



**Documenting Good Practice:  
The Children at Risk Protection Mechanism  
in Alexandria**

**Mostafa Hashish  
Freelance Consultant  
February 2009**

## Table of Contents

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION .....	
A. Overview .....	
B. Approaches Adopted .....	
C. Project Stakeholders .....	
D. Project Components and Activities Undertaken .....	
E. Programmatic/ Operational Innovation .....	
F. Case Identification and Intervention Process .....	
III. OVERVIEW OF RESULTS .....	
A. Results per Component .....	
B. Influence on Policy Change .....	
C. Potential for Replication .....	
IV. WINNING STRATEGIES AND HIGHLIGHTS OF THE EXPERIENCE .....	
A. Responsiveness to Community Needs .....	
B. Networking and Partnerships .....	
C. Capacity Development and Empowerment .....	
D. Effectiveness of Monitoring .....	
V. SUSTAINABILITY .....	
A. Soliciting Government Ownership .....	
B. Fundraising and Mobilization of Resources .....	
VI. CHALLENGES AND LESSONS LEARNT .....	

## **I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Children at Risk Protection Mechanism (CPM) in Alexandria is a successful UNICEF intervention that established a multi-partner framework for child protection.

In 2006 the Governor of Alexandria issued a decree that established the Governorate Protection Committee, and in turn, both the District Protection Committee and the Monitoring Committee began operation. This three-tier hierarchy allowed for a system where community-level operations were monitored and where obstacles were swiftly dealt with even if they required policy changes or high-level decision making.

In addition to government ownership and the political will and commitment this entailed, two factors were fundamental for the success of the CPM. One is the careful selection of partner NGOs that were institutionalized and trusted by the communities. The second is the capacity development component that preceded operations and continued alongside the Mechanism.

The capacity development workshops brought together players from both governmental and non-governmental organizations. This was the first time governmental players were in a position to interact with, and understand the work of, civil society. Networking and informal lunch breaks created a spirit of friendliness and cooperation. Social workers, the bottom line facilitators of this program, established connections that were vital for resolving risks faced by children. In turn, governmental players became committed to the program and its success. Government resources that existed but scarcely found the appropriate channels to reach rightful beneficiaries were now being tapped for the first time.

The essential activities carried out by social workers not only helped solve risks faced by children but also served as liaisons between the people and government resources. The people had very limited knowledge of the services available to them, and by the mere involvement of the social workers, families became informed of ways to solve their problems, even when they did not involve the CPM. This led to the important byproduct of printing a guidebook of state services available to families at risk.

In the two years from March 2006 to April 2008, the Mechanism identified 11,829 cases of children at risk, carried out 12,437 successful interventions, and held 209 community awareness forums attended by 8,212 participants, just to name a few results.

Most significantly, the Mechanism was integrated into the New Child Law endorsed by the Egyptian Parliament in June 2008. The law requires every governorate to establish this framework for child protection and requires the Governorate Protection Committee to be headed by the Governor himself.

The CPM is gaining momentum and achieving greater impact as time progresses. The social workers are now able to mobilize community resources such that an increasing number of interventions are being financed by non-CPM sources. However it remains that such fundraising is mostly sporadic and not targeted at the CPM structure itself. One improvement could be better compensation levels for the social workers and others who are instrumental to the success of the program.