix. The evaluation was further supported by an inclusive participatory approach; utilisation-focused principles; mixed-methods; and purposive sampling. The rationale for the technical approach is described in the sub-sections that follow.

Theory-based evaluations and the evaluation matrix:

The theory-based approach to evaluation involves structuring the evaluation around the theory of change/ logical framework of the development intervention that is being evaluated.²⁹ This approach is used to test the theory of change, to better identify the contextual factors, whether positive or negative; that have contributed to emergent results, irrespective of whether these results have been anticipated or unforeseen. The applicability of the theory-based approach to the current evaluation was noted especially by the emphasis of the ToR on generating evidence of expected, as well as unexpected, results.³⁰ Further, by seeking to identify the contextual factors that contributed towards results achievement, the ToR further justified the need for a theory-based approach.

To support the identification of the contextual factors that contributed to or impeded results achievement, the evaluation matrix was informed by the project theory of change. Further, the evaluation matrix conceptualised the evaluation under the five evaluation criteria that were to be

evaluated (relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact; and sustainability), along with other relevant criteria, notably, the cross-cutting theme, gender; lessons learned; and recommendations. By default, therefore, the client-approved evaluation matrix articulated a supporting logic of enquiry to guide data generation and analysis. The definition of each evaluation criterion is provided in Appendix IV, followed by the evaluation matrix in Appendix V. The articulated logic of enquiry comprised the key evaluation questions and sub-questions; data sources; and means of verification. In essence, the evaluation matrix supported the theory-based approach by establishing a process for verifying causal inference.

Of interest, ToR specifications implied that a performance measurement framework, as informed by the results of a project baseline, was established for the UN General Comment project.³¹ Yet, the quantitative measures that were outlined in the ToR (sub-Sections 1.2 and 1.3) were not reflected in the project theory of change, and the results chain that comprises the latter was not fully captured in the ToR. Significantly, the identification of the contextual factors that have affected results achievement is highly dependent on a clearly articulated results chain/ theory of change that identifies all anticipated project results. To support this process, the evaluation re-visited the project theory of change to take account of ToR specifications and the project theory of change. The result was a revised logical framework (see Table A1), which was used to inform the evaluation matrix, to accurately reflect the areas in which the project could have produced tangible results.

²⁹ Rogers, P., 2007. Theory-based Evaluations: Reflections ten years on. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 114, p.63.

³⁰ ToR, sub-Section 2.1

³¹ ToR, sub-Sections 1.2 and 1.3, and Section 3

Table A1: Logical Framework (Re-visited)

Logical Framework (Re-visited)			
Impact: The rights of CYLWS in Tanzania are respected, through implementation of the UN-GC No. 21 on children in street situations			
Ultimate Project Outcome			
Cycles of intergenerational violence are broken by creating systems that protect CYLWS, and by breaking cycles of behaviour that perpetuate dysfunction and intergenerational violence			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12,465 CYLWS, or at risk of going to the streets, have improved social and emotional well-being • 12,465 CYLWS, or at risk of going to the streets, have improved access to food and education • 2,970 adult family members have improved social and emotional well-being, food and education 			
Immediate Outcomes			
Outcome 1: CYLWS establish a secure sense of identity and belonging and respond resiliently in the face of adversity (Sense of self and Behaviours)	Outcome 2: CLWS develop strong and healthy relationships with their families (Family relationships)	Outcome 3: The authorities apply and enforce the child protection, fit persons, and fostering rules and regulations in ways that protect children’s best interests (The system)	Outcome 4: Community members and frontline professionals are attuned to CYLWS emotional and practical needs (Mindsets)
Output 1.1: 7,200 CLWS reached through street outreach activities	Output 2.1: 2,100 impoverished families affected by violence are supported to provide a caring and safe environment that can ensure emotional and physical development for at least 8,400 children	Output 3.1: Central and local government create a supportive legal and policy environment for CYLWS	Output 4.1: Community Champions quickly support CYLWS and raise awareness among community members about the causes and impact of children coming to the streets
Output 1.2: 60 youth associations established across Tanzania	Output 2.2: 1,350 supported families are of children from the street	Output 3.2: Social workers, police, magistrates and probation officers empathise with children, know about Attachment and Trauma Theory, and can and do apply the basic concepts with CYLWS	Output 4.2: The media is prepared to tell the story of the lives of CYLWS, and the human and economic impacts on society of not acting to support them
Output 1.3: 1,200 young people receive support to improve their self-esteem and enhance their livelihoods	Output 2.2: 540 supported families are at risk families		Output 4.3: Universities and Institutes of Social Work integrate Trauma and Attachment Theory into their training for social workers
	Output 2.3: 270 families are of children in long term care homes		

Inclusive participatory approach:

As the project was implemented through multiple partnership agreements, the use of an inclusive participatory approach was appropriate for this evaluation. On the one hand, the inclusive participatory approach allows for a pragmatic evaluation, as all categories of relevant project stakeholders are engaged during the development and implementation of the evaluation. The approach draws on the knowledge and experience of the project stakeholders, who become the key informants of the project experience, with emphasis on design, implementation and impact. On the other hand, as the project stakeholders/ key informants have a right to be involved in decision-making that affects them, an inclusive participatory approach is ethical. The overall advantage of this approach, therefore, is the avenue it creates for generating better-quality data, to inform reliable results and appropriate recommendations, thereby increasing the potential for policy uptake of the evaluation results.³²

Utilisation-focused principles:

By responding to the requirement that this evaluation would have assessed lessons learnt and proposed areas of critical learning, utilisation-focused evaluation principles address the need for an evaluation that is useful to its end-users.³³ It was critical, therefore, to ensure that the evaluation met the expressed needs of its end-users, to support end-user ownership of the evaluation results, including the uptake of recommendations and lessons learned during strategic planning and follow-on programming. As noted in the ToR, this evaluation could be used to not only improve RCA's work, as the main end-user, but also the work of 'others working in this field'.³⁴ As a contribution to this process, the evaluation was designed to engage all categories of stakeholders who were involved in the design and implementation of the UN General Comment project. Based on the understanding that the end-users are key informants of 'the project story', utilisation-focused principles complement the inclusive participatory approach, by facilitating

an evaluation that is conducted for and by its end-users. Importantly, however, to the extent that the external evaluation team has been responsible for the final analysis of data and the synthesis of results, the evaluation has remained independent and impartial.

Mixed methods:

As ToR specifications, supported by the re-visited logical framework, indicated that the evaluation would have generated qualitative and quantitative data, mixed methods were used, where applicable, to generate results that aligned with the type of data that was generated. The use of mixed methods has the advantage of supporting data triangulation across multiple sources, which creates the potential for increased data accuracy to inform the reliability of the evaluation results.

Purposive sampling:

Purposive sampling was used to achieve the level of rigour that is required for a robust evaluation. The process responded to the diversity that was anticipated across project documentation and stakeholder groups, and was conducted using a sequential approach. Purposive sampling that is based on a sequential approach is structured around the main evaluation criteria and questions, to support greater results accuracy. The rationale for this approach is its capacity to mitigate one of the main limitations of an evaluation, namely, resource scarcity. Specifically, the purposive approach to sampling supports the identification of key informants who are best suited to provide detailed responses to the evaluation questions, to accurately reflect given elements of the project experience. When purposive sampling is supported by a sequential approach, it further allows for additional data generation at any stage of the evaluation, in response to the need for results reliability and completeness.

In the interest of selecting a sample of project cities and sites/ stakeholders within the project cities of focus for the evaluation, the selection criteria were

³² Guijit, I, 2014. *Participatory Approaches*. Florence: UNICEF.

