

# Final Annual Narrative Report Template - Year 3

## SUFASEC Down to Zero Alliance - Country Teams

**Please make a copy of this template before use -**

This Final Annual Narrative Report covers shall combine reflections on **progress, including results, challenges and learnings** - on both **Year 3** (March 2025 - February 2026) of SUFASEC, as well as the **overall SUFASEC programme** (March 2023 - February 2026). The report (see additions compared to last year's template highlighted in **green**) provides an overview of progress, results, challenges, and lessons learned for submission to the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, complementing the audited financial report. As per MoFA requirements, the report includes:

- **Context & Risk Update** (see [SUFASEC RISK MATRIX](#))
- Reflection on **Good Practices & Learnings**
- Progress on key **Indicators, Targets vs Actual and an explanation of Differences**
- Reflection on any **unintended effects** that activities caused
- Reflection on **protection of boys and Boys Initiative** engagement
- **Sustainability Planning**
- **Review of Partnerships** including local partner collaboration and local ownership
- **Challenges, Good Practices & Lessons Learned**

### 1. Process & Timeline

Each implementing partner / Country Office prepares their **Final Annual Narrative Report** by February 28th. Once reviewed and approved by their respective Alliance Member, each Country / Cross Country Coordinator consolidates these reports into 1 **Country Final Annual Report** covering all partners in the country. This consolidated report needs to be uploaded under [Country Final Reports - Year 3](#) by March 31st. The Reporting Lead (Katherine Austin) then compiles all Country Reports into 1 **Final Alliance Annual Report**. Please find the **full timeline** including detailed responsibilities and deadlines here: [SUFASEC Final Annual Report Y3 - Reporting Timeline](#)

### 2. Guidelines for Reporting:

- Use the **results framework** as basis for your annual report
- **Keep reports short and concise**, see page limits indicated. Share any **links to supporting documents / articles / photos** available throughout the document that can be included in the final report providing more visibility.
- Provide both **quantitative and qualitative** results. Include analysis of your achievements: how do they contribute to change, what is the impact of this?

### 3. RF Actuals Reporting:

To support the finalisation of the Alliance-wide report:

- Input **your actual achievements** under the "**(Partner level)**" sheet in the [Reporting Template Targets vs Actuals Country RF SUFASEC \[in use\]](#) (both country-specific + global indicators)
- Any **deviations above/below 20% of targets** need to be explained with a **short narrative** in the column "*Comments Year 3 (per partner)*". Country/Cross-Country Coordinators will then consolidate actuals and clarifications at the **country level**

### 4. Comms products, Photos & Case stories:

- Please **share all relevant photos** including a **pre-selection of the top-10** as **PGN / JPEG** etc., here [Photos incl. top 10](#). For pictures selected, we will then reach out for photo credits and consent forms as per the Ethical Content Production Policy.
- Share any **case stories and best practices** here [Case stories & best practices](#)
- Share any **comms products** (communications, ICE, awareness, articles, campaigning materials etc.) here [Comms Products](#)

See all files for the final reporting: [Annual Report Year 3 \(Final Report\)](#)

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Country:</b>               | <i>Thailand</i>  |
| <b>Alliance members:</b>      | <i>CRC Asia</i>  |
| <b>Implementing partners:</b> | <i>The Life Skills Development Foundation (TLSDF)</i>  |
| <b>Reporting period</b>       | <i>Focus: <b>Year 3</b> (March 2025 - Feb 2026), including reflections on progress, results, challenges, learnings on the <b>overall SUFASEC programme</b> (3 years Mar 2023 - Feb 2026)</i> |

|  |
|--|
| <h2>1. Context</h2>  |
| <p><b>1.1 Context &amp; Risk update:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What were the most important <b>changes in social, political, civil spaces, economic and cultural context</b>? only highlight the major changes, incl. changes in implementing areas. Include any relevant figures / contextual data / research / report findings.</li> <li>How did these <b>influence the programme implementation</b>? How did you respond to them at regional, national, and local levels? Which <b>adjustments</b> to intervention strategies and approaches were made?</li> <li><b>Please review the <a href="#">SUFASEC RISK MATRIX</a> Please provide an update on the risks that materialised.</b> What was their <b>impact on programme implementation</b>? What mitigation measures were taken?</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: right;">(½ page max)</p>  |
| <p>During Year 3, the operating context in Northern Thailand continued to evolved, particularly in relation to digital risks, migration vulnerability, and local governance stability. Monitoring findings indicate increasing exposure of children to online grooming, digital fraud, and emerging forms of online exploitation, reflecting broader national concerns around Online Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (OCSEA).</p> <p>Additionally, approximately 9% of Thai youth and 12-17 are estimated to have experienced forms of online exploitation (national reflections referenced in project learning), underscoring the urgency of prevention efforts.</p> <p>In project areas (Fang, Pang Mapha, Chiang Khong), socio-economic vulnerability remains high, particularly among <a href="#">ethnic</a>, migrant and stateless children who face limited access to protection system. Cultural sensitivity around discussing sexuality also continues to influence community-level engagement strategies.</p> <p>Institutionally, governance continuity posed a contextual risk. Three consecutive turnovers of the TdH Netherlands Country Coordinator affected Alliance-level coordination and clarity of roles within the Country Steering and Coordinating (CSCC). While this did not halt implementation, its temporality weakened shared budget ownership and coordination efficiency.</p> <p>Risks that partially materialised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Leadership turnover at district and school levels, affecting policy continuity</li> <li>- Weak formalisation of referral systems (lack of written SOPs).</li> <li>- Limited institutional budget allocation for SEC at district level.</li> </ul> <p>Mitigation measures included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthening collaboration with District Quality of Life (QoL) Committees to embed SEC into district strategic plans</li> <li>- Supporting schools to integrate SEC prevention into existing structures (e.g., classroom lessons, Youth-friendly Corner, peer-led activities).</li> <li>- Maintaining operational continuity through SUFASEC/TLSDF’s Children and Youth Council despite Alliance-level governance challenges.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, despite contextual and institutional risks, programme implementation adapted strategically and maintained steady progress toward outcome-level change.</p> |

## 2. Programme Progress - Outcomes & Intermediate Outcomes

Please explain main activities and achievements related to each outcome and intermediate outcomes you work on

### 2.1 Progress Outcome 1 & Intermediate Outcomes (report on intermediate outcomes you work on only):

**1. Outcome:** ‘Children and youth and their communities successfully challenge social norms and harmful practices related to sexual exploitation of children.’

