



Results-Based Protection
Field mission to document results-based protection in practice

Trip Report¹


May 2016

Strengthening humanitarian action to prevent the use of and recruitment of children by armed groups in Nariño, Colombia


Overall Finding²

Significant effort by multiple actors has helped to shape policy to prevent and stop the use of and recruitment of children by armed groups; however, this progress is not mirrored in efforts to change attitudes and behavior. Humanitarian actors have focused on addressing *general* vulnerabilities and capacity (not necessarily as it relates to the specific threat) while neglecting to address the threat component of risk. Engagement with the affected population—including families and children—indicates that communities are using multiple methods to prevent child recruitment whereas most other actors (e.g. humanitarian, government) rarely seek out alternative solutions to the problem beyond policy change. There is a strong inclination to leave the threat component to someone else claiming “*it’s not our role.*” While the Colombian government has restricted humanitarian organizations from engaging directly with non-state armed groups, this restriction should not limit how humanitarian actors establish a causal logic of the change needed to address the use and recruitment of children by armed groups. A causal logic helps to expose assumptions about the proposed solutions and helps all actors recognize opportunities for how to engage and at what level.

How do actors address risk?



How does the community address risk?³



¹ Two trip reports have been prepared on the findings of the InterAction visit to Colombia. Report 1: **Strengthening Humanitarian Action to Prevent the Use of and Recruitment of Children by Armed Groups** focuses on the response in Colombia and provides recommendations for incorporating a results-based approach to protection. Report 2: **Documenting Results-Based Protection in Practice** focuses on the programmatic aspect of the Results-Based Protection Program and includes recommendations to enhance the methodology for future documentation and input into the development of the Learning Network for RBP.

² A chart of actions and a timeline of milestones leading to change in policy, practice, attitudes, and behavior can be found in the Annex.

³ These charts illustrate the different types of initiatives that actors or communities use to address capacity, vulnerability, and threat. This does not illustrate the number of initiatives.

Key Findings to Enhance the Prevention of the Use of Children and Child Recruitment by Armed Groups

Specific Findings to Prevent Child Recruitment and the Use of Children

There has been significant emphasis by humanitarian actors in Colombia on the need to change policy to prevent child recruitment by armed groups. While this has been quite successful, the plethora of new policy has not yielded a complete change in behavior or practice in the use and recruitment of children by armed groups. New pathways should be explored to address this gap and ensure a more well-rounded strategy to definitively address the risk of child recruitment. In addition, a stronger evidence base, highlighting effective action, is needed to demonstrate the link between policy and prevention of child recruitment. Shifting the balance to explore initiatives that promote change in practice and behavior can help to advocate for increased resources and funding to address the use and recruitment of children by armed groups.

It is worth noting that while the state has a legal obligation to prevent the use of and recruitment of children by armed groups, a contributing factor to a lack of change in behavior or practice is the lack of government presence where recruitment continues to take place. Unfortunately, there are limited or no strategies articulating how to address this problem. While trust between the community and government is recognized as a contributing factor for why there is a lack of government presence, new and multiple methods should be used to strengthen expectations and the relationships between communities and government actors. The government, too, should identify new strategies and methods for enhancing sustainable state presence in areas where trust with communities is weak and services are in adequate or lacking.

While many humanitarian actors have shied away from addressing the threat directly, there is supporting evidence that community cohesion helps to prevent child recruitment. Having strong cohesion within a community strengthens community-protection mechanisms and empowers communities to address the threat collectively (e.g. by engaging in dialogue with armed groups or identifying actions that prevent the use of children in armed groups). Programs that support community cohesion could be reoriented to monitor their effectiveness in helping to change patterns of risk.

Prevention of child recruitment requires a multidisciplinary response across multiple sectors and levels. Many programs such as education and livelihoods can be easily redesigned to contribute to protection outcomes. Actors working on peacebuilding and conflict resolution at the community level also need to be brought into discussions more comprehensively. Stronger engagement with these actors should foster innovation to prevent child recruitment in some areas. Likewise, attention should be given to the prevention of sexual violence within the household. There is strong evidence to show that a pull factor for girls joining armed groups stems from gender-based violence in the household and within the community. Development actors working on root causes of gender inequality should be engaged and their efforts incorporated into humanitarian programming to strengthen action aimed to prevent child recruitment.

Strengthening Results-Based Protection

While there are positive examples that demonstrate how humanitarian actors are addressing child recruitment, the response can be significantly enhanced by incorporating a results-based approach to protection. The points below highlight both opportunities and recommendations.

Element 1: Context-Specific Protection Analysis

- **Opportunities**
 - There is strong engagement by multiple actors to analyze the components of risk: threat, vulnerability, and capacity.
 - Strong analysis of the context has led to the development of interagency collaboration to design protection contingency plans.
 - Humanitarian actors are able to describe in detail the mechanisms used by individuals and communities to protect themselves.

- **Recommendations**
 - While there is strong analysis on all the components of risk, there is a need to strengthen the articulation of how to respond to the threat and identify multiple pathways to address it.
 - More attention should be made to critically analyze and build on community-based protection mechanisms as a first response. Community-led and developed strategies should be studied to better understand how these initiatives can be supported.
 - Although country-wide analysis is significant, better disaggregated analysis is needed to understand community-specific patterns of threat, vulnerability, and capacity.
 - In order to strengthen the continuous nature of analysis needed for a results-based approach to protection, there is a need to prioritize methods that can support continuous analysis and inform program implementation.
 - While it may be implied, there is a need to articulate the desired change (policy, practice, attitude, behavior) behind actions in order to better illustrate and monitor the logic behind the response.

Element 2: Outcome-Oriented Methods

- **Opportunities**
 - Current methods used for analysis support the identification of multiple sectors (education, livelihoods) necessary to address protection outcomes.
 - There are good examples of community-based and participatory methods that lead to innovative approaches to protection programming (for example, using methods that build trust and tap into culturally appropriate and traditional mechanisms to shape strategies and program design).

- **Recommendations**
 - Opportunities should be prioritized to strengthen integrated protection (e.g. multi-sectoral programming) and link it to measuring protection outcomes (for example, education and cultural activities can be directly linked to addressing child recruitment. Unfortunately, current programs do not monitor whether or not these activities help change vulnerabilities or capacities vis-à-vis specific threats).
 - There is a need to use more innovative approaches for analysis and designing programs. Strengthen problem-solving and critical thinking skills for program staff.
 - To support an iterative process, actors should incorporate methods of reflection (for example, using reflection journals, incorporating frequent reviews, linking monitoring processes to situational analysis) into program implementation as a way to revisit assumptions and patterns of risk, and monitor the progress towards achieving results.

- Humanitarian actors should use creative methods that may involve new actors/individuals to help explore and establish pathways to create a more open and engaging space for thinking through the threat component of risk.
- There is a need to develop the causal logic underpinning the strategy and response. This should include a breakdown of assumptions about actors, opportunities, and barriers that may support or hinder an effective response. (Aspects of culture, tradition, language, motivation, power dynamics, capacity, timing, and other elements which are relevant to the risk being addressed should be explored.)
- At an organizational level, humanitarian actors should explore opportunities and constraints that support or hinder flexibility and program adaptation (for example, how donor requirements or organizational policies may affect a response).
- Humanitarian actors should explore and use methods to understand and design for the contribution of multiple actors. This could include finding opportunities to engage with actors outside of the humanitarian community, building new alliances, and strengthening capacity of local actors.
- While national indicators may provide a general overview of the response, there is a need to develop context-specific indicators at the sub-national and community levels to monitor changes in risk patterns. Monitoring these context-specific indicators will support continual real-time adaptation of the response.