³³ Patton, M.Q., 2010. *Utilisation-focused evaluation*. 4th edition. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

³⁴ ToR, Section 2

established during the Inception Phase in collaboration with RCA. The project sites were selected based on: i) the city in which the project had been implemented for the longest period of time (Mwanza); ii) the location of the RCA headquarters (Dar es Salaam); iii) the seat of Government (Dodoma); and iv) a city that provided an example of the community care component of the project (Arusha).

Methods

Part 1 of the evaluation was executed over five distinct, but overlapping phases: Phase 1: Inception (3.75 days); Phase 2: Data generation (19 days); Phase 3: Data analysis and results synthesis (8.5 days); Phase 4: Reporting and validation (13.5 days); and Phase 5: Assignment management (0.25 day).

Part 2 of the evaluation was executed over an additional 26 days, comprising: Inception (1.25 days); Data generation (8 days); Data analysis and results synthesis (4.75 days); Reporting and validation (11.25 days); and Assignment management (0.25 day).

A description of each phase of activity is presented in the sub-Sections below.

Inception:

Further to contract signature, the evaluation commenced with a remote Start-Up discussion between the evaluation team and RCA, to allow both parties to gain a better understanding of client expectations and team requirements. This meeting was further used to clarify the evaluation methodology, as well as elements of the ToR, where required. The evaluation team also requested e-copies of all relevant project documents for preliminary review.

Following the Start-Up meeting, the team produced the first draft of the main deliverable of Phase 1, the draft Inception Report (and Work Plan). This report reflected all directives that were outlined within the ToR, and updated specifications that were provided during the Inception Phase. The draft Inception Report and Work Plan was submitted to RCA for

internal dissemination and review. Feedback received was used to inform its finalisation, for use as the client-approved guide for the evaluation.

Data generation:

Data generation engaged two methods, an in-depth review of relevant documents and the literature; and key informant consultations. As a result of the travel restrictions that emerged from the COVID-19 pandemic, the team leader for the evaluation engaged in data generation remotely (through the Microsoft Teams platform; electronic mail; and telephone calls), while the local consultants on the team generated the evaluation data through in-country fieldwork.

The selection of potential sources of data, key informants and documents inclusive, was based on purposive sampling using a sequential approach. As required, this approach was also used to facilitate follow-up data collection from additional sources throughout the evaluation.

Desk review:

An in-depth desk review of relevant programme documents and the literature was guided by the key questions and sub-questions of the client-approved evaluation matrix. All available project documents that were relevant to the evaluation were included in the evaluation sample. Where necessary, the team also requested additional documents for in-depth review.

Key informant consultations:

Key informant consultations were facilitated as individual and/ or small group interviews/ focus group discussions. During all consultations, team members and key informants were required to comply with all COVID-19 precautions (use of hand sanitizer; social distancing; etc.). Each consultation was also guided by data generation tools that were tailored to each category of key informant.

The primary and secondary sources of data that were consulted/ engaged during the evaluation are outlined in Table A2.

Table A2: Primary and Secondary Sources of Data :

Data source	Description
Primary sources	Relevant project stakeholders from the following categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RCA staff • RC UK staff • Donor agency (FCDO, formerly DFID) • Implementing Partners • Target youth beneficiaries (e.g. street connected youth; young persons in the fit programme; young persons receiving vocational support; etc.) and their families/ relatives • Community members, including fit persons and community champions • Public sector officials (e.g. social welfare officers; Ministry of Health staff) • Other relevant stakeholders, as applicable
Secondary sources	Relevant project documents and the literature: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual documents (project Theory of Change; logical framework; project document; training manual; advocacy plans; etc.) • Project management reports (progress reports; financial reports; internal review reports; results monitoring reports; etc.) • Strategic reports (National and local Policy documents; organisational strategic plans; etc.) • External reviews/ assessments/ evaluations • Other relevant documents

Data analysis and results synthesis:

In order to purposefully influence analysis through cross-validation, to produce credible evaluation findings, the following methods of analysis were used:

- **Descriptive analysis** of the project to understand and describe its main components, including related activities; partnerships; modalities of delivery; etc. Descriptive analysis preceded more interpretative approaches during the evaluation;
- **Content analysis** of relevant documents, the literature, and the notes from key informant consultations, to identify

common trends and themes, and patterns for each of the key evaluation issues (as the main units of analysis). Content analysis was also used to flag diverging views and opposite trends, and determine whether there was need for additional data generation. Emerging issues and trends were synthesised to inform each stage of the reporting process (validation; draft and final evaluation reports);

- **Quantitative analysis** of data on resource use during project design and implementation. Simplified analyses were conducted on all quantitative datasets using spreadsheet software (Microsoft

Excel), where applicable, to generate summary statistics. The statistics that were generated were used to develop emergent findings and inform a comparative analysis.

- **Counterfactual analysis:** The analysis of project impact comprised a qualitative and a quantitative component, in response to the establishment of the project counterfactual using both types of data. Quantitative values, as measured at project baseline, constituted the estimate of the quantitative targets that would have been attained without the project intervention. These baseline values were compared with endline values, as available, to gauge the extent of quantitative project impact. Similarly, perception data generated during key informant consultations were used to estimate the situation that would have been realised, from the perspectives of the key informants, if the intervention had not been implemented. The results of the counterfactual analysis were also used to inform the comparative analysis of emergent evaluation results;
- **Comparative analysis** to examine findings across emerging themes, and to identify good practices and innovative approaches, where applicable, and lessons learnt. Information was organised according to the hypotheses that emerged. The main evaluation findings were generated through this process. Case study vignettes were also developed, where applicable, to document examples of project impact; lessons learned and/or examples of good practice from project design and implementation. Case study vignettes are short, descriptive, summary examples of the effects and workings of programming.³⁵ They vary in length and detail according to the specific example provided and the availability of data. While they are not indicative of the overall project impact, they can provide rich contextual data on a given intervention.

Reporting and validation:

In line with the use of utilisation-focused principles, the initial findings from data generation were shared with RCA following data generation. Consolidated feedback received was used to initiate further data generation, where required, and inform the development of the draft evaluation report.

Using the client-approved report guidelines, as incorporated into the Inception Report and Work Plan, the evaluation team produced a draft evaluation report for review by RCA. The report was submitted to the RCA programme manager for internal dissemination and review. Consolidated feedback on the draft evaluation report was used to inform the production of the final evaluation report.

Assignment management:

To ensure ethical compliance, the evaluation strictly adhered to the RCA Safeguarding Policy in all contact with the target project beneficiaries. Ethical considerations were also applied to emergent issues pertaining to reported cases of abuse or violation of the rights of children and youth who live and work on the streets.

In the interest of quality assurance, the evaluation complied with the international standards of OECD-DAC and the United Nations Evaluation Group. The evaluation team leader also provided regular progress updates to the RCA programme manager throughout the evaluation, and facilitated close collaboration between team members; the project implementing partners, and the advocacy steering group partners. Any emergent incidents that could have implicated the evaluation was reported to the programme manager without delay. The team leader also ensured that no team member used or reproduced any product of the evaluation for personal purposes without the written permission of RCA.

Limitations and mitigation measures:

The evaluation was challenged by four main issues: i) resource limitations; ii) the unavailability of some stakeholders for consultations; iii) the COVID-19

³⁵ Patton, M. 2001. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. California: Sage Publications.

travel restrictions; and iv) the post-evaluation receipt of the project theory of change.