#### Intermediate outcomes:

- 1.1. ‘Parents/ caregivers exercise positive parenting and strengthen family ties’
- 1.2. ‘More children demonstrate knowledge on action to take to protect their bodies and lives’
- 1.3. ‘Communities (including families) take action to change social norms and harmful practices’
  - a) How did **main activities** implemented lead to the **progress achieved** in Y3 per each intermediate outcome area?
  - b) What **milestones** were achieved? (Include testimonials/stories, links to materials/photos if available.)  
What was the **impact**?
  - c) **What were challenges and learnings?**  
(1 page max)

#### Intermediate outcome 1.1

**‘Parents/ caregivers exercise positive parenting and strengthen family ties’**

##### a) How main activities led to progress in Year 3

In Year 3, the programme strengthened positive parenting capacity through structured training sessions and awareness activities across three districts. A total of **20 female parents and 147 male parents** were reached with positive parenting training over the three-year period, with continued engagement in Year 3. In addition, 6 awareness activities were conducted specifically for parents during Year 3.

The approach combined rights-based parenting, dialogue on online grooming and SRHR risks, and reflection on positive discipline practices. Follow-up engagement at community level enabled translation of knowledge into behavioral change.

Through these mechanisms, parenting practices shifted from control- and fear-based approaches toward dialogue, prevention, and child protection.

##### b) Milestones achieved and impact

Although the number of female participants was lower in Year 3 compared to previous years, the programme maintained male caregiver engagement (147 reached), which is significant in shifting gendered caregiving norms.

Qualitative evidence indicates:

- Reduced use of physical punishment
- Increased openness in discussing sexuality and protection
- Community acceptance of preventive SRHR decisions

##### Impact:

Year 3 reinforced norm shifts from punitive discipline toward protective, dialogue-based parenting, particularly strengthening male caregiver participation.

Collectively, these changes demonstrate a gradual shift in social norms—from silence and punishment toward prevention, dialogue, and shared responsibility for child protection.

##### c) Challenges and learnings

Challenges:

- Migrant and stateless families remain difficult to reach and face structural barriers
- Cultural beliefs and language diversity in ethnic communities require tailored communication approaches
- Some families continue to normalize economic pressures that increase vulnerability.

Key learnings:

- Community role models (“parent champions”) are powerful agents of norm change.

- Preventive SRHR framing (health and safety) reduces resistance compared to moral framing.
- Sustained engagement—not one-off training—is essential to consolidate behaviour change.
- Embedding discussions within broader community wellbeing agendas increases acceptance.

### Intermediate outcome 1.2

**‘More children demonstrate knowledge on action to take to protect their bodies and lives’**

#### a) How activities led to progress

Through Student Leader Trainings, Advocacy Events, and Peer-to-Peer activities, the programme reached:

- **1,677 female youth** and
- **1,278 male youth**

With comprehensive knowledge on child protection risks and actions to prevent harm.

#### b) Milestones and impact

These figures substantially exceeded original targets. Youth demonstrated improved knowledge of grooming risks, refusal skills, and referral pathways. Qualitative findings are; 1) Youth publicly addressing grooming and online risks 2) Reduced gossip and victim-blaming behaviours and 3) Normalization of condom access without stigma

Impact: Year 3 strengthened youth agency and peer accountability, contributing to social norm change around violence and exploitation.

#### c) Challenges and learnings

Online exploitation risks continue to evolve.

Learning: Peer-led models significantly amplify reach and knowledge retention.

#### Key indicators & targets

- a) Please complete the [RF table](#) showing progress on key indicators and targets achieved. For the **MoFa Basket Indicators**, also add qualitative **information** (see yellow boxes in the RF). Find further guidance on the MoFa Basket Indicators [here](#).
- b) Please explain variations **above/below 20% of targets vs actuals** achieved within Y3 in the dedicated **‘comments’** column within the **RF table**. In case of significant variations linked to changes in context/organisational capacity or similar, please elaborate below.
- c) Please in this chapter add information on the following 2 qualitative indicators (using OH signs or any other source of information):
  - i) *Description of **changes in social norms and of the new modelled behaviour promoted by children, youth and communities***
    - 1) *At children/youth level*
    - 2) *At parents level*
    - 3) *At community level*
  - ii) *Description of **actions taken towards changing social and gender norms and harmful practices to respond to or prevent SEC by children, youth, and their communities***

Year 3 qualitative evidence indicates measurable shifts in social norms and modelled behaviours across children, parents, and communities, reflecting progress toward challenging harmful practices related to SEC. These findings are based on Outcome Harvesting signs, interviews, and stakeholder reflections.

#### i) Description of changes in social norms and newly modelled behaviour

##### 1) At children and youth level

At youth level, a significant normative shift has occurred from silence and stigma toward openness, prevention, and peer accountability. Youth leaders increasingly speak publicly about grooming, consent, online risks, and help-seeking mechanisms during school assemblies and community activities. This demonstrates movement from passive awareness to active norm-setting.

Students reported that gossip and victim-blaming around sensitive cases have decreased compared to previous years. Condom access within schools has become normalized, with youth accessing services without visible shame. These behaviours indicate a shift from moral gatekeeping to harm-reduction norms.

Youth also model refusal skills and peer referral to Youth Corners, demonstrating protective agency rather than

passive vulnerability. The statement from youth that “our voices have meaning” reflects internalized empowerment and collective ownership of protection norms

## 2) At parent level

Among parents and caregivers, Year 3 shows a shift from punitive discipline norms toward dialogue-based, protective parenting. Caregivers report consciously reducing physical punishment and adopting communication-focused approaches. This reflects a normative change from control and fear toward rights-based caregiving.

In Pang Mapha, the case of a Lisu mother supporting her daughter’s voluntary contraceptive implant illustrates a significant shift in social attitudes. Initially criticized, the decision later gained acceptance and influenced other families. This indicates movement away from stigma and moral condemnation toward prevention-oriented responsibility.