Element 3: Designing for Contribution

- **Opportunities**

- The initiative to incorporate development and peacebuilding actors into the protection cluster through regional interagency working groups is a positive step towards designing for the contribution of multiple types of actors to achieve protection outcomes.
- Initiating dialogue between the Humanitarian Donor Group and the Development Donor Group is a step towards better collaboration and can encourage multidisciplinary responses to achieve protection outcomes.
- Humanitarian organizations have effectively taken actions at multiple levels (individual, family, community, and government) to address protection issues.
- Humanitarian organizations have developed strong relationships with both local and national government to address child recruitment.

- **Recommendations**

- To ensure collective engagement among multiple actors, UNHCR, as the co-chair of the Protection Cluster, can play a significant role by enhancing its investment towards achieving protection outcomes. This requires strong leadership and interagency coordination in protection analysis and the development of protection strategies.
- While there is momentum to engage new actors, there is need to ensure that engagement includes actors from peacebuilding, academia, and the private sector. Consultations revealed that actions and knowledge from these actors could be relevant to address child recruitment.
- To design for the contribution of multiple actors to achieve protection outcomes, humanitarian organizations should incorporate the actions of others (development, human rights, academia, private sector, etc.) into protection strategies and program design.
- While protection strategies are developed at the national level, there is a need to empower local-level decision-making to address protection outcomes. Sub-national level strategy should influence and shape national action plans—not the other way around.

- There is a need for humanitarian organizations to track how the actions of other actors, positively or negatively, contribute to protection outcomes.
- Contributions by multiple actors should be analyzed to understand what action is needed both in the short and long-term. Strategies should be articulated in a way that can capture both timeframes. This should help with prioritization of the response and highlight key dynamics between different actors that may influence short or long-term initiatives.
- While training was noted as one opportunity to strengthen collaboration between different actors, there is a need to expand beyond training as a way to engage across sectors and disciplines. For example, joint analysis, interagency workshops, monthly meetings engaging actors outside of the protection cluster, joint initiatives, and other opportunities should be explored.



Annex

Results-Based Protection

Field mission to document results-based protection in practice

Terms of Reference

Location: Bogota and Narino, Colombia

Travel Date: April 25-May 4, 2016

Objective:

- *Document examples of results-based protection in practice*

Background and Purpose:

There is increasing attention to the need to achieve more meaningful results and demonstrate impact through protection programming, for example, as underscored in the 2015 'Independent Whole of System Review of Protection in the Context of Humanitarian Action'. There is a tendency to rely heavily on activity-focused or supply-driven responses and pre-determined vulnerability criteria without undertaking a more thorough context-specific protection analysis to understand the nuances and patterns of risk. This has led to an unfortunate focus on outputs over outcomes and an inability to fully understand the necessary pathways that may lead to an actual reduction in risk in a given context.

Results-based protection is based on a view that it is possible to bring about reduced risk, and establish an evidence base to measure these changes and inform relevant strategies to bring about protection outcomes. InterAction has identified three key elements of results-based protection that support measurable results:

- 1) Continuous context-specific protection analysis;
- 2) Designing for the contributions of multiple actors, at multiple levels, and through multiple sectors and disciplines;
- 3) Outcome-oriented methods⁴.

Following several years of consultations, reviews, and in-country roundtables, InterAction now seeks to document these approaches in practice, including the supporting tools and methods. Documentation exercises will seek to retrace the analysis, decisions, and actions undertaken in assessment, design, implementation, and monitoring from the perspective of implementing organizations. Concurrently, these steps will be retraced from the perspective of the affected population in order to test the assumptions underpinning the programs and the relevance to the affected population's own assessment of their threat environment. This process will help to identify practical application of the key elements of results-based protection.