A common issue during most evaluations is the limitation of available resources as a stark contrast to the work that is required during data generation, in particular. It is usually difficult, therefore, to engage all stakeholders who have been involved in a development intervention. Similarly, at times it is not possible to gain access to all documents that were produced during the intervention. The main factors that contribute to resource challenges are the limited timeframe that is available for conducting the evaluation; limited human resource capacity on the evaluation team; and a limited evaluation budget. As this limitation was foreseen, the approach to mitigation was incorporated into the evaluation methodology. Specifically, purposive sampling based on a sequential approach was used to identify and select the most appropriate sources of primary and secondary data for engagement during data generation. The sequential approach enhanced this process by allowing data generation to continue throughout the evaluation, as required, to ensure data accuracy and results reliability.

The unavailability of project stakeholders is another common challenge during an evaluation. Competing priorities and/ or emergent issues often make it difficult for project stakeholders to exercise their role key informants during data generation. During the evaluation, some stakeholders at the level of government, as well as within the implementing partner organisations were unavailable for consultation. Purposive sampling was also used to mitigate this limitation, through the selection of alternative stakeholders for consultation, where

available. In-depth discussions were also held with those stakeholders who were able to speak at length about their project experience.

As a direct result of the global COVID-19 pandemic, travel restrictions prevented the evaluation team leader from being present in Tanzania to engage in fieldwork and support in-country management of the evaluation team. Remote data generation was used to mitigate the challenge created by the emergent travel restrictions. The process was made possible through the use of the Microsoft Teams platform to facilitate interviews with key informants; as well as electronic mail and telephone calls to allow for informational exchanges. The team leader also used these methods to communicate regularly with the evaluation team in the interest of quality assuring the evaluation process. In accordance with the ToR, regular updates were also provided to the RCA programme manager on the progress of the team, and by extension, the status of the evaluation.

The project theory of change was received after the draft report for Part 1 of the evaluation had been developed. On the one hand, this limitation had possible implications for data generation; data analysis and the evaluation. On the other hand, the alignment of the evaluation with the RCA theory of change and the project logical framework was used to mitigate the risk of an evaluation that did not align with the project objectives, including the target results. As the target outcomes of the project theory of change were not explicitly incorporated into the logical framework, as an additional mitigation measure, they were retrofitted into the evaluation analysis to inform report finalisation.

Appendix IV: Evaluation Criteria

	Evaluation Criteria	Definitions
1.	Relevance	The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change
2.	Effectiveness	The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups
3.	Efficiency	The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way
4.	Cross cutting theme: Gender	The extent to which the intervention achieves gender equality and eliminates all discrimination on the basis of sex
5.	Impact	The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effect
6.	Sustainability	The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue
7.	Lessons learned	Generalisations based on evaluation experiences with projects, programs, or policies that abstract from the specific circumstances to broader situations; frequently, lessons highlight strengths or weaknesses in preparation, design, and implementation that affect performance, outcome, and impact
8.	Recommendations	Proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a development intervention; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources

Source:

- OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation, 2019. Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use, #1 - #3; #5 - #6
- UNDG RBM Handbook 2009 (last modified 2019), #4
- OECD DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-based Management, #7 - #8

Appendix V: Evaluation Matrix

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
1.0 Relevance	1.1 What is the relevance of the project to the identified needs and priorities of its main stakeholders?	1.1.1 How responsive has the project been to the needs of its target beneficiaries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of alignment between project objectives expressed need of target beneficiaries ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
1.0 Relevance		1.1.2 In what way has the project been relevant to the organisational goals and priorities of its implementing partners?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementing partners - RCA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of alignment between project objectives and organisational goals/ priorities of implementing partners ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
1.0 Relevance		1.1.3 What evidence is there to indicate that the project has been relevant to the strategic priorities of the donor agency?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RCA - RC UK 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of alignment between project objectives and RC UK strategic priorities ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
1.0 Relevance		1.1.4 How has the project responded to the priorities of stakeholder agencies at the local/ regional/ national levels?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RCA - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of alignment between project objectives and priorities of stakeholder agencies ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
2.0 Effectiveness ³⁶	2.1 To what extent has the project achieved its target outcomes?	2.1.1 What evidence is there to indicate that CYLWS: - have developed a secure sense of identity and belonging? - respond resiliently in the face of adversity? (Immediate Outcome 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7,200 CLWS reached through street outreach activities ▪ 60 youth associations established across Tanzania ▪ 1,200 young people receive support to improve their self-esteem and enhance their livelihoods ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
2.0 Effectiveness		2.1.2 How has the project enabled CLWS to develop strong and healthy relationships with their families? (Immediate Outcome 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 2,100 impoverished families affected by violence are supported to provide a caring and safe environment that can ensure emotional and physical development for at least 8,400 children ▪ 1,350 supported families are of children from the street ▪ 540 supported families are at risk families ▪ 270 families are of children in long term care homes ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
2.0 Effectiveness		2.1.3 What evidence is there to show that the authorities have applied and enforced the child protection, fit persons, and fostering rules and regulations to protect children's best interests?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Central and local government create a supportive legal and policy environment for CYLWS ▪ Social workers, police, magistrates and probation officers empathise with children, know about Attachment and Trauma Theory, and can and do apply the basic concepts with CYLWS ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

³⁶ The effectiveness criterion will be used to examine results at the level of project outcomes only. Higher level results will be examined under the impact criterion.

