

The sample below illustrates the final product. If you wish to see the original Word document with edits in tracked changes, please email alice@crealitygroup.org.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is produced for the **Final Summative-Formative Evaluation** of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Angola Country Office (ACO) Programme titled **Birth Registration and Justice for Children in Angola** (hereinafter referred to as “BR and J4C” or simply “the Programme”). The evaluation was commissioned to AAN Associates, Pakistan, and was conducted from November 2019 to July 2020. The Programme was jointly funded by the European Union (EU), as major contributor or donor, and UNICEF ACO, as a minor contributor. The Programme remained in implementation from August 1, 2014, until January 31, 2020.

Intervention and Programme Context: The Republic of Angola is among the least developed countries, with about 40 per cent of its population (12.6 million people) living in poverty (2018–2019 data). The country ranks low on the Human Development Index (at 149 out of 189 countries). Angola is facing a myriad of economic and governance challenges, including weak institutional capacity and slow economic performance. The child protection sector is underfunded, as evident from the poor indicators, such as the low rates of birth registration (BR); only 25 per cent of children under 5 are registered (2014), while the registration rate of children between 5 and 14 years is 50 per cent (2015–2016). The situation around justice for children (J4C) is also precarious, as Angola has only one fully functioning Minor Court. When the Programme began in 2014, Angola did not place well on the J4C indicators. Similarly, a situation analysis of children and women in Angola (2015) suggested that children living outside of a family environment, such as children in prison or living on the street, were among the most vulnerable child populations in Angola. Considering this context, UNICEF ACO signed a cooperation agreement with the EU to strengthen BR and J4C systems in Angola.

Object of the Evaluation: The object of the evaluation for the BR and J4C Programme in Angola was initiated by UNICEF ACO to support the Government of Angola (GoA) in strengthening its BR and J4C systems. The general objective was to “**support national efforts to serve and protect the rights of children to BR and access to justice by creating intervention models and strengthening administrative systems and procedures in Angola.**” The Programme had two distinct components, namely BR and J4C. The primary focus of the **BR component** was to strengthen the BR system and increase the rate of child registration in Angola. The **J4C component** focused on strengthening the J4C system of Angola by creating a comprehensive model for the protection of children in contact with the law.

The Programme was implemented from August 2014 to January 2020. It was initially planned for 48 months (until August 2018); however, a no-cost extension was sought until January 2020 due to various implementation-related delays. Key constraining factors included slow pick-up, staffing and management changes, and relationship challenges between UNICEF ACO and the European Commission Delegation in Angola. Following a Mid-Term Review (MTR) in 2017 and Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) in 2018, the Programme underwent a series of changes to revise its scope and targeting. The geographic scope for BR changed from seven to eight provinces, namely **Luanda, Malange, Bié, Huila, Moxico, Uige, Kuanza Sul and Benguela (added in 2018)**, and for J4C from five to six provinces, namely **Luanda, Malanga, Bié, Huila, Moxico and Uige (added in 2018)**.

The total budget of the Programme was EUR16.07 million. The primary donor was the EU, while about EUR2 million were contributed by UNICEF ACO. The key government partners included the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights (MJHR) through its National Directorate for Justice

Administration, the Delegation of Justice, UNICEF ACO (as a technical partner) and a range of civil society organizations, including People in Need and Don Bosco.

The Programme beneficiaries include a range of stakeholders, such as service providers or duty bearers, civil society organizations (as implementing partners) and service users or rights-holders, such as children (boys and girls), parents and caregivers, and communities in general.

The Programme began implementation without a documented Theory of Change (ToC). As part of the evaluation, the Evaluators evolved two separate ToCs for each of the two components using the revised logical framework analysis (LFA) (2018).

Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation: The present document constitutes an end-of-Programme Evaluation with a focus on accountability, making it a Summative Evaluation. The key evaluation objectives (rephrased by the Evaluators in consultation with UNICEF ACO) were to (1) provide an objective assessment of the Programme achievements concerning the planned results for the two components of the Programme, (2) construct the Programme ToC in consultation with key stakeholders, (3) provide an objective assessment of how well the Programme adapted to and evolved with the changing realities and context at the national and subnational levels, (4) evaluate the design and feasibility (as per local context) of the Programme exit strategy, (5) assess the value added that the Programme has created for the institutionalization of BR and J4C in Angola by integrating gender, equity and child rights programming principles in its design and implementation, including the cross-cutting component of Communication for Development (C4D) and (6) document key lessons and propose recommendations for future programming at the country and regional levels to contribute to programming around BR and J4C.

Scope of the Evaluation: The geographic scope includes eight provinces for the BR component and six for the J4C component. The temporal scope includes activities carried out from August 1, 2014, to January 31, 2020. The thematic scope comprises interventions implemented under the two Programme components throughout the Programme life cycle, with an added focus on interventions implemented after the Programme revision in 2018. The evaluation followed the OECD-DAC¹ criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The non-DAC criteria elements include a human rights-based approach (HRBA – with a child rights lens), gender equality and equity.

Evaluation Design and Methodology: Two overarching approaches formed the foundations of the Evaluation, namely the mixed-methods and the participatory evaluation approaches. The mixed-methods approach was selected for overcoming method-related deficiencies, generating rich evidence bases (from varied sources), cross-validating information and data, and supporting data triangulation. The participatory approach was employed to contact all key stakeholders at national, provincial and field levels, including ultimate beneficiaries (boys, girls, mothers, fathers, caregivers and community leaders), to inform the evaluation. At the design level, the evaluation adapted the Outcome Harvesting Evaluation Design for mapping and tracing the achievement of outcome-level changes to the Programme interventions (at the output and activity levels) to establish Programme contribution.

Initially, the Evaluators planned to conduct a household survey; however, the survey was dropped during fieldwork in consultation with UNICEF ACO due to a lack of baseline data. The cancelled survey was compensated by expanding the scope of qualitative data, whereby eight community-level focus group discussions were added to inform the evaluation findings. The primary data was collected through qualitative methods and included 63 Key Informant Interviews, 30 Focus Group Discussions (with 134 male and 118 female participants) and a day-long Reflection Workshop with 27 key stakeholders. The qualitative data analysis utilized a content and thematic analysis approach. The selection of respondents and geographic areas for primary data collection was

¹ The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>.

primarily purposive, and the data collection was executed in consultation with UNICEF ACO. The contractor recruited, trained and deployed a team of experienced professionals with knowledge of the sector and local context. The evaluation team was gender-balanced and executed the evaluation in compliance with the UNEG and UNICEF evaluation standards and ethical guidelines.

Evaluation Findings and Analysis

Relevance: The BR component is found relevant in its consistency with the objectives, plans and strategies of GoA, community needs and adaptability. The Programme has demonstrated BR as being a right for every child and a key to access other entitlements, such as health and education. The objectives and approaches used for the BR component appear relevant to the priorities and plans of GoA to accelerate BR rates, as highlighted in the National Development Plans 2013–2017 and 2018–2022. The strategies of the BR component are also found coherent with the national strategies, such as tackling low BR rates through modernization. The BR component's policy-level coherence with those of national policies is evident from the GoA-approved 11 Commitments for Children, wherein BR is listed as Commitment 3.

Moreover, the country's Constitution (2010) sets the protection of children's rights as an ultimate priority for the State, family and society. Additionally, the National Law on the Protection and Integral Development of the Child (2012) sets BR as mandatory and calls for access to rights and protection for all children. Similarly, the BR component is also aligned to the global development commitments of GoA, particularly SDGs 16 and target 16.9.

The BR component is relevant in terms of its observed needs for the Government and communities, as evident from the fact that three in four Angolan children under 5 are not registered (69 per cent in 2016). As a significant proportion of adults are also not registered, which is a mandatory requirement for child registration, the Programme appeared relevant to the community need for adult registration (i.e. Massification of Civil Registry). While empirical evidence indicates an improvement in BR numbers, the overall situation has not changed significantly, which calls for Programme continuation until all Angolan children are registered.

The objectives and strategies of the J4C component appeared highly aligned with those of the national priorities of GoA and the international commitment around the protection of justice-related child rights. The J4C design is found to be consistent with the Angolan Law on the Protection and Holistic Development of the Child (Law no. 25) of 2012. Moreover, the J4C design is consistent with various strategies of GoA to safeguard child rights and protection, including the regulations on alternative sentencing measures on community services (Joined Executive Decree No 17/08) and the strategy for the prevention and combating of violence against children (2011).