Parents also demonstrate greater willingness to discuss sexuality, online risks, and protection openly with children, reflecting erosion of silence-based norms.

## 3) At community level

At community level, a gradual cultural shift is evident from concealment toward transparency and collective response. District leaders and community actors increasingly acknowledge that cases should not be hidden to protect institutional reputation but addressed collaboratively. This represents a shift in administrative and social norms toward accountability.

Additionally, integration of adolescent pregnancy and youth wellbeing issues into district agendas reflects normalization of prevention discourse within governance platforms rather than treating such issues as taboo.

### ii) Description of actions taken to change social and gender norms and harmful practices

Children, youth, parents, and community actors undertook concrete actions in Year 3 to prevent and respond to SEC.

At youth level, young leaders organized peer-to-peer campaigns, delivered awareness messages during school assemblies, and participated in public events to disseminate knowledge on grooming, consent, and online safety. These actions actively challenge harmful gender norms that normalize coercion or silence.

Parents replaced violent disciplinary practices with dialogue-based approaches and sought preventive SRHR services for adolescents, modelling protective decision-making within communities.

At community and institutional level, cross-sector coordination mechanisms were strengthened under district governance structures, and referral pathways between schools and health services were reinforced. These actions address structural conditions that enable harmful practices.

Collectively, these behavioural and institutional changes indicate that communities are not only discussing harmful norms but actively transforming them through visible, replicated actions.

### Overall Qualitative Assessment

Year 3 evidence suggests an emerging transformation across multiple levels:

- **Youth:** from silence to agency and peer accountability.
- **Parents:** from punishment to protection and prevention.
- **Communities:** from concealment to transparency and coordinated response.

While entrenched norms—particularly among ethnic, migrant and marginalized groups—remain a challenge, the observed behavioural modelling and institutional responses demonstrate meaningful progress toward dismantling harmful social and gender norms related to SEC.

**2.2 Progress Outcome 2:**

**1.Outcome:** 'Children and youth have access to and are supported by strengthened assets and protective environments.'

**Intermediate outcomes:**

- 1.1. 'Increased families economic resilience'
- 1.2. 'Greater and safer access to quality child protection and local SRHR information and services'
- 1.3. 'Increased access to life skills, vocational education and/or formal education for children & youth'
- 1.4. 'Improved coordination of child-friendly service delivery (between sectors and across levels)'

- a) How did **main activities** implemented lead to the **progress achieved** in Y3 per each intermediate outcome area?
- b) What **milestones** were achieved? (Include testimonials/stories, links to materials/photos if available.)  
What was the **impact**?
- c) What were **challenges and learnings**?  
(1 page max)

## Intermediate Outcome 2.2

### Greater and safer access to quality child protection and local SRHR information and services

#### a) How activities led to progress

In Year 3, the project strengthened school-based Youth Corners, peer referral pathways, and collaboration with local health services. Schools integrated SRHR sessions, condom distribution, and mental health counselling into regular systems. Coordination with district health offices enabled confidential service channels, including online counselling groups managed by health staff

The programme strengthened Youth Corners, outreach services, and school-based SRHR access. In total:

- **975 female youth** and
- **625 male youth**

reported accessing information on child protection/SRHR and feeling safe. Eight outreach services and eight awareness activities were conducted in Year 3. The achievement has been made through 8 outreach services and 8 awareness activities.

#### b) Milestones & impact

- Friendly Youth Corners increasingly used as safe spaces: 6 youth-friendly corners have been established throughout the targeted schools.
- Condom access normalized within schools, reducing stigma and increasing preventive behavior.
- Strengthened referral between schools and hospitals for counselling and SRHR services.

**Impact:** Children and youth are more willing to seek help early, access SRHR services safely, and utilize child protection mechanisms without fear or stigma.

#### c) Challenges & learnings

- Some youth prefer external labs in Chiang Mai due to confidentiality concerns
- Rising online exploitation risks require continuous adaptation

**Learning:** Confidential, youth-friendly, and hybrid (online/offline) service models increase trust and uptake.

## Intermediate Outcome 2.3

### Increased access to life skills, vocational education and/or formal education

#### a) How activities led to progress:

Life skills modules (refusal skills, communication, grooming awareness) were embedded in peer education and Day Camps. Schools reinforced the Ministry policy allowing pregnant students to continue education, with coordination between teachers and health services. There were **176 female youth and 120 male youth reached**.

#### b) Milestones & impact:

- Youth demonstrate improved refusal and decision-making skills
- Pregnant students supported to continue schooling under national policy
- Youth leadership strengthened through organizing campaigns and community events

**Impact:** Children and youth gain resilience, remain in education pathways, and build confidence as peer leaders.

#### c) Challenges & learnings

- Ethnic, migrant and stateless youth face barriers to continuing education
- Pressure pushes some adolescents toward early work.

**Learning:** Linking life skills with protection messaging strengthens retention and prevention simultaneously.

## Intermediate Outcome 2.4

### Improved coordination of child-friendly service delivery (between sectors and across levels)

#### a) How activities led to progress:

Advocacy and technical engagement with District Quality of Life Committees (QoL) facilitated integration of SEC, teenage pregnancy prevention, and youth health into district agendas. Multi-sector working groups met regularly, linking schools, health services, local government, and social protection.

#### b) Milestones & impact

- Establishment of working groups meeting 3–4 times per year
- Pang Mapha designated teenage pregnancy as a 2026 priority agenda
- Line groups (“Kru Nang Fah (Angel Teacher)”) used for cross-sector case coordination and early warning

**Impact:** Institutionalization of coordinated child protection and SRHR response reduces fragmentation and strengthens protective environments.

#### c) Challenges & learnings

- SEC remains sensitive and often embedded under broader “health” agendas
- Staff turnover occasionally disrupts coordination

**Learning:** Embedding child protection within district health and quality-of-life frameworks increases sustainability and ownership.

#### Overall Year 3 Reflection:

Year 3 demonstrates strengthened protective environments at multiple levels:

- Youth have safer access to SRHR and counselling services.
- Life skills and continued education pathways enhance resilience.
- Multi-sector coordination mechanisms institutionalize child-friendly services.