In the collection of examples of results-based protection in practice, the visit to Colombia aims to explore this methodology. The visit will focus on 1-2 specific protection issues in a given community. Although a desk review will be done on understanding the issues in a general sense (e.g. child soldiers, landmines), the consultations and documentation will aim to look at the specific patterns of risk in one or two communities in order to understand the nuances of the issue and the response. Given the limited timeframe for this visit, the documentation process will not be comprehensive. It may prove possible, however, to return to Colombia at

⁴ Further information on the key elements that support a results-based approach to protection can be found on <http://protection.interaction.org>

a future date to further refine and capture the full methods and causal logic used for supporting protection outcomes.

Key Questions:

Although all the key elements will be explored, the field mission will put a particular emphasis on “designing for contribution”⁵ as a key element to document. The following questions will help identify and unpack positive examples of how this key element is applied throughout the program cycle:

- How do international humanitarian organizations work with multiple actors including national and local actors, non-humanitarian organizations, and others to understand their perspective, relationships, responsibility, and ability to reduce risk?
- Is there an agreed casual logic underpinning efforts to address a specific protection issue? How are the contributions of different actors understood and monitored towards achieving a protection outcome?
- How have programs made course corrections and adapted programming involving multiple actors during implementation?
- What are examples of outcome-oriented methods that support designing for contribution? How are results and outcomes measured and what indicators, methods and tools have proven useful?
- From a field perspective, what are the requirements for coordination, resources, establishing trust, and capacity to practically apply the element of designing for contribution?
- What does the collective action or joint contribution look like from a community and/or national partner perspective? Are there good examples that illustrate what this looks like?
- How do donors contribute to protection outcomes?

In addition to exploring a process for documenting results-based protection, the visit will also explore how protection outcomes are measured. Consultations will look at indicators, methods, and tools used to measure results for protection. This should complement the additional work used to retrace the causal logic for addressing a specific risk and how well the response was able to measure results, adapt programming, and make course corrections along the way.

Methodology

The documentation process will seek to capture:

- What has worked /not worked with an emphasis on positive experiences as it relates to one protection issue in 1-2 community contexts.
- Practical examples of the application of outcome-oriented methods;
- How the roles of multiple actors have functioned, including how:
 - National, local partners, and other actors have organized themselves;
 - International humanitarian actors have engaged in the response and structured themselves to engage with national actors;
 - Multiple sectors see their role to contribute to a particular protection outcome;
 - Whether and how donors have contributed to protection outcomes;
 - What roles other actors outside the humanitarian system have had to contribute to the protection outcome.
- What methods have been used to measure results and protection outcomes

The following methods will be used to document how the elements of a results-based approach to protection have been applied in practice:

⁵ Designing for Contribution: Achieving protection outcomes requires multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral efforts targeting various components of risk at multiple levels. This demands a conscious approach to mobilize relevant actors to cultivate complementarity between their roles. The relationships, boundaries, and synergies between humanitarian actors and other relevant stakeholders, including those with formal and informal roles to address the risk factors, must be acknowledged and considered.

1. **Pre-trip desk review and outreach:** Prior to the trip, InterAction will reach out to key actors to obtain and review relevant protection strategy and program materials. Additional, more general background materials will be reviewed that include historical and context specific analysis of the protection issue within Colombia.
2. **Recreate the causal logic:** Based on current protection strategy/workplans and relevant programming, the RBP Program team will:
 - Rebuild a causal logic for one protection issue;
 - Map and identify pathways, linkages and gaps within the response;
 - Establish where various actors contribute to the change required to bring about the outcome.

The causal logic will also be explored with actors in Colombia to understand their own perspective for how and what the logic behind the response entailed. A half day meeting at the beginning of the visit will take place with key actors of the protection cluster. This information will be crosschecked and analyzed against the causal logic the team pulled together. Additional questions, challenges, and issues the protection cluster members raise will be used to help refine a more complete picture of the causal logic.

3. **Key stakeholder consultations:** Meetings will take place with a range of actors to explore multiple perspectives on how the results-based approach has been applied in practice:
 - Bi-lateral meetings: to explore how individuals are contributing to the outcome;
 - Community focus groups: to gather the perspective from the affected population.

