



USAID | **ROMANIA**
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The USAID CHILDNET PROGRAM: ROMANIAN-AMERICAN PARTNERSHIP FOR THE WELFARE OF CHILDREN

FINAL REPORT

DECEMBER 2007

This report was prepared by World Learning for review by the United States Agency for International Development.

SUBMITTED BY:

World Learning

Romanian-American Partnership for the Welfare of Children
Cooperative Agreement No.: 186-A-00-01-00102-00

PREPARED FOR:

United States Agency for International Development/Romania

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) provided funding for this report through a Cooperative Agreement with World Learning.

DISCLAIMER:

The opinions and observations expressed in this document are those of World Learning. They are not necessarily the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	4
<u>I. THE CHILDNET PROGRAM</u>	6
<u>A. Program Description</u>	6
<u>B. Objectives and Results</u>	10
<u>C. Activities and Accomplishments</u>	12
<u>D. Fiscal Information</u>	20
<u>II. THE CHILDNET ASSESMENT</u>	21
<u>A. Summary</u>	22
<u>B. Introduction</u>	23
<u>C. Project Design</u>	25
<u>D. Findings and Key Components</u>	29
<u>E. Conclusion and Lessons Learned</u>	40
<u>ANNEX A-F: CHILDNET SUB-GRANTS AND CONTRACTS</u>	43

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ChildNet, the Romanian-American partnership for the welfare of children, was a joint program of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the National Authority for the Protection of Child's Rights (NAPCR) and World Learning. The project was originally funded by USAID for \$15 million for five years, beginning July 15, 2001. Later, USAID funded with-cost extensions (totaling \$1.55 million) for the project until October 31, 2007.

The USAID strategic objectives for child welfare reform in Romania and the primary objectives of ChildNet were:

1. Reduction in number of classic state-run institutions;
2. Reduction in number of children living in classic state-run institutions;
3. Increase in percentage of children receiving community child welfare services;
4. Increase in number of standards for child welfare services developed and enacted.

These objectives were consistent with the Romanian Government's strategy for the protection of child's rights.

Specific targets for child welfare objectives were established by USAID and were met by ChildNet through sub grants to NGOs (Romanian or Romanian/American partners) in partnership with local governments that provided family-focused, community-based child welfare services and through training, technical assistance and policy development that facilitated child welfare reform on both the national and local level. ChildNet sponsored activities involved partnerships among non-governmental, private-for-profit and governmental organizations and between Romanian and American organizations. The ChildNet program emphasized sustainability in order to assure continuation of child welfare reform activities after the project ended.

ChildNet promoted civil society/local government partnerships to address priorities of NAPCR and USAID, which included community-based services for: children residing in institutions, adolescents residing in institutions, children with disabilities, children at risk for abuse and neglect. ChildNet awarded \$7.8 million for 96 sub-grants to Romanian NGOs in partnerships with Romanian local governments. The program provided over 50 training, technical assistance and policy development activities in support of child welfare reform in Romania with Romanian NGOs delivering 30 training and technical assistance projects through contracts with ChildNet that totaled \$2.4 million.

During the sixth year extension period, ChildNet focused on leveraging the achievements of the previous five years to reform legislative frameworks for the future and provide a system to support the financial sustainability of child welfare NGOs. The focus of the program evolved from increasing the number of quality services available to children in the communities to increasing the sustainability of the already created services.

ChildNet sub-grant activities delivered a range of community services for children and families, including day care, life skills training, foster care, national adoptions, services to disabled children, family counseling, maternal assistance, permanency plans, parent training,

respite care, services to children with HIV/AIDS, prevention of child abuse and neglect. The sub-grantees created 470 services that served approximately 19,000 children and 10,000 parents from over 900 communities in all counties/sectors of Romania.

Over 6,000 Romanian professionals and paraprofessionals participated in training and technical assistance activities provided by ChildNet to further child welfare reform. These activities, which were primarily delivered through contracts with NGOs, addressed critical issues of child welfare administration and services, organizational development and sustainability. ChildNet formed policy development task forces that produced 16 standards of practice, in addition to methodological guides, procedural manuals and draft legislation.

The achievement of all USAID expected results for child welfare reform is presented as evidence of ChildNet's contribution during 2001 to 2007 to Romania's dramatic decrease in residential/institutional care for children under protection and significant expansion of high quality community services for children and families. This document includes the report of a final assessment of the ChildNet project conducted by an external, independent consultant. It discusses the critical plans and actions that determined the project's success including consistent strategy and goals, flexible implementation, design for sustainability and active, participatory, multilevel partnerships. The ChildNet perspective, strategy and operations may be useful to USAID missions and International NGOs involved in facilitating social sector system reform and improving social welfare services in other countries.

I. THE CHILDNET PROGRAM

A. Program Description

ChildNet presented a plan to achieve the broad goals of reforming the Romanian child welfare delivery system, creating community support for alternatives to institutions, improving the skill and knowledge of social workers and other child welfare professionals, and providing grants to stimulate community programs and Romanian-American partnerships to support child welfare service delivery. The program relied on and took advantage of community-driven approaches to child welfare reform, providing services and programs from the grass-roots, while simultaneously closing government-run institutions and moving children from institutions to community-based programs.

For well-known and documented historical reasons, the child welfare system in Romania relied heavily on government programs, particularly government-operated residential institutions. Deeply rooted attitudes and practices had hindered significant movement nationwide towards the creation of an environment that is family and community-based, focusing on the welfare and rights of children. The program substantially reduced the unacceptably high levels of child institutionalization in Romania, decreased the number of classic state-run institutions, and increased the number of counties implementing reform through sustainable public/private partnerships with local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) as service providers. The collaborative models of service demonstrated in the program were used in restructuring child welfare and protective services throughout the country.

In order to increase the effectiveness of child welfare services throughout the country, the ChildNet program addressed the sector's numerous problems by interventions and implementing sustainable solutions into coherent, whole programs. Emphasis was placed on improving mobilization, allocation and use of social sector resources, increasing access to quality integrated services and improving the legal, regulatory and policy framework.

The Government of Romania (GOR) announced its Government Strategy Concerning the Protection of the Child in Difficulty which underscored the fact that the GOR, United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and World Learning were committed to achieving the same targets of continuing the process of decentralizing the child welfare system from the county to the local level, closing institutions, fostering community-based strategies, offering targeted programs to meet the specific needs of disabled children and of adolescents about to leave institutions, providing professional training and support for social workers and other child welfare workers, and making needed changes in legal and financial policies to support the necessary reforms. World Learning, in consultation with USAID, worked with the National Authority for the Protection of Child's Rights (NAPCR) to ensure that technical assistance and grants programs were used to reinforce and enhance the National Authority's efforts. A Coordinating Committee was formed to help assure ongoing coordination and its members included representatives of USAID, NACPR and World Learning.

ChildNet was a joint project of USAID, NAPCR and World Learning that promoted child welfare reform in Romania. It began as a five year, \$15 million project funded by USAID through a cooperative agreement with World Learning awarded on July 15, 2001. A

memorandum of understanding establishing ChildNet in Romania was signed by the U.S. Ambassador to Romania and the General Secretary of Government of Romania on October 19, 2001. Towards the end of the planned five year program, USAID modified the cooperative agreement to extend ChildNet for an additional 14 months and awarded an additional \$1.55 million to World Learning. During the course of the project, a cost share of \$5,727,313 was generated by World Learning and the NGO sub-grantees. The total financial investment in the ChildNet program, which concluded on October 31, 2007, was \$22,144,585.

The USAID/Romania Strategic Objective 3.4 was “Improved effectiveness of selected social and primary health care services for targeted vulnerable groups”. Under SO 3.4, there were four indicators for child welfare. The ChildNet objectives were in concurrence with the USAID/Romania indicators for child welfare and with NAPCR’s strategy for children in difficulty and in need of protection. The objectives were as follows:

1. Reduction in number of classic state-run institutions.
2. Reduction in number of children living in classic state-run institutions.
3. Increase in percentage of children in the state welfare system receiving community based child welfare services.
4. Increase in nationally legislated standards for child welfare services.

Unlike traditional projects involving a donor (USAID), a grantee (World Learning) and a client (NAPCR), ChildNet was structured as a partnership. All decisions regarding planning, implementation and monitoring of ChildNet were made by consensus by the Coordinating Committee with representatives of USAID/Romania, NAPCR and World Learning/Romania.

Priorities

During the beginning month of the project, the Coordinating Committee agreed on program priorities for ChildNet. Throughout the entire period of time that ChildNet functioned, these four priorities served as a guide for discussions about program plans, actions and operations. These priorities are described in the paragraphs that follow.

Promoting Partnerships and Sustainability:

Members of the ChildNet Coordinating Committee drafted and signed a Partnership Agreement in October 2001 including objectives, responsibilities, procedures, and communications methods. Based on a review of professional literature and USAID documents, the Coordinating Committee established a working concept of partnership which was revised in January 2003 to include the following characteristics:

- Voluntary collaboration to achieve mutually desirable objectives;
- Shared decision making, investment and rewards;
- Transfer of human and/or financial resources;
- Written agreement with objectives, responsibilities, procedures, communication methods; and
- Active collaboration towards parity and mutuality.

ChildNet’s focus was on promoting the following three types of partnerships: 1) Coordinating Committee of USAID, NAPCR, World Learning; 2) Romanian NGOs and local Romanian governmental organizations; 3) Romanian NGOs and American NGOs. All sub-grants were

awarded to Romanian NGOs (or Romanian-American Partnerships) in partnership with local governments. The Coordinating Committee approved a plan to promote sustainability among sub-grantees which included design and delivery of training curricula in sustainability and fundraising for Romanian NGOs participating in ChildNet projects.

Promoting Local Government and Civil Society Involvement:

The ChildNet Coordinating Committee established that local governments, local administrations and local NGOs were priorities for training and technical assistance. Training/Technical Assistance activities were provided for County Commissions for Child Protection, mayors, social workers, NGO leaders. In addition, the sub-grants program awarded grants for child welfare services in towns, communes, and villages where the local political leadership was committed to child welfare reform. All sub-grants were awarded to Romanian NGOs (or Romanian-American Partners) who were in formal partnerships with local governments.

Targeting Specific Populations:

The ChildNet Coordinating Committee identified, as priorities, four target populations for services through the sub-grant program. These priorities were:

- Children with disabilities/deficiencies residing in institutions or communities;
- Adolescents leaving institutions;
- Children, particularly infants (0-2 years), residing in institutions;
- Children, particularly infants, at risk or in need of protection from abuse and neglect.

The Coordinating Committee reaffirmed USAID strategic objectives and NAPCR national strategy, each of which focused on providing least restrictive, family focused, community based services for children at risk and children in need of protection.

Targeting Specific National Reform Activities:

The priorities for national level specific reform activities were established by the Coordinating Committee in consultation with USAID and NAPCR leadership. These priorities included:

- a. Expanding community services for handicapped children;
- b. Providing life skills training for adolescents leaving institutions;
- c. Developing and disseminating standards for child welfare services;
- d. Preventing child trafficking, abuse, neglect, labor and abandonment; and
- e. Involving local government officials, community leaders and citizens in child welfare prevention programs at the community level.

Implementation

ChildNet had two major components: 1) sub-grants; 2) training, technical assistance, and policy development. Over the initial five year period, \$7.8 million in sub-grants were awarded to Romania NGOs or Romanian NGOs in partnership with American NGOs to provide child welfare services throughout Romania in order to facilitate child welfare system reform. All sub-grants included partnerships between the sub-grantee (Romanian NGO) and local government. In support of the sub-grants program, ChildNet provided selected training

and technical assistance to NGOs, local government and NAPCR. Most of these activities were delivered by Romanian NGOS through contracts with ChildNet, totaling \$2.4 million.

Sub-grants and training/technical assistance were directed towards the main program priorities described previously. Over the life of the program, ChildNet awarded 96 sub-grants to 75 NGOs in partnership with local governments to implement projects in support of child welfare reform. All sub-grant projects contributed to one or more of the USAID objectives – decreasing the number of children in institutions, decreasing the number of institutions, increasing the percentage of children receiving community child welfare services, and increasing the percentage of child welfare services covered by professional standards. In addition, sub-grant projects served one or more of the following target populations – children with disabilities, adolescents residing in institutions, children residing in institutions and children at risk for abuse and neglect in their families.

Approximately \$3.8 million was invested in 16 large and mid-size two-year projects, delivered during years 1, 2 and 3 of the ChildNet program. Approximately \$480,000 funded 29 small single-year projects that were implemented during years 1 and 2. Approximately \$1 million was committed to nine midsize multiyear projects delivering life skills training to adolescents during years 3, 4 and 5. Approximately \$370,000 was awarded to 20 small NGOs for single-year projects providing community based services for disabled children during years 3 and 4. An additional \$1.8 million was distributed during years 4 and 5 to 19 NGOs for 18-month projects, addressing specific child welfare issues. Approximately \$2.4 million was awarded to Romanian NGOs through 30 contracts to provide training and technical assistance.

Training and technical assistance activities supported sub-grant projects in implementing reform of the child welfare system. Training/technical assistance addressed the promotion of sustainability and partnerships between local governments and NGOs, while targeting specific populations and national priorities for child welfare reform. The activities contributed to improving mobilization, allocation and use of social sector resources and/or to improving access to integrated quality services. Included were programs for NGOs, professional associations, local governments, local administrations, community boards, social workers and other child welfare professionals. Topics addressed concerned partnerships, sustainability, child welfare administration and child welfare services.

ChildNet organized and sponsored task forces that developed standards, methodologies and procedures for child welfare services towards improving legal, regulatory and policy frameworks. Standards and methodological guidelines for foster care, life skills training, national adoption, services for disabled children, case management, maternal / child centers, reintegration services, counseling services, child abuse / neglect prevention and intervention services were completed by ChildNet task forces and delivered to NAPCR to be legislated. The standards and methodologies are available in Romanian at the NAPCR website (www.copii.ro).

Sixth Year Extension

As USAID's assistance program for child welfare in Romania entered its final phase, ChildNet assisted the Mission to ensure that a substantial and meaningful USAID legacy in child welfare was in place at the end of the program. Therefore USAID amended World Learning's cooperative agreement for a 14-month addition. The goals for year six were accomplished in part by the creation of a procurement system that provides local authorities with a mechanism to purchase child welfare services from Romanian NGOs and through the design and demonstration of child welfare policy and procedures that facilitate permanency planning for children in state care.

During this final period, ChildNet focused on leveraging achievements from the program's first five years to reform the legislative framework for the future and provide a system to support the financial sustainability of child welfare NGOs. The focus of the program evolved from increasing the number of quality services available to children in their communities to increasing the sustainability of the already-created services. In order to achieve this, ChildNet worked towards four broad objectives during the extension period:

- Reform of the legislative framework so that local governments could contract with NGOs for child welfare services and promoting demonstration models for purchase of services
- Increase in the sustainability of child welfare service provider NGOs and federations
- Increase involvement of civil society and private companies in child welfare services through promoting corporate social responsibility
- Finalizing key items on the child welfare policy agenda

B. Objectives and Results

The ChildNet program supported USAID/Romania Strategic Objective 3.4 - Improved effectiveness of selected social and primary health care services for targeted vulnerable groups. It made direct contributions towards the attainment of the following. Intermediary results:

- 3.4.1. - Improved legal, regulatory and policy framework.
- 3.4.2. - Improved mobilization, allocation and use of social sector resources; and
- 3.4.3. - Increased access to quality integrated services.