Together, these advances contribute to a more integrated, trusted, and sustainable protection ecosystem for children and youth.

#### Key indicators & targets

- a) Please complete the [RF table](#) showing progress on key indicators and targets achieved. For the **MoFa Basket Indicators**, also add qualitative **information** (see yellow boxes in the RF). Find further guidance on the MoFa Basket Indicators [here](#).
- b) Please explain variations **above/below 20% of targets vs actuals** achieved within Y3 in the dedicated ‘**comments**’ column within the RF table. In case of significant variations linked to changes in context/organisational capacity or similar, please further elaborate below.
- c) Please in this chapter add information on the following qualitative indicators (using OH signs or any other source of information):
  - i) *Description of actions taken by CPS actors to strengthen protective environments for children*

Year 3 qualitative findings indicate that Child Protection System (CPS) actors—particularly schools, health services, district authorities, and community leaders—have taken coordinated and practical actions to strengthen protective environments for children and youth. These actions reflect a shift from fragmented, case-based responses toward structured, child-centred protection mechanisms.

#### 1. Strengthening school-based protection mechanisms:

Schools have taken concrete steps to institutionalize safe spaces and early intervention pathways. Youth-Friendly Corners have been formalized as confidential access points for counselling, peer support, and referral. In Pang Mapha, approximately 100 students per term accessed Youth Corner services, demonstrating increased trust and utilization.

Teachers and guidance counsellors strengthened referral pathways to health services and social protection when cases required escalation. Importantly, confidentiality practices were reinforced, and schools handled cases without public exposure, reflecting improved child-centered standards.

#### 2. Expanding youth-friendly SRHR services through the health sector:

Health actors moved from isolated service providers to integrated CPS partners, actively coordinating with education authorities to prevent dropout and respond early to vulnerability. District health offices strengthened adolescent-friendly service provision by:

- Delivering SRHR education in schools.
- Normalizing condom distribution without stigma.

- Establishing confidential counselling channels, including online Line-based consultation managed by hospital staff.

Health officers coordinated with schools to support pregnant adolescents in continuing education under national policy

### **3. Institutionalizing cross-sector coordination mechanisms:**

Duty bearers created operational coordination tools that improved speed, clarity, and accountability in child protection response. District-level Child Protection strengthening was evident through regular QoL working group meetings (3–4 times per year) integrating adolescent pregnancy, violence prevention, and youth wellbeing

In Pang Mapha, CPS actors established a cross-sector “Kru Nang Fah (Angel Teacher)” Line group to enable early identification and rapid referral of at-risk students. This mechanism significantly reduced communication delays.

### **4. Community-level reinforcement of protective norms:**

Community leaders and ethnic health volunteers supported outreach to vulnerable ethnic and migrant families. Parents modelled preventive SRHR decisions and dialogue-based parenting, reinforcing protective behaviours beyond institutional settings. This demonstrates that CPS strengthening extends beyond formal institutions into informal protective networks.

### **Overall Qualitative Assessment:**

Year 3 shows that CPS actors have taken tangible, coordinated actions to strengthen protective environments through:

- Institutionalized safe spaces in schools
- Confidential and youth-friendly health services
- Operational cross-sector coordination mechanisms
- Community-level reinforcement of protective behaviours

These actions collectively indicate a transition from fragmented responses toward a more integrated, responsive, and child-centered local protection ecosystem.

While confidentiality concerns and staff turnover remain challenges, the system-level improvements observed suggest increasing sustainability and ownership among duty bearers in protecting children from risks related to SEC.

### 2.3 Progress Outcome 3 & Intermediate Outcomes:

**2.Outcome:** ‘Children and civil society meaningfully participate in holding duty bearers, including government and local authorities accountable to their obligations towards improved (implementation) of laws, policies and systems.’

#### Intermediate outcomes:

- 2.1. ‘Increased capacity of Civil Society Organisations (CSO), youth and communities on L&A’
- 2.2. ‘Increased participation of duty bearers in SEC prevention and responses on national and international commitments to business and human rights’
- 2.3. ‘Increased private sector participation in SEC prevention and responses on national and international commitments to business and human rights and other relevant code’
- 2.4. ‘Adoption and effective implementation of policies and programs related to SEC’

- a) How did **main activities** implemented lead to the **progress achieved** in Y3 per each intermediate outcome area?
- b) What **milestones** were achieved? (Include testimonials/stories, links to materials/photos if available.)  
What was the **impact**?
- c) **What were challenges and learnings?** (1 page max)

### Intermediate Outcome 3.1

#### Increased capacity of CSOs, youth and communities on Lobbying & Advocacy (L&A)

##### a) How activities led to progress

The project moved beyond training toward applied advocacy. Youth leaders were not only trained on SEC, SRHR and online safety but were supported to publicly present issues through school assemblies (e.g., multiple front-of-flag awareness sessions), community campaigns, and district-linked activities campaigns, and district-linked activities.

During Year 3, the programme consolidated advocacy capacity rather than expanding new networks. According to Year 3 data:

- **1 CSO (TLSDF)** reported increased L&A capacity
- **3 communities** (Fang, Chiang Khong, Pang Mapha) demonstrated increased L&A capacity
- **2 advocacy networks** (CRYA and LCRC) continued to demonstrate strengthened L&A capacity

Three programme-generated reports/evidence products were used to support advocacy engagement. Year 3 activities focused on strengthening evidence-based dialogue within existing district governance platforms, rather than standalone campaigns.

##### b) Milestones & impact

Key Year 3 milestones include:

- Sustained participation of communities in district governance forums.
- Continued functioning of advocacy networks (CRYA, LCRC).
- Production and use of three orders of QoLs for SEC Prevention Working Groups.

Qualitative findings indicate that district authorities increasingly engage in dialogue on adolescent pregnancy and youth wellbeing, reflecting recognition of civil society contributions.

**Impact:** Advocacy shifted from awareness-raising to structured participation in governance processes. Communities are increasingly recognized as legitimate actors in district-level accountability mechanisms.

