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This questionnaire is to check whether or not a selected project area is suitable to set up a Community Ambassador Model (CAM). It is a crucial check since Child-Centered Community Development projects are 100% funded through this funding model. Setting up CAM is a significant investment and holds risks when not implemented well. Therefore, it is important to take time to fill out this questionnaire.

The CAM feasibility assessment consists of 5 checks in relation to the following dimensions:  
- Scale  
- Stability of the area  
- Community support  
- Sponsorship logistics  
- Other sponsorship organisations  
  
The assessment form needs to be submitted by the implementing partner with the support of the Country Office and needs to be approved by Help a Child Netherlands.

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **General information** | |
| 1 | Name of selected area |  |
| 2 | Name of implementing (partner) organization |  |
| 3 | Name contact person |  |
| 4 | Distance of selected project area to national office of partner (in hours of driving) |  |
| 5 | Distance of selected project area to Help a Child Country Office (in hourse of driving) |  |
| 6 | Estimated population of target area |  |

**Check 1: SCALE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Questions** | Answers |
| *A. Is the size of the population sufficient for supporting the CAM model?* | | |
| 1. | Number of villages |  |
| 2. | Distance between the nearest and most remote village in the targeted area (in hours driving) |  |
| 3. | Is it possible to arrange a minimal of 300 Child / Family Ambassadors in the starting phase of th project (with potential growth to 600-900 sheets)? |  |
| 4. | Do the levels of population movement and migration in the area raise concern over the viability of CAM (ie, indicators are that greater than 5% of target group migrate/year)? | Yes / no Actual migration rate  Source: |
| 5 | Is there seasonal migration amongst potential target groups that will make monitoring of community representatives every 90 days difficult to manage? | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
| 6 | Does this migration include children of sponsorship age (welke leeftijd is dat?) | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
| 7. | Do children leave the area for long periods, eg, to attend boarding school or to stay with relatives? | Potential problem/No problem  Source: |
| *B. Further analysis* | | |
| 8. | Are there any factors that significantly could reduce the number of children in this area in the coming years? | Yes/no (please indicate) |
| 9. | Are there groups of children amongst the target population who would not qualify for sponsorship selection? (think of wealth, upcoming migration, cultural factors, sponsored by another NGO, difficulty to access areas etc.) | Yes / no |
|  | **Conclusion: Is the feasibility for CAM favorable or unfavorable, based on above analysis?** | **Favorable/ unfavorable** |

**Check 2: STABILITY**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Questions** | **Answers** |
| *A. Identify issues that may affect long-term programming* | | |
| 1. | Does the government support the implementation of CAM and/or are there any (legal) restrictions to carry out CAM? | Yes / no  Source: |
| 2. | Select the statement that most accurately describes the situation of the proposed project area:  1. Project area is in conflict, widespread displacement of people, collapse in government services, serious humanitarian needs  2. Active violence and displacement has either ceased within last 5 years or become highly localized, government relatively stable.  3. Violent rhetoric is circulating though not overt. Violence is not widespread.  4 There is a stable peace that has lasted longer than five years and no violent rhetoric. | Rate:  Source: |
| 3. | Community tensions: Are there any other past, present or emerging tensions within the community that should be taken into account? | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
| 4. | Is the target population internally displaced likely to be subject to forced eviction, slum destruction or other forms of resettlement? | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
| *B. Long-term outlook* | | |
| 5. | Is the outlook stable enough to foresee continued access to this community over the next 5-8 years for each of the above categories? | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
| 6. | Are there groups of children amongst the target population who would not qualify for sponsorship selection? (think of wealth, upcoming migration, cultural factors, sponsored by another NGO, difficulty to access areas etc.) | Yes / no |
|  | **Conclusion: Is the feasibility for CAM favorable or unfavorable, based on above analysis?** | **Favorable/ unfavorable** |