The objectives and strategies of both components are aligned with the Angolan Juvenile Justice Law No. 9 of 1996, as well as the Angolan National Development Plans 2012–2017 and 2018–2022. The J4C component is also found relevant to the community needs, as it initiated new models of child-friendly service delivery, such as CIACA, and developed SOPs and Fluxos to ensure child protection. The community education and awareness interventions lacked focus on J4C-specific messaging (excluding non-violent education) in campaigns to address the communities' low knowledge on child rights related to the justice sector.

Effectiveness: Overall, the BR component of the Programme remained **Partially Effective** in achieving its planned results (outcomes and outputs), despite its evolving nature and a number of risks and challenges that materialized over the course of its implementation. The key positive highlights include policy changes for implementing BR through maternities and mobile brigades, interoperability with health and education, capacity-development initiatives (BR manual and training of birth registrars) and community education through the Responsible Fatherhood Campaign. The most notable areas which undermined BR component effectiveness are weak leveraging of the local government potential, discontinuity of BR with the Massification campaign, a lack of prioritization on digitalization of BR services and CRVS system strengthening.

Additionally, the Evaluators have determined various enabling and disabling factors in the execution of the BR component. Key enabling legal and policy factors include the Simplification Law (2015), the continuation of free registration of children under 5 and the continued political commitment and support from GoA (post-2017 elections). The institutional factors aiding the components' execution include the effective institutional coordination and memorandums of understanding (MOUs) between MJHR and the Ministries of Health and Education, the leveraging of synergies with the APROSOC project, the encouraging response from the provincial governments and the availability of trained and committed staff for BR. Some of the key social aspects that supported the BR component delivery include increased awareness about the importance of BR among parents, the involvement of community leaders (Sobas) and the existence of a large network of Traditional Birth Attendants (TBAs) at the community level.

The factors that hindered the delivery of the BR component include legal and policy, institutional, social and economic factors.

The key legal and policy factors hindering the BR component delivery include a lack of progress made towards the required amendments to the 1967 Civil Registration Code, as no stakeholder could highlight what has changed in the law. The key institutional factors include a lack of formal partnerships with local governments. If formed, these partnerships would have proved instrumental in raising awareness around BR and increasing the BR rates of children. The requirement of a parental identity card for child BR also added to the hindrances of the component. The most significant social factors influencing the delivery of the component include the non-involvement of religious leaders, social stigma faced by single mothers, socially driven delays by parents in naming a child (as they are required to follow a national law regulating child naming protocols) and the lack of recognition of fatherhood. Collectively, these factors limited the effectiveness of the BR component.

The economic factors, such as the ongoing economic crisis, led to substantial budget cuts, insufficient financial capacity of GoA to support digitization and repair work, a ban on hiring in the public sector and a lack of steady power supply and internet connectivity. These factors collectively hindered the achievement of component results. Notable unintended positive results of the component include the registration of adults (parents) by mobile brigades before the registration of children and the registration of 1,175 refugee children in remote areas.

The J4C component could be argued as **Partially Effective** for achieving most of its defined outputs. J4C mainly emerged in Angola in late 2019, and most of the Programme duration could not capitalize on implementation, as planning, undertaking formative assessments, establishing partnerships and training took a significant amount of time. A crucial factor (applicable to the initial years of the Programme execution and the late emergence of results) contributing to the component effectiveness was that GoA had little experience and lacked expertise in J4C. As a result, the component invested in creating an enabling environment by sensitizing key stakeholders on the intended J4C actions by undertaking various activities, such as a learning trip to Brazil and PALOP training.

The J4C component could not introduce any significant legal and policy framework change while executing its interventions. Nevertheless, the main contributions of the component include the introduction of Fluxos, SOPs and the CIACA model. Although CIACA is yet to be legalized through a Presidential Decree, the premise of such intervention is to organize various services under Child Protection Law. Moreover, the Evaluators also found that fully functional Juvenile Courts have not yet been developed, as the established Courts are not fully operational in all Angolan provinces (except for Luanda, where the Court has its own facility), as required by the Angolan Juvenile Justice Law (1996).