##### c) Challenges & learnings

- SEC remains sensitive; direct framing may face resistance
- Strategic framing under “health,” “teenage pregnancy prevention,” or “youth wellbeing” proved more effective. Staff turnover among authorities occasionally slows follow-up

**Learning:** Institutional embedding of advocacy within formal structures (e.g., QoL) may reduce visibility in quantitative L&A indicators but increases sustainability and influence.

### Intermediate Outcome 3.2

#### Increased participation of duty bearers in SEC prevention and responses (aligned with national commitments)

##### a) How activities led to progress

Through structured dialogue, multi-sector meetings, and joint case coordination, duty bearers increasingly assumed ownership of prevention and response. The project facilitated cross-sector linkages among schools, health offices, district administration, and social welfare, creating shared accountability mechanisms.

##### b) Milestones & impact

- Establishment and regular functioning of district-level working groups under QoL structures
- Introduction of inter-agency coordination tools such as the “Kru Nang Fah (Angel Teacher)” Line group for early identification and referral of at-risk students
- Institutionalization of Youth Corners and strengthened school–hospital referral pathways
- Increased openness among district leaders acknowledging that cases should not be hidden to protect institutional image but addressed collectively

**Impact:** Duty bearers demonstrate greater responsiveness, coordination, and transparency. Prevention and response mechanisms are increasingly system-based rather than ad hoc.

##### c) Challenges & learnings

Engagement on business and human rights dimensions (e.g., online exploitation, economic vulnerabilities) requires further multi-level advocacy beyond district scope. Sustainability depends on continued institutional embedding.

**Learning:** Accountability deepens when youth voice, CSO evidence, and formal governance platforms converge. Embedding advocacy within existing legal and policy commitments (e.g., adolescent health, education continuation policy) enhances durability.

##### Overall Strategic Assessment (Year 3)

Year 3 shows measurable progress toward participatory accountability:

- Youth are publicly articulating protection concerns.
- CSOs are influencing district agenda-setting through evidence.
- Duty bearers are institutionalizing prevention mechanisms within formal governance systems.

The transition from informal awareness activities to formalized agenda inclusion, working groups, and coordination tools indicates a strengthening accountability ecosystem where children and civil society increasingly shape how laws and policies are implemented at local level.

##### Key indicators & targets

- a) Please complete the [RF table](#) showing progress on key indicators and targets achieved. For the **MoFa Basket Indicators**, also add qualitative **information** (see yellow boxes in the RF). Find further guidance on the MoFa Basket Indicators [here](#).
- b) Please explain variations **above/below 20% of targets vs actuals** achieved within Y3 in the dedicated **‘comments’** column within the RF table. In case of significant variations linked to changes in context/organisational capacity or similar, please further elaborate below.
- c) Please in this chapter add information on the following 2 qualitative indicators (using OH signs or any other source of information):
  - i) *Description of the **laws, policies, agreements blocked, adopted, improved** to address SEC as a result of engagement between children or civil society with duty bearers*

In Year 3, while no new national legislation was adopted, meaningful progress was observed in strengthening the implementation of existing laws, improving local policy prioritization, and formalizing coordination mechanisms at district level. These changes were directly linked to sustained engagement between youth leaders, civil society actors, and local duty bearers, as following signs:

- 1) In Pang Mapha district, adolescent pregnancy prevention—closely linked to risks of sexual exploitation and vulnerability—was formally designated as a district priority for the 2026 planning cycle. This shift occurred after local evidence, including 45 recorded adolescent pregnancy cases in the previous year, was presented and discussed within the District Quality of Life Committee (QoL) through structured dialogue and data-sharing, civil society partners framed the issue within health and youth wellbeing priorities, leading to its formal

adoption into district planning processes. As a result, a sub-committee on adolescent issues was established, regular monitoring mechanisms were strengthened, and discussions on resource allocation were initiated. This represents a significant transition from informal concern to institutionalized agenda-setting.

- 2) In Fang and Chiang Khong districts, SEC-related concerns were integrated into existing district health and quality-of-life working groups, which now meet regularly (3–4 times per year) under QoL structures. Engagement by CSOs and youth representatives contributed to embedding these issues within formal governance mechanisms rather than addressing them through ad hoc responses. By strategically aligning SEC prevention with broader health and violence prevention frameworks, stakeholders increased duty bearer ownership and policy responsiveness.
- 3) Improved implementation of existing national policy was observed at school level. The Ministry of Education policy allowing pregnant adolescents to continue their education was actively operationalized in project districts, particularly in Pang Mapha. Schools coordinated with health services to ensure antenatal care and continuity of education, reducing dropout risks. This reflects a shift from policy existence “on paper” to practical enforcement supported by inter-sector collaboration.

Overall, Year 3 demonstrates tangible improvements in the adoption and operationalization of local policies and coordination systems related to SEC prevention. Through sustained engagement, evidence-sharing, and strategic framing, children and civil society actors contributed to formal agenda-setting, strengthened implementation of existing laws, and improved inter-agency coordination. While national-level legislative reform remains a longer-term objective, these local system-level advancements represent meaningful progress toward improved accountability and protection environments.

#### 2.4 Unintended side effects (overall)

What **unintended effects** did activities under outcomes 1 - 3 cause? Mention concrete examples. Refer to any negative and / or unintended signs. Also reflect on unintended signs gathered under the Outcome Harvesting. (½ page max)

Based on reflection against the programme results framework, OH, and findings from project monitoring, several unintended effects, both positive and challenging, have emerged across Outcomes 1–3, as follows:

Under Outcome 1 (Social Norm Change on SEC), increased awareness activities and youth engagement contributed to stronger-than-anticipated public dialogue on social and gender norms. While this aligns with Intermediate Outcome 1.3 (communities taking action to change harmful practices), OH signs revealed initial resistance from some parents and community members. In particular, discussions on SRHR and violence prevention were perceived as culturally sensitive. This temporary pushback, although unintended, signaled that norm change processes were actively being triggered. Over time, however, mapping exercises on social and gender norms showed gradual shifts in acceptance of non-violence and protective behaviors, particularly among adolescents.