**Check 3: COMMUNITY SUPPORT**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Questions** | **Answers** |
| *A. Willingness to support and participate in CAM* | | |
| 1. | Are most community members willing to participate in the implementation of CAM? | Yes / no  Describe indicators of commitment |
| 2 | Are community leaders willing to support the implementation of CAM? | Yes / no Describe indicators of commitment |
| 3. | Are there local/cultural issues and restrictions or other factors that may affect children’s participation in sponsorship or day-to-day sponsorship operations? (think of suspicion for photography, whether or not in relation to superstition / fear for witchcraft etc. etc.) | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
| 4. | Are there any other NGOs active in the direct neighbourhood of the targeted communities which might affect the expectations and/or the commitment of the communities to cooperate with CAM? |  |
|  | Conclusion: Is the feasibility for CAM favorable or unfavorable, based on above analysis? | Favorable/ unfavorable |

**Check 4: SPONSORSHIP LOGISTICS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Questions** | **Answers** |
| *A. Communications* | | |
| 1. | Is there reliable access to electricity? | Yes / no |
| 2. | Is there reliable access to connectivity/e-mail? | Yes / no |
| 3. | Is there reliable access to postal/courier services? | Yes / no |
| 4. | Is there reliable access to phone? | Yes / no |
| *B. Regular contact with children* | | |
| 5. | Can children in all parts of the proposed area be contacted on a regular basis throughout the year (eg, safe roads, manageable distances)? | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
| 6. | Are there seasonal factors that may affect accessibility for project implementation and child monitoring (eg, rains, snow)? | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
| 7. | Is the population highly scattered or concentrated in centers? [note: large travel distances can have an effect on costs for sponsor administration/photography etc, as well as for monitoring] | Highly scattered /  Concentrated in centres |
| *B. Security and mobility of staff* | | |
| 8. | Are there crime or security issues in the area that might affect the operation of the program or the ability of staff/volunteers to move freely? | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
| *C. Language and translation* | | |
| 9. | Are field staff competent with the language(s) spoken in the targeted area? | Yes / a bit / no |
| 10. | Are field staff competent with English? | Yes / a bit / no |
| *D. Volunteerism* | | |
| 11. | The CAM model requires the support of local volunteers. Does the community have a proven track record of volunteerism in working together or with NGOs? | Yes / no  Source / examples: |
| 12. | Is there sufficient capacity in the communities to facilitate CAM related activities (child monitoring, facilitation of correspondence)? (consider literacy levels, language skills etc) | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
|  | **Conclusion: Is the feasibility for CAM favorable or unfavorable, based on above analysis?** | **Favorable/ unfavorable** |

**Check 5: OTHER SPONSORSHIP ORGANISATIONS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Questions** | **Answers** |
| *A. Presence of other child sponsorship agencies in the vicinity* | | |
| 1. | Are there any other sponsorship agencies in the area or close enough for families to be involved? | Yes / no  Source: |
| 2 | If yes) Which organisation(s) and where are they operating? Describe in detail how accessible they are to the proposed target population, and what is their sponsorship offer for families (eg, pay school fees, etc):\_ |  |
| 3. | Is this organization / are these organizations willing to cooperate (discuss coordination of selection of target areas etc)? | Yes / no |
| 4. | If yes, are MoUs signed? | Yes / no  Please attach copy of MoU |
| *B. Factors influencing expectations of the community* | | |
| 5. | Has this community experienced CAM-like models with other organizations that might influence their expectations or commitment? | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
| 6. | Are there any other NGOs active in the project area providing handouts, that may influence expectations about Child Sponsorship? | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
| 7. | Are there any government practices or external parties involed in providing handouts in the area, which may influence expectations around Child Sponsorship? | Potentional problem / no potential problem.  Source: |
|  | **Conclusion: Is the feasibility for CAM favorable or unfavorable, based on above analysis?** | **Favorable/ unfavorable** |

**CHILD SPONSORSHIP OPERATIONAL RISK MANAGEMENT MATRIX**

Mention here issues that require risk management in the design of the CCCD project and CAM implementation.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk** | **Likelihood High / medium / low** | **Consequence Fatal / Serious / Managable** | **Mitigation strategies** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |