Slavery and child labour: governance and social responsibility project

Mid-term evaluation report

Asmita Naik

Independent consultant

22 November 2010

Table of Contents

Contents	Page numbers

Acronyms

ASI – Anti-Slavery International
CDW – Child Domestic Workers
DW – Domestic Workers
DBIS – Department for Business, Innovation and Skills
DFID – Department for International Development
DWP – Department for Work and Pensions
GTF – Governance and Transparency Fund
ILC – International Labour Conference
ILO – International Labour Organisation
NGO – Non-governmental organisations
SGS – Small Grants Scheme
TUC – Trade Union Congress

Evaluator's contact details: Asmita Naik, Independent Consultant

Email address: asmitanaik.consultancy@gmail.com; asmita.naik@yahoo.com; asmita99@yahoo.co.uk

Tel: + 44 (0) 208 558 7578; + 44 (0) 776 323 3868

Executive Summary

Introduction

1. This report was commissioned by Anti-Slavery International in order to evaluate its four year project on child domestic workers (CDW) which runs from 2008 to 2012 and is being implemented in partnership with local organisations in six countries (Costa Rica, India, Peru, Philippines, Tanzania and Togo). The project is funded by DFID's Governance and Transparency Fund and the Oak Foundation; it has an overall budget of nearly £2 million with DFID/GTF contributing some three-quarters of the overall budget.

2. The evaluation was carried by an external consultant in accordance with DFID/GTF requirements between June and November 2010. It used a qualitative methodology comprised of documentary review, interviews, focus group discussions and an evaluation questionnaire. The evaluator visited three out of the six project countries (Costa Rica, India and Togo) and assessed the remaining countries on the basis of information provided in self-assessment forms (annex 5). The evaluation assessed the project according to a number of criteria listed in the evaluation terms of reference (annex 4) namely, relevance, impact, effectiveness and efficiency. A full list of contributors to the evaluation is contained in Annex 3.

Key Conclusions

3. The evaluation concludes that the project is highly relevant; it is deemed a priority among those working on child labour at the international level, and national stakeholders, including government ministers in person, confirmed the importance of this issue to the evaluator during country visits. Although it is early days in terms of impacts, the project can claim credit for influencing international policy on child domestic workers. ASI has been active within the International Labour Organisation and achieved substantiated impacts which involve ensuring that the issue of child domestic workers is integrated into emerging international policy and legislative documents. Impacts at the national level are more sporadic but signs of influence on government policy and practice are starting to appear in places. At an individual level, child domestic workers testify that the project has brought about a positive change in their lives.

4. Despite these encouraging outcomes, the project has not been working at optimum level. The four components of the project have been implemented with uneven success: child participation is working well; the small grants scheme is partially rolled out; advocacy efforts are underway but need strengthening; and the research component has not been as effective as anticipated.

5. The real strength of the project is the strong dedication and commitment of the implementing organizations to the issue. However, it has been held back for a variety of reasons: the project design is overly complex and ambitious for the level of capacity available in the implementing organizations – it does not play to their strengths; and there are logistical difficulties in coordinating partners who are geographically dispersed across six countries

(three continents) and have varying skills and priorities. Moreover, internal management issues at ASI have meant inadequate oversight and support, and a recognised lack of capacity in project design, monitoring and evaluation. The efficiency of the project has been considerably undermined in this first half of the project by these factors and in particular, by the research component which has consumed an inordinate amount of time, resource and energy. The policy impacts described above have infact been achieved at little cost.

6. Some adaptations to the project approach at this stage would facilitate implementation as it moves to completion. A recent change in leadership at programme management level in ASI also brings with it new plans for tackling underlying challenges and the likelihood of increased support for the project. Nonetheless, the expectations of what the project can achieve in terms of GTF must be tempered in the long run; some of the shortcomings are structural and not easily resolved; the project fit with GTF is not as close as it might be; and the project is quarter funded by another donor who has an interest in other types of results which are not necessarily recognised by this particular DFID fund.

7. It is foreseeable that the project will have some important outcomes when it is complete; it should achieve governance impacts of interest to GTF, (for instance, through the important global advocacy work being carried out by ASI), but it will also touch the lives of individual children and bring greater insights to practitioners working on these issues – these impacts can be seen as having an inherent value in and of themselves. The aim now must be to streamline and simplify the design as far as possible so that the implementing organizations can focus on the core objective of influencing governance (policy, legislation, programmes) by mobilizing public opinion, civil society and communities on the issue of CDW.