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
		(Immediate Outcome 3)	- Stakeholder organisations			
2.0 Effectiveness		2.1.4 In what ways have community members and frontline professionals become attuned to the emotional and practical needs of CYLWS? (Immediate Outcome 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community Champions quickly support CYLWS and raise awareness among community members about the causes and impact of children coming to the streets ▪ The media is prepared to tell the story of the lives of CYLWS, and the human and economic impacts on society of not acting to support them ▪ Universities and Institutes of Social Work integrate Trauma and Attachment Theory into their training for social workers ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
2.0 Effectiveness		2.1.5 What evidence is there to demonstrate that the project has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - broken cycles of intergenerational poverty by creating systems that protect CYLWS - broken cycles of behaviour that perpetuate dysfunction and intergenerational violence? (Ultimate Project Outcome) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 12,465 CYLWS, or at risk of going to the streets, have improved social and emotional well-being ▪ 12,465 CYLWS, or at risk of going to the streets, have improved access to food and education ▪ 2,970 adult family members have improved social and emotional well-being, food and education ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
2.0 Effectiveness	2.2 To what extent has the project generated unexpected outcomes?	2.2.1 What are the main factors that have contributed to outcomes achievement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reported factors (strengths/ opportunities / strategies/ tools) that have contributed to project outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal/ organisational factors - External/ environmental factors ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
2.0 Effectiveness		2.2.2 What were the main challenges to outcomes achievement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reported challenges (weaknesses/ threats) to outcomes achievement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal/ organisational challenges - External/ environmental challenges ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
2.0 Effectiveness		2.2.3 What evidence is there of unforeseen project outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reported evidence of unforeseen project outcomes ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
2.0 Effectiveness		2.2.4 How did the project address outcomes that were unexpected but positive?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reported measures taken to address positive but unexpected project outcomes ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
2.0 Effectiveness		2.2.5 How did the project mitigate its unexpected challenges?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reported measures taken to mitigate unexpected project challenges (weaknesses/ threats) ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
3.0 Efficiency	3.1 To what extent has the project been managed efficiently?	3.1.1 What evidence is there of the efficient use of project resources (time; human resources; material resources; financial resources; etc.) during project implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Financial reports ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adequate/ realistic / appropriate allocation of project resources (human; time; financial; material) - Timely dissemination of required project resources - Use of internationally approved procedures for project management, including financial management; results monitoring; troubleshooting; etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Timely implementation and completion of project activities - Timely disbursement and receipt of financial resources - Key informant perceptions 	
3.0 Efficiency		3.1.2 How has the project provided value for money?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Financial reports ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of use of indicators for monitoring delivery of value for money ▪ Evidence of achievement of intended outcomes ▪ Cost of inputs/ resources relative to outputs ▪ Capacity to produce quality outputs at least cost ▪ Capacity to produce quality outputs on time and within budget ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
3.0 Efficiency	3.2 To what extent has the project design been realistic?	3.2.1 How has the overall project design enhanced the capacity for results achievement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of contribution of project design (strategy/ structure/ tools) to results achievement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence of design strengths - Evidence of opportunities created for enhanced results achievement (e.g. surpassing of project targets; increased rate of behavioural change; etc.) ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
3.0 Efficiency		3.2.2 In what way has the overall project design impeded the capacity for results achievement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK ▪ Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reported challenges to results achievement created by overall project design (strategy/ structure/ tools): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence of design weaknesses and threats (e.g. delayed results achievement; lo evidence of behavioural change; low evidence of policy formulation/ uptake; etc.) ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
3.0 Efficiency		3.2.3 What evidence is there to show that the objectives of the project have remained valid?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-implementation of UN-GC No. 21 on children in street situations - Non-enforcement of the child protection, fit persons, and fostering rules and regulations to protect children’s interests - Statistical growth/ unchanged statistics on street entry of children/ young persons - Ongoing inter-generational poverty and behaviours that perpetuate dysfunction and intergenerational violence - Negative mindset by community members and frontline professionals on CYLWS ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
3.0 Efficiency	3.3 How has results achievement been affected by differences in strategies/ approaches across the project cities?	3.3.1 What are the main differences in project strategies across the project cities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reported differences in project design and implementation across the project cities ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
3.0 Efficiency		3.3.2 What evidence is there to indicate that project strategies and activities have been consistent with the target project results across cities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of alignment between project strategies/ activities and: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved social and emotional well-being for CYLWS/ At-risk of street entry - Improved access to food and education by CYLWS/ At-risk of street entry - Improved social and emotional well-being for Adult family members of CYLWS/ At-risk of street entry - Improved access to food and education by Adult family members of CYLWS/ At-risk of street entry - Creating a sense of self and resilient behaviours among CYLWS/ At-risk of street entry - Support for CLWS to develop strong and healthy relationships with their families - Advocating that authorities apply and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
					<p>enforce the child protection, fit persons, and fostering rules and regulations, in ways that protect children’s best interests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changed mindsets among community members / frontline professionals about the emotional and practical needs of CYLWS ▪ Key informant perceptions 	
3.0 Efficiency	3.4 To what extent can project results be attributed to a collaborative approach among its stakeholder agencies?	3.4.1 In what ways have project stakeholders/ implementation partners collaborated to support the achievement of target results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK ▪ Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: ▪ Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reported examples of collaboration among project stakeholders and/ or implementation partners to support results achievement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence of knowledge exchange/ technical advisory - Evidence of funding support - Evidence of collaboration for advocacy - Etc. ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
3.0 Efficiency		3.4.2 What evidence is there to indicate whether project activities overlapped/ duplicated interventions funded by other agencies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK ▪ Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: ▪ Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reported examples of duplicated project activities across stakeholder organisations ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
4.0 Cross-cutting theme: Gender	4.1 What evidence is there to show that the project has been gender responsive?	4.1.1 How have gender equality considerations been integrated into project design and implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of the development and implementation of a gender equality strategy/ plan/policy based on contextual data and analysis at the local/ regional/ national level ▪ Evidence of the allocation of human and financial resources to gender integration at the levels of project coordination and implementation ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
5.0 Impact	5.1 What progress has the project made towards the achievement of its overall impact?	5.1.1 How has the project contributed towards the implementation of UN-GC No. 21 on children in street situations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of advocacy for policy and legislation at local/ regional/ national levels ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
5.0 Impact		5.1.2 In what way has the project contributed towards respect for the rights of CYLWS?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changed mindsets towards CYLWS at the local/ regional/ national levels - Increased service provision to CYLWS at the local/ regional - Implementation of national policies/ legislation on the rights of CYLWS ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
5.0 Impact		5.1.3 What have been the main challenges to the achievement of the project impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reported challenges (weaknesses/ threats) to impact achievement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal/ organisational challenges - External/ environmental challenges ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
5.0 Impact		5.1.4 What evidence is there of an unintended project impact, whether positive or negative and how has it been addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reported evidence of unintended project impact ▪ Factors contributing to positive unintended project impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal/ organisational factors/ strengths/ opportunities - External/ environmental strengths/ opportunities ▪ Factors contributing to negative unintended project impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal/ organisational factors/ weaknesses/ threats - External/ environmental weaknesses/ threats ▪ Reported measures taken to build on unintended positive project impact ▪ Reported measures taken to mitigate unintended negative project impact ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
6.0 Sustainability	6.1 To what extent have effective steps been taken to ensure that the net benefits of the project are sustainable?	6.1.1 What evidence is there of the successful implementation of an exit/ sustainability strategy to phase-out funded project activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorporation of exit/sustainability strategy into project design - Results ownership by implementing partners - Strategic planning for continuity of project activities by implementing partners - Efforts to phase-out funded project activities - Strategic planning for providing supporting services to project beneficiaries - Advocacy for results ownership by local/regional/national government - Results ownership by target beneficiaries - Sourcing of resources for continuation of service provision to target beneficiaries ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
6.0 Sustainability		6.1.2 In what ways have the implementing partners supported target project beneficiaries to take ownership of results sustainability?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of efforts to phase-out funded project activities ▪ Evidence of support for : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Skills development - Employment - Entrepreneurship - Housing - Accessing government services - Family reunification - Community reengagement - Accessing civil society support services ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
6.0 Sustainability		6.1.3 What evidence is there to show that the target beneficiaries have taken steps towards sustaining the benefits of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Skills development - Employment - Entrepreneurship - Housing access - Accessing of government services - Family reunification - Community reengagement - Accessing of civil society support services ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
6.0 Sustainability		6.1.4 What are the main challenges to results sustainability at the level of the target beneficiaries?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expressed challenges to sustaining project benefits ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
6.0 Sustainability		6.1.5 What evidence is there of steps that have been taken to minimise the challenges faced by target beneficiaries in relation to results sustainability?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of support for : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Skills development - Employment - Entrepreneurship - Housing - Accessing government services - Family reunification - Community reengagement - Accessing civil society support services ▪ Commitment by government/ civil society/ to support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of relevant policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations

RELEVANT EVALUATION CRITERIA	KEY QUESTIONS	SPECIFIC SUB-QUESTIONS	DATA SOURCES	DATA COLLECTION METHODS/TOOLS	INDICATORS/ SUCCESS STANDARDS	METHODS FOR DATA ANALYSIS
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time-specific project continuity - Service provision - Results sustainability ▪ Key informant perceptions 	
7.0 Lessons learned	7.1 What are the emergent lessons of the project?	7.1.1 What are the elements of the project that have worked well?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) ▪ Synthesis of results of data analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Best practices - Innovation ▪ Major factors positively influencing results achievement ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
7.0 Lessons learned		7.1.2 What are the project elements that need to be strengthened in future projects?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic documents ▪ Conceptual documents ▪ Progress monitoring reports ▪ Assessments/ Reviews/Evaluations ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target beneficiaries (CYLWS; At-risk children and youths; Family members/ Relatives/ Guardians) - Community members/ Business owners/ Educators - Implementing partners - RCA - RC UK - Stakeholder organisations ▪ Main findings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of relevant documents ▪ Consultations with key informants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interviews (individual/ small group/ in-person/ remote) ▪ Synthesis of results of data analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Areas for improvement ▪ Factors impeding results achievement ▪ Key informant perceptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Desk review, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Descriptive analysis - Content analysis - Quantitative analysis - Comparative analysis ▪ Key informant consultations
8.0 Recommendations	8.1 What are the main recommendations that have been generated from this project?	8.1.1 How can the results and lessons of the project be used to enhance RCA's programming?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Main findings ▪ Lessons learned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Synthesis of results of data analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emergent recommendations from main findings and lessons learned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Results synthesis