Under the quality of justice administration, the J4C component addressed the commitment of GoA to enforce the legislation required for the creation and maintenance of well-structured and fully equipped justice institutions with a duly trained staff, which was virtually non-existent in Angola. The lack of institutions became evident during the establishment and validation of the CIACA

model, Fluxos, SOPs and various training courses offered by the Programme. The development of these initiatives laid the foundation for GoA to internalize the SOPs into the rules and regulations. As the SOPs are highly relevant for effective J4C service delivery in Angola, GoA validated the drafts during December 2019, and their induction may already have begun in GoA institutions. Stakeholders appreciate the investment in Fluxos and its relevance in the capacity enhancements of judges and service providers. However, the Evaluation has found that model service delivery mechanisms initiated by CIACAs are only a pilot initiative; without further scale-up, the positive externalities of these centres will be lost.

Additionally, the problem with access to justice services for children persists, as judicial institutions, including Minor Courts, are located far away from the majority of the population, and long distances make it difficult for legal staff and community members to access services. Concerning knowledge management and dissemination, the J4C component actively contributed to creating evidence by supporting research studies. Two studies were considered to inform the baseline for J4C, and the Responsible Fatherhood Campaign (2017–2018) included messages on non-violent caregiving for parents at the community level. However, J4C-specific awareness-raising messages regarding children’s legal rights and other protection issues comprised the missing element in the campaign.

Efficiency (BR and J4C): Considering both components of the Programme, the distribution of funds shows almost an even share among the two components (28 per cent and 26 per cent for BR and J4C, respectively), while a 46 per cent share was allocated to common interventions and cross-cutting activities. There was no specific division of budget by components in the Programme budget. The evaluation found that the Programme was adequately resourced financially and was able to execute its full budget. At the time of the evaluation’s field mission (January 2020), UNICEF ACO reported USD400,000 in commitments to be disbursed by the end of January 2020. In addition to the above-stated financial aspects, the efficiency analysis covered the following key aspects:

- Time: The yearly Programme expenditures indicate that the Programme had a slow start and a low implementation rate in the initial years (2014–2015) due to volatile environment, coordination issues with GoA and internal staffing changes in UNICEF ACO and GoA. Compared to the J4C subcomponent, the BR component became operational earlier and started delivering results faster (see figures 1 and 2 in the main Efficiency section).
- Human resources: The staffing of the Programme has undergone several changes during the Programme’s life cycle. Overall, the evaluation identified that the Programme could have benefited from additional national Programmatic resources to support the heavy implementation load of the Programme.
- Efficiency of financial resources compared to the key results achieved: In terms of resource efficiency relative to key Programme results, the Evaluators cannot comment on resource efficiency regarding the available financial and material resources allocated. Due to a lack of documentation of the results of each intervention, as well as clearly disaggregated allocations, it is not possible to calculate the cost per intervention (such as cost per registration in maternities and by mobile brigades). As a result, the Evaluators’ analysis could distribute financial expenditures at only two broader components (i.e. BR and J4C and common expenditures).
- Resource utilization for C4D: The resources allocated for communication and awareness activities (C4D) for both components stands at 8 per cent. An evaluation of the Responsible Fatherhood Campaign (2019, encouraging BR) revealed that only about one-third (31 per cent) of survey respondents could recall the campaign. This indicates that about two-thirds (69 per cent) of respondents remain unaware of BR messages, thereby pointing to the low (8 per cent) investments on C4D regarding the low gains. The Evaluation may conclude that resources spent on C4D in conjunction with other interventions of the J4C component have plausibly partially contributed to increasing awareness on BR but not for the majority (69 per cent) of the population.