Achievements

In direct cooperation with NAPCR, ChildNet contributed to achievement of the following four major USAID objectives:

1. Reduction by 30% in number of classic state-run institutions
2. Reduction by 50% in number of children living in classic state-run institutions

3. Increase in number of community based services so that they will address 75% of the children needing assistance
4. Increase in number of standards for child welfare services to cover the specific child welfare services provided

The chart below reports on the baseline data (June 2001), final targets (August 2007) and final results (August 2007) for the following USAID and ChildNet major objectives:

Objective	Baseline	Final target	Final result
Number of classic state-run institutions	340	238	166
Number of children in classic state-run institutions	48,363	24,131	21,015
Percentage of children assisted by community services	52%	75%	75%
Number of child welfare services regulated by standards	1	16	23

Based on the data obtained from NAPCR and presented in the chart above, it can be reported that all four major objectives were achieved and that in the case of three objectives, the results exceeded the targets by the end of the program.

At the request of USAID, four additional objectives were established for the sixth year extension. The extension objectives were:

5. An adequate legal framework in place to enable local authorities to contract with NGOs for child welfare services
6. At least 5 counties contracting with NGOs for child welfare services
7. At least 10 NGOs funded from corporate social responsibility programs to provide child welfare services
8. At least 16 community-level child welfare NGOs initiated activities to diversify their funding sources beyond traditional international donors

The chart below reports on the baseline data (August 2006), final targets (October 2007) and final results (October 2007) for the following ChildNet extension objectives:

Objective	Baseline	Final target	Final result
Adequate legal framework for contracting services	No	Yes	Yes
Number of counties in process of contracting services	0	5	5
Number of ChildNet affiliated NGOs funded from corporate social responsibility programs	0	10	16
Number of ChildNet affiliated NGOs initiating funding diversification activities	0	16	20

These four additional objectives for the ChildNet sixth year extension were achieved and for two of the extension objectives, the results exceeded the targets. The Ministry of Labor, Family and Equal Opportunities has proposed legislation that would expand contracting services to include all social services in addition to child welfare services.

Legacy

Selected legacy accomplishments that were achieved through ChildNet during the initial five year program (2001 – 2006) were identified as USAID/Romania legacy achievements in child welfare reform. These legacy achievements are:

- Initiation and replication throughout Romania of a continuum of family focused, community based services for children in need of protection or at risk for abuse, neglect or abandonment;
- Establishment throughout Romania of ongoing and functional partnerships, between NGOs and county/local governments, that deliver quality child welfare services;
- Involvement of local officials, citizens and for-profit businesses in assuming responsibilities for the well-being of children and families in their community;
- Development and expansion of specific child welfare services for selected underserved populations: children and adolescents with disabilities, adolescents leaving institutions, children especially infants experiencing neglect, abuse, abandonment;
- Assurance of quality child welfare services by developing, establishing and disseminating national standards and methodological guides for child welfare services;
- Human capacity development through child welfare training for professionals, paraprofessionals and citizens including social workers, health professionals, maternal assistants, mayors, county commissions, community leaders, NGO leaders.

These legacy achievements are discussed in two reports by independent consultants:

- USAID and Child Welfare Reform in Romania: Challenges, Successes and Legacy. (2006)
- The USAID ChildNet Program: Romanian – American Partnership for the Welfare of Children - An Analysis of Key Components for Success. (2007)

Both reports are available at USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse at www.usaid.gov and at www.worldlearning.org/ChildNet. The second report mentioned above is the Final Assessment of the ChildNet program and is contained in this document (see section II: The ChildNet Assessment). It describes the successes and lessons learned from this innovative partnership program and may be used by USAID to disseminate the expertise gained from this project to other counties.

C. Activities and Accomplishments

Sub-Grants

Based on USAID objectives and NAPCR priorities, the ChildNet staff drafted the initial two Requests For Applications (RFA) that were reviewed by the Coordinating Committee and

subsequently approved by USAID and NAPCR. The first RFA soliciting proposals for two-year sub-grants for large (up to \$500,000) projects, and mid-size (\$100,000 to \$200,000) projects was issued in November 2001. The second RFA for small (up to \$20,000), one-year projects was issued in December 2001. The ChildNet Coordinating Committee established procedures and criteria for grant review and appointed grant review committees.

In response to the initial RFAs, over 120 Romanian NGOs formed partnerships with local governments and submitted proposals to implement child welfare reform and provide child welfare services throughout Romania. The ChildNet Review Committees selected 45 projects to be funded to provide community based services to children in need of protection, adolescents leaving institutions, children with disabilities, and children at risk of abuse and neglect in their own families. All funded projects, ranging from \$20,000 to \$500,000, contributed to the realization of USAID child welfare objectives.

ChildNet executed 45 sub-grants to Romanian NGOs and Partnerships. These sub-grantees implemented specific child welfare reform projects emphasizing community based services for children in need of protection or at risk, including closing institutions, reintegration services, life skills programs, day care centers, family counseling, and prevention services. In July 2003, 29 single-year small sub-grants were completed. The remaining 16 sub-grants were completed by fall of 2004.

The three large sub-grants implemented by For Our Children NGO, Bethany Social Services and SERA (Solidarité Enfants Roumaine Abandonnée) were aimed at the development and/or expansion of community services through complex, multi-county projects. The 13 medium size projects supported reform efforts at the county or local level and were implemented by the organizations: International Orthodox Christian Charities, A Family for Every Child, Heart of a Child, Our Children Foundation, Bethpage Coalition, Pestalozzi Foundation, Philip's Home, Community Support Foundation, International Foundation for Child and Family, Mission Without Borders, Social Alternatives, Foundation for Development of Sustainable Reciprocity.

The 29 small sub-grants were awarded to grass-roots small NGOs including emerging organizations, parent associations, rural and village-based groups. In addition to funding, they received monitoring, training and technical assistance under two ChildNet subcontracts with two partnerships consisting of experienced Romanian NGOs. ChildNet contracts were awarded to the partnership of Princess Margarita Foundation, Opportunity Associates, ECHOSOC and the partnership of Foundation for Civil Society Development, Center for Resources and Information for Social Professions.

In continuing support of USAID objectives and NAPCR priorities, ChildNet issued a third RFA in February 2003 soliciting proposals for two-year projects (between \$100,000 and \$150,000) to provide vocational and life skills training to adolescents aging out of institutions. In response, 24 proposals were received from Romanian NGOs (or American-Romanian NGO collaborations) in partnership with local governments and private businesses. A review committee selected nine proposals to be funded. These sub-grants were awarded in fall 2003 and completed by fall 2005. The implementing organizations were: Society for Children and Parents, Save the Children, Prison Fellowship, Feed the Children, Hope Worldwide, and Association for Non-governmental Professional Social Assistance, Heart of a Child, Pestalozzi Foundation, and Association for Social Integration of Youth.

In May 2003, a fourth RFA was prepared and issued by the Coordinating Committee. This RFA solicited applications from small NGOs to provide community based services for disabled children. There were 42 applicants for single year grants up to \$20,000 each. A review committee selected 20 proposals for funding and implementation of the sub-grants began in November 2003. The implementing organizations benefited of monitoring and training and technical assistance for capacity building from a partnership of three Romanian NGOs (Center for NGO Resources and Support, Center for Resources and Information for Social Professions, National Federation of Social Workers in Romania) under a contract with ChildNet.

The fifth and last RFA was issued in January 2004 soliciting proposals for 18-month sub-grants to address specific child welfare issues identified by the ChildNet Coordinating Committee. The issues identified were: prevention of child abandonment in maternity hospitals; prevention of child labor, exploitation, and trafficking; prevention child abuse and neglect; prevention of HIV/AIDS among adolescents; development of rehabilitation services for disabled children; promotion of national adoption. There were two categories of midsize grants: Up to \$50,000; and between \$100,000 and \$150,000. Review committees selected nine of 27 proposals for funding in the first category and ten of 44 proposals in the second category. The 19 sub-grants were awarded in September 2004 and USAID transferred three midsize grants from the USAID Democracy Program to ChildNet. The sub-grants were completed by spring 2005.

The projects from the fifth and final round were implemented by the following organizations: Foundation for Child, Community and Family, Foundation for Innocents, Mara Foundation, Holt Romania, St. Ana Association, Diaconia Charitable Association, ProSocial Association, International Foundation for Child and Family, World Vision Romania, Save the Children, Vasiliada Association, Hope for Children, Bethany Social Services, Social Alternatives, Bethpage Coalition, ASSOC, CRIPS, Community Support Foundation, Ovidiu Rom Association, St. Stelian Association, Association for Research and Development in Education, International Orthodox Christian Charities, Association for Non-governmental Professional Social Assistance, Center for Resources and Information for Social Professions, Philanthropy Association.

The projects financed by the ChildNet sub-grants directly benefited 38 of Romania's 41 counties, as well as, all six sectors of Bucharest Municipality. The projects focused on creating prevention, intervention and rehabilitation services at the community level as alternatives to residential institutions for children requiring protection. All sub-grants included a training component for increasing knowledge of the beneficiaries regarding HIV/AIDS. Similarly, the sub-grants for life skills training for young adults graduating from child welfare institutions included a component on prevention of trafficking in persons.

The 96 grants provided by ChildNet directly contributed to:

- Development of 166 centers for services and creation of 300 new services
- Closure of nine classic, state-run institutions
- Provision of services for 19,248 children, including 3,419 children with disabilities, as follows:
 - 1,419 children reintegrated in the biological/extended family;
 - 616 children placed in foster care;
 - 340 children deinstitutionalized through domestic adoption;

- 689 children moved to family-type homes and supervised apartments;
- 2,118 adolescents leaving institutions were taught independent life skills;
- 14,000 children prevented from abuse/neglect or separation from the family;
- Counseling, parental education, support groups for 10,481 parents;
- Training of 6,239 child welfare specialists.

Training, Technical Assistance, and Policy Development

Training and Technical Assistance:

30 contracts for the delivery of training and technical assistance were awarded to NGOs to improve the knowledge and skills of social workers, child welfare managers, NGOs leaders, mayors, county commissioners, allied health professionals, maternal assistants, parents and citizens, in order to foster reform of the child welfare system. One contract was signed with an American NGO (American Humane Association) and 29 subcontracts were signed with 15 Romanian NGOs: For Our Children NGO, ProChild Federation, National Federation of Social Workers of Romania, World Vision Romania, Progress Foundation, Foundation Princess Margareta, Foundation for Civil Society Development, Feed the Children, United Way Romania, Broken Heart Foundation, Foundation Tulane/Romania, Center for Resources and Information for Social Professionals, Center for NGO Resources and Support, National Society for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect.

In addition, ChildNet staff and consultants (Romanian and American) provided training and technical assistance on topics and issues including sustainability, partnerships, child welfare administration, child welfare services, organizational development, federation building, fund raising, and project management.

Fostering Communication among Child Welfare Professionals:

At the beginning of ChildNet, the staff organized an orientation seminar in each of Romania's eight regions to ensure broad information about the opportunities available under the program. Over 520 professionals from NGOs, county departments for child protection and local governments attended and were informed about the programs goals, strategy, plans and operations. These seminars were followed by ChildNet issuing the initial RFA for sub-grants.

Under ChildNet contracts, CRIPS edited and produced the NAPCR's quarterly magazine "In the Interest of the Child" which was published in Romanian, English, and French. Under the same contract, CRIPS maintained the NAPCR website www.copii.ro which was selected for an award for as Outstanding Government Social Sector Communication Website among EU countries. ChildNet funded periodic meetings between NAPCR senior staff and the directors of the county/sector departments for child protection to foster adequate communication of national policies to the field and of barriers in the implementation of policies from the field to the national level. These meetings were very important as child welfare was the first public sector to be decentralized in Romania.

Under ChildNet sponsorship, 31 Romanian child welfare experts participated in various international conferences and U.S.-based study tours to obtain advanced skills and specialized knowledge. Romanian and Bulgarian child welfare leaders, including senior government officials, met to exchange information and lessons learned in reforming child

welfare systems in the two countries in a series of four seminars organized by ChildNet in collaboration with the World Bank.

Increasing the capacity of child welfare NGOs and Federations:

The NGOs and local government partners from all 96 ChildNet sub-grants attended workshops on sustainability, project management, organizational development, and child welfare service. In addition, technical assistance was provided by three NGO partnerships to the grass-roots organizations implementing the 49 small sub-grants. The 47 large/mid-size projects were monitored and assisted during implementation by ChildNet staff and consultants. Technical assistance and training was also provided to four NGO federations: ProChild Federation, Federation of NGOs for the Protection of Children, National Federation of Social Workers in Romania, National Society for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect. In the last year of the program, ChildNet facilitated the merger of ProChild and FONPC to form a more sustainable, unified federation of over 100 child welfare NGOs with a stronger voice to advocate of child welfare reform.

Increasing capacity of County Departments for Child Protection:

ChildNet contracted with CRIPS to develop curricula and provide training for county commissions for child protection. Six days of training were delivered to each of the 47 commissions operating at county or Bucharest sector level. USAID and the U.S. Department for Health and Human Services created a computer based national Child Monitoring, Tracking and Information System (CMTIS) for NAPCR. ChildNet funded training of county child protection staff to ensure data entry for CMTIS for all children in the child welfare system.

ChildNet consultants conducted two studies – on permanency planning and on prevention services. Both studies resulted in reports that were distributed nation-wide, to County Departments for Child Protection and child welfare NGOs.

Improving Services for Disabled Children:

A ChildNet funded project, conducted in collaboration with UNICEF, evaluated residential institutions for severely disabled children and each child residing in these institutions. The report documented the existing situation and the resources available in the counties where the institutions were located. In response and based on this document, NAPCR closed or restructured most of these institutions. In collaboration with the International Voluntary Health Network of Australia, ChildNet trained 375 specialists, including social workers and maternal assistants, in hands-on procedures involved in community care of disabled children.

Three American Universities (Tulane, Minnesota, Maryland) established a Child Development Institute (CDI) in Romania with Mac Arthur Foundation funding. ChildNet contracted with CDI to train 1,200 psychiatrists, psychologists, physical therapists, speech therapists on the diagnosis and treatment of developmental disabilities. In collaboration with Baylor Pediatric AIDS Center, Abbott Corporation, Ministry of Health and NAPCR, a ChildNet project for pediatric HIV/AIDS testing was delivered. Approximately 200 health and counseling professionals were trained and over 36,000 children in placement centers or foster families were tested for HIV/AIDS.

Devolving ChildNet Reform to Towns, Communes and Villages:

ChildNet was unique in its investment to extend child welfare services beyond counties, cities and municipalities. Approximately half of Romania's population lives in rural areas with

higher rates of poverty and fewer social safety nets. Under ChildNet subcontracts, For Our Children NGO developed a curriculum of six days to train mayors about child welfare reform, which was delivered to 1040 mayors from 19 counties and established the Mayor's Institute for Training in Child Welfare. To assist rural mayors to provide prevention and early intervention services for children and families in their communes and villages, World Vision Romania under a ChildNet contract designed curricula for community social workers and trained 360 of these paraprofessionals.

Under a different ChildNet sub-grant, For Our Children NGO created a model for community consultative boards which engaged citizens in assuming responsibilities for the well-being of children living in their town, commune or village. Initially, the NGO established and trained 100 community boards in 10 counties. Subsequently, they initiated a Training of Trainers and rolled out the concept to all counties resulting in numerous community boards functioning across Romania. Based on the results achieved in the counties with active community boards, NAPCR introduced legislation that provided a legal basis for this innovative child protection program. With ChildNet funding, a manual on child welfare reform for local governments was produced by For Our Children NGO and 4,000 copies were distributed to mayors, local councils and community leaders.