Appendix VI: List of Documents Reviewed

1. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 20 Quarter 4
2. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 21 Quarter 2
3. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 18 Quarter 3
4. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 19 Quarter 3
5. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 18 Quarter 4
6. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 19 Quarter 4
7. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 19 Quarter 2
8. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 20 Quarter 2
9. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 21 Quarter 1
10. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 20 Quarter 3
11. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 21 Quarter 2
12. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 19 Quarter 1
13. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 21 Quarter 1
14. Amani Centre for Street Children, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project – Quarterly Progress Report for FY 20 Quarter 1
15. Annual Planning Workshop – Aid Direct Implementing Partners 9th to 11th April, 2018
16. Association Model Training and Facilitation Manual
17. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 19 Quarter 2
18. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 20 Quarter 3
19. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 20 Quarter 1
20. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 19 Quarter 3
21. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 19 Quarter 2
22. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 20 Quarter 4
23. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 20 Quarter 1
24. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 20 Quarter 3
25. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 21 Quarter 2

26. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 18 Quarter 3
27. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 19 Quarter 1
28. Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth Trust, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 18 Quarter 4
29. Cheka Sana Tanzania, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 18 Quarter 2
30. Cheka Sana Tanzania, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 20 Quarter 2
31. Cheka Sana Tanzania, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 20 Quarter 4
32. Cheka Sana Tanzania, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 21 Quarter 2
33. Cheka Sana Tanzania, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 20 Quarter 3
34. Cheka Sana Tanzania, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 19 Quarter 4
35. Cheka Sana Tanzania, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 19 Quarter 1
36. Cheka Sana Tanzania, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 19 Quarter 3
37. Cheka Sana Tanzania, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 21 Quarter 1
38. Cheka Sana Tanzania, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 18 Quarter 3
39. Cheka Sana Tanzania, USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project: Quarterly Progress Report, FY 19 Quarter 3
40. Child Protection Manual, Tanzania Mainland Facilitator's Guide – Module 22: Social Welfare Officers and FIT Persons
41. Child Protection Manual, Tanzania Mainland Participant's Handbook – Module 22: Social Welfare Officers and FIT Persons
42. Consortium for Street Children, DFID Aid Direct Project, Partner : Quarterly Progress Report for Year 3, Quarter 1, April – June 2020
43. Consortium for Street Children, DFID Aid Direct Project, Partner : Quarterly Progress Report for Year 1, Quarter 4, January – March 2019
44. DFID Achievements from April 2018 to March 2021
45. DFID Project RCA Kivuko Quarterly Progress Report for FY 2019-20 Quarter 1
46. DFID Project RCA Kivuko Quarterly Progress Report for FY 2019-20 Quarter 2
47. FCDO/DFID Rapid Response Project Report, RCA Kivuko Final Rapid Response Project Report for August 2020 – February 2021
48. FIT Person Guideline with COVID-19 Update
49. FP Form No. 1 – Application to be a FIT Person
50. Government of Tanzania, 2009. The Law of the Child Act
51. Impact Application KWNV-WNLL-VQ, Advocating for the Implementation of UN General Comment to Change Lives of Tanzania Street Children
52. Impact Grant KWNV-WNLL-VQ, Railway Children, Advocating for the Implementation of UN General Comment to Change Lives of Tanzania Street Children, Report 8, 01 January to 31 March 2020
53. KWNV-WNLL-VQ Logframe

54. KWNY-WNLL-VQ, Railway Children, Advocating for the Implementation of UN General Comment to Change Lives of Tanzania Street Children, Impact Report 12 of 14, 01 January to 31 March 2020
55. Partnership Agreement between Railway Children Africa and Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth
56. PowerPoint Presentation, Child Protection Manual – Tanzania Mainland Facilitator’s Guide – Module 22: Social Welfare Officers and FIT Persons
57. Project Evaluation Report: Community Reintegration of Children and Youths Living on the Streets of Mwanza
58. Railway Children – DFID Delivery Chain Map
59. Railway Children Africa Kivuko Project, Quarterly Report, January – March 2019
60. Railway Children Africa Kivuko Project, Quarterly Report, October – December 2018
61. RCA Five Year Strategy June 2017 – May 2020
62. RCA Kivuko DFID/FCDO Project, Quarterly Progress Report for FY 2020-21, Quarter 4, January – March 2021
63. RCA Kivuko DFID/FCDO Project, Quarterly Progress Report for FY 2019-20, Quarter 4, January – March 2020
64. RCA Kivuko DFID/FCDO Project, Quarterly Progress Report for FY 2020-21, Quarter 2, July – September 2020
65. RCA Kivuko DFID/FCDO Project, Quarterly Progress Report for FY 2020-21, Quarter 2, October – December 2020
66. RCA Kivuko DFID/FCDO Project, Quarterly Progress Report for FY 2020-21, Quarter 4, April – June 2020
67. RCA Kivuko Fit Person Workstream, Project End Report, 1st August 2020 – February 2021
68. RCA Theory of Change
69. Responsibilities of Trusted Persons (Fit Persons)
70. Standard Operating Procedures for Case Management of Youth Living on the Streets Aged 15 – 19 Using the Youth Association Model Work
71. Technical Brief: USAID Kizazi Kipya, Support for Improved and Expanded Services for Children and Youth Living and Working on the Streets, May 2018
72. UK Aid Direct Annual Review – Year 1
73. United Nations General Comment 21 (General Comment No. 21 (2017) on Children in Street Situations | CSC (streetchildren.org))
74. United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (OHCHR | Convention on the Rights of the Child)
75. USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project, CSO Quarterly Progress Report for Quarter 1 -FY 20
76. USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project, CSO Quarterly Progress Report for FY 19 Quarter 4
77. USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project, CSO Quarterly Progress Report for FY 19 Quarter 2
78. USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project, CSO Quarterly Progress Report for FY 20 - Q2 Implementation Report
79. USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project, CSO Quarterly Progress Report for FY 20 Quarter 4
80. USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project, CSO Quarterly Progress Report for FY 21 – 1, Summary Report December 2020
81. USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project, CSO Quarterly Progress Report for FY 19 Quarter 3
82. USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project, CSO Quarterly Progress Report for FY 20 Quarter 3
83. USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project, CSO Quarterly Progress Report for FY 18 Quarter 4

84. USAID Kizazi Kipya and DFID Project, CSO Quarterly Progress Report for FY 19 Quarter 1
85. USAID Kizazi Kipya Project, CSO Quarterly Progress Report for FY 18 Quarter 3