Key Recommendations

8. The evaluation report suggests that the following recommendations will facilitate implementation of the project and help bring it as far into line as possible with GTF objectives. These are summary recommendations only indicating the types of issues to be addressed, the 'Conclusions and Recommendations' gives further elaboration and explanation:

➢ Defer the research component to a later time when other funds are found to complete the work and divert the research budget to other project components.
➢ Decide how the research done so far should be used taking into account the ethical considerations and risk factors discussed in this report.
➢ Enhance the child participation component through efforts to involve more children and by seeking greater engagement with decision-making structures.
➢ Strengthen the advocacy component through the development of more holistic advocacy strategies.
➢ Review the focus and purpose of the small grants scheme.
➢ Review project plans, budgets and accounting procedures.
➢ Strengthen project monitoring.
➢ Bring in specialized external expertise to help project staff revise the logframe and budget.
➢ Strengthen overall programme management at ASI.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

9. Anti-Slavery International (ASI), founded in 1839, is the world's oldest international human rights organisation and the only charity in the UK working exclusively against slavery. This project is a continuation of ASI's long-standing work with child domestic workers (CDW): children who work in private households on domestic tasks have a particular vulnerability to exploitation and abuse due to the lack of legal protection governing such work arrangements, the low status of domestic work as an occupation, and the poor socio-economic background from which such children come. ASI takes the view that the rights and protections normally accorded to citizens are so seriously eroded in such situations that domestic work can in effect become a form of slavery.

1.2. Project description

10. The project focuses on six countries where ASI believes a pronounced problem exists: Costa Rica, India, Peru, the Philippines, Tanzania, and Togo. ASI has well established relationships with the local partners involved in this project; the Indian partner is new but the remaining five partners worked on the predecessor project which culminated in the following project publications: *Child Domestic Workers: A Handbook on Good Practice in Programme Interventions* (2005) and *They respect their animals more: Voices of child domestic workers* (2008).

11. The project budget is around £2 million over a period of four years; £1.5 million from DFID/GTF and £400,000 from the Oak Foundation. The application for funding was made in 2007, funds were granted in June 2008, and the project began in September 2008 with an end date of December 2012. The overall purpose of the project is to enhance the protection of CDWs in these six countries (and beyond where possible) by promoting and implementing best practice and encouraging the adoption of legislation for the protection of CDWs, all based on psycho-social research on the effects of domestic work on children.

12. The project is organised around four main streams of activities which are specifically linked to the four outputs listed in the second version of the logframe dated 2010 as follows:

1) Research on the psycho-social impact of domestic work on children which leads to output 1: *"Measures have been promoted to reduce the treatment of CDWs that result in psycho-social or other harm to their health";*

2) Child-participation which is a cross-cutting activity linking with the other three activities also which leads to output 2: *"The situation of CDWs has improved and CDWs have been empowered, as a result of the identification of new good practices and the implementation of previously identified and new good practice models and the delivery of services";*

3) A small grant scheme which leads to output 3: *"The capacity of the NGOs and groups of CDWs involved (as partners or SGS recipients) to defend the rights of CDWs has*

been strengthened, notably to carry out research and advocacy [i.e. influencing statutory and other organisations] and to provide services and share the lessons learned about good practice with other organizations";

4) Advocacy at local, national and international levels which leads to output 4: *"Relations between employers and CDWs have improved".*

1.3. Purpose and scope of evaluation

13. The evaluation was set up in line with DFID's GTF rules and guidance notes[1] which require a mid-term evaluation *"to provide an independent assessment on the progress and performance to date, to measure and report on achievements and early signs of change and impact, and to indicate adjustments that may need to be made to ensure the success of your programme".*

14. The full terms of reference are attached in annex 4 and set out a number of evaluation criteria as well as suggested questions which are summarised here as follows:

- **Relevance:** significance of the project to the local context, and its relationship with national priorities.

- **Impact:** as this is a mid-term evaluation, the focus is on considering emerging and likely impacts both in terms of governance (government level - legislation, policy, programmes) and at the level of children, communities, parents, employers and wider society.