Sustainability: For the BR component, the interventions that are highly likely to be sustainable include (1) legal and policy changes advocated by the Programme, such as the 2015 Simplification

Law (2) the partnership with Health (MOU, 2015), given the commitment of GoA to expand national BR services in maternities (to 182 by 2022), (3) the partnership with the education sector (MOU, 2017) and (4) the BR Manual. The interventions that are partially likely to be sustainable include (1) the Programme-supported mobile brigades, although there are no specific financial commitments by GoA to fund their continuation, (2) social mobilization and awareness efforts (C4D), given the absence of a dedicated communication budget at the GoA level, and (3) the CRVS data collection and reporting system, which remains fragmentary and hinders provinces from reporting BR data in a timely, properly disaggregated and regular fashion. The Evaluators stipulate that pre and in-service training of birth registrars offered under the component is least likely to continue in the absence of allocated financial resources.

For the J4C component, the evaluation has found that the interventions with a high likelihood of sustainability are (1) training sessions for various categories of judicial officials, (2) the SOPs developed for five sectors and (3) the referral pathways (Fluxos). The intervention of Integrated Information Management System (IIMS) is partially likely to be sustainable, as it was still under development during the fieldwork. The intervention with the least likelihood of sustainability is the model of Alternative Measures to Detention for adolescents in conflict with the law, due to its short life cycle (only eight months).

The key factors affecting the sustainability of the J4C interventions are the lack of legalization of the CIACA model and the information management system, as well as weak coordination between ministries involved in the justice and child protection system. Moreover, the uncertain financial capacity of GoA for investments in the necessary skills enhancement of the justice sector officials hindered trained through the Programme, despite the judicial officials being an integral part of the scale-up phase of CIACAs. Finally, although the Programme considered a clearly articulated exit strategy, the plan was unable to be fully materialized due to various internal (delayed start and design revision time-lapse) and external reasons, thereby lowering the overall sustainability of most interventions and results.

HRBA, Gender Equality and Equity: The BR component design and implementation were found compliant to the HRBA principles of accountability, equality and non-discrimination, participation and inclusion in the rights-based frameworks, such as CRC and CEDAW. The BR component involved rights-holders, duty bearers and influencers to comply with HRBA programming. The Evaluators found that the implemented approaches were inclusive and did not discriminate against race, religion or other factors. In terms of inclusion, the component prioritized marginalized and disadvantaged populations by registering children in remote areas through mobile brigades. Moreover, the BR component was mostly responsive to specific child rights provisions of various international and regional treaties, as well as national commitments, such as CRC (art. 7), the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (art 6), the SDGs (target 16.9) and the Angolan Law on the Protection of the Child (2012). As a result, the component was largely regarded as compliant with child rights principles.

The BR component is also mostly in conformance with gender programming principles. By integrating BR services in maternities, BR services were made more accessible by enabling mothers to register their child immediately after birth or while having postnatal check-ups. For single mothers, the component produced a brief educational guide on BR and demonstrated equality and inclusiveness (including equity) in its design and implementation. Finally, the Programme engaged TBAs for the dissemination of BR-related messages to educate mothers.

The J4C component was found to be largely in compliance with HRBA principles and child rights. The interventions were directly aligned with the agenda, laws, strategies and plans on child rights of GoA. The J4C interventions (CIACAs, SOPs and Fluxos) embedded key principles of accountability, inclusion and participation to provide legal and judicial services to Angolan children in conflict or contact with the law. Additionally, the J4C component was both a rights and accountability intervention that addressed children as rights-holders, and its accountability dimension focused on strengthening capacities of duty bearers (judges, lawyers, police and

detention officers) to protect and deliver J4C services in a fair, timely and holistic manner. The components approaches were inclusive and did not discriminate against race, religion or other factors and fostered participation and social mobilization around J4C through CIACAs, SOP formulations and Fluxos, as well as by implementing capacity-development activities. However, no J4C-specific awareness-raising campaign was considered to educate the masses in addressing Violence against Children (VAC).

Gender equality: At the design level, the J4C component is largely regarded as gender-sensitive. Regarding implementation and results, the majority of the J4C component is noted as gender-responsive, as reflected in the various J4C initiatives, such as Fluxos and SOPs. Moreover, the Responsible Fatherhood Campaign to sensitize fathers responded to the existing gender norms wherein women generally hold more responsibility than men regarding children upbringing. However, there are several aspects which undermine the compliance of the components with gender-sensitive and gender-responsive programming. For instance, the tracking and reporting of results under the J4C interventions remained weak, and the Evaluators did not find gender-disaggregated results reporting for all indicators.