Appendix VII: Key Informants Consulted

PART II

Community Champions

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
MWANZA			
ATHUMAN, Mwanaid Abdalah	Entrepreneurship Facilitator	Female	Focus group discussion
BAKERY, Ester	Community Health Worker/ Farmer	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
BARNABAS, Annastazia	Entrepreneur	Female	Focus group discussion
BENJAMIN, Frank	Technician	Male	Focus group discussion
BONIPHACE, Stella	Entrepreneur	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
CHALAMILA, Emmy	Teacher	Female	Focus group discussion
DAUDI, Juliana	Farmer	Female	Focus group discussion
EMMANUEL, Julieth	Food Vendor	Female	Focus group discussion
FRANCIS, Cornel	Entrepreneur/ Shoemaker	Male	Focus group discussion
FRANUS, Asunta	Petty Businesswoman	Female	Focus group discussion
JOHN, Venance	Entrepreneur	Male	Focus group discussion
KAFUKU, Ester	Street Chairperson	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
KAJUGUSI, Annajoyce	Pastor	Female	Focus group discussion
KAKEYE, Leah	Entrepreneur	Female	Focus group discussion
LEVILIAN, Levina	Petty Businesswoman	Female	Focus group discussion
LIKICHO, Veronica	Entrepreneur	Female	Focus group discussion
MAGENI, Angelina	Entrepreneur	Female	Focus group discussion
MAKWI, Naomi	Community Health Worker	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
MALASHI, Asteria	Entrepreneur	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
MALFEDHA, Julius	Community Health Worker	Male	Individual interview (Remote)
MALUMBO, Zuhura	Entrepreneur	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
MASINDIKA, Leticia	Entrepreneur	Female	Focus group discussion
MCHAMA, Grad	Nurse	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
MGANGA, Jumanne	Local Herbalist/ Street Chairperson	Male	Individual interview (Remote)
MICHAILE, Catherine	Entrepreneur	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
MINJA, ROSEMARY	Entrepreneur	Female	Focus group discussion
MKAMA, Saba	Street Chairperson	Male	Individual interview (Remote)
MLEKWA, Mwajuma	Community Health Worker/ Paralegal	Female	Community Health Worker
MOSES, Eustachia	Entrepreneur	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
MTUMWA, Aisha	Farmer	Female	Focus group discussion

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
NYAMUHANGA, Anastazia	Entrepreneur	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
NYANGANYI, Samweli	Charcoal Seller	Male	Individual interview (Remote)
PALAPLA, Gerald	Entrepreneur	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
SAID, Latifa	Petty Businesswoman	Female	Focus group discussion
SHAYO, Anna	Businesswoman	Female	Focus group discussion
STEPHANO, Joyce	Entrepreneur	Female	Focus group discussion
SWENA, Mastidia	Unemployed	Female	Focus group discussion
TERRY, Lisa	Entrepreneur	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
TRAYPHONE, Rose	Entrepreneur	Female	Focus group discussion
WANGI, Yohana	Entrepreneur	Male	Focus group discussion

(Former) Street-connected children

SURNAME, First name	Age	Sex	Method of Consultation
MWANZA			
PAULO, Mathias	10	Male	Focus group discussion
PAULO, Kelvin	12	Male	Focus group discussion
MASALU, Lucia	11	Female	Focus group discussion
JOHN, Baraka	13	Male	Focus group discussion
SAMUEL, Jacqueline	14	Female	Focus group discussion
Total	5 (former) street-connected children		

Implementing Partners

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
MWANZA			
MABEBE, Domina	Project Manager – Cheka Sana Tanzania	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
MUSHI, Mary	Acting Project Manager – Railway Children Africa	Female	Individual interview (Remote)

PART I

Community Champions and Fit persons

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
ARUSHA			
HAJI, Bahati	Fit Person	Female	Individual interview
MRAMBA, Tachi	Community champion	Male	Individual interview
PETER, Regina	Fit Person	Female	Individual interview
SEKE, Issa	Community champion	Male	Individual interview

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
DAR ES SALAAM			
LUCY, Ms	Fit person/ Entrepreneur	Female	Individual interview
DODOMA			
CHIMANDI, Zuberi	Community Champion	Male	Individual interview
NDAHANI, Esther	Fit Person	Female	Individual interview
MWANZA			
MWANAMAZA, Yuster	Community Champion	Female	Individual interview
NYAMULIL, Manyama	Fit Person	Male	Individual interview
LOSELIANI, Mr	Community Champion	Male	Focus group discussion
MBOGA, Mama	Community Champion	Female	Focus group discussion
VANESSA, Mama	Fit Person	Female	Focus group discussion
STELLAH, Ms	Fit Person	Female	Focus group discussion
ANNA, Ms	Fit Person	Female	Focus group discussion

Implementing Partners and Stakeholders

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
ARUSHA			
ALLY, Ibrahim	Street Worker – Amani Centre for Street Children	Male	Individual interview
AUFI, Hassan	Family Worker – Amani Centre for Street Children	Male	Individual interview
INNOCENT, Benedictor	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer – Amani Centre for Street Children	Male	Individual interview
JOHN, Mr	Youth Worker – Amani Centre for Street Children	Male	Individual interview
KAMUNGU, Hassan	Health and HIV Officer – Amani Centre for Street Children	Male	Individual interview
KIMALO, Naomi	Family worker – Amani Centre for Street Children	Female	Individual interview
KIWIYA, Groy	Street Worker – Amani Centre for Street Children	Female	Individual interview
MOLEDINA, Shermin	Country Safeguarding Lead/ Practice Development and Training Advisor – Railway Children Africa	Female	Individual interview (Remote)
MRUMA, Emmanul	Youth Worker – Amani Centre for Street Children	Male	Individual interview
MTANDIKO, Elsant	Street Worker – Amani Centre for Street Children	Male	Individual interview
MTANDIKO, Jasper	Street Worker – Amani Centre for Street Children	Male	Individual interview
MWANJA, Ally	Youth Worker – Amani Centre for Street Children	Male	Individual interview

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
NUMBU, Shija	Director, Social Welfare Department, Arusha District Council	Male	Individual interview
NYITA, Anastela	Street Worker – Amani Centre for Street Children	Female	Individual interview
SHUNGU, Beatrice	Family worker – Amani Centre for Street Children	Female	Individual interview
SILASI, Godfrey	Police Officer, Gender Desk – Central Police Station	Male	Individual interview
WAMPEMBE, Irene	Project Coordinator – Amani Centre for Street Children	Female	Individual interview
ZABON, Mr	Director – Imbaseni Vocational Training School	Male	Individual interview
DAR ES SALAAM			
DAVID, Jackline	Middle Manager – Day Centre	Female	Individual interview
KAGORO, Rose	Advocacy Manager – Railway Children Africa	Female	Individual interview (Remote) Small group interview
LEMA, Herieth	Youth Manager – Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth	Female	Individual interview
MAGATA, Mary	Programme Manager – Railway Children Africa	Female	Individual interview (Remote) Small group interview (Remote)
MAGUBU, Joyce	Legal and Advocacy Officer – Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth	Female	Individual interview
MALOCHA, Hilda	Police Inspector, Gender Desk – Urafiki Police Station	Female	Individual interview
MGATA, Mussa	Country Director – Railway Children Africa	Male	Individual interview Small group interview (Remote)
MPELETA, Rose	Social Welfare Officer – Ubungu Municipal Council	Female	Individual interview Small group interview (Remote)
SALUMU, Asha	Psychologist – Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth	Female	Individual interview
WANGWE, Alphayo	Deputy Director – Baba Watoto Centre for Children and Youth	Male	Individual interview
DODOMA			
MDENDEMI, Theresia	Police Inspector/ Head, Gender and Children Desk – Dodoma City Council	Female	Individual interview
MFURU, Elizabeth	Health and HIV Officer – Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training	Female	Group interview