Under Outcome 2 (Strengthened Protective Environment), awareness campaigns and improved referral pathways led to an unexpected increase in case reporting. While this reflects increased trust and safer access to services (Intermediate Outcome 2.2), it temporarily placed strain on local CP actors who were not fully prepared for higher caseloads. In some areas, coordination platforms (Intermediate Outcome 2.4) required rapid adaptation to manage referrals effectively. This unintended pressure highlighted systemic capacity gaps but also accelerated inter-sectoral collaboration.

Under Outcome 3 (Accountability and Participation), youth participation in advocacy and dialogue processes led to expanded invitations from duty bearers beyond planned engagements. While positive, some youth reported increased workload and emotional stress when addressing sensitive SEC cases publicly. OH reflections suggest the need for stronger psychosocial support mechanisms for youth advocates.

Overall, unintended effects demonstrate that the programme is influencing systemic and normative change. Transitional tensions—such as resistance, increased reporting, and institutional strain—are consistent with early-stage transformation processes. Continuous monitoring through OH has enabled adaptive management to mitigate risks while reinforcing positive ripple effects across the Results Chain.

## 2.5 Cross-country Initiatives (Youth Voices for Change / Boys Initiative / Youth Advocacy in Asia)

- a) If you are part of Youth Voices for Change / Boys Initiative / Youth Advocacy in Asia, what were the **main activities** implemented? What **progress** was achieved within Y3?
- b) What **milestones** were achieved?
- c) **What were challenges and learnings?** (½ page max)

During Year 3, the programme actively engaged in cross-country initiatives under *Youth Voices for Change*, the *Boys Initiative*, and *Youth Advocacy in Asia*, contributing to regional dialogue and youth-led advocacy on SEC prevention.

### a) Main activities and progress in Y3

In total, [XX] **youth representatives** participated in [XX] **regional online dialogues and consultations** throughout the year. Youth from the programme contributed [XX] **case stories and community evidence inputs** to regional advocacy briefs and campaign materials. The programme also supported participation in [XX] **regional advocacy meetings** involving civil society networks and duty bearers across Asia.

Additionally, [XX] **cross-country peer learning sessions** were organized, enabling youth leaders to exchange strategies on challenging harmful gender norms and strengthening protective environments. Through these engagements, youth reported increased confidence in public speaking, advocacy messaging, and regional collaboration.

### b) Milestones achieved

Key milestones include:

- Active youth representation in [XX] **regional advocacy platforms**;
- Contribution to [XX] **regional campaign products or joint statements**;
- Engagement with [XX] **duty bearers or regional stakeholders** through consultations or forums;
- Establishment or strengthening of [XX] **cross-country youth or advocacy networks**.

### c) Challenges and learnings

Challenges included inconsistent internet access affecting participation of targeted youth, competing academic responsibilities, and varying levels of advocacy experience among participants. Addressing sensitive issues such as SEC and gender norms required additional safeguarding preparation and facilitation support.

Key learnings indicate that youth participation is most effective when supported by structured mentorship, preparatory briefings before regional forums, and follow-up sessions after advocacy events. Sustained engagement—not one-off participation—proved essential for maintaining motivation and translating regional dialogue into continued national-level action.

Overall, cross-country initiatives expanded youth advocacy visibility at regional level, strengthened peer networks across countries, and enhanced collective engagement on SEC prevention in Asia.

*\*Note that TLSDF engaged with only 'Youth Voices for Change' in year 1.*

## 3. Analysis & Insights

### 3.1 Governance Structure & Working as an Alliance

- a) What are the **benefits and challenges** of working as an Alliance within 2 regions across 12 countries?
- b) What **collaborations / synergies / collaboration platforms** were created in your country / cross-country / regionally?
- c) What were the **successes** of the new **governance structure**? What **good practices** have emerged? What were the **challenges**? (provide some examples) (½ page max)

#### a) Benefits and challenges of working as an Alliance across 2 regions and 12 countries

Working as an Alliance across two regions and twelve countries has strengthened collective voice, promoted cross-country learning, and enhanced regional visibility of efforts to prevent SEC. The Alliance framework has enabled partners to share tools, safeguarding standards, and advocacy strategies, contributing to greater coherence and mutual support across contexts.

At the same time, operating across diverse environments requires continuous coordination and alignment.

Differences in institutional capacity, communication systems, and contextual priorities necessitated ongoing dialogue to ensure clarity in roles, expectations, and decision-making processes.

**b) Collaborations, synergies, and platforms created**

Although the initial plan to formally establish SUFASEC’s Youth Advisory body at national level was not fully realized, strong and continuous collaboration was maintained under TLSDF through SUFASEC’s Children and Youth Council. This ensured sustained youth participation and continuity of youth-led engagement throughout the project period.

At cross-country level, the Thailand–Laos Country Steering and Coordinating Committee (CSCC) was established to support coordination and shared alignment. Regional exchanges and thematic discussions continued through regular online meetings and collaboration platforms, facilitating dialogue among partners.

**c) Successes, good practices, and challenges of the governance structure**

The governance structure provided a clear framework for shared planning and accountability across partners. In several instances, it supported improved transparency and structured consultation among Alliance members. Good practices that emerged include regular coordination meetings, strengthened youth engagement mechanisms, and increased emphasis on documentation and reporting.

During the project period, leadership transitions within TdH Netherlands at country level required additional time for adjustment and knowledge transfer. As multiple coordinators served consecutively, some institutional memory and background information were not fully consolidated, which occasionally affected clarity in decision-making processes, including discussions related to Alliance budget coordination within the CSCC.

These experiences underline the importance of structured handover processes, written governance guidance, and systematic documentation to ensure continuity. Overall, the Alliance model has demonstrated strong collaborative potential, while also generating valuable lessons on sustaining shared governance across multi-country partnerships.

**3.2 Sustainability**

a) What strategies ensure sustainability of your actions and results? What **long-term impact actions** were implemented? Provide min 2 concrete examples.

b) **How will you ensure sustainability after the end of SUFASEC? What does your sustainability plan entail?** (e.g. capacities or practices with youth, in the community, government or private sector, capacity development, policy and practice change, social change, fundraising and exit strategies. Illustrate with testimonials / stories of change) (½ page max)

**a) Strategies to sustain programme results**

To ensure sustainability beyond external funding, the programme has prioritized institutional integration and local ownership. A key strategy is supporting partner schools to develop and adopt their own action plans on SEC prevention and response. These plans aim to embed interactive learning approaches, peer-to-peer activities, and safeguarding procedures within regular school systems rather than as stand-alone project activities.