Increasing Funds for Child Welfare NGOs:

ChildNet facilitated the development of United Way of Romania (UWRo) by organizing and leading the pilot campaign and allocation committee. Subsequently, ChildNet funded contracts for consultants and staff to develop UWRo strategic plan, increase volunteerism and enlarge annual campaigns. In 2006, UWRo raised approximately \$500,000 from 35 participating companies and their employees and funded 15 NGOs providing social services. For the 2007 campaign, still ongoing at the conclusion of ChildNet, United Way of Romania was anticipating a 100% increase in the funds raised compared to 2006, thus exceeding \$1 million.

ChildNet organized a task force on the purchase of child welfare services. The task force drafted legislation enabling counties to contract with NGOs for the delivery of services and completed a methodological guide on purchase of services. Pilot projects were initiated in five counties and the task force provided technical assistance throughout the process. In follow up to ChildNet activities, the Ministry of Labor, Family and Equal Opportunities proposed to expand the legislation to include all social services. The Romanian Governing Plan mentions a goal of 40% of public social services to be outsourced through contracts by 2008.

Elaborating the Profession of Social Work:

ChildNet facilitated the creation of the Romanian National Federation of Social Workers (NFSW) by 12 local and regional social work professional associations and facilitated NFSW membership in the International Federation of Social Workers. With ChildNet support, NFSW was successful in promoting Law 466/2004 defining the profession of social work in Romania and in drafting a code of ethics and standards of practice for professional social workers.

Improving the Quality of Child Welfare Services:

In 2003, under a ChildNet sub-contract, the ProChild Federation organized a national competition to identify the best practice models of child welfare services in Romania. Over 200 service providers submitted applications, of which 19 best practice models were

identified, presented and discussed during a national conference attended by 200 professionals from NGOs and county departments for child protection. Under a second sub-grant from ChildNet, ProChild disseminated the best practice models through workshops and in-country study tours which resulted in the replication of the best practice models throughout the country.

ChildNet task forces produced 14 standards of practice for specialized child welfare services with accompanying methodological guides for implementation. The standards were legislated by NAPCR through government orders. With funding from UNICEF and ILO, 10 additional standards were written, primarily for residential placement centers and services for street children. ChildNet funded CRIPS and ProChild to provide training and technical assistance for the dissemination of 10 national standards. Participants were 376 professionals representing all 47 county public service providers and 225 professionals from 68 child welfare NGOs.

To summarize, ChildNet's training and technical assistance projects resulted in:

- a. Increased capacity of 49 small child welfare NGOs;
- b. Created human capacity to deliver local child welfare services by training 360 community social workers in 7 counties;
- c. Identified and disseminated best practice models in child welfare through conference, workshops and site visits;
- d. Improved the decision-making process of county/sector commissions for child protection by training all members of all 47;
- e. Facilitated involvement of local community leaders through training over half of Romanian mayors in child welfare reform, publishing and distributing 4,000 child welfare manuals to local authorities and leaders, and establishing a Mayors' Training Institute for Child Welfare;
- f. Promoted the social work profession through the National Federation of Social Workers;
- g. Provided continuing professional education to 1,600 child psychiatrists, child psychologists, physical therapists and speech therapists on rehabilitation services for disabled children;
- h. Supported NAPCR's national communication strategy through website, quarterly magazine and national seminars;
- i. Established over 950 community consultative boards throughout Romania;
- j. Supported the implementation and use of the Child Monitoring, Tracking and Information System by training county child welfare professionals and managers in utilizing this system;
- k. Facilitated compliance with standards for child welfare services through national dissemination;
- l. Improved care of children with disabilities in community-based services by training 220 specialized professionals and 160 maternal assistants;
- m. Facilitated the creation of a unified federation of child welfare NGOs with over 100 members;
- n. Increased the capacity of 24 emerging NGOs;
- o. Increased sustainability of 46 established NGOs and fostered their partnerships with local government;
- p. Created a communication channel between Romania and Bulgaria by organizing seminars for senior child welfare leaders;

- q. Enabled United Way of Romania to develop a strategic plan, increase volunteerism by five fold and double the amount of money raised in annual campaigns;
- r. Promoted corporate social responsibility and increased funds and in-kind donations available for child welfare NGOs;
- s. Established a legal mechanism for counties to purchase services from NGOs, completed a methodological guide for contracting services and assisted in piloting procedures in 5 counties;
- t. Completed and distributed two studies: Permanency planning for children in the child welfare system and Prevention of separation of children from families;
- u. Evaluated all residential institutions for severely disabled children and presented a report that lead to the closing or restructuring of these institutions;
- v. Sponsored and funded 31 Romanian child welfare experts to participate in international conferences and seminars
- w. Assisted NAPCR in the drafting and implementation of Romania's National Strategy for Protection of Children in Difficulty.

Policy Development:

ChildNet organized, coordinated and funded 14 policy development task forces that produced standards and methodologies for services for disabled children, foster care, various child abuse and neglect services, domestic adoption, life skills training for adolescents, integration/reintegration services, mother-child centers, counseling centers, case management, social work practice, and intake services. The key accomplishments of the task forces are described in following paragraphs.

Medical-psycho-social criteria for the classification of handicaps were approved by Order of Minister of Health and Secretary of State of NAPCR 725/12.709/2002. The methodological guidelines for Evaluation of children with disabilities and assignment of categories of handicap were approved by Joint Order of Minister of Education, Secretary of State of NAPCR, Minister of Health and President of NAPH 18/3.989/416/142/2003. In 2007, a review was completed of all criteria for establishment of levels of handicap and criteria for school and occupation by GD 1437/2004.

Standards for Children in Foster Care were approved along with the methodological guidelines by Order of Secretary of State of NAPCR 35/2003. Standards for Centers for Counseling Abused and Neglected Children, Resource Centers on Child Exploitation, Hotlines were approved by Order of Secretary of State of NAPCR 177/2003. The methodological guidelines for Prevention and Intervention in Cases of Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of the Child were completed. In 2007, the standards for Hotlines were revised and methodological guidelines for Hotlines were implemented.

Standards on Domestic Adoption Procedure were approved by Order of Secretary Of State of NAPCR 45/2004. The methodological guidelines for implementation were finalized and assumed by the Romanian Office for Adoption in 2004. Standards for Developing Independent Life Skills Services, approved by Order of Secretary of State of NAPCR 48/2004, republished by Order 14/2007, along with methodological and implementation guidelines. Standards for Centers for Preparation and Support of Reintegration or Integration of the Child in the Family were approved by Order of Secretary of State of NAPCR 287/2006, together with the methodological guidelines for implementation.

Standards for Case Management in the Field of Protection of the Child's Rights were approved by Order of Secretary of State of NAPCR 288/2006. In 2007, practices in child welfare required the revision of Case Management standards and this standard is to be republished, together with the methodological guidelines for implementation which was developed in the same year. All the minimum compulsory standards for the various special services have been harmonized, following the latest reviews and adjustments made to case management procedures and are to be republished.

Standards Regarding the Operation of the Mother and Child Center were approved by Order of Secretary of State of NAPCR 87/2004 (republished in Order 101/2006, together with the implementation and methodological guidelines). Standards regarding Center for Counseling and Support for Parents and Children were approved by Order of Secretary of State of NAPCR 88/2004 (republished in Order 289/2006, together with the implementation and methodological guidelines). Standards for Mobile Team for Recovery of Children with Disabilities, together with the guidelines for implementation are in public debate and subject to modifications before final approval.

D. Fiscal Information

The ChildNet cooperative agreement was funded by USAID from July 13, 2001 until October 31, 2007 for a total of \$16,550,000. In addition, World Learning and NGO sub-grantees provided \$5,727,313 in cost share funds, which exceeded the amount required by the cooperative agreement. The grand total invested in the ChildNet program was \$22,144,585.

The final budget for the ChildNet program is below:

Budget Category	
Personnel	
Fringe benefits	
Travel & transportation	
Equipment	
Supplies	
Contractual	
Other	
Sub contractor costs	
Indirect costs	
Sub grant funding	
Total USAID Funds	
Total Cost Share Funds	
Grand Total	

ChildNet awarded \$7,766,638 in sub-grants to 75 NGOs for 96 projects to establish community based child welfare services. In addition, \$2,379,607 was awarded through contracts to 16 NGOs for 30 projects to provide training and technical assistance for child welfare reform. The total amount spent for sub-awards to NGOs was \$10,146,245. In the Annex of this report are charts presenting information about each sub-grant and contract, including fiscal data.

II. THE CHILDNET ASSESSMENT

The externally written report, an analysis of key components for success of the ChildNet Program follows. The assessment was designed and carried out by Pamela Awtrey during July and August 2007. Ms. Awtrey is a Licensed Social Worker in Michigan and an Independent Consultant with over 25 years of child welfare experience in USA, Canada, Romania, Sri Lanka, China and Republic of Georgia. In September 2007, she prepared the report which was presented to World Learning and submitted to USAID. It is also available through the USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse under the title The USAID ChildNet Program: Romanian – American Partnership for the Welfare of Children - An Analysis of Key Components for Success (2007).

A. Summary

The work of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in Romania began in 1991 at a time of increasing public outcry at the spiraling decay of the country's institutions and the dismal care of its abandoned children. The death of the Ceausescu regime ushered in the decade of the 1990s and a time of convulsive change. Institutionalized infants and children in horrific conditions became symbolic of the desperate situation of Romanian families, yet at the same time there was a youthful optimism for the promise of a brighter future.

It was in this daunting dichotomy that USAID began its task that would have direct impact on the lives of thousands of children and families in the next 16 years and provide a foundation for many more to follow. From crisis-oriented assistance and small-scale pilot projects for the first eight years, overall strategy evolved to become more systems-oriented and by 1997 institutional closure and replacement with community-based services was encouraged. While these demonstration projects of various local services were deemed successful on the scale in which they operated, large-scale systemic change was difficult and it was clear that an integrated project with strong national and local buy-in was necessary.

ChildNet, a \$16.55 million partnership between USAID, World Learning and the National Authority for the Protection of Child's Rights was a response to this need. Operating from 2001- 2007, it was deemed highly successful by the Government of Romania as well as USAID and World Learning. A comprehensive approach based on a unique project design, this summative undertaking required heavy investment, both monetarily and in its use of human resources. Building upon experiences, staffing, and relationships from USAID's previous projects, it is expected that ChildNet will continue to have large-scale impact. This is substantiated in part by the fact that all project objectives have been met or exceeded. ChildNet was expected to contribute to the decrease of the number of classic state-run institutions and the number of children living in them, the percentage of children assisted by community services and the number of child welfare services regulated by standards.

The keys to ChildNet's success are the subject of this strengths-based assessment. Taking into consideration the many complexities that contribute to a positive venture, an inquirer may chalk up its success to chance, the environment, or a historical convergence of events. However, the components that contributed to the significant achievements of ChildNet deserve to be explored in an effort to learn from the years of experience that formed its foundation and helped to bring the country to a place of substantial reform and progress.

Through 35 interviews, historical accounts, previous personal experiences, and documentation of events, processes and outcomes detailed in ChildNet's many quarterly reports, it is evident that the project was strategically designed and envisioned to create a strong foundation and partnership with the Government of Romania's child welfare reform endeavors. Clearly, the project's overall design was innovative. From this base, an exploration of factors contributing to ChildNet's success grew; many possibilities arose but congregated around three key components. First, the building of participatory and multi-level partnerships was apparent from the local villages to the government's macro level and in all sectors. Next was a dual methodology that included the use of partnership-based sub-grants along with provision of all the means necessary for success: technical assistance, training and tools including the development of nation-wide standards of care. Finally, plans for

sustainability that were built in from the beginning and took advantage of country-wide development were found to contribute greatly to ChildNet's achievements.

An analysis of these components suggests lessons learned and possibilities for future endeavors that may be applicable to other countries and regions. The ChildNet project adapted to the realities of a transitional context with the hope of creating positive outcomes for generations of children and families. This report examines the strengths and practical realities of a project that built upon previous achievements, contributed greatly to Romanian child welfare reform, and now hold the promise of proactive change for all the children and families whose lives have yet to be impacted.

B. Introduction

“[ChildNet brought] a different perspective on the partnership concept, a partnership based on trust and respect.”

(General Secretary, National Authority for Protection of Child Rights, The Ministry of Labor, Family, and Equal Chances)

ChildNet, a joint child welfare reform project involving the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Government of Romania's National Authority for Protection of Child Rights (NAPCR) and World Learning (WL) began in July 2001 and ended in October 2007. The project provided funding, training, and technical assistance to revolutionize Romania's child welfare reform. The \$16.55 million program is widely regarded as being highly successful and productive, providing country-wide impetus for holistic, comprehensive and systemic reform on an expansive scale.

As USAID completes its child welfare reform work in Romania, and ChildNet ends, there has been much discussion regarding the noteworthy progress and accomplishments, particularly during the past six years. Questions of interest include: How did ChildNet's overall strategy factor into its success? What were the essential program components of the project that helped to create an environment in which child protection could thrive and grow, directly contributing to the achievement of child welfare reform in Romania? What lessons gleaned from the Romanian experience could be relevant to other countries engaged in reform, especially those in the Europe and Eurasia region?

This strengths-based study, conducted in July-August 2007, sought to respond to these important questions in a realistic and pragmatic manner. Thirty-five interviews were held with previous and current leaders in the NAPCR and with individuals who had participated in various ChildNet-related programs during the past six years. Field visits were also conducted in four counties and several Bucharest sectors. These interactions sought to discover the underlying mechanisms by which ChildNet was able to assist the country in creating a viable and inclusive foundation for the future.

A complete account of the evolution of USAID's child welfare reform work in Romania, including ChildNet, can be found in [USAID and Child Welfare Reform in Romania: Challenges, Successes, and Legacy](#) by L. Correll, T. Correll, and M. Predescu, 2006 (available on line from the USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse at <http://dec.usaid.gov>). All ChildNet sub-grants and contracts are listed with a description of services at www.worldlearning.org/childnet (also included in the ChildNet Final Report to be posted at USAID/DEC). Historical and cultural impacts on Romanian children's services are

well documented due to the heavily publicized institutional system and subsequent negative consequences on child well-being.

Building on USAID's work in Romania begun in 1991, ChildNet, along with its partners, provided Romania's child welfare system with a remarkably strong vision, identity, and underlying foundation. During its operative years from 2001-2007, emphasis was on systemic and lasting change through partnerships, community development, non-governmental organization (NGO) capacity building, and the creation or enhancement of policy. Thirteen Standards of Practice and 11 Methodology Guides were written through an open process, most of which have since been enacted into law. Ninety-six sub-grants were awarded in a transparent process, affecting over 19,000 children, many with disabilities. More than 10,000 parents and 6,200 professionals working in areas of child protection were also beneficiaries. Additionally, these sub-grants provided funding for the development of services and programs in over 950 communities targeted toward thousands of children and families with the greatest needs and for NGO capacity building. Thirty ChildNet partnership contracts were awarded to NGOs for technical assistance, training, and policy development. Each indicator of ChildNet's objectives was met or exceeded.

ChildNet: Objectives, Indicators and Results

In direct cooperation with the National Authority for Protection of Child Rights, ChildNet was expected to contribute to the objectives listed below. Following each objective is the accompanying indicator with baseline, target and final result.