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
MHANGA, Peter	Youth Officer – Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training	Male	Group interview
MINDATU, Victoria	Ten Cell Leader	Female	Individual interview
MKUMBA, Mariam	Social Welfare Officer – President’s Office – Regional Administration and Local Government	Female	Individual interview
MTAIWA, Happiness	Data Clerk – Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training	Female	Group interview
MUKAMA, Mandago	Project Coordinator – Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training	Male	Group interview
MWAMBE, Aneth	Social Work Officer – Dodoma City Council	Female	Individual interview
NDAKI, Shilungu	Assistant Commissioner, Social Welfare – Ministry of Health	Male	Individual interview
NDALU, Anderson	Orphans and Vulnerable Children Officer – Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training	Male	Group interview
NDOJE, Hamisi	Youth and Family Officer – Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training	Male	Group interview
NELSON, Enid	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer – Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training	Female	Group interview
PETER, Sabrina	Youth and Family Officer – Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training	Female	Group interview
SELEMANI, Maria	Street worker – Kigwe Social Economic Development and Training	Female	Group interview
MWANZA			
DAVIES, Mr	Child Protection and Advocacy Officer – Cheka Sana Tanzania	Male	Individual interview
NDARO, Rico	Assistant Police Inspector, Gender Desk – Kirumba Police Station	Male	Individual interview
DAUD, Mr	Youth Programme Coordinator – Day Centre	Male	Individual interview
DYNESS, Ms	Middle Manager, Centre and Intensive Family Intervention	Female	Individual interview
LUKINDO, Feith	Regional Social Welfare Officer – Mwanza City Council	Female	Individual interview
KANTUKOLA, Lucy	District Social Welfare Officer – Mwanza City Council	Female	Individual interview
GERTRUDE, Ms	District Social Welfare Officer – Mwanza City Council	Female	Individual interview
NTENDELWA, Mr	Police Officer, Children and Gender Desk – Central Police Station	Male	Individual interview
ZAKARIA, Mr	Owner – Sherppigo Garage	Male	Individual interview
JOSEPH, Mr	Headmaster – Muhonza Primary School	Male	Individual interview
DAUD, Joyce	Family Worker – Railway Children Africa	Female	Individual interview

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
EDWINI, Hilda	Family Worker – Railway Children Africa	Female	Individual interview
EVA, Ms	Street Worker – Railway Children Africa	Female	Individual interview
HEZRON, Ayoub	Lead, Outreach Department – Railway Children Africa	Male	Individual interview
MUSHI, Mary	Acting Project Manager – Railway Children Africa	Female	Individual interview (In-person and Remote)
MASHIMA, Adam	Lead, Family Department – Railway Children Africa	Male	Individual interview
MWAJUMA, Ms	Entrepreneur/ Fit Person/ Paralegal	Female	Focus group discussion

Families of Street-connected young persons

SURNAME, First name	Title - Affiliation	Sex	Method of Consultation
ADDALA, Manam	Parent of Street-connected child	Female	Individual interview
ALLY, Neema	Parent of Street-connected child	Female	Individual interview
HUSSEINI, Zainabu	Parent of Street-connected child	Female	Individual interview
JOHN, Melina	Parent of Street-connected child	Female	Individual interview
JONAS, Janeth	Parent of Street-connected child	Female	Individual interview
JUMA, Reyla	Parent of Street-connected child	Female	Individual interview
MASINGA, Carolina	Parent of Street-connected child	Female	Individual interview
NASRA, Mama	Parent of Street-connected child	Female	Individual interview

Street-connected Children and Youths

Project City	Description	Age	Method of Consultation
Arusha: 26 young persons	2 boys who use the facilities at the Amani Centre	12 – 13 years	Small group discussion
	7 boys who live and work on the streets	13 – 15 years	Focus group discussion
	3 boys who were reintegrated into their families	11 – 16 years	Focus group discussion
	3 young men who are apprentices at a garage	17 – 18 years	Focus group discussion
	1 young woman who is an employee	22 years	Individual interview
	10 young men who received technical vocational training	15 – 19 years	Focus group discussion
Dar es Salaam: 11 young persons	11 boys who participated in activities at the Baba Watoto Mburahati Community Centre	10 – 14 years	Focus group discussion
Dodoma:	2 boys/ young men who were reintegrated into their family	15 – 17 years	Small group discussion

Project City	Description	Age	Method of Consultation
37 young persons	15 girls/ young women who received technical vocational training	15 – 17 years	Focus group discussion
	12 boys/young men who received technical vocational training	15 – 17 years	Focus group discussion
	8 boys/ young men who live and work on the streets	15 – 17 years	Focus group discussion
Mwanza: 46 young persons	1 young woman and 2 young men who received technical vocational training	20 – 21 years	Focus group discussion
	6 young men who received technical vocational training	18 – 21 years	Focus group discussion
	8 boys who live and work on the streets	11 – 14 years	Focus group discussion
	8 boys who live and work on the streets	13 – 15 years	Focus group discussion
	6 boys who live and work on the streets	12 – 14 years	Focus group discussion
	7 boys who live and work on the streets	12 – 16 years	Focus group discussion
	2 boys who were reintegrated into their families	13 – 14 years	Focus group discussion
	3 young men who are apprentices at a garage	15 – 17 years	Focus group discussion
	3 young women who are employees	24 – 25 years	Focus group discussion
1 young woman and 1 young man who participate in the youth platforms	20 – 21 years	Small group discussion	
Total	120 street-connected young persons		

Appendix VIII: Data Generation Protocols

Interview Protocol: Implementing Partners

Introduction:

Railway Children Africa (RCA) aims to create lasting change for children and youth living and working on the street (CYLWS or street-connected youth) by creating systems that protect them and by breaking cycles of behaviour that perpetuate dysfunction and intergenerational violence. In support of this process, RCA has implemented the UN General Comment project for the past three years (2018 – 2021), to engage CYLWS and the people around them who can make a real difference to their lives. The project has been funded by the United Kingdom Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) and involves service delivery and advocacy. To facilitate effective project implementation across Tanzania, RCA has collaborated with six local implementing partners from civil society, as well as three advocacy intervention partners.

As the UN General Comment project is in its final stages, RCA has commissioned an external evaluation firm, Halcyon Louis Consulting, to assess project performance and design, and substantiate key achievements; challenges and lessons. The evaluation will focus on project activities in four cities: Arusha; Dar es Salaam; Dodoma; and Mwanza. To increase the accuracy of the evaluation results, all categories of project stakeholders are being provided with the opportunity to share their views on their individual project experience. All discussions conducted during the evaluation are confidential. As the evaluator will only share generalised findings and anonymous comments, you will not be identified in any material that is produced. You are therefore encouraged to speak openly and honestly.

This discussion will last for a maximum of 45 minutes. Before we begin, do you have any general questions?

Background:

- How does Cheka Sana/ Kivuko select community champions? What screening criteria do you apply to the selection process?
- How does Cheka Sana/ Kivuko select fit persons? What process and criteria do you use?
- What process do you use to place a child with a fit person?

Relevance and Effectiveness:

- In your opinion, what would be the situation if there were no fit persons? If there were no community champions?

Efficiency:

- Do the community champions receive any form of training to assist them with their role? **If yes**, please describe the training that is provided.
- Do the community champions receive any follow-up supervision after being trained? **If yes**, please describe the supervision process and explain why it is necessary.
- Is there any other post-training support that is provided (e.g. meetings with other community champions)? **If yes**, please describe the support that is provided and explain why it is provided.
- How many children are placed with a fit person at any one instance?
- How long does each child stay with the fit person?

- Does the fit person receive any form of remuneration or compensation? (food; money; clothing; etc.)
If yes, please describe how the fit persons are remunerated or compensated

Gender:

- In what way, if at all, was gender considered during the selection of fit persons? Of community champions?
- How, if at all, was gender used to inform the placement of children with fit persons?
- In your opinion, what could have been done differently to ensure that gender was a key consideration during the selection of fit persons? Of community champions?
- What could have been done differently to ensure that gender was a key consideration during the placement of children with fit persons?