- **Effectiveness:** progress towards achieving the objectives set out in the original proposal, the effectiveness of the programme approaches, challenges, areas for improvement, as well as fit with DFID priorities, especially **equity** and **innovation.** The report takes a preliminary look at **sustainability** and **replicability**.

- **Efficiency:** how the budget and resources have been used in implementation and whether the project represents **value for money**.

15. The evaluation report addresses these evaluation criteria and the proposed issues as far as possible within the time and resource constraints facing the evaluation itself and with regard to their relevance and immediacy at this stage of the project life. The evaluator was informed by ASI in September of the grant administrator's particular interest in knowing about wider organisational and capacity issues at ASI. These matters were considered to the extent feasible within the remit set by this evaluation; while the report does not make a full analysis of these aspects, it does pinpoint a number of issues which arise from a consideration of the project in question.

---

[1] Guidance on Commissioning a Mid-Term Review and Final Evaluation for GTF Grant Holders, 7th April 2009, DFID.

1.4. Evaluation methodology

16. The research comprised two parts: a desk review which included an analysis of documents and stakeholder interviews; and field visits to three out of the six project countries. A qualitative methodology was used which involved the following methods:

Document Review – a review of project and GTF documents as well as supplementary national and international level information provided by ASI, its partners and external counterparts (such as governments and ILO). Specific sources of information are referenced as necessary in the narrative and the footnotes.

Interviews and focus groups - at the global level, this involved phone and face-to-face interviews with ASI staff, former staff and consultants; Triple Line as the grant administrator; and other counterparts such as the ILO, TUC etc. During country visits, meetings were requested with staff, child domestic workers, parents, employers, representatives of other international organizations and civil society groups, government officials etc. Focus groups were the preferred methodology for soliciting information from project beneficiaries such as children, parents, community members etc., as this enabled the participation of a wide and representative cross-section of stakeholders. A list of those contributing to the evaluation is given in annex 3.

Field visits - The project covers a wide range of partners, countries, locations, interventions and sectors. As such and given the limited time available, the evaluator elected to visit half of the project countries (i.e. three out of six) at mid-term stage in order to sample progress being made. The selection of countries was made by the evaluator herself at the very start of the evaluation process on a random basis except for seeking to ensure a balanced regional spread. The evaluator conducted field visits of around seven to ten days to various locations[2] in Costa Rica, India and Togo[3].

Self-assessment questionnaire – a self-assessment questionnaire (annex 5) was developed for the three countries which were not being visited by the evaluator (Peru, Philippines, and Tanzania) in order to assess progress in those locations. The questionnaires were completed by partners in two of the countries (Peru and Tanzania) and their contributions taken into account in this evaluation. The partner in the Philippines did not respond[4].

17. The evaluation observed full confidentiality: meetings with staff, partners, communities, beneficiaries and other counterparts were held without the presence of project staff or others

---

[2] The evaluator visited the capital San Jose in Costa Rica; the capital Lome in Togo plus a day trip to a rural area; and two distinct project sitess in India, the city of Mumbai in the west of the country, and Shillong a hill station in the North-east. Locations are not distinguished in reporting except in the case of India where notable differences were observed.
[3] Tanzania was the original choice but was substituted by Togo on the advice of ASI because of staff turnover in the partner organisation at the time of the planned visit
[4] Partners had between early August and mid-November to reply to the questionnaire. They were reminded to do so by both the evaluator and ASI.

in order to give respondents the opportunity to speak freely. The evaluator was accompanied by an independent translator in all locations. Other ethical considerations such as ensuring the evaluation meeting and reporting process itself did not cause harm to children were also kept in mind. The self-assessment questionnaire for programmes which were not visited by the evaluator (annex 5) was the main evaluation instrument; it was also used as a basis for developing tailored evaluation questions for the semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions which took place during field visits. The evaluator enlisted another independent consultant, Angela Cunningham[5] to peer review the draft report and assess whether it was balanced and well-substantiated. The draft report was peer reviewed before submission to ASI and then shared with ASI and partners for comments before finalisation. The report represents the view of the evaluator; the project will set out its view on the findings of the report in a separate document.