A range of techniques will be used to build an illustrative case study, including audio recordings, videos, and photographs. Engagement with affected populations and the use of any content will follow strict ethical procedures and include the use of informed consent, confidentiality, and security protocols.

4. **End of trip meeting with key stakeholders:** A meeting will be convened with key actors in-country to share key findings on positive steps already being taken to achieve protection outcomes.

The end of trip meeting will be done in conjunction with a workshop on results-based protection—providing an overview of the key elements and how using a results-based approach to protection can lead to protection outcomes. The meeting will use the findings from the pilot documentation process to illustrate how agencies are applying results-based approaches and how they can further strengthen these efforts to better support protection outcomes.

Finally, the end of trip meeting provides an opportunity to reflect on the methods used to pilot the documentation process. Discussion on what additional methods might be useful for exploring and documenting a more comprehensive picture can help inform future documentation processes and possibly a return to Colombia to further the findings.

Outputs

- Several documented examples, utilizing different media (including voice recordings, video and photographs) to illustrate the practical application of key elements of a results-based approach to protection.

Poverty

Protection



Non-compliance with IHL



Violence in household

Pressure from armed groups

Lack of government presence

Drugs





What are we doing?

Action	Threat/Vulnerability / Capacity	Level	Change in...
Awareness-raising on rights of education to children	Capacity	Individual	Attitude
Awareness-raising on rights of education to parents	Vulnerability/Capacity	Family	Attitude
Awareness-raising on rights of education to government	Capacity	Community/Local/ Sub-national	Attitude
Campaigns on children's rights (violence, abuse, right to education)	Vulnerability	Multiple	Attitude
Youth Initiatives	Vulnerability/Capacity	Community	Attitude
Cultural context of education	Vulnerability	Community	Attitude
Social media campaigns (awareness raising)	Vulnerability/Capacity	Community	Attitude
Media campaign (newspaper, flyer, media) on children's rights	Vulnerability/Capacity	Community/Local/s ub-national	Attitude
Awareness raising on drug trafficking (broadly and in schools)	Vulnerability	Community/Local/ sub-national	Attitude
Training of military on children's rights and IHL	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	National	Attitude
Ad campaign to promote desertion/escape/demobilization	Capacity	Individual	Attitude
Community Centers/cultural activities	Vulnerability/Capacity	Community	Attitude Practice
Local radio programs, TV, Carnival events on awareness raising to not join groups	Vulnerability	Local	Attitude/ Behavior
Strengthening community networks/community cohesion	Vulnerability/Capacity	Community	Attitude Practice Behavior
Educational centers	Vulnerability/Capacity	Community	Behavior
Parent workshops to reduce family violence (parenting skills, positive discipline)	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Family	Behavior
Protection by presence	Threat	Community	Behavior


Community Council – speak directly with armed groups when recruitment issue	Threat	Local	Behavior
ICRC negotiation with armed groups on recruitment	Threat	Local	Behavior
Psychosocial support	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual/Family/Community	Behavior
Develop/shape local education policy	Capacity	Local/sub-national	Policy
Develop/shape national policy	Capacity	National	Policy
Electoral processes/democracy (voting)	Vulnerability/Capacity	Local	Policy
Shape policy for Victims’ law, etc.	Vulnerability/Capacity	National	Policy
Advocacy (letter-writing) to influence peace process/ government policy	Vulnerability/Capacity	National	Policy
Establish process to move children under threat	Vulnerability	Community/Local/sub-national	Policy Practice
Identify pathway/route for children under threat/out of groups	Capacity	Local/sub-national/national	Policy Practice
Contingency planning – link to government structures	Capacity	Local/sub-national/National	Policy Practice
Development of action plans with communities	Vulnerability/Capacity	Community/Subnational	Policy Practice
Community Council Action Plans	Vulnerability/Capacity	Local level	Policy Practice
Direct engagement with schools (teacher training for protection issues, quality education)	Capacity	Institutional/Community	Practice
System-strengthening	Capacity	Multiple	Practice
Establish/send children to boarding homes	Vulnerability	Individual	Practice
Establish/send children to foster care system	Vulnerability	Individual	Practice
Flexible models of education through NGO	Vulnerability	Community	Practice
Child participation in decision-making	Capacity	Individual	Practice
Capacity building government (case management)	Capacity	Local/ Subnational/ National	Practice