Objective#1: Decrease of the number of classic institutions

Indicator: 30% reduction in the number of classic institutions

Baseline: 340 Target: 238 Final Result: 166

Objective#2: Decrease of the number of children in classic state-run institutions

Indicator: 50% reduction in the number of children living in classic institutions

Baseline: 48,263 Target: 24,131 Final Result: 21,015

Objective#3: Percentage of children assisted by community services

Indicator: Increase the number of community based services to address 75% of the children needing assistance

Baseline: 52% Target: 75% Final Result: 75%

Objective#4: Number of child welfare services regulated by standards

Indicator: Increase in the number of standards for child welfare services to cover all the specific child welfare services provided

Baseline: 1 Target: 16 Final Result: 23

ChildNet was able to successfully respond to rapid-paced developments on local, national, and regional fronts. Changes during the past six years include political turbulence and governmental shift, de-centralization of child protection responsibilities, a plethora of new laws and policies, and accession into the European Union. Many challenges characteristic of a difficult transition remain. Approximately 21,000 children continue to reside in institutions, comprehensive services for children with disabilities are rare, professional social workers are

exiting the country for higher salaries and expanded opportunities, and budgetary allotments for social services are insufficient for the vast need. Additionally, with decentralization and geographical variations in capacity and resources, not all children are receiving even the minimum level of services. Entrance into the European Union in 2007 has brought new challenges. One noted trend is that expanded international employment opportunities sometimes result in children being left behind in Romania when their parents leave the country for work-related reasons.

The legacy of this multi-faceted and large-scale USAID-funded project will continue to guide policy, inform services, build on partnerships and act to create healthy environments for all of Romania's families and is described below. First, the overall project design will be discussed, followed by three critical components that contributed to its success: (1) multi-level partnerships, (2) methodology including sub-grants and contracts for training, technical assistance, and policy development, and (3) purposeful design for sustainability. Examples are included to illustrate how these components were realized. Concluding comments will summarize important points, discuss lessons learned, and suggest principles to consider in future endeavors, particularly as they may be applicable in other countries engaged in child welfare reform.

C. Project Design

“This was a true partnership, not just a partnership on paper.” (NAPCR Leader and Coordinating Committee Member)

Clear Strategic Vision and Alignment:

ChildNet's strategic design as a partnership between USAID, NAPCR, and WL was essential to its success. This approach leveraged USAID's assistance and resulted in the Government of Romania's buy-in for essential reform steps, including the development of standards and legislation, promotion of public-private partnerships, and the initiation of a contractual process for purchase of child welfare services from NGOs. Directly aligned with both the Government of Romania (GOR) and USAID strategy, the parameters were clear and guided the project's philosophy and all activities. Nothing was approved or initiated outside the strategies of the GOR and USAID. Shared decision making and voluntary participation increased the investment in reaching substantial and sustainable outcomes.

The proactive, broad-based strategy was rooted in and built upon USAID's experience in Romania. This experience included previous provision of technology, US study tours involving key civil servants, democracy and civil society projects, pilot projects and demonstration models of community based services for children and families, and establishment of a network of child welfare organizations. In these years prior to ChildNet, strong nation-wide relationships were constructed within government, community based organizations and in various fields.

Taking advantage of these relationships and the developmental progression of activities since 1991, ChildNet intentionally complemented and essentially became part of the GOR's child welfare reform process. USAID's objectives were:

1. Improved legal, regulatory, and policy framework;
2. Improved mobilization, allocation and use of social sector resources;

3. Increased access to quality integrated services; and
4. Citizens better informed about social services, rights and responsibilities.

These objectives aimed to reduce dependence on and use of institutions as a solution for children in need of protection and to develop and increase the use of community-based child welfare programs.

USAID's objectives were consistent with and supportive of the GOR's strategy which includes:

1. Preventing and reducing the abandonment of children by their own families;
2. Restructuring existing services and residential care institutions;
3. Improving, completing, and harmonizing legislative framework;
4. Promoting adoption as a special measure for the protection of the child, with a special Emphasis on encouraging national adoption;
5. Continuing decentralization;
6. Improving financial mechanisms;
7. Establishing a system of minimum mandatory standards;
8. Creating a national accreditation system for NGOs;
9. Developing and improving the professional level of human resources; and
10. Creating and developing a national system for the monitoring and assessment of the situation of children in difficulty or at risk.

ChildNet strove to work in targeted collaboration with the above objectives through accomplishment of the following main indicators:

1. A 30% reduction in the number of classic state-run institutions;
2. A 50% reduction in the number of children living in these institutions;
3. Increase in the number of community based services to address 75% of children requiring assistance; and
4. Increase in the number of standards for child welfare services to cover all the specific child welfare services provided.

As a result of well articulated and measurable objectives and a commitment to mobilize and use all available resources, unmistakable parameters were established from the outset. Though challenging, these mandates served to bring focus, clarity, and credible evidence-based outcomes.

Frequent, Proactive, and Relational Communication:

The vision for quality child welfare services evolved over time. The formation and use of a coordinating committee comprised of decision makers from the three partnership entities (USAID, NAPCR, and WL) steered the process. From the beginning, weekly meetings were held. ChildNet provided resources as a tool of empowerment for the reform of child welfare services, respecting and supporting the role of the NAPCR as the coordinator of all child and family-related donor activity, thus avoiding duplication and gaps in services. The coordinating committee became the channel for clear and accessible communication. The ability to have frequent, sometimes daily, communication based on positive working relationships and a clear vision was reported to have prevented many problems and misunderstandings and kept a steady momentum. Members strove for agreement in decision

making and division of tasks. Jointly created agendas were distributed and partnership leaders were consistently present at coordinating committee meetings, allowing for optimal dialog and productivity.

Many interviewees referred to the members of this coordinating committee as a “well-functioning team”. With a strong vision, members’ opinions were sought out and respected. ChildNet program managers and specialists were integral members of the coordinating committee, recruited for their professionalism, expertise, experience, and ability to provide assistance with integrity and a team perspective. Many had previous working relationships with various committee members as most were trusted employees who had managed other projects; in a sense, ChildNet was a capstone project that demonstrated advanced skills acquired through the years of transition. From this communication structure and subsequent strengthening of rapport, members felt heavily invested and that they “were on the same side”. They stated that they developed an understanding of the concerns and constraints of the other parties. One member affirmed that this open dialog, even with strong and sometimes heated discussion and difference of opinion, sharpened and stimulated the group, increasing determination to optimally use the resources at hand.

Coordinating committee members were able to continuously monitor, assess, and support the process. Rather than somewhat typical mid-term and final reviews associated with many projects, the committee meetings became a tool for engaging in ongoing evaluation and assessment of outcomes allowing for immediate feedback, sometimes leading to a change in course.

Flexibility:

Facilitated by strong communication, flexibility was possible within clear strategic boundaries. ChildNet was able to react quickly to the multiple changes in government and legislation and fill in gaps left by other donors. For example, when child welfare legislation changed in 2004 after the first case management standards were written, ChildNet understood the necessity of updating these standards and sponsored a second task force process for revision. Another example of flexibility was seen when an NGO requested a change in their original contract to conduct a national adoption conference. Due to imminent changes in the law, the NGO was able to approach the coordinating committee and discuss more appropriate alternatives. This culminated in the shifting of resources to the design and implementation of a series of regional conferences. Because ChildNet was heavily concerned with addressing holistic matters that would increase and sustain child well-being, it was open to facilitating changes in plans according to the country’s current events and the identified needs that arose. Long-term planning procedures revolved around clear objectives and overall vision rather than specific activity requirements and a rigid “cookie-cutter” approach.

Inclusiveness and Integration:

Strong advantages of the project were country-wide application and widespread encouragement of geographic and organizational diversity. ChildNet integrated public and private organizations on various levels and with differences in expertise. There were sub-grants in all but three counties, 934 mayors were trained and 100 community boards were established and trained. Using the same model developed for community boards, almost 3000 more were added throughout the country by means of ChildNet sub-grants, contracts, and training of trainers. By design, educational endeavors included a mix of people from various locations and sectors, and citizens were encouraged to envision a broad continuum of possibilities and experiences. Because sub-grants promoted partnerships from businesses,

NGOs, citizenry, and public sectors, the scope of influence increased greatly throughout the country.

In response to NAPCR's coordination role and macro-level understanding of the entire country's needs, many of the sub-grants tackled programmatic gaps left by other donors. These programs were frequently difficult endeavors with clientele that had not been at the forefront in previous projects. They were deliberated and undertaken with full participation and cooperation of all coordinating committee members, often delegating other community, financial, or human resources so that all aspects of service provision were supported. Sub-grants included prevention services, independent living services for youth with disabilities leaving large residential facilities, education for children and young adults with mental health concerns, HIV/AIDS, family violence, and child labor. These projects often influenced and required action from other ministries such as those of health and education. Because many institutions were closing and a continuum of community-based services was being established, it was also imperative that re-training and employment placement services were mobilized.

Process-Oriented:

Many participants interviewed mentioned that in developing their capacity to function as viable players in a modernized child welfare system, the process of learning was just as important as the specific client services provided. In a very real sense, sub-grant management along with the training and technical assistance modeled a professional approach for the future. Hands-on experiences along with sustainability trainings then laid the groundwork for expansion including the tapping of potential funding sources.

An example of a process-focused undertaking was the creation of the standards. After the overall draft format was discussed and agreed upon by all donors, the process consistently followed the same pattern. First, a draft was written by a small task group comprised of members specifically chosen for their expertise related to the standard. This draft was then distributed to all stakeholders who gave feedback. Based on this input, the draft was revised and then publicly posted. After final appraisal, the standard was reviewed by the NAPCR's legal department to ensure compatibility with existing documents, and most of these were enacted into law. Because this was done on a national basis, the impact was far-reaching and emphasized participatory and transparent methods of engagement and exemplary outcomes. An understanding of developmental processes carries over into other areas, and many NGOs continue to use the general principles and participatory methods when re-evaluating or branching out into new areas.

One NGO director expressed this orientation to process and quality outcomes when he said that the assigned ChildNet project manager encouraged him to "slow down, do it right, and don't sacrifice quality for quantity." The director added, "He was very supportive and we learned to build quality services from the very beginning rather than accomplishing inferior goals in a haphazard way. We have continued to operate as we were taught."

"The Right Project at the Right Time":

ChildNet anticipated a period of continued and vast change in Romania and was intentionally designed to be able to accommodate and respond to that change. The overarching strategy was one that was strong and broad enough to adapt to extensive systemic change and variation in political philosophy and structure. There was also a sense of urgency, knowing that with EU accession this would be a final opportunity to access USAID assistance.

ChildNet's strength was in its ability to capitalize on the moment and stay true to its vision of broad systemic reform. By design, the project fit with the social and political ecology; in a true sense, it was able to "lead by following."

D. Findings and Key Components

Key Component # 1: *Participatory Multi-level Partnerships*

"We are now responsible for our children. By attending conferences and working with people from other sectors, we began to understand the bigger picture and how we could all work together to assist children and families." (*County Executive Director, General Direction of Social Assistance and Child Protection*)

ChildNet was characterized by extensive participatory partnerships on multiple levels along with the creation of a supportive context that included training, technical assistance, networks and linkages, and macro-level shifts to ensure success. Governmental entities included those at the Prime Minister's office with the signing of a formal Memorandum of Understanding, the NAPCR and the coordination committee, and the county, sector, local community, and village levels. As a non-traditional USAID program, the project allowed for planning and implementation decisions to be made through consensus of the partnership triad while ensuring compliance with the USAID's administrative requirements.

NAPCR, through individual and committee undertakings, provided primary coordination and leadership, creating a positive and supportive environment in which transformation could happen on all levels. Through its proactive and constructive stance and energetic professionals, it lent a "can-do" attitude that was modeled for the rest of the country.

Capacity-building through Partnerships:

ChildNet used a large number of various sized sub-grants and contracts for training, technical assistance, and policy development in the vast majority of counties and sectors of Bucharest. The variety and geographical pervasiveness promoted the development of robust relationships and created a sense that change was indeed possible if actors could work together. Because the entire structure of the ChildNet project was designed to spark or enhance interaction and affiliation, it was in the interest of persons of influence on all levels to build linkages and rapport with one another. Through trainings such as those for the mayors, these key figures began to more clearly understand their roles in child well-being and how they could form complementary rather than competitive or conflictual relationships with other official departments or non-governmental organizations. Social issues became points of positive agreement and many community agencies earned the respect of officials as they worked alongside one another to accomplish shared goals.

This shift to increased collaboration also took place outside of government. Both local and foreign NGOs had to accommodate to the structure of ChildNet and adjust to the new legislation and evolving standards. Some NGOs, particularly those from outside Romania, were accustomed to working independently from government and found it difficult to align themselves with the national strategy and collaborate with those they had previously rivaled. Eventually, however, many of these resistant NGOs saw the benefits of effective coordination and professional working relationships and went on to develop strong bonds with public and private organizations.

ChildNet sub-grants required the applicant to have functional and active local partnerships. This mandate compelled large and small organizations with various management styles and philosophical paradigms to forge working relationships under the umbrella of a concerted national strategy in an effort to make an impact on children and families. Along with frequent technical assistance from ChildNet staff, these relationships provided essential learning experiences. The resulting strong alliances proved to be important for the reform to take root particularly on the local levels. In the spirit of reciprocity, not only were the larger NGOs able to expand their circles of influence and use their expertise to assist smaller NGOs, but the local partners were able to aid the NGOs in providing a grass-roots perspective and the opportunity to replicate models.

Professional organizations were also incorporated into the partnership process, often with ChildNet contracts for training provision and technical assistance to other organizations. Through contracts with alliances such as The Association of Professional Social Workers in Valcea County, The National Association of Mayors, and The National Federation of Social Workers, multiple trainings for hundreds of mayors, community social workers, and professionals working for children with disabilities were facilitated.

Training and technical assistance for strengthening the capacity of 50 small child welfare NGOs was also provided through contractual agreements with Romanian NGOs. Interviews with leaders of these organizations revealed that the act of providing training and technical assistance not only raised the organization's profile, created or reinforced important relationships, and validated its national reputation, but that a substantial amount of the organization's own learning transpired as a result of the facilitation process. The interactive technical assistance methodologies used resulted in stronger organizations as well as better equipped and trained staff in the small local NGOs that benefited from their services. One staff person of a small rural NGO spoke for many others when she stated, "We felt isolated prior to ChildNet and appreciated the opportunity to participate in the workshops. We were fortunate to have a wonderful rapport with the NGO that guided us. We continue those relationships even now on an informal basis."

Because of the aforementioned benefits, contracts for training and technical assistance were awarded to Romanian organizations whenever possible. However, there were some instances when American consultants were engaged to provide highly specialized and proficient guidance. For example, all counties and Bucharest sectors received training by an American association on the subjects of case management and prevention of child abuse and neglect. In these situations, Romanian professionals were paired with the consultants to work in tandem, thus serving to build local capacity and mentorship experience as well.

Enlistment of Non-traditional Partners:

Other businesses and industries also came to further understand child welfare systems through partnership agreements. The establishment of United Way Romania alongside a recent law that now allows 2% of one's income tax to be redirected as a charitable donation was one means by which businesses became informed of their civic responsibility to assist children and families in need. Concurrently, agencies were being accredited under strict requirements which contributed to a beginning level of confidence by the public that donations to organizations, most of which relate to child protection and prevention services, would be spent wisely.

A partnership example given during this study regarding a project for social and occupational integration of 42 young women with special needs from an institution confirmed that this was a positive interchange for both business and social services. The NGO working with the state institution slated for closure, found group housing and provided social skills for these clients. The director initiated a relationship with the head of the garment industry to propose a project that could provide needed employees for the garment industry as well as give opportunities to women with disabilities. These young adults, representative of the more than 1600 recipients of ChildNet-sponsored life skills programming, were given occupational training at a garment factory in Bucharest. After the NGO director prepared the management and the workers through formal training and informal discussion groups, most of the factory employees, who were also female, developed positive and supportive attitudes toward their new co-workers. At the time of this study, plans were being made to extend the project to other areas of the country where garment factories were in desperate need of employees, particularly due to a shortage of workers.

As participatory partnerships have developed, the citizenry has become more interested and invested in proactive change. Parents' groups for children and adults with disabilities have been formed and volunteerism seems to be on the rise. Media campaigns have heightened awareness that the primary responsibility for children belongs to the family but that support and enhancement of the family's well-being is the responsibility of the entire community.