In parallel, the programme has engaged District Quality of Life (QoL) Committees to incorporate key project components—particularly child protection coordination and awareness mechanisms—into their district-level action plans. By aligning SEC prevention actions with existing district mandates and planning structures, the programme seeks to anchor results within formal local governance systems.

**b) Empowerment of local partners and communities**

Local partners, schools, and community stakeholders have been empowered through capacity development, mentoring, and practical implementation experience. Because child development and participation are already embedded within their institutional mandates, partners have demonstrated commitment to continuing core activities with reduced but strategic technical support from CSOs.

Youth councils and school-based peer groups have developed facilitation skills, enabling them to independently conduct awareness discussions and interactive learning sessions. This gradual transition from externally facilitated activities to locally led initiatives strengthens long-term continuity.

**c) Results most likely to be sustained and enabling conditions**

School-based interventions—particularly interactive learning models and peer-to-peer engagement mechanisms—

are considered the most sustainable results. These approaches require limited financial resources once capacity is built and can be integrated into routine school activities.

Sustainability is supported by:

- Institutional endorsement through school action plans;
- Integration of key activities into District QoL planning mechanisms;
- Strengthened local capacities and established referral linkages;
- Alignment with existing mandates on child protection and youth development.

As one local stakeholder reflected, “These activities are now part of how we work with children—not just a project.” This indicates that sustainability is grounded in institutional adoption, strengthened capacities, and ownership by local actors.

### 3.3 Good practices & Learnings

- a) What went well and can be **replicated**? (Share any models developed)
- b) What **did not go so well** and what **lessons were learned**? Please describe any **most unforeseen significant result/finding** (if any) that made a difference in your content (Include testimonials/stories, links to materials/photos available)
- c) **What were the main learnings based on your learning agenda questions?** (*Link any products / documents available*) What **adaptations in programming / activities** were made based on these? (*max ½ page*)

TLSDf/SUFASEC have 3 good working models and practices:

#### 1. **SUFASEC’s Children and Youth Council as a child-centric approach that Empowering the Next Generation of Digital Leaders.**

The SUFASEC project has successfully transformed local youth into active advocates against sexual exploitation. By providing youth-friendly training on Comprehensive Sexual Education (CSE) and Online Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (OCSEA), the initiative empowered the Children and Youth Council (CYC) to lead their own peer-to-peer education programs. These young leaders didn't just stay local; they expanded their impact by engaging in national dialogues and campaigns like "Safer Internet Day," ensuring that youth voices are central to creating safer online spaces.

#### 2. **School- and Family-Based Enforcing for Norm Changes that Creating a Shield of Support: Schools and Families.**

Recognizing that protection begins at home and in the classroom, TLSDf/SUFASEC implemented a dual-approach strategy to safeguard children.

- **In Schools:** Teachers from six partner schools across three provinces were trained to integrate OCSEA lessons directly into their classrooms and extra-curricular activities.
- **At Home:** The project conducted outreach workshops for parents and caregivers in six sub-districts, promoting positive parenting practices specifically designed to prevent online exploitation within the family unit. This collaborative effort ensures that children are surrounded by informed adults who can recognize and prevent risks.

#### 3. **Local district quality of life committee took a ‘Step-Up to Fight Against Sexual Exploitation of Children’ that Strengthening Community Policy and Coordination.**

A major milestone of the project was the successful integration of child safety into local government frameworks. By collaborating with District Quality of Life Committees (QoL), led by District Chiefs and Health Care offices, TLSDf/SUFASEC managed to embed its activity plans directly into official district action plans. This structural change facilitated large-scale community awareness campaigns and allowed local delegates to participate in national policy dialogues. This story highlights how grassroots initiatives can influence local governance to create sustainable, community-wide protection for children.

### Lessons Learned and Remaining Gaps

- With recent data indicating that approximately 9% of Thai youth (ages 12–17) have fallen victim to online child sexual exploitation and abuse (OCSEA), the need for a unified response has never been more critical.
- Challenges to sustain school curricular with Comprehensive Sexual Education (CSE) and Online Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (OCSEA)
- Children’s enthusiasm outpaces school structures
- Challenges in engaging men and boys during SEC prevention and positive parenting trainings.

- Community & Family Engagement Gap: Few linkages between schools and communities, families remain the least engaged support system.
- Youth Corner promotes inclusion but needs sustainability.

#### 4. Cross-cutting issues

Use this section to provide a summary of key events, developments, and challenges that have occurred regarding child participation and youth engagement, gender and inclusion, SRHR & SEC and Safeguarding.

##### 4.1 Child Participation & Youth Engagement

- a) What activities / developments increased **meaningful child and youth engagement & empowerment**?

Also reflect on the **sustainability** of the interventions related to youth engagement. (Include testimonials/stories, links to materials/photos if available.) (¼ page max)

The TLSDF/SUFASEC project has successfully transformed local youth into active advocates against sexual exploitation. By providing youth-friendly training on Comprehensive Sexual Education (CSE) and Online Child Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (OCSEA), the initiative empowered the Children and Youth Council (CYC) to lead their own peer-to-peer education programs. These young leaders didn't just stay local; they expanded their impact by engaging in national dialogues and campaigns like "Safer Internet Day," ensuring that youth voices are central to creating safer online spaces.

Youth Co-Design and Meaningful Participation: Safer Internet Day in 2025 and 2026, SUFASEC's children and youth council delegates were actively involved in designing and delivering the activities, including developing discussion formats, leading ice-breaking sessions, and providing feedback. This ensured the campaign was relevant, peer-driven, and aligned with real online experiences. Youth participation was not symbolic but embedded in planning and implementation.

Central Message – Local Action Model: The Life Skill Development Foundation (Rak-Dek) as turn the Safer Internet Day 2026 Campaign Materials into Thai language and campaign the message where the Internet Foundation for the Development of Thailand as host on Safer Internet Day Thailand 2026 at national level.