18. The evaluation began later than originally planned, in June 2010 and was completed in time for the project's mid-term review meeting in late November 2010 in order to be of optimum use to project planning and development (evaluation schedule in annex 2). It was carried out over approximately 50 days within this time period. DFID made a request in mid-November to see the report before the mid-term review meeting and so the date for submission of the final report was brought forward by a month[6]. Whilst not wishing to pre-empt the final outcome of the evaluation, the evaluator decided to share preliminary findings with ASI on an ongoing basis, being conscious that any decisions and commitments made by the project whilst the evaluation was underway might render its findings superfluous. It is also important to note that the report is an overview of progress across the board and not a comment on specific country programmes. The country examples cited are included for illustrative purposes in order to highlight issues which may apply to others.

2. Findings

2.1. Relevance

19. The project is addressing a relevant issue and a recognised problem at international level; the ILO launched its work on CDWs in 2004 with a research publication which looked at the causes and consequences of this form of child labour[7]. The latest ILO global report on child labour highlights child domestic work as a key area requiring attention[8]. The issue has become even more topical since the project was conceived as a standard-setting process was initiated in 2008 by the ILO and a Convention on Decent Work for Domestic Workers will be

---

[5] Angela Cunningham is a freelance consultant who has never worked for ASI or its partners but is familiar with its work, having assessed ASI proposals for another donor in the past. She has worked in academia and is experienced in evaluating projects with significant research components.
[6] The original due date was 20th December 2010.
[7] Helping hands or shackled lives, ILO, 2004, http://www.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/2004/104B09_138_engl.pdf
[8] Accelerating action against child labour, ILO, 2010, http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_126752.pdf

discussed at the International Labour Conference in June 2011. The proposed convention aims to address issues facing adult domestic workers but it also provides an opportunity for putting children in domestic work on the international agenda.

20.   The issue is likewise acknowledged by national governments in the countries in which the project is working. The evaluator met government officials in Costa Rica, India and Togo; the high level of meetings secured (e.g. with the Minister of Labour himself in Togo, and with a State level Deputy Chief Minister in India) is indicative of the importance given to this issue in the countries concerned. Official research and statistics on child domestic work are available in some countries such as Costa Rica and Tanzania, and governments like Togo and Costa Rica have shown a willing to pass legislation for the protection of CDW.

21.   Project activities are operating within international and national frameworks on child labour. International advocacy targets the ILO mechanisms. At national level, partners are sitting on top policy-making bodies e.g. the Indian partner participates in a taskforce set up to develop policy on domestic work in general; the Peruvian partner is an observer member of the National Committee for the Prevention and Eradication of Child Labour. In Costa Rica, the partner has participated in discussions on the Roadmap on Child Labour and legislative proposals. In Tanzania, the focus is more on local rather than national government as the partner has a provincial base.

22.   There is not much collaboration with DFID which is only present in two out of the six project countries (India and Tanzania); the partners there do not report any contacts – the project broadly fits the governance and social service sectors of the country assistance plans but it is unknown whether it resonates with other DFID-funded work on child labour. In terms of global advocacy, ASI has had greater contacts with other UK government departments (DWP and DBIS) rather than DFID. GTF project administrators encouraged links with DFID but from the project viewpoint, such contacts have not proved necessary as the implementing organisations are already well-connected with national policy-makers. Contacts may be more useful from DFID's perspective: they may help foster greater coherence between DFID-funded work, optimise learning, and contribute the development of its own policy positions – the project has a number of well-informed policy papers on the issue of child labour, for example.

2.2.   Impact

23.   The report considers impacts achieved in line with the objectives of the GTF. The GTF criteria and guidelines[9] which were made available to applicants emphasised *"....The ability of citizens to make their voices heard and hold their governments to account....."* and sought proposals which focused on advocacy for change; the reform and development of governance structures; and the development of innovative approaches. The subsequently developed GTF

---

[9] Available at national archives http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.dfid.gov.uk/consultations/gtf-guidelines.pdf

programme logframe[10] summed up the purpose of the fund as follows: *"Strengthened civil society to help citizens effectively represent their views and interests and hold governments to account for their actions – at different levels in the governmental system".*

24. This section looks at what difference the project is making to the policy environment and the lives of those with whom it is working. Although it is early days to talk about impact with half the project term yet to go, an eye to current and potential impacts is a good indicator of what is working well in the project and what needs to be improved. The evaluation report considers impact on governance, both international and national, in terms of changes to legislation, policy and programmes. It also looks at wider impacts on society, on the public consciousness, on communities and individuals for two reasons: firstly, and directly in line with the objectives of GTF, to see how far the project is mobilising citizens to hold governments to account on the issue of CDW; and secondly, because such impacts may directly affect the issue of child labour by changing individual behaviour e.g. persuading employers and parents to ensure under-age children do not work or that children of working age enjoy improved conditions.