Cross-Sectoral Initiatives:

In addition to these partnerships on many levels, there have been formal cross-sectoral opportunities including informational sessions and conferences. By training people from several disciplines together, there were experiences of cross-fertilization and prospects for increased understanding. Several social workers remarked that because they met professionals from outside their disciplines, such as politicians, they were able to have a more comprehensive understanding of a spectrum of attitudes, needs and focus. A spirit of cooperation developed as parties empathized with each other through a new understanding of others' pressures, limitations, and realities. For example, a county child protection official commented that a conversation with an institution director led him to a new appreciation of the fear of job loss as the institution was closing. As their relationship progressed, he realized the burden she carried, not only for her own financial security, but also for other employees for whom she felt responsible. She and her staff expressed a concern for the children as they experienced major upheaval and loss of the only relationships many of them knew. This led to brainstorming sessions regarding options for the employees, transitional plans for children, and family-friendly alternate uses for the structure. A better overall working relationship resulted.

Because of the emphasis on a holistic approach, other ministries have been encouraged to become involved. For example, a Romanian NGO for persons with disabilities is making plans to work alongside governmental health and education ministries as an institution for children with disabilities in their county closes. Most of these children will be reintegrated into their birth families or placed in foster care. To support these families and create community stability, ongoing intensive health services and special educational and occupational attention will be necessary. It has become clear that functional bridges between organizations and other ministries are mandatory.

Also by design ChildNet encouraged informal relationship building and information sharing as well as formal networking. This was constantly modeled by ChildNet employees who are

astute and engaged in connecting people to each other. Informal times at trainings were encouraged and it was reported that many positive relationships and formal partnerships came out of these casual settings.

Finally, the creative ability of ChildNet to accommodate various sizes, natures and activities of partnerships led to innovation and further implementation of quality practice models. Programs were designed to meet the unique needs of the community. For example, while programs for deinstitutionalization were needed in some towns with large traditional institutions, some groups of villages required more prevention services. The project's flexibility noted earlier greatly influenced the positive and inventive tone of these collaborative accords.

Key Component # 2: *Methodology*

“We never realized that the grant would be so much more than money. We were given the support and understanding to be successful with the money. Even though it was a very small grant, we tapped all the expertise we could. We set up a structure for the future, are now working in three sites, and have been successful in acquiring more funding.” (*NGO Director*)

The methodology that optimized success in the ChildNet project was two-fold: (1) Sub-grants, and (2) Technical Assistance, Training, and Tools for Success. An overwhelming majority of persons interviewed, especially those representing small NGOs who received capacity development funding, commented that the funding, while important, became secondary to the firm foundation that was built through the support, training, and specialized technical assistance given.

Sub-grants

Sub-grant Process Design:

One of the main features of ChildNet was the provision of \$7.8 million in funding for sub-grants. ChildNet was a voluntary, inclusive project open to all organizations in each county or sector of Bucharest nationwide. During the project's first three months, six Orientation Conferences were held at the regional level and one at the national level. These meetings introduced potential participants to the overall project objectives, the sub-grant methodology, partnership requirements, and the application process.

Recipients noted the relative ease of the sub-grant application process, in striking contrast to other grants for which they had applied that consumed vast amounts of time and human resources. The ChildNet process was streamlined and understandable. Organizations and their local partners easily accessed information through the internet, and had a point of contact if there were additional questions. The structure of the process and the grants themselves was clear and logical, becoming the initial step of the training process. Because there were various size offerings to accommodate organizations and projects of diverse ranges, applicants could self-assess their organizational desire and capacity. They were also aware that they could apply for a second and potentially larger grant at a later date.

For successful sub-grant awards, serious motivation and realistic community planning for sustainability were prerequisites for both governmental and non-governmental organizations. Rather than an outside organization proposing a project and asking government officials to validate it, an internal community consortium needed to combine forces and have detailed plans to initiate services. Matching funds of over \$4 million provided by sub-grantees and partners demonstrate the depth of investment and preparation in these projects. Groups often required direction, resources, and technical assistance to capitalize on their enthusiasm, drive, and strengths.

Transparency:

Because of USAID and WL's history, publicity, and track record, along with the Best Practice Conference, a fair selection process had come to be expected. Criteria for awarding the grants were clear in the application process using a checklist with weighted points for various aspects of the submission. Members of review committees were chosen for their reputations and respected judgment, and consensus was expected and achieved during the selection process.

One NGO director who was not awarded a second grant stated that she felt the process was nonetheless fair and open. When the rationale for denial was explained, she was satisfied, made changes, and went on to use the experience to successfully apply for a grant through another source of funding.

The sub-grant monitoring process was also seen as open and non-confrontational. One NGO director captured this approach when he said, "We enjoyed our visits from ChildNet advisors, even when we were not entirely successful at the beginning. We could discuss things as friends. It was easy to know what was expected. We were supported and together found solutions. They didn't judge us. We were asked the question, 'How can we make this happen *together*?' This team spirit carried us through some difficult times."

Demonstration of Integrated and Focused Models:

The sub-grants were used to demonstrate and incorporate working models of community-based practice within the wide parameters of the project. Because of the flexible design, these services could proactively target areas of critical need identified and articulated by the NAPCR. The coordinating committee mapped out underserved areas and populations and, according to their objectives, initiated or supplemented services and endeavors. For example, if an international organization had plans to work with the government to close an institution, ChildNet sub-grants could be used to support the closing, providing reintegration services or training in life skills for young adults, depending on the projected needs. In this way, it became a collaborative project with a common vision and mission.

An example of a productive sub-grant was the formation of community boards consisting of local government representatives, NGO members, and influential citizens such as the priest or school principal. These boards acted as steering committees and coordinating bodies to assist and make referrals for children and families in need on the local level. Originally a sub-grant to develop, train and monitor ten boards in ten communities, these quickly became popular in other areas and eventually became a main referral source of prevention and intervention services. With a common understanding of the community's responsibilities, members' roles, and varied resources, the support of families and well-being of children came to be seen as a community priority. It was reported that approximately 90% of these boards remain a

functional and integral part of the transition from a centralized system to one of local level services and referrals.

Additional attention was drawn to the ChildNet sub-grant programs because they often incorporated difficult areas and populations but received technical assistance to successfully integrate the developing standards and methods. By demonstrating best practices, the emphasis was clearly on quality, sustainability, and child-focused services. Frequent contact and professional technical assistance provided by ChildNet offered a strong sense of team and synergy. With a sustainability plan required from inception, strong investment was evident and the focus was on laying a sturdy foundation for the future.

Technical Assistance, Training, and Tools for Success

A common discussion with interviewees centered on the high quality, accessibility and frequency of support given to the projects. Once a project was funded, ChildNet staff was committed to ensure the project's success through a variety of tools including guidance from experienced specialists, frequent and applicable training, and specific tools to ensure success.

Technical Assistance:

Technical assistance was delivered through the ChildNet project managers and specialists assigned to various sub-grants. The experience and professional reputation of the ChildNet staff was often cited by interviewees. None of the employees were newcomers; all were well established Romanian professionals who had spent considerable time working in the field. ChildNet's director, a United States-educated social worker, worked long-term in Romania including the entire period of the ChildNet grant.

Grantees commented frequently that they were impressed by staff knowledge and integrity, and the fact that the program coordinators were Romanian and not people brought in on a temporary basis from another country. They felt confident that the staff was competent and accessible. Interviewees often focused not only on the assistance offered by staff but also the positive relationships they brought. ChildNet staff looked for the strengths of the projects and staff and gave technical advice in an accommodating, caring, and non-punitive way. This intentional modeling of a team perspective from the top level of NAPCR to the smallest sub-grantee was replicated in other organizations as people reached out to each other in helpful ways to accomplish shared and vested goals.

Practical Training:

In addition to the technical assistance provided, sub-grant recipients were also involved in trainings held with other grantees. These were facilitated and taught by ChildNet or other Romanian organizations contracted to do so. These trainings included topics such as financial administration, project management, child welfare services and administration, and sustainability.

In an effort to mobilize and increase access to integrated services, there was widespread training covering the entire country. The comprehensive nature of the project is shown in the extensive commitment and participation of many human services specialists, government entities at various levels, and citizen group involvement including social workers, mayors, county boards and commissions, businesses, NGOs, parents, and advocacy groups.

Trainings were experiential and focused on giving the participants the material they needed to appropriately accomplish their goals. Interactive adult learning methods were used and participants shared many years' experiences. Actual cases pertaining to difficult situations were brought to the group and discussed in smaller teams, processing various solutions and then assessing them in light of operative standards and laws.

This learning technique was illustrated by a young single parent who volunteered to be interviewed as part of this assessment. A beneficiary of services provided by a ChildNet-supported NGO, she vividly described her previous situation of poverty and of being completely overwhelmed with work and parenting her young son who had extensive cognitive disabilities. At the time of her referral to the NGO, her resources were exhausted and she was planning to institutionalize her child. During our discussion, she listed a number of prevention services the NGO had provided including advocacy with the son's school, an after-school child care program that offered tutoring and a meal, help with parenting skills, emergency services, and counseling sessions with her son's father. Although she was not an active member of the parent advocacy group for children with special needs, she was aware of it and planned to attend as her time allowed. She credited these services for giving her hope and saving her family.

After the interview, the mother's caseworker discussed the fact that she originally had no experience with a family such as this and was desperately trying to find ways to work with the mother who had so many problems. She stated that she brought up this young woman's case during ChildNet training where she realized for the first time that through the use of referrals and community linkages, there were practical, creative solutions for clients with multi-faceted challenges. This motivated her to think more broadly and she reported being able to apply what she learned to many other situations.

Two government officials described these times of training as intensely thought-provoking and stimulating. The solutions generated were built on an accurate understanding of client needs and strengths. Awareness of various referral networks and community based services required working relationships between these entities, and it was often during these seminars that these relationships were solidified. The interactive training process itself served to model a productive method of problem-solving that could be used as participants worked to build purposeful, responsive teams within their own circles of influence.

Tools for Success:

The creation and dissemination of standards and accompanying methodology guidelines was seen by many interviewees as important accomplishments of the ChildNet project. The adoption of national standards of practice was critical in establishing unified, measurable, evidence-based, and consistent directives. Participatory and inclusive, the process of developing a range of standards used the national expertise of social workers, psychologists, sociologists, lawyers, and civil servants. Because of this profound investment and subsequent enactment into law, there was significant buy-in by officials, human service professionals, and citizenry.

In 2001, only one standard existed. In keeping with the national strategy, ChildNet convened and supported task forces that produced 13 standards and 11 methodology guides. Another 10 were developed through the work of other donors including those for Day Care, Residential Care, Emergency Centers, and five standards related to Services for Street Children. Through strong working relationships with NAPCR and the structure of the coordinating committee,

all of the standards and methodologies were approved by NAPCR without exception, and most of the 23 standards were enacted into law. In addition to financial backing and coordination of task forces, ChildNet's main actions in orchestrating participatory involvement in the standards and methodologies consisted of research activities, group leadership, organization and facilitation of public debates and large community meetings, development of materials, collection of feedback, mobilization of consultants, and editing for clarity.

ChildNet developed the following standards:

- Foster Care
- National (Domestic) Adoption
- Reintegration-Integration Services
- Maternal-Child Centers
- Life Skills Services for Adolescents
- Counseling Services
- Child Abuse and Neglect Resources Centers
- Child Abuse and Neglect Helplines
- Child Abuse and Neglect Specialized Services
- Mobile Team Services for Disabled Children
- Case Management
- Professional Social Workers Standard
- Intake Services

Methodology Guides produced by ChildNet are as follows:

- Foster Care
- National (Domestic) Adoption
- Reintegration-Integration Services
- Maternal-Child Centers
- Life Skills Services
- Counseling Services
- Child Abuse and Neglect Helplines
- Mobile Team Services for Disabled Children
- Case Management
- Intake Services
- Psycho-social Criteria for Disabled Children

Nationwide training and distribution of the standards were accomplished through two contractual agreements. A Romanian NGO was responsible for dissemination and training for public institutions, related professionals and civil servants, while an alliance of NGOs working in child welfare handled this for NGOs active in child protection issues. Forums for the discussion of laws, standards, and the sharing of implementation ideas were created through the dissemination and training process. As a result of the standards and accompanying laws, there is now a common understanding of the structure and expectations of a modern and viable child welfare system. Often in Romanian communities the resources for child welfare are limited, especially in areas severely impacted by poverty. However, while many communities have a long, difficult road ahead for full achievement of ideal child welfare services, there is now unified awareness and direction. Conduits for communication can thrive and working relationships have opened doors that will continue to provide resources and encouragement to all who are concerned with child welfare issues. It is

anticipated that both government and non-governmental agencies will continue to use these channels in accomplishing joint goals.

An example that illustrates the wide understanding and direction the new standards have provided is related to foster care. Prior to this standard's development, there were great misconceptions by both foster parents and professionals in a myriad of areas. Some of these related to the role of the foster parent, the foster parents' relationship to the birth family, the overall goal of foster care, the physical requirements of the home, medical expectations, and ethical issues such as case confidentiality. Various regions, counties, and even towns and villages had different expectations and requirements. While many children thrived in spite of the lack of minimum standards, the concept of "best interest of the child" varied widely, sometimes leaving children unprotected and vulnerable to abuse or neglect.

In an impromptu visit with a foster mother at her home in a small town, it became clear that she was acutely aware of her role and had a good understanding of the standards governing the placement of her foster child. This six-year-old boy with moderate cognitive disabilities had been placed with her for two years. When asked to discuss her responsibilities, the foster mother impressively described the permanency plan for her foster son and the steps that were being taken to reunite him with his mother. The child's mother, who suffered from a mental disorder, came to visit her son in the foster home on a regular basis. The foster mother described in detail the trainings in which she had participated and how she learned to work with the birthmother, validating her progress and encouraging the son in his attachment to her. She was also part of a foster parents' association and appeared to have an amiable and productive working relationship with the county social workers from whom she received supervision and support. This type of professionalism was notable and very beneficial for the child.

Increased vision and impetus for improved child welfare services was also spread from a Best Practice Conference held in 2002. Through a well-promoted national endeavor and a transparent selection process involving objective assessment by multiple committees, more than 200 projects applied for recognition. The components of these projects were verified through visits, and professional video tapes were created for use during the conference and disseminated throughout the country. The conference centered on showcasing the 19 projects that were chosen as highly exemplary and innovative services, demonstrating the methodologies and logistics for implementation. After the conference, national follow-up and publicity encouraged interested professionals to visit the models. Training groups for interested parties resulted. Many interviewees referred to this conference as the driving force that planted the seeds of change, and they expressed regret that this conference was not repeated on a regular basis.

Key Component # 3: Purposeful Design for Sustainability

"We grew up during the ChildNet years. We are now ready to move ahead on our own." (Social Worker and Active Member of Social Work Association)

The ChildNet project was designed from the beginning with sustainability in mind. Sub-grantees were required to consider on-going community needs and resources in their grant applications. Although other issues such as capacity development and community services

took precedence in the first years of the project, a deliberate shift was made in the last half of the project to focus more heavily on sustainability.

Growth of Professionalism:

It was reported by NGO employees that a new respect for the expertise of their organizations has developed throughout the years, spurred by the requirements of the sub-grants and the desire of child welfare specialists to be engaged in positive reform for children and families. Various actors in the child welfare system now know what is expected of them and can function within their roles.

One mayor admitted that, prior to becoming involved in his training groups and taking advantage of the relationships built along with the technical assistance provided by ChildNet, he really did not know what he should do with “social cases”. He understood well his traditional role with infrastructure and management, but did not understand his place as part of child welfare reform. Once he was able to recognize and accept his role, he was able to use his social and political resources to bring various parties together, discuss what each had to offer, and create a plan that has been very successful. He also saw this activity as being good for his political longevity and has been re-elected.