Equity: the guiding principles and parameters set out in the SOPs and Fluxos documents indicate that the J4C component had a clear focus on addressing the needs of vulnerable and marginalized children (children of the streets and teenaged girls in conflict or contact with the law who require special handling and inclusion). However, the application of equity issues was partially addressed by the component. Despite these measures, some children still ended up in social transit shelters for long periods, with weak infrastructural structures, hygiene issues and overcrowding. These issues exposed children to more cases of sexual, physical and psychological violence, exploitation and abuse, especially if children returned to the families where the problems started, thereby undermining the compliance to equity principles.

Conclusion, Lesson Learned and Recommendations

The DAC criteria conclusion for BR and J4C is provided separately in chapter 5. Hereunder, the overall conclusion for the entire Programme is narrated, and the lessons collectively cover both components.

Conclusion: The Evaluation concludes that BR and J4C managed to achieve most of the output targets. However, the outcome results of the Programme remain unknown. This may be attributed to the fact that the Programme began in a volatile environment, with economic slowdown, political transition and significant staffing adjustments in both UNICEF ACO and GoA. These hindrances led to design and geographic changes mid-Programme, with most outputs being delivered towards the conclusion of the Programme. This distribution of results made the Programme delivery tail-end heavy, which strained the implementers and left little room to institutionalize measures for long-term sustainability, signalling the need for follow-ups and nurturing care from both UNICEF ACO and GoA. Considering the profound contextual changes impacting its design and implementation, the Programme has done well in achieving all possible goals. While the Programme attempted to adapt to the external environmental changes, it struggled to balance between the UNICEF ACO institutional programming commitments and standards and the expectations from GoA and donors.

As the Programme continued to adjust and adapt to GoA demands, it may have over-committed. This could and should have been avoided, as it stretched the Programme resources (teams, finances and materials) to the limit. As implementation and completion of interventions were prolonged until January 2020, Evaluators are unsure of which interventions may be sustainable and for how long once the Programme ends. The Government's ownership and contribution should ideally have been secured at the onset; however, the turbulent environment made this difficult to obtain, thus affecting the implementation of the exit strategy and failing to shift GoA's role from "beneficiary" to "owner/driver". The Programme attempted to integrate the HRBA, gender equality and equity principles in multiple ways. While the Evaluators noted design deficiencies around this

intervention, the implemented interventions have not been fully captured by the monitoring system. As a result, the monitoring system remains a key area of improvement for future programmes.

Moving forward, both UNICEF ACO and GoA acknowledge that this level of funding is less likely to be available in the future. UNICEF ACO may need to continue focusing on strengthening the system while shifting towards low-cost strategic investments for both BR and J4C components. For BR, technical assistance must focus more on simplification, decentralization and expansion of services (including outreach services for remote locations). Moreover, there is a need to actively link BR with the national Massification campaign. Furthermore, efforts should be made to assess and explore the potential to scale up the CRVS Model piloted in Hulia province. The importance of ICT cannot be overstated; however, in the given circumstances, the Government may need to implement a hybrid approach featuring manual and IT-based registration.

For J4C, the Programme has effectively laid the foundations to build further interventions. Partners must be cognizant that the models supported by the Programme, including CIACA, SOPs and referral pathways (yet to be put into motion), are still new and may present issues, hence would require nurturing support. The recent legal and administrative reforms pose a risk to the achievements and merit continued engagement with MJHR and the Supreme Court to sustain and build further on the initial gains. The J4C Programming must not exclude VAC, and this aspect should remain integral to future investments. Both components would need a considered focus on organizing communities and creating awareness around both issues to leverage communities as key influencers and gate-keepers. UNICEF ACO may need to continue advocating and promoting greater space and engagement of CSO, in assistance of the public sector service providers.