Victims' Unit	Vulnerability	Individual	Practice
Police Action	Threat	Community	Practice
ICBF reintegration process	Vulnerability	Individual	Practice
Family Police address custody issues and violence against children	Threat/Vulnerability	Individual/Family	Practice
Increasing transportation (bus) to access schools	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	Practice
Child Friendly Spaces	Vulnerability/Capacity	Community	???
Direct support to children	Vulnerability	Local/sub-national	???
ICLA	Capacity	Family/Community /Local/ sub- national/national	???
Basic stipends and material support	Vulnerability	Individual	???
National Navy provides food delivery	Vulnerability	Individual	???
National Police provide basic schooling supplies	Vulnerability	Individual	???


What is the community doing?

Action	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Level	Change in...
Awareness-raising in schools	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	Attitude
Build trust/respect with armed groups as an individual community member and/or indigenous leader	Threat	Individual/ Community	Attitude
Welcoming/acknowledging all children at school	Threat/ Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	Attitude
Building faith/trust among community	Capacity	Community	Attitude
Women engaging directly with leaders of armed groups	Threat	Individual	Attitude
Peace band in schools/ Peace mass	Capacity	Community	Behavior
Presence of INGO used by community to negotiate with illegal groups	Threat	Community	Behavior
Mine Risk Education	Vulnerability	Individual	Practice
Collective defiance/action by communities	Threat	Community	Practice
Negotiate to keep kids in schools as outsider	Threat	Individual	Practice
Action by children: don't talk to strangers, know where to go and not to go (invisible barriers), don't go out at night, talk quietly, going to school, comradery	Threat	Individual	Practice Behavior
Community policing	Threat	Community	Practice
Displacement	Vulnerability	Individual/Family	???

How are we addressing risk?



How does the community address risk?



Recommendations for addressing risk

Recommendations from individuals			
Action	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Level	Change in...
Awareness-raising/media campaigns – with focus on one-on-one discussions	Vulnerability	Individual	Attitude
Raise confidence/resilience of children	Capacity	Individual	Attitude
Commitment from parents	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual/ Family	Attitude
Have more friends	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	Attitude Behavior
Stronger authority of parents + better parenting skills	Vulnerability/Capacity	Family	Attitude Behavior
Projects for teenagers	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	Attitude Behavior
More sports	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	Attitude Behavior
Good manners	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	Attitude Behavior Practice
ICBF should support more/better	Vulnerability	Individual/ Family	Practice
School/work opportunities and materials	Vulnerability	Individual	Practice
Better analysis by NGOs to target the right people	Capacity	Sub-national National	Practice
Needed in the community: school, Red Cross, church, drug store, cafeteria, park, doctor	Vulnerability/Capacity	Community	Practice
Immediate action by police	Threat	Individual	Practice
Ombudsman’s office should defend children’s rights better	Capacity	Local/Sub-national/ National	Practice
Navy should set up more branches for activities	Vulnerability	Community	Practice