Commonly accepted professional tools were taught and consistently modeled, such as the use of agendas, meeting minutes, written agreements, and strategic planning processes, which enabled various community groups to feel empowered, productive and accountable. These organizational and management tools continue to be used and have allowed for dynamic and fruitful pursuits as entities engage in other projects with a variety of funding sources including those of the European Union.

Sustainability trainings were held for all sub-grant partners in preparation for grant endings. These were regional trainings held with a cross-section of governmental and non-governmental organizations with an emphasis on the use of guidelines that had been practiced throughout the time of the funding. Because project awards were based in large part on the investment of the partners and because ChildNet had offered substantial technical assistance to assist in the projects’ success, projects were well-rooted and continued in some form in the vast majority of cases.

Capacity Development for Professional Organizations:

It is anticipated that the development of professional organizations will continue to play a major role in maintaining standards, sustaining quality services, assisting in accreditation, and continuing the momentum that has begun. Two bodies have been established through ChildNet that have much potential in the future as mechanisms of accountability and empowerment. These include:

1. The National Federation of Romanian Social Workers (FNASR)
The National Federation is a voluntary membership organization that consists of ten professional associations from various regions in Romania. It serves to provide support and networking for social workers employed in all fields of practice, and
2. Federation of Non-governmental Organizations for Children (FONPC)
FONPC was the result of a 2006 merger of two organizations that incorporated the USAID-initiated organization, ProChild. FONPC now acts as a unified voice in making recommendations and advocating for children, families, and non-

governmental organizations that work with children throughout the country. It currently consists of over one hundred members of active agencies engaged in child protection work.

As noted, experienced Romanian organizations were contracted for training, monitoring and project management whenever possible. When it was not possible and additional technical assistance was necessary, consultants from the United States were paired with local NGOs and worked side by side with them, allowing frequent interaction and the opportunity to initiate and develop expertise in a needed area. Life skills training and work with young adults with disabilities are examples of areas in which there was a need for Romanian expertise to be developed. Local specialists and NGOs were able to increase their capacity and in this way, a foundation of sustainability was built.

Purchase of Services:

Another potentially powerful voice in a sustainable and professionally credible child welfare endeavor is found in the current groundwork being laid through the development of a plan for purchasing services from non-governmental organizations. The contracting of services by government can tap vast expertise and potential funding support, and can utilize the many years of experience NGOs have had in managing successful and innovative child welfare programs. In addition, this process would encourage the creation of more state-of-the-art services targeted to various clienteles. In 2005, government officials participated in an 8-day study tour in a model county in the US to learn about the development of the system of contracting for services and to experience first-hand the inner workings of that system.

ChildNet-funded technical experts drafted legislation and implementation rules for contracting of services, which are being piloted within the legal framework of a government decision. As of this writing, the pilot projects are in the planning and implementation stages in five counties. Work is being undertaken to create a new law through which contractual child welfare services can optimally function. Additionally, the Ministry of Labor Family and Equal Opportunities is considering expansion and application to all social services.

The potential of contracting with established NGOs who have the ability to raise funds through a variety of sources, thus multiplying efforts and resources, has been the subject of much discussion by both child welfare agencies and government and came up frequently in this analysis. Contracting is expected to complement the endeavors of the government and also ensure community involvement. It will also assist the many small NGOs that have been working on the local level during the past 15 years. With professional standards of practice in place and an agreement for strategic alliances, NGOs and government can form a powerful non-competitive coalition of successful programs for children and families.

Development of a Holistic Approach:

Because of the extensive educational opportunities afforded and the wide range of sub-grants awarded, many linkages have been created to provide a holistic framework for child and family services. The wide continuum of community-based services developed to take the place of institutions has demanded an inclusive and individualized approach, customized to meet the wide variety of needs presented by families. Integrated services must include those from many disciplines working in concert. These linkages are critical in building and sustaining viable services to children and families.

E. Conclusion and Lessons Learned

“We have not yet arrived, but we now have a road map to follow. When we arrive, we will arrive together.” (*Orthodox Priest and NGO Director*)

A comprehensive system of child protection and child welfare services continues to be a work in progress. However, the ChildNet years of involvement in Romania are concluding with a strong impression of satisfaction and accomplishment. As USAID ends its formal work in Romania, it leaves behind a myriad of achievements. ChildNet has contributed to a sense of national pride by encouraging the demonstration of world-class child welfare services with a noticeable increase in momentum.

More than this, however, is the creation of a viable environment in which demonstrated and credible services can now continue to grow. Advocating for and utilizing a responsive atmosphere of affirmative political will, a foundation was built, models were launched, information linkages were created and formal associations were established. There was very little talk of the past; these organizations have clearly moved on and have a powerful sense of direction and confidence.

It was interesting to note that the beneficiaries of ChildNet funding saw their sub-grants as an experiential means to a much greater end than a time-bound narrow project. For many smaller NGOs with capacity development grants, their worlds expanded and they began to dream bigger dreams, learning how to build stalwart bonds with local, county, and even national partners. ChildNet combined the best of democracy building and civil society with the need to change course by making major shifts in the protection and well-being of children and families.

Three initial questions were proposed in this study, the first relating to ChildNet’s strategy. The critical components that contributed to the success of ChildNet were based in an innovative project design that grew out of many years of past experience and accurate analysis of historical, cultural, social, and political matters. The strategy of alignment with stated governmental goals was best implemented through clear and frequent communication based on long and strong relationships and the trust that developed over time. As a holistic, complex, multi-level and inclusive project, it was able to influence the entire country, setting a precedent that can continue to effectively affirm and support national reform through mechanisms of sustainability.

The second area of consideration was related to the essential program components of ChildNet that helped to create an environment in which child protection could thrive and grow, directly contributing to the achievement of child welfare reform in Romania. Key mechanisms for success identified in this study were (1) participatory multi-level partnerships; (2) a mixed methodology that included not only a sub-grant process strategy but the tools, training, and technical assistance to maximize full participation and success; and (3) a purposeful design for sustainability. Everything in ChildNet was not only future-focused, but was aligned with macro-level goals, helping to effectively and efficiently mobilize the entire process of reform. ChildNet provided “behind the scenes” empowerment, funding, and prompting that never took center stage; in its efforts to assist and encourage ownership and investment, organizational achievements were applauded.

While the Romanian people have undergone many unique experiences, broad principles of ChildNet may be applicable to other countries, especially those in the region. The final question was: What lessons gleaned from the Romanian child welfare progress could be relevant to other countries engaged in reform, especially those in the Europe and Eurasia region?

In light of the many successful aspects of ChildNet, salient principles to consider when engaging in child welfare reform are as follows:

- Project design should be rooted in sound assessment of all factors contributing to the current eco-system. This ability to appropriately assess is based on long-term, trusting relationships built with key stakeholders.
- Sustainability planning must be built in from the beginning with exploration of various methods. Optimal sustainability exists when all elements of the system such as services, training, standards, legislation, and public awareness, can be developed at the same pace.
- Businesses and charitable donations can provide a powerful avenue for child welfare services.
- The project's strategy must be intricately aligned and in partnership with governmental strategic plans. This may indeed cause the project to move off center stage and take on a supportive role. *Prima donna* programming may provide publicity for the donor but sustainable returns could be compromised.
- A project must come under a comprehensive coordination body to avoid duplication, conflict of interest, and the potential of working at cross-purposes.
- As children and families are multi-faceted and must be viewed from a holistic perspective, so child welfare reform must be approached from an integrative, multi-level stance.
- Flexibility opens the door to relevant, innovative, and practical responses.
- Strategic design mandating vested multi-level partnerships can facilitate a basis for team-building and sustainability.
- The educational process of learning to effectively deliver services may be as important as the outcomes. The establishment of solid project management skills can pave the way for sustainability and expansion.
- Trainings, conferences, and workshops should be multi-disciplinary and include both formal and informal opportunities to encourage relationship building and shared vision.
- Project staff must be highly respected, relationship-based professionals who have a commitment to be involved for the life of the project.
- A highly effective and straightforward sub-grant process with various sizes of grants can be used to develop capacity and target underserved populations and geographic areas. Clear structure and outcomes are essential as is openness to innovative, locally envisioned services.
- Sub-grants must be supported with tools and technical assistance to ensure project success.
- Energy should be expended in reaching out to new partners and bringing those who are inexperienced up to optimal professional levels.
- The identification of national model programs that comply with existing policies and demonstrate and publicize best practices can generate a vision for creative possibilities in child welfare.

- Standards of practice are critical to the ability to provide a minimum level of care and protection for all children. They must go hand in hand with dissemination and practical, adult-level participatory training.
- Holistic services rely on multi-level linkages and integrative, cross-cutting methodologies.
- All aspects of programming should create and nurture an environment that encourages strong relationships and communication.

ChildNet, by all standards, has laid very successful and necessary groundwork for ongoing reform in Romania. The continuity of the staff and their long-term, culturally astute, in-depth knowledge of the overarching needs of families and children contributed greatly to the project's success. In addition, an understanding of national, political and economic realities and their impact on the delivery of children's services was essential. Through the standards, partnerships, professional development, capacity development, trainings, creation of community boards, technical assistance, and special projects such as the Best Practice Conference, ChildNet has engraved its signature on the future of child welfare services. As a result of the partnership's ability to both shape the design of services and understand the complex milieu in which the project operated, the legacy of ChildNet's years is comprehensive, nationwide, and will have perpetual impact. There was a keen ability to understand and anticipate the priorities of government, civil society, and citizenry and to work in relationships of good faith. The long-term commitment to child welfare programs and ability to work in partnership provided for this meaningful confluence. A continuum of child protection and well-being services has become a reality for many families in need, and promotion of a spectrum of family based alternatives to institutionalization has resulted in changed lives of thousands of children and families.

Annex – ChildNet Sub-Grants and Contracts

On the following pages are Annexes A, B, C, D, E which present program and fiscal information about each ChildNet sub-grant and Annex F which presents program and fiscal information about each ChildNet contract.

Annex A: *ChildNet Sub-Grants to Established NGOs for Innovative Child Welfare Activities*

Annex B: *ChildNet Sub-Grants to Smaller NGOs for Capacity Building*

Annex C: *ChildNet Sub-Grants to Smaller NGOs Working with Disabled for Capacity Building*

Annex D: *ChildNet Sub-Grants to Established NGOs for Life Skills Activities*

Annex E: *ChildNet Sub-Grants to Established NGOs for Specific Child Welfare Reform Activities*

Annex F: *ChildNet Contracts for Training and Technical Assistance*

ChildNet quarterly reports from 2001 to 2007 are available at www.worldlearning.org/childnet.

Annex A: ChildNet Sub-Grants to Established NGOs for Innovative Child Welfare Activities

(April 2002 to September 2004)

No	Applicant	Local Government Partners	Location	Start Date	End Date	ChildNet Award	Cost Share	Activities
1	Pentru Copiii Nostri (PCN)	County Council of Vrancea and Tulcea and Mayors of Dumitresti, Tifesti, Cirligele, Vidra, Straoane, Urechesti, Mahmudia, Greci, Sulina, Peceneaga, Jurilovca, Niculitel, Topolog, Gugesti, Dumbraveni, Macin	Counties: Vrancea, Tulcea	April 08, 2002	March 31, 2004	\$509,773	\$224,669	Provide day care centers, foster care network, life skills training for adolescents, community consultative boards in 16 localities in 2 counties
2	SERA	County Councils of Caras Severin and Prahova, Municipality of Ploiesti	Resita, Caransebes (Caras Severin County), Ploiesti (Prahova County)	April 30, 2002	April 30, 2004	\$509,946	\$288,851	Close 2 state-run residential institutions and provide rehabilitation centers for disabled children, day care centers, family counseling and support services, training programs for specialized personnel.
3	Inima de Copil <u>Partner Organization:</u> Project Concern Int'l	DPC Galati	Galati County	June 06, 2002	May 31, 2004	\$199,210	\$132,878	Close a residential institution and provide reintegration services, maternal assistants program, permanency plans, day care center and professional training program.
4	Pentru Fiecare Copil o Familie (PFCE) <u>Partner Organization:</u> SCOP, ASB Timisoara	County Council of Caras Severin, Timis	Counties: Caras-Severin, Timis	June 06, 2002	May 31, 2004	\$200,000	\$167,945	Provide counseling and support centers for women at risk of abandonment of infants, day care centers, parent training programs, vocational training for adolescents leaving placement centers – in 12 communities in 2 target counties.
5	Int'l Orthodox Christian Charities (IOCC) <u>Partner Organization:</u> Romanian Orthodox Church	DPC: Dolj, Gorj Mehedinti, Mayoralty Punghina, County Police Inspectorate: Mehedinti, Dolj, Gorj, County Health Department: Dolj, Gorj	Counties: Dolj, Gorj, Mehedinti	May 08, 2002	April 30, 2004	\$199,813	\$135,489	Provide community-based, family centered social assistance services throughout rural areas of 3 target counties in partnership with Romanian Orthodox Church network of rural priests and local government child welfare specialists.

6	Bethphage <u>Partner Organizations:</u> Motivation Romania, Trebuie, ASCHF-R	DPC Bucharest sector 3 and Ilfov	Bucharest sector 3, Ilfov County	June 28, 2002	June 30, 2004	\$200,000	\$126,967	Through a partnership of 4 NGOs and two county directions, provide group houses and living units, foster placements, family reunification, respite care, parent training and deinstitutionalization services for children with disabilities.
7	Fundatia Pestalozzi <u>Partner Organization:</u> Family and Child Protection Foundation	DPC Buzau, Gorj, Sector 5 Bucharest	Counties: Buzau, Gorj Bucharest sector 5	Sept 02, 2002	Aug 31, 2004	\$189,241	\$88,582	Provide reintegration services, foster placements, community centers that provide school activities, diagnostic services, independent living skills, counseling and material assistance in 3 locations.
8	Fundatia Caminul Phillip <u>Partner Organization:</u> Community Development Assoc.	Mayor of Nehoiu, DPC Buzau	Nehoiu (Buzau County)	Sept 10, 2002	Aug 31, 2004	\$140,376	\$47,222	Provide day care center, deinstitutionalization services, vocational training and income generating activities.
9	Fundatia de Sprijin Comunitar (FSC) <u>Partner Organization:</u> The Doe Fund	Bacau City Hall and DPC Police Dept, Health Dept, School Inspectorate, Desteptarea (newspaper) and Asociatia Betania	Bacau	April 24, 2002	April 31, 2004	\$172,709	\$81,394	Reduce truancy and child beggars by providing vocational training for mothers and educational services for children.
10	Fundatia Copiilor Nostri <u>Partner Organization:</u> ARED (Romanian Association for Education and Development)	Mayor of Caragiale, DPC Dimbovita, DPC sector 1	Bucharest sector 1, Targoviste, Caragiale (Dambovita County)	June 19, 2002	June 30, 2004	\$143,475	\$53,095	Provide community resource centers, day care and kindergartens, family support services and parent training in 2 communities.
11	Bethany <u>Partner Organization:</u> Bethany Christian Services Intl	County Council of, Neamt, Vaslui, Bistrita Nasaud, Hunedoara, Arad	Counties: Neamt, Vaslui, Bistrita Nasaud, Hunedoara, Arad	April 23, 2002	April 30, 2004	\$470,807	\$239,056	Provide family reintegration services, foster care, independent living skills training, employment generation, and national adoptions in 5 counties.
12	Mission Without Borders Romania <u>Partner Organization:</u> World Vision Int'l - Romania, Prosocial	County Council of Alba, Orthodox Patriarchy, Local Council Aiud	Alba County	Sept.12, 2002	August 31, 2004	\$199,475	\$96,718	Provide case management services, health services, day care center, parent counseling and training for rural social workers.