25. The question of attribution of impacts is always difficult in social projects where multiple factors are at play. The organisations involved in this project have been working on this issue for years and some of the effects felt now are the result of long-standing work and hard-earned reputations. Furthermore, current work is supported by different donors, all of whom can claim some contribution to project outcomes – some 25 per cent of the main project is funded by the Oak Foundation and in addition, the local partners have funding for other related CDW and child rights activities which are running alongside this. The evaluation has been careful to tease out impacts where GTF can be said to have made a contribution.

2.2.1. Global level

26. The advocacy carried out by ASI at a global level within the ILO structures has recognised impacts. It is seen as one of the leading international NGOs working on child labour; it has a *"key voice"* and plays a critical role in helping to shape international legislation and policy. Although the ILO secretariat has been working on the issue of child domestic work itself for several years, its role is to implement policy rather than define it. The policy itself is developed through negotiation by governments, employers and workers representatives and NGOs - organisations like ASI play a vital role in this process.

27. ASI has contributed to international policy in two ways in this first half of the project. It participated in the Global Conference on Child Labour convened by ILO and the World Bank in May 2010 where the ILO Roadmap on the Elimination on Child Labour by 2016 was discussed. ASI was given a prominent role; it was invited to speak at plenary sessions and elected to a small drafting committee set up to develop the roadmap document – ASI was one of two NGOs elected by ILO's constituent organs to represent the NGO community in this

---

[10] DFID GTF, First Annual Report, December 2009, pp. 31 – 33 http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/funding/gtf/gtf-annual-report-09.pdf

drafting committee which was comprised of 15 states and a representative each from the employers' and workers' side. ASI's contribution to the negotiations and resulting text was described as *"very focused"* and led to the child domestic work being highlighted in the final wording – this was a considerable achievement as only two types of child labour were mentioned explicitly in the document (CDW and children working in agriculture) despite opposition from some governments who argued that no types of child labour should be singled out over others.

28. ASI has also contributed to the standard-setting process around the proposed Convention on Decent Work for Domestic Workers which will come up for discussion at the International Labour Conference in 2011. ASI has worked in close partnership with Human Rights Watch and other NGOs to ensure that children are taken into account in this text – this would amount to important progress because existing international legislation (such as ILO Convention 182) does not recognise CDW as explicitly as desired. Interviewees remarked that ASI was a leading player in the NGO group, that it demonstrated a good understanding of the issue and provided useful technical inputs into the draft convention. Counterparts commented on ASI's willingness to support other organisations and its constructive approach to divisive debates in the child labour community. ASI, in an offshoot activity funded by the Oak Foundation, also brought together six child domestic workers from the participating countries, and organised a speaking event where they presented their concerns to the June 2010 session of the International Labour Conference – while impacts on policy as such are hard to claim, those who witnessed this event found the intervention powerful to listen to and effectively managed.

29. The Home Alone initiative[11], a global petition and website on the issue of domestic slavery more generally, was commended by interviewees as *"very professional".* It is not funded by this project but inevitably interacts with it as a mobilisation campaign on the issue of domestic work.

2.2.2. National level

Government policy

30. At national level, advocacy efforts are not yet fully started and even where partners have been active, the long-term nature of advocacy work means that significant impacts on policy are few. Peru reports that it has influenced the National Committee for the Prevention and Eradication of Child Labour to see CDW as a key priority; and that it has persuaded the Ministry of Women and Social Development to set up a training programme for staff on CDWs and to include some types of child domestic work in a 2010 decree on hazardous jobs for adolescents. The project in India has been very active on the advocacy front; examples of impact include a 2009 railway station campaign and 5000 signature petition aimed at preventing the trafficking of children from rural to urban areas for domestic work which

---

[11] http://www.antislavery.org/english/campaigns/home_alone/default.aspx

prompted the state government of Maharashtra to launch rescue operations. In Shillong, the project has influenced the Child Welfare Committee and the Social Welfare Department to focus on the issue of CDW.

31. In other countries, dialogue with government counterparts is continuing in the usual way in response to government initiatives but a fully fledged advocacy campaign has not yet started. In Costa Rica, the partner has participated in meetings on the