Economic opportunity	Vulnerability/Capacity	individual	Practice
Housing	Vulnerability	Family	???
Money	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	???
Recommendations from families			
Action	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Level	Change in...
Build trust/love among family and community	Vulnerability/ Capacity	Family Community	Attitude
Raising confidence/resilience of children	Capacity	Individual	Attitude Behavior
Better parenting skills	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Family	Behavior
Stronger authority of parents and government	Vulnerability/Capacity	Family/Local	Behavior
Jobs/business	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	Practice
ICBF better programs for schools, psychosocial support beyond schools, ensure school attendance, focus of parents	Vulnerability/Capacity	Community Local	Practice
NFIs	Vulnerability	Individual Family	??
Recommendations from community			
Action	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Level	Change in...
Parent awareness about importance of education	Vulnerability/Capacity	Family	Attitude
Government presence to build trust	Vulnerability	Community	Attitude
Social/cultural activities	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual Community	Attitude Behavior
Leadership from Mayor's office	Capacity	Local	Attitude Practice
Literacy	Capacity	Individual	Practice
Job opportunities	Capacity	Individual	Practice
Stronger communities/collective action (without designated leader)	Capacity	Community	Practice

Empower/support community action boards	Capacity	Community Local	Practice
Action led by communities	Capacity	Community	Practice
Better coordination/collectively solving problems	Capacity	Local/ Sub-national/ National	Practice
Strengthen education	Vulnerability/Capacity	Local	Practice
Inclusive programming	Vulnerability	Individual	Practice
Recommendations from government			
Action	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Level	Change in...
Families commit to children	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual Family	Attitude
Recognition of people's participation	Capacity	Local Sub-national National	Attitude
Education	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	Attitude Behavior
Family values/Parenting skills	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Individual Family	Attitude Behavior
Focus on long-term	Vulnerability	Individual Family Community Local Sub-national National	Attitude Practice
End corruption	Vulnerability	Local Sub-national National	Attitude Practice Behavior
Peace agreement and commitment to end recruitment	Threat	National	Policy
Social programming and public policy to prevent exclusion	Vulnerability	Local Sub-national National	Policy Practice
Economic opportunities	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	Practice
Support for foster homes/funding/resources/materials	Capacity	Local	Practice
Better coordination among actors to understand how they support each other	Capacity	Sub-national National	Practice

Interventions should start early	Vulnerability	Individual	Practice
Need more articulation to focus on a specific issue	Capacity	Local Sub-national National	Practice
Government empowerment	Capacity	Local	Practice
Participatory approach	Vulnerability/Capacity	Sub-national National	Practice
Decentralized management of resources	Vulnerability	Sub-national National	Practice
Government accountability	Vulnerability/Capacity	Local Sub-national National	Practice
Government presence to expand services	Capacity	Local Sub-national National	Practice
Stronger measures to have options for children beyond secondary school	Vulnerability/Capacity	Local Sub-national National	Practice
Recommendations from INGOs			
Action	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Level	Change in...
Championing children's causes	Vulnerability/ Capacity	Community Local Sub-national National	Attitude
Engaging with men	Threat	Individual	Attitude Behavior
Family strengthening	Vulnerability/ Capacity	Family	Behavior
Dialogue with parents and caretakers	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Family	Behavior
Parenting skills	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Family	Behavior
Education/cultural programs	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual Community	Behavior
Address sexual violence in household	Threat	Individual	Behavior
Critical thinking with focus on prevention	Capacity	Local Sub-national National	Practice

Child participation	Capacity	Sub-national National	Practice
Entrepreneurial/job opportunities	Vulnerability/Capacity	Individual	Practice
Address problem from different angles/sectors	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Local Sub-national National	Practice
Build capacity of Attorney's office	Capacity	Local Sub-national National	Practice
Build capacity of ICBF	Capacity	Local Sub-national National	Practice
Implement public policy (increase resources, political will, participation)	Capacity	Local Sub-national National	Practice
Adaptable education opportunities	Vulnerability/Capacity	Local Sub-national National	Practice
Recommendations from donors			
Action	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Level	Change in...
Increased government presence to build trust to reduce risk	Threat/Vulnerability/ Capacity	Local	Practice

Recommendations for Action by All Actors