13	Fundatia Internationala pentru Copil si Familie (FICF)	County Council –DPC Valcea, Galati and Brasov	Counties: Galati, Valcea, Brasov	August 06, 2002	July 31, 2004	\$198,897	\$71,960	Provide reintegration services, prevention services, counseling, parent training, domestic violence prevention and training of specialized personnel in 3 counties.
14	Asociatia Alternative Sociale (AAS) <u>Partner Organization:</u> Community Safety and Mediation Center	County Council, Police and DPC Iasi, The Service of Social Reinsertion Service of Iasi Court, Metropolitan Church of Moldova , Save the Children NGO, Prosecutor Offices, Juvenile Court, Magistrates Assoc., Iasi Legal Clinic	Iasi County	Sept.17, 2002	Sept.30, 2004	\$216,936	\$83,807	Provide training for professionals, foster care program, crisis intervention, reintegration services, family counseling.
15	Asociatia Profesionala Nonguvernamentala de Asistenta Sociala (ASSOC)	DPC Maramures, The State Inspectorate for People with Special Needs	Baia Mare - Maramures County	July 17, 2002	June 30, 2004	\$137,873	\$37,351	Provide reintegration services, foster care, permanency planning, and mobile team for disabled children.
16	Fundatia pentru Dezvoltarea Popoarelor prin Sustinere Reciproca (FDPSR) <u>Partner Organization:</u> AVSI USA, Health Aid Romania	Specialized public Service for Child Protection Ilfov, Ilfov County Council , Bucharest Orthodox Church and Bucharest Romano-Catholic Church	Bucharest and Ilfov County	July 17, 2002	July 31, 2004	\$118,312	\$52,674	Provide services for HIV positive children including counseling and family type residential services.

Annex B: ChildNet Sub-Grants to Smaller NGOs for Capacity Building

(July 2002 to August 2003)

No.	Applicant	Local Government Partners	Location	Start Date	End Date	ChildNet Award	Cost Share	Activities
17	Asociatia Sprijinirea Integrarii Sociale (ASIS)	DPC sect.4,5,6	Bucharest, sector 5,6	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$17,445	\$18,193	Social integration of children leaving placement centers
18	Pro Child Romania	DPC sector 3	23 NGOs	August 2, 2002	August 1, 2003	\$22,313	\$19,794	Promote social services through the NGO members of the federation
19	Asoc.Centrul de Studii & Prog.pt. Dezv. Serv. Comunit. ASCENDENT	Primaria 1 Dec., Scoala	Locality 1 Decembrie (Ilfov County)	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$19,235	\$4,380	Social intervention to reduce the risk of abandonment in poor families
20	Centrul de Recuperare a Copiilor cu Handicap Motor Cluj (CRCHM)	DPC Cluj	Cluj (Cluj County)	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$23,992	\$10,400	Assistance for handicapped children, family support, personal assistants.
21	RENINCO	DPC from 3 counties	Counties: Buzau, Timis, Valcea	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$15,373	\$7,800	Reintegration of disabled children
22	PROSOCIAL Cluj	DPC +CJ Alba, Maramures	Counties: Alba and Maramures	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$19,684	\$32,480	Training and supervision for community social workers; establish 2 community centers
23	Asociatia Hraniti Copiii -Feed the Children	DPC sector 2	Bucharest, sector 2	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$20,563	\$5,440	Family support, counseling, day care center
24	Asociatia Sfantul Petru si Pavel	Prefectura Timis	County: Timis	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$18,475	\$6,950	Social reintegration and residential services for delinquent children
25	Organizatia pentru Copii si Adulti cu Nevoi Speciale TREBUIE - Filiala OLT	DPC Olt	Slatina (Olt County)	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$19,020	\$5,300	Prevention of abandonment and institutionalization; Reintegration of children with special needs

26	Asociatia Sfanta Ana	DPC sector 1	Bucharest, sector 1	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$13,642	\$3,490	Services for children with severe mental handicaps
27	Fundatia FOC	DPC sector 5	Bucharest, sector 5	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$19,972	\$7,137	Services for the victims of family violence, abuse
28	Fundatia pentru Initiative Comunitare Cojocna	Primaria Cojocna	Cojocna village (Cluj County)	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$18,297	\$4,590	Prevention of school abandonment, training for parents
29	Fundatia OMENIA	Asociatia Mestesugarilor Nemteanca, Administratia Publica Locala	Tirgu Neamt (Neamt County)	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$12,438	\$3,124	Life skills for adolescents from poor families and placement centers
30	Organizatia pentru Copii si Adulti cu Nevoi Speciale TREBUIE - Filiala Sebes	Min.Muncii si Solid.Soc	Sebes (Alba County)	July 5, 2002	July 4, 2003	\$9,280	\$10,804	Services and activities for disabled preschoolers
31	Fundatia Romana "O voce a Sperantei"	DPC Tulcea	Babadag (Tulcea County)	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$19,931	\$11,409	Reorganize a day care center and reduce the number of children in residential institutions
32	Asociatia "Copii Sperantei"	Primaria Vladesti, AASP Valcea	Vladesti (Valcea County)	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$16,847	\$4,315	Social services network in child protection
33	Asociatia Filantropia Ortodoxa	DPC Alba	County: Alba	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$7,206	\$5,600	Help-Line for children
34	Fundatia Sfantii Imparati Constantin si Elena Focsani	Dir.Jud.M-ca Vrancea	County: Vrancea	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$19,900	\$7,550	Social reintegration, life skills
35	Fundatia Pentru Ajutorarea Categ.Soc.Defavorizate Medgidia	Holt, Local Council Medgidia	Medgidia (Constanta County)	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$13,668	\$3,450	Parents' skills training, education for parents
36	Asociatia Humanitas Pro Deo	DPC Hunedoara, Primarie	Petrila (Hunedoara County)	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$20,000	\$7,096	Social assistance for poor families, community awareness
37	Fundatia "Cezara Codruta Marica"	DPC Mures	County: Mures	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$8,000	\$2,000	Alternative services for children with mental handicaps.

38	A.S.C.H.F.-R (Asociatia de Sprijin a Copiilor Handicapati Fizic Romania) Filiala Neamt	DPC Neamt	Roman (Neamt County)	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$17,976	\$4,756	Alternative services, rehabilitation center for disabled children
39	ASOCIATIA DOMUS	DPC Harghita	County: Harghita	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$17,905	\$16,219	Skills development for adolescents social integration
40	Asociatia SETRA Faurei	DPC Braila, Primaria	Braila (Braila County)	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$8,000	\$2,000	Skills development for institutionalized children, social integration
41	Asociatia de Binefacere "Diaconia" Braila	DPC Braila, Directia Penitenciarelor Braila	County: Braila	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$18,416	\$4,736	Prevention of family abandonment of children with imprisoned parents
42	Fundatia "Podul Dragostei"	DPC Vaslui	County: Vaslui	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$8,250	\$4,191	Deinstitutionalization through placement with maternal assistants
43	Asociatia "Casuta Dragostei"	DPC Dolj	County: Dolj	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$19,500	\$6,500	Social reintegration of institutionalized children
44	Fundatia Crestina de Asistenta Sociala "CASA"	DPC Bihor	County: Bihor	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$9,966	\$2,492	Assistance for single mothers, social reintegration
45	Asociatia "Lumina" Comanesti	Primaria Comanesti	Comanesti (Bacau County)	Aug 1, 2002	July 31, 2003	\$17,950	\$4,870	Center for information and training for parents and maternal assistants

Annex C: ChildNet Sub-Grants to Smaller NGOs Working with Disabled Children for Capacity Building

(November 2003 to November 2004)

No.	Applicant	Local Government Partners	Location	Start Date	End Date	ChildNet Award	Cost Share	Activities /Services
46	Fundatia RCE Speranta Copiilor	DPC Arad, School Inspectorate Arad County	Arad (Arad County)	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$20,000	\$5,000	Social and health services for children with special needs.
47	Fundatia Totul pentru Copii	DPC Sector 3 DPC Sector 4	Bucharest	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$19,232	\$19,000	Deinstitutionalization and special services for children with special needs.
48	Asociatia Langdon Down Oltenia	Local Council Bailesti Jud. Dolj, DPC Dolj,	Bailesti (Dolj County)	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$19,656	\$15,732	Day care center for children with severe handicap.
49	FRCCF (Fundatia Romana pentru Copiii, Comunitate si Familie)	DPC Maramures, Local Council Baia Mare, City Hall Baia Mare	Baia Mare (Maramures County)	Nov. 17, 2003	Nov. 30, 2004	\$19,817	\$27,824	Prevention, deinstitutionalization and additional services for children with special needs.
50	Fundatia Mara	DPC Hunedoara, City Hall Deva	Hunedoara, (Hunedoara County)	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$17,082	\$8,358	Deinstitutionalization and alternative services for children with special needs.
51	Organizatia pentru Copii si Adulti cu Nevoi Speciale Trebuie – Filiala Braila	School Inspectorate Braila County, DPC Braila	Braila (Braila County)	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$18,300	\$7,574	Independent living training for children with special needs.
52	Fundatia Conexiuni	DPC Hunedoara, City Hall Vulcan, City Hall Petrosani, S.C. Soci Pro SRL Petrosani	Vulcan, Petrosani (Hunedoara County)	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$9,860	\$3,027	Prevention services and training for personnel working with children with special needs
53	Holt Romania – Fundatia de Consultanta si Servicii Sociale pentru Copii si Familii	DPC: Constanta, Iasi, Mures, Bucuresti, Org. “Si Tu”, Sf. Maria Foundation, Day Care Center “Aurora”, Org. Star of Hope	Counties: Constanta, Iasi, Mures, Bucharest	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$19,302	\$5,280	Prevention services for families with children with special needs

54	Asociatia Socio-Culturala Matei Basarab	DPC Ialomita, Episcopia Sloboziei si Calarasilor	Slobozia (Ialomita County)	Nov. 17, 2003	Nov. 30, 2004	\$19,948	\$6,760	Deinstitutionalization and reintegration services for children with special needs.
55	Fundatia Romanian Children's Appeal	DPC Sector 3	Bucharest	Nov. 17, 2003	Nov. 30, 2004	\$17,317	\$6,076	Personnel training and alternative services for HIV infected children.
56	Fundatia Alaturi de Voi	DPC: Bacau, Botosani, Prahova, Suceava, Vaslui, Galati	Counties: Bacau, Botosani, Galati, Prahova, Suceava, Vaslui	Nov. 17, 2003	Nov. 30, 2004	\$19,996	\$11,036	Personnel training and alternative services for HIV infected children.
57	Fundatia Casa Luminii	DPC Olt	Olt (Slatina)	Nov. 17, 2003	Nov. 30, 2004	\$19,330	\$3,360	Rehabilitation, deinstitutionalization and training for independent living.
58	Asociatia Sprijiniti Copiii	Filiala Hunedoara, Calan City Hall, Hunedoara Social Work Department, Ovid Densusianu Calan School	Calan (Hunedoara County)	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$20,000	\$20,570	Home care and rehabilitation services for children with special needs.
59	A.S.C.H.F. - R. (Asociatia de Sprijin a Copiilor Handicapati Fizic Romania) Filiala Olt	Corabia City Hall, Corabia Local Council	Corabia (Olt County)	Nov. 17, 2003	Nov. 30, 2004	\$16,598	\$14,449	Prevention and social reintegration for children with special needs.
60	Asociatia Romana Anti SIDA ARAS Piatra Neamt	DPC Neamt	Piatra Neamt (Neamt County)	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$19,595	\$4,908	Day care center for HIV infected children.
61	Asociatia Asistentilor Sociali Profesioniști, Valcea	DPC Valcea, Valcea Social Protection Dept.	Rm.Valcea (Valcea County)	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$19,690	\$2,400	Prevention and support services for families with HIV infected children.
62	Fundatia Un copil, o Speranta	DPC Sibiu, Sibiu City Hall, Sibiu County Council-Child Protection Dept.	Sibiu (Sibiu County)	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$20,000	\$21,302	Rehabilitation and prevention services for children with special needs.
63	Asociatia pentru Copii si Adulti cu Handicap Psihic Speranta Braila	DPC Braila, Braila County Council-Child Protection Dept.	Braila (Braila County)	Nov. 17, 2003	Nov. 30, 2004	\$16,243	\$5,172	Counseling and social reintegration of children with autism.

64	Asociatia Esperando	DPC Maramures, MM County Council-Social Assistance Dept., Baia Mare Local Council	Baia Mare (Maramures County)	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$19,091	\$13,338	Rehabilitation and counseling services for children with special needs.
65	Organizatia Usile Deschise	Pestalozzi, DPC Sector 2, 3, Mioveni , Arges County Local Development Dept., Hilton Hotel, Social Dialog Group	Bucharest	Nov 17, 2003	Nov 30, 2004	\$19,892	\$11,970	Home care and rehabilitation services for children with special needs.

Annex D: ChildNet Sub-Grants to Established NGOs for Life Skills Activities

(July 2002 to December 2005)

No.	Applicant	Local Government Partners	Location	Start Date	End Date	ChildNet Award	Cost Share	Activities
66	Asociatia Hraniti Copiii- Feed the Children)	DPDC sector 2, Police Department sector 2, Public Health Dept., Tehnologica Radion SRL, Youth & Sports Ministry, Diamant Group SA	Bucharest Sect. 2	July 17, 2002	July 31, 2005	\$103,477	\$184,420	Life skills, social and occupational integration for special needs children; closure of Lizuca Placement Center
67	Organizatia Salvati Copiii (Save the Children)	DJPDC+AJOFM+County Councils from Neamt, Iasi, Dambovita, Vaslui, Galati and Bucharest sector 1	Counties: Neamt, Dobrogea, Iasi, Vaslui, Galati, Bucharest	Nov 26, 2003	Nov 30, 2005	\$148,060	\$77,009	Life skills, social-occupational integration of children, deinstitutionalization from placement centers
68	Prison Fellowship Romania	DJPDC Bistrita, DJPDC Cluj, St. Mary School in Bistrita	Counties: Cluj, Bistrita Nasaud	Oct 01, 2003	Sept 30, 2005	\$90,116	\$99,260	Life skills, social/occupational integration for children with incarcerated parents
69	ASSOC (Asociatia Profesionala Nonguvernamentala de Asistenta Sociala)	DJPDC Maramures, AJOFM Maramures, Somaschi Foundation, ProVita Foundation, Mantart SRL, Flexibil SRL, Prelucmar SRL	Maramures County	Oct 16, 2003	Oct 31, 2005	\$146,602	\$59,622	Life skills, social/occupational reintegration services for children
70	Inima de Copil (IDC)	DJPDC Galati, DJPDC Braila, AJOFM Galati, SC Galfirtex SA, SC EMCOD PROD COM SRL	Galati (Galati County), Braila (Braila	Nov 11, 2003	Nov 30, 2005	\$112,183	\$137,713	Life skills, social and occupational integration of children from two placement centers