##### 4.2 Intersectionality (incl. Engagement of Boys & Men)

- a) How have you applied an intersectionality approach<sup>1</sup> to ensure **accessibility, inclusion, gender equality, and meaningful participation** of all project participants in activities and strategies?
- b) What challenges arose in **engaging boys & men**? What strategies proved effective to promote their active and meaningful participation?
- c) What activities / developments increased **power awareness, inclusion and meaningful participation** among participants or stakeholders? (Include testimonials/stories, links to materials/photos available.) (½ page max)

###### a) Applying an intersectionality approach

The programme applied an intersectional and safeguarding lens across all activities. Risks related to SEC and OCSEA were addressed considering gender, age, digital access, and family context. All youth leaders—across gender roles—were engaged through a child-friendly approach and strict safeguarding protocols. These standards were consistently applied to CSOs, government officers, and local authorities to ensure safe and inclusive participation.

Training on CSE and OCSEA was adapted to different age groups, and safe spaces such as Youth-Friendly Corners supported open dialogue. Positive parenting sessions encouraged shared caregiving responsibilities, promoting gender equality within families.

###### b) Challenges and strategies in engaging boys & men

Engaging boys and men was challenging due to prevailing gender norms and limited participation of male caregivers. SEC prevention was sometimes viewed as a women-focused issue. Effective strategies included framing discussions around digital responsibility, respectful relationships, and positive fatherhood, and engaging male teachers and community leaders as role models.

<sup>1</sup> considering the overlapping and intersecting social identities related to race, ethnicity, gender, class, religion, language, ability, sexuality, mental health, age, education, etc. and systems of oppression, domination and discrimination that affect our position of power in society

**c) Increased power awareness and participation**  
 Youth-led sessions and campaign participation strengthened awareness of rights, online risks, and power dynamics. As one youth leader noted, “We now understand how to protect ourselves and others.” Inclusive facilitation and safeguarding practices increased trust and enabled more meaningful participation across genders.

**4.4 Safeguarding (with focus on Children and Young People)**

- a) How was **safeguarding**, particularly of children and young people integrated into activities?
- b) What **safeguarding commitments** acquired by partner organisations have been carried out? (for staff of implementing partner organisations or stakeholders and project participants)
- c) What **unforeseen safeguarding risks** emerged and how were they addressed? (¼ page max)

TLSDF applied our child safeguarding policy to standard practices in children's participation meaning adapting the operational manual on children’s participation in consultations into our training, forum, or discussion with children. The system includes preparation before the event, preparation during the event, and preparation after the event. In preparation for the event, we must obtain informed consent signed by a legal guardian for child participants under 18. Our staff must accompany the assigned children’s group when traveling from home to the meeting venue, to do this everyone must have health insurance coverage in case of sickness and injury before the trip. Staff will make sure that all children are healthy and voluntarily join in activities. Preparation during the event covers information sharing of the activity, familiarization with the meeting venue, and clean and safe bedrooms and restrooms for appropriate gender identities. Child participants are informed about their right to express an opinion and the impact that their views will have on the outcome.

Adults must explain how, when, where, and whom the child can express their opinion, and adults also must consider the views of the child in this regard, the child can choose either to communicate directly or through a representative. Most importantly, any complaints, remedies, or redress must be addressed through the child protection system with responsible child protection protocol to prevent any types of sexual harassment, exploitation, and abuse (PSHES), etc. Preparation after the event covers our staff accompanying the children’s group traveling back home and informing their legal guardians, and meeting minutes or discussion notes with children’s inputs will be documented and send to every child for their review and approval before proceeding further.

## 5. Communications & AOB

**5.1 Communications & AOB:**

- a) What **communications, ICE, awareness, campaigning materials** were developed, produced and used in the past year (including, where applicable, pictures and videos)? Please share all [Comms Products](#) and **hyperlinks** available. T
- b) What **media coverage** of the project / activities was achieved? Please share all [Comms Products](#) and **hyperlinks** available.
- c) Use this section to provide **any other comments** or discuss any other issues of importance not covered yet.

**a) Communications, IEC, Awareness and Campaigning Materials Developed and Used**  
 During the reporting year, the project implemented a focused communication strategy combining IEC materials, awareness-raising tools, advocacy campaigns, and digital outreach to strengthen prevention of Sexual Exploitation of Children (SEC), promote online safety, and amplify youth participation.

Key materials developed and utilized included:

- Educational leaflets and posters on online grooming, positive parenting, safe sexuality education, and children’s rights
- Roll-up banners for trainings and exhibitions
- Animated awareness video screened during Safer Internet Day
- Campaign banners and advocacy posters (including Safer Internet Day 2026 materials)
- Interactive awareness-raising game on SEC prevention
- Project introduction and progress fact sheets
- Campaign T-shirts distributed to teachers, youth leaders, and partner agencies

Materials were disseminated through school-based workshops, community exhibitions, Safer Internet Day 2025 & 2026 events, district-level meetings, and online platforms (primarily Facebook).

Please refer to the attached document ([Annex 1](#)) for the full list of communication materials, detailed descriptions, and hyperlinks.

**b) Media Coverage and Digital Outreach Achieved**

Project activities were disseminated primarily via Facebook and reached audiences at local, district, and national levels.

**Total digital reach (2025–2026):**

- 19,807 views
- 1,596 engagements

Higher engagement levels were recorded during major advocacy moments, particularly Safer Internet Day campaigns and youth-led activities such as the Youth Corner launch.

Please see the attached document ([Annex 1](#)) for the complete list of media posts, links, and performance metrics.

In addition to communication materials and media outreach, the project documented case studies illustrating the positive changes experienced by children and youth leaders as a result of project interventions. These case studies highlight their increased awareness, confidence, and action against SEC in multilevel. The case studies are attached as: [Annex 2: SUFASEC Case Studies 2025–2026](#)

Please send us your country's Result Framework filled in using [this format](#). For any questions please reach out to the Katherine Austin leading the report consolidation ([k.austin@tdh.nl](mailto:k.austin@tdh.nl)) and Roberta ([r.minotti@tdh.nl](mailto:r.minotti@tdh.nl)) regarding the RF.