Impact:

- What was the most significant contribution of the fit persons programme? Of the community champions programme?

Sustainability:

- Now that the project is coming to an end, does Cheka Sana/ Kivuko have any plans to continue to work with fit persons? With community champions? **If yes**, please describe those plans. **If no**, what is preventing you from continuing to work with fit persons/ community champions?

Lessons learned:

- What were the challenges of the fit persons programme? How were they addressed?
- What were the challenges of the community champions programme? How were they addressed?

Recommendations:

- How can the fit persons programme be improved in future projects?
- How can the community champions programme be improved in future projects?

Close:

- Are there any further comments or suggestions you wish to make?

Thank you for your time and participation.

Interview Protocol/ Focus group discussion Protocol: Community Champions

Introduction:

Good morning/ afternoon. My name is..... and I am doing some work for Railway Children Africa so they can help children who live and work on the street to return to their families. I am interested in learning about your experience with children who live and work on the street, so I would like to ask you a few questions. Your responses will be confidential so please share you honest views. Before we begin, do you have any questions for me?

FOR IN-PERSON CONSULTATIONS: This discussion will last for a maximum of 45 minutes. Before we begin, do you have any general questions?

FOR REMOTE CONSULTATIONS: This discussion will last for a maximum of 20 minutes. Before we begin, do you have any general questions?

Background:

- Please tell me about yourself, your name; your age; job; etc.?
- How did you become a community champion?
- What are the duties of a community champion?

Efficiency:

- Did you receive any training to help you in your role as a community champion? **If yes**, please describe the training you received?
- What type of compensation, if any, do you receive for your services? (e.g. money; phone credit; etc.)
- Do you receive any type of supervision or visits from Cheka Sana Tanzania/ Kivuko? **If yes**, who visits you and why? How often do they visit? What is the reason for the visits? How do the visits help you?
- Do you have any meetings with other community champions? **If yes**, how often do you meet and where do these meetings take place? What do you discuss? Do you think the meetings are helpful? **If yes**, how do the meetings help you? **If no**, why are the meetings not helpful?

Impact:

- Has the community champion programme helped the street children in any way? **If yes**, how have the community champions helped children on the street?
- In your opinion, have the community champions managed to change the attitudes of persons in the community towards street children? **If yes**, how have the attitudes of persons in the community changed towards street children? What have the community champions done to cause this change? **If no**, what is the attitude in the community towards street children? Why has this attitude not changed?
- In your opinion, has there been a reduction in violence against street children because of the community champions? Please provide an example to support your response

Lessons learned and Recommendations:

- What are the main aspects of the community champions programme that have worked well?
- In your opinion, how can the programme be improved in the future?

Close:

- Do you have any further comments or suggestions you wish to make?

Thank you for your time and participation.

Interview/ Focus group Protocol: Children (Reunified with their families or At the home of Fit Persons)

Introduction:

Good morning/ afternoon. My name is..... and I am doing some work for Railway Children Africa so they can help children who live and work on the street to return to their families. I am interested in learning about your experience since you left the streets, so I would like to ask you a few questions. Your responses will be confidential so please share you honest views. Before we begin, do you have any questions for me?

Ice breaker:

e.g. First, let us all get to know each other better. In my spare time I like to What do you like to do in your spare time?

Background:

- How old are you?
- Do you have any brothers and sisters? If yes, did any of them live with you on the street? **If yes**, where is your brother/ sister now?
- How did you end up on the street? Can you tell me how long you lived on the street?
- Who are some of the people that you trusted when you were on the streets? Why did you trust them?
- Do you attend school? **If yes**, what do like the most about being back in school? **If no**, are you looking forward to being back in school? Why do you say that?

Effectiveness:

- Did anyone help you leave the streets? **If yes**, who helped you? What did they do to help you leave the streets?
- **FOR CHILDREN AT FIT PERSON'S HOME:** How did you come to live in that home? What are some of the things you do each day?
- **FOR CHILDREN AT FIT PERSON'S HOME:** Do you like living there? **If yes**, what do you like the most about living there? **If no**, what are the things that you don't like about living there?
- **FOR CHILDREN REUNITED WITH THEIR FAMILIES:** When dd you return home? Who helped you to return home? Are you happy to be back with your family? **If yes**, what do you like the most about being with your family again? **If no**, what are some of the things that you don't like now that you are back home?
- **FOR CHILDREN REUNITED WITH THEIR FAMILIES:** When you think about your home before you went on the streets and now, have things improved between you and your family? **If yes**, what are some of the things that have improved? **If no**, what are some of the things that are still happening?
- Do you feel safe where you currently live? **If yes**, what are some of the things that are making you feel safe? **If no**, why don't you feel safe?

Impact:

- How do the people in the community treat you now that you have left the streets?
- Do you think you will ever go back on the streets? **If yes or no**, why do you say so?

- Who are some of the people that you trust now that you have left the streets? Why do you trust him/her?

Lessons learned and Recommendations:

- What advice do you have for children who are still on the streets?
- What are some of the things that should be done to help street children?
- What are some of the things that should be done to help street children leave the street?

Close:

- Is there anything else you would like to say?

Thank you for your time and participation.

Appendix IX: Map of Findings

Evaluation Criteria	Findings	Recommendations
Relevance	Finding 1: The RCA Fit Persons intervention has been contextually relevant for providing temporary accommodation for rescued CLWS in a nurturing setting during family reunification and child reintegration.	Related to Recommendations #1; #3; and #6
Effectiveness	Finding 2: The collaboration between the implementation partnership and local government, to assign fit persons to rescued CLWS, has contributed to a standardised forward-looking process for quality assuring child placement.	Related to Recommendation #1
Effectiveness	Finding 3: As the trainings for fit persons have supported enhanced childcare capacities among successful applicants, they have contributed towards increased potential within communities for improved parenting and respect for the rights of street-connected young persons. The intervention has been challenged, however, by the mindset and expectations of some fit persons.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; and #3
Effectiveness	Finding 4: While the Fit Persons intervention has had notable success in reunifying CLWS with their families, the reasons for dropout have remained underexplored.	Related to Recommendations #1 and #6
Efficiency	Finding 5: While the engagement of communities in the nomination of fit persons can lead towards community ownership of family reconciliation efforts, a general change in community mindsets about CLWS remains a work in process.	Related to Recommendations #1; #2; and #3
Efficiency	Finding 6: Although the average length of child placement has been informed by the unique situational needs of each rescued child, follow-up support to facilitate successful family reconciliation for CLWS has been less than adequate.	Related to Recommendations #1 and #5
Efficiency	Finding 7: The late provision of material supplies during CLWS placement, in some instances, has counteracted the success of the Fit Persons intervention in establishing a care plan to address the needs of each rescued child.	Related to Recommendations #1 and #4
Impact	Finding 8: While there has been an increasing aversion to the streets among rescued CLWS, progress towards family reunification and reintegration has been challenged by an	Related to Recommendations #1 and #5

Evaluation Criteria	Findings	Recommendations
	emergent attachment by some of the young persons towards the households of the fit persons.	
Gender	Finding 9: Although gender has not been the main criterion for the selection of fit persons by the implementing partners, it has been prioritised during actual LGA child placement.	Related to Recommendation #1
Sustainability	Finding 10: The alignment of the RCA intervention with the LGA-managed Fit Persons programme has created the potential for project continuity beyond the funded timescale. The potential for results sustainability is being challenged, however, by inadequate follow-up and therapeutic intervention after child reintegration.	Related to Recommendations #1 and #5