			County)					
71	Pestalozzi Foundation	DJPDC Giurgiu and Buzau, AJOFM Giurgiu and Buzau, Texware SRL, SC GHE-STUBEANU, M CONSTRUCT SRL, ALPHA CONSTRUCT SRL	Counties: Buzau, Giurgiu	Sept 29, 2003	Sept 30, 2005	\$107,773	\$81,761	Life skills, social/occupational integration of children
72	SCOP (Societatea pentru Copii si Parinti)	AJOFM Timis, Rudolf Walter Foundation, DJPDC Timis, City Halls in Timisoara, Sannicolau Mare, Dudestii Vechi, Valcani, Cheglevici	Timisoara County	Oct 1, 2003	Sept 30, 2005	\$147,205	\$98,059	Life skills, social /occupational reintegration services for children
73	<u>Main Applicant:</u> HOPE World Wide Romania <u>Partner Organization:</u> Bulgarasii de Aur	County Council Ilfov, Bucharest Marriott,	Ilfov County	Oct 07, 2003	Sept 30, 2005	\$111,029	\$126,694	Transitional Living Center serving children
74	Asociatia Sprijinirea Integrarii Sociale (ASIS)	DPDC sector 5, DPDC sector 4, DPDC sector 6, Heidi Premium Chocolate, Sfera Plastic Design, Trans Top Tim SRL,	Bucharest Sect. 4, Sect. 5, Sect. 6	Dec 12, 2003	Dec 31, 2005	\$106,438	\$111,247	Independent life skills training and social integration for children

Annex E: ChildNet Sub-Grants to Established NGOs for Specific Child Welfare Reform Activities

(September 2004 to March 2006)

No.	Applicant	Local Partners	Location	Start Date	End Date	ChildNet Award	Cost Share	Activities and Services Provided
75	FRCCF	DPC Cluj, Dej Town Hall	Dej (Cluj County)	Sep 29, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$49,726	\$14,085	Community based day care center
76	Inocenti Foundation	Romanian Childrens' Relief, DPC Bistrita, Bistrita County Hospital, Bistrita Rotaract Club, School of Nursing in Bistrita	Beclean (Bistrita Nasaud County)	Sep 27, 2004	Sep 30, 2005	\$49,662	\$26,756	Outreach services and support for children exiting the Camin Spital in Beclean
77	Mara Foundation	General Direction for Children's Rights Protection – Hunedoara County, The Curative Pedagogical Center in Simeria	Deva, Simeria (Hunedoara County)	Sep 29, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$49,381	\$63,354	Counseling and Support Center for providing specialized services for children with hearing deficiencies
78	Holt Romania	Holt International Children's Services	Constanta, Iasi, Mures, Braila, Alba, Ialomita, Suceava, Bacau, Dimbovita, Giurgiu, Covasna, Bucharest	Sep 21, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$48,860	\$47,190	Improve domestic adoption services, establish Adoptive Parent Associations
79	Sfanta Ana/Saint Ana Association	General Direction for Social Welfare of District 1; Special	Bucharest, District 1	Sep 22, 2004	Sep 30, 2005	\$23,580	\$15,853	Create a department within the association for severely mentally disabled children, provide rehabilitation and independent living training

		School 10; Petrom, Inc., "SIROIS" Foundation for Romanian Children; S.C. Zefirul, Ltd.						
80	Diaconia Charitable Association	Braila DCP; Braila School Inspectorate; Braila Department for Dialogue, Family and Social Solidarity; Local Police Department	Braila County	Sep 23, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$48,555	\$18,978	Offer assistance to children and their families to prevent institutionalization
81	ARED-Targoviste	DJPDC Dambovita; Dambovita County Council; Targoviste, Pucioasa, Doicesti, Sotanga, Teis; I.L. Caragiale; Kindergartens and Primary Schools; County Department for Public Health; National College for Pedagogy ; "Valahia" University; Floriana Foundation	Dambovita County: Pucioasa, Caragiale, Doicesti, Sotanga, Teis	Sep 23, 2004	Sep 30, 2005	\$49,830	\$18,075	Extend the previous developed model of community-based services to the rural area of Dambovita County and extend the category of beneficiaries to school age children
82	Prosocial Association	Specialized Public Service, County School Inspectorate, Health Dept. from Satu Mare and Alba Counties	Satu Mare and Alba Counties	Sep 23, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$47,014	\$34,000	Create a network of specialized maternal assistants for disabled children.
83	Filantropia Ortodoxa Asociation <u>Partner organization:</u> Prosocial Association	Town Halls, from Ocna Mures and Cetatea de Balta, DGPDC Alba	Ocna Mures and Cetatea de Balta (Alba County)	Sep 23, 2004	Sep 30, 2005	\$44,321	\$13,450	Establish two community centers and develop a network of social assistance services.
84	FICF/International Foundation for Child and Family	DGPDC Galati and Valcea; Local Communities;	Galati and Valcea Counties	Sep 23, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$144,972	\$41,043	Create community counseling centers for abused, neglected and trafficked children
85	World Vision - Romania.	DPC and	Valcea	Sep 30,	Mar 31,	\$100,885	\$32,280	Provide early intervention services for children with

		Department of Social Assistance of Valcea County	County	2004	2006			disabilities
86	Salvati Copiii/Save the Children-Romania	DPC Bucharest District 1,2; County DPC in Iasi, Neamt, Suceava; School Inspectorates; Centers for Abused and Neglected Child; Local Schools	Bucharest; Iasi, Suceava, Neamt Counties	Sep 22, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$148,987	\$64,727	Decrease child labor through rehabilitation and school reintegration for working street children
87	Vasiliada Association	Archiepiscopacy of Craiova, IOCC, ANCAAR, DSA Mehedinti, DJPDC Dolj, DJPDC Gorj	Counties: Dolj, Gorj, Mehedinti	Sep 24, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$149,935	\$79,262	Establish center for children with autism; support for families at risk of child abandonment
88	Hope for Children International	DJPDC Botosani, Dorohoi City Hall and Municipal Hospital, Child Life International, Center of Hope, Neemia Association	Botosani County: Dorohoi	Sep 17, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$115,791	\$ 48522	Establish a day care center and a counseling center
89	Bethany Social Services Foundation - Romania <u>Partner organization:</u> Bethany Christian Services International	DPC/DAS from counties: Bacau, Calarasi, Cluj, Constanta, Dolj, Iasi, Prahova, Suceava, Timis, Maramures; Metropolitan Church of Banat	Counties: Bacau, Calarasi, Cluj, Constanta, Dolj, Iasi, Prahova, Suceava, Timis, Cluj, Maramures	Sep 17, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$149,986	\$76,156	Promote national adoption through awareness campaigns, post adoption support services and training sessions for child welfare professionals.
90	Alternative Sociale Association <u>Partner organization:</u> Save the Children Romania – Iasi Branch	DPC Vaslui, DPC Botosani, Vaslui and Botosani County Police Inspectorates, Metropolitan Church of Moldova	Vaslui and Botosani Counties	Sep 30, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$149,824	\$55,728	Create specialized services for abused and neglected children and their families.

		and Bucovina, Judges Association Iasi						
91	ASSOC - Professional Nongovernmental Association of Social Assistance	DGPDC/DAS Maramures, Direction of Public Health Maramures, "Hope for Romania" Foundation	Maramures County	Sep 30, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$149,172	\$51,513	Develop a rehabilitation service for disabled children in foster care, prevention of infant abandonment.
92	Bethphage USA <u>Partner organizations:</u> Motivation Romania Foundation, ASCHF-R Bucharest Branch-Aurora Day Care Center, Trebuie- Organization for Children and Adults with Special Needs	Bucharest City Hall- Sector 3, Bucharest DPC-Sector 3, Ilfov County Council and Public Service for Child Protection, Cornetu Local Council	Bucharest Sector 3, Ilfov County: Bragadiru, Cornetu, Clinceni, Domnesti, Magurele, Darasti, Tancabesti.	Oct 1, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$135,000	\$90,000	Establish three community-based services for children with disabilities
93	CRIPS	National Authority for the Protection of Child Rights	41 counties, 6 sector of Bucharest	Nov 24, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$147,112	\$36,868	Training of trainers and consultants for implementation of standards, information sessions concerning standards and new legislation; development of institutional framework for the promotion of child welfare services
93 *	Fundatia de Sprijin Comunitar (FSC) <u>Partner organizations:</u> Ovidiu Rom Association Alex Fund	City Hall Bacau, Public Service for Social Assistance and Child Protection, Direction of Public Health, County School Inspectorate, County Agency for Labor Occupancy, Victim Protection and Delinquent Social Reintegration Services of Bacau Court	Bacau	Dec 21, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$97,070	\$110,525	Decrease the number of children who are working to support their families, increase the number of children receiving community based services and decrease the number of abandoned children by increasing the number of self sustained families
94	Ovidiu Rom Association	Bucharest School Inspectorate,	Bucharest Sectors 4	Dec 21, 2004	Mar 31, 2006	\$124,146	\$49,245	Decrease the number of abused, neglected or exploited children by supporting their families, increase the

*		Children Club Sector 5, City Hall Sector 5	and 5					number of families receiving community based services; prevent children from entering the protection system by increasing the sustainability of their families
95 *	Saint Stelian Association	Bucharest General Direction of Social Assistance, School Inspectorate, Local Council Sector 5 – Direction of Child Protection		Dec 21, 2004	Feb 28, 2006	\$108,706	\$41,732	Prevent children from entering the protection system and decrease the number of abused, neglected or exploited children; increase number of children receiving community based services and develop services for abused, neglect or exploited children and their families.

* Sub Grants transferred from GRASP to ChildNet at request of USAID

Annex F: ChildNet Contracts for Training and Technical Assistance

(November 2001 to July 2007)

No.	Contractor	Partner	Start/ End Date	Amount from ChildNet	Counties	Activities
1	American Humane Association		11/01- 7/06	\$82,845	all counties and Bucharest	Training, technical assistance and consultation on preventing child abuse/ neglect and on case management
2	CRIPS	NACPR	2/02-3/03	\$57,400	all counties and Bucharest	NACPR quarterly magazine and website that disseminates child welfare info to professionals
3	ProChild	FONPC	2/02- 11/03	\$53,436	all counties and Bucharest	Best practices in child welfare program - conference, training and technical assistance for 250 professionals
4	Pentru Copiii Nostri	National Association of Mayors	4/02- 7/03	\$158,756	Braila, Maramures, Satu Mare, Vrancea, Timis, Bihor, Buzau, Bacau, Neamt, Ialomita, Giurgiu, Arges	Child welfare training for 700 mayors
5	World Vision/ Romania	Prof. Social Workers Assoc., ProSocial, Pentru Copiii Nostri	4/02- 12/02	\$196,221	Braila, Maramures, Satu Mare, Vrancea, Timisoara, Bihor, Dambovita, Buzau	Child welfare training for 120 community social workers
6	Foundation Princess Margareta of Romania	Opportunity Associates, ECHOSOC	7/02- 8/03	\$105,786	Bucharest, Ilfov, Cluj, Buzau, Timis, Valcea, Alba, Maramures, Slatina, Cojocna, Tg.Neamt, Sebes, Baia Mare	Training and technical assistance for capacity building of 15 small child welfare NGOs
7	Foundation for Civil Society Development	CRIPS	7/02- 8/03	\$101,873	Tulcea, Valcea, Alba, Vrancea, Constanta, Hunedoara, Mures, Neamt, Harghita, Braila, Vaslui, Dolj, Bihor, Bacau	Training and technical assistance for capacity building of 15 small child welfare NGOs
8	CRIPS II	NACPAR	3/03- 3/04	\$47,000	all counties and Bucharest	NACPAR quarterly magazine and website that disseminates child welfare info to professionals
9	National Federation of Social Workers of Romania		5/03- 5/04	\$59,822	all counties and Bucharest	Technical assistance to promote social work profession, code of ethics, standards

10	Pentru Copiii Nostri II	National Association of Mayors	7/03- 12/03	\$91,928	Vaslui, Caras Severin, Arad, Bistrita Nasaud, Teleorman, Calarasi	Child welfare training for 340 mayors
11	CRIPS III	NACPA , UNICEF	8/03- 12/04	\$122,860	all counties and Bucharest	Training for all 462 members of County Commissions for Child Protection
12	CENTRAS	CRIPS, Natl. Fed. Of Social Workers	12/03- 12/04	\$141,554	Arad, Bucharest, Olt, Maramures, Hunedoara, Braila, Constanta, Ialomita, Iasi, Alba, Neamt, Sibiu, Valcea	Training and technical assistance for capacity building of 20 small child welfare NGOs providing services for disabled children
13	ProChild II		12/03- 02/054	\$87,527	all counties and Bucharest	Training and technical assistance for replication of best practice models of child welfare services
14	Foundation Tulane Romania	SERA, Johnson & Johnson, IOMC	1/04- 12/05	\$149,920	Bistrita, Bacau, Braila, Iasi, Maramures, Mehedinti, Timis, Valcea	Training for 1,600 professionals working with disabled children
15	Pentru Copiii Nostri III	National Association of Mayors	2/04- 2/05	\$59,330	all counties and Bucharest	Follow up training and technical assistance in child welfare for 200 mayors
16	Pentru Copiii Nostri IV		2/04- 8/05 completed	\$156,898	Suceava, Neamt, Bacau, Buzau, Sibiu, Caras, Alba, Dambovita, Giurgiu, Ilfov	Training and technical assistance for establishing 848 community boards for child welfare, development of curriculum for county authorities training
17	INDACO		3/04- 12/04	\$75,000	all counties and Bucharest	Training and technical assistance for implementing national child welfare monitoring, information and tracking system
18	CRIPS IV	NACPR	3/04- 3/05	\$53,800	all counties and Bucharest	NACPR quarterly magazine and website that disseminates child welfare info to professionals
19	ProChild III	FONPC	05/05 – 06/06	\$102,703	all counties and Bucharest	Dissemination of standards for child welfare services to NGOs
20	Pentru Copiii Nostri V		04/05 – 04/06	\$178,849	41 county departments for social assistance	Develop curriculum for child welfare specialist training, establish 410 new community boards and train 123 county officials and 82 social workers, produce 4 000 copies of a guide for local authorities
21	Natl. Fed. Of Social Workers II		01/05 – 08/05	\$73,000	all counties and Bucharest	Establish Romanian National College for Social Workers and support start-up activities
22	CRIPS V		08/05 – 01/06	\$21,626	all counties and Bucharest	Editing, printing & distribution of two issues of NAPCR newsletter
23	United Way Romania		11/05 – 05/06	\$18,228	Bucharest	Organize awareness and fundraising campaigns, promote private philanthropy in order to increase the amount distributed to NGOs for children
24	Pentru Copiii Nostri VI		05/06 – 12/06	\$24,450	all counties and Bucharest	Create, at the County (DGASPC) level the intake service and develop a methodology for this service

25	ProChild IV	FONPC	06/06 – 11/06	\$24,116	all counties and Bucharest	Organize the negotiation process between FONPC and ProChild and build the combined National Federation of 100 child welfare NGOs
26	Broken Heart Foundation		06/06 – 11/06	\$4,801	Bucharest	Training and curricula for maternal assistants with children with special needs
27	Hraniti Copiii Foundation	Leaders Foundation, Marriott Hotel	07/06 – 04/07	\$12,125	Bucharest	Provide social support for “Youth Career Initiative” – vocational training and social integration for young people
28	Progress Foundation	Strategicus Consulting; Association for Community Relations	07/06 – 02/07	\$67,169	Bucharest, Cluj, Alba, Sibiu, Olt, Braila, Valcea, Gorj, Ialomita, Mures, Neamt, Caras, Maramures, Vrancea	Increase capacity for being sustainable for 24 participating small NGOs by delivering training and technical assistance
29	United Way Romania II		08/06 – 06/07	\$43,525	Bucharest	Support the strategic development of UWRo through volunteer involvement, organizational excellence, community impact, PR, Marketing & Communications
30	National Society for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect-SNCAN		11/06 – 07/07	\$7,059	Bucharest	Increase public awareness on child abuse, neglect and exploitation issues and develop an interdisciplinary network of professionals working in the field

U. S. Agency for International Development
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20523
Tel: (202) 712-0000
Fax: (202) 216-3524
www.usaid.gov