Lesson Learned: The Programme has contributed to useful lessons learned that have been shared by key stakeholders involved in Programme development and delivery at the Reflection Workshop. During the Workshop, all participating stakeholders consolidated and refined the lessons learned listed, as outlined below:

1. The technical assistance for accelerating BR must strike a balance between interventions and resources for both civil registration and the vital statistics to help construct a functional CRVS. The Programme missed this initiative, as it laid more focus on BR.
2. A decentralized BR system must always be linked with local leaders and governance structures to mobilize communities and generate the demand for services. While decentralization efforts of the Programme focused on engaging with the health and education sectors, the Programme failed to fully leverage the potential of the most influential actors (i.e. Sobas and traditional leaders).
3. For sensitive operating environments (such as Angola), international staff recruitment must consider the staff's ability to converse in local languages. The Programme initially struggled due to a lack of Portuguese-proficient international staff members. However, the later deployment of a team with local language skills, aided by the competent and dedicated national staff, helped improve the situation. This stands valid for any international context (where not many people speak English) and sector in which UNICEF operates.
4. The C4D interventions, particularly the mass media and outreach campaigns, are more useful if implemented with pre-post campaign monitoring. The Programme appeared unable to assemble a functioning and decision-enabling monitoring system for C4D interventions. Furthermore, the campaigns were implemented without a clear strategy on measuring results, and there is limited evidence of pre- and post-campaign monitoring having been completed until the last year of the Programme.

Recommendations: The recommendations are offered separately for BR and J4C and are categorized by main stakeholders' (Government and UNICEF), and by priority for improving the design, execution, and future scale-up of the Programme if any. It is important to note that

subsequent text provides the only outline of key recommendations and details are accessible from respective sections.

Birth Registration

The GoA (MJHR-National Directorate of Registration and Notary, INE, MINSA, MED, and MININT)

1. The GoA should simplify, decentralize, and expand BR services with a considered focus on making services equitable and a 'one-step and one visit' process for all. [*Priority: Short and Medium-term*].
2. The State and BR-related Ministries must advocate for prioritization of BR services by seeking greater political and administrative commitment, adequate public sector financing, building capacities of service providers, and promoting greater use of IT (digitization, dashboards, servers, databases). [*Priority: Short to Medium-term*].

The UNICEF ACO

1. Must provide technical assistance to MJHR on BR services reform processes including the proposed review/amendment of Civil Registration Code and engagement of interoperability partners (for simplification, decentralization, and expansion of BR services). Moreover, the UNICEF ACO will have to provide technical assistance for the proposed 'Institutional Capacity Assessment' and formulation of 'Capacity Development Road Map'. [*Priority: Immediate to Medium-term*].
2. Should focus on registering the left-outs (late registration, remote population, births outside health facilities by extending BR services to remote communities, conducting BR in schools, and maternity wards; and by expanding BR services by registering in train stations located in remote areas with support from Ministry of Transportation. Moreover, UNICEF ACO ought to promote 'convergence and integration' at various levels and with existing Programmes such as WASH. [*Priority: Short to Medium Term*].

Justice for Children

The GoA (MJHR, INAC, and MININT)

1. The MJHR should provide technical, financial, and advocacy support to relevant Ministries in influencing Government to prepare a national policy to test, document, and budget the implementation of alternative measures to the detention of children. [*Priority: Long-term*].
2. The GoA must ensure a proper transition of CIACA to Supreme Court by legalizing CIACA, introducing legal provisions for Mobile Courts (as an extension of CIACA), scaling-up CIACA to all 18 Angolan provinces, and retaining Judiciary officials trained by the J4C component for piloting CIACA model in targeted provinces. [*Priority: Short to Medium-term*].
3. The MJHR and relevant Ministries must implement the IIMS to ensure timely and accurate data collection on all children in conflict or contact with the Law. This will enable evidence-based decision making vis-à-vis child protection. [*Priority: Short to Medium-term*].

The UNICEF ACO

1. Must conduct comprehensive monitoring of CIACA, implementation of SOPs, and Fluxos including costing and analysis of GoA budget allocations. [*Priority: Short to Medium-term*].
2. Should continue and increase investments in campaigning for behaviour changes to promote Gender and Children's rights in the communities and within Government institutions, and Ministries (MJHR, MASFAMU, MININT, MED, and MINSA). [*Priority: Short to Medium-term*].
3. Will have to provide technical support for enabling GoA to formulate a National Human Resource Development Strategy. This will enable justice administration services and will be a pathway for the sustainability of the J4C system in the country. [*Priority: Short to Medium-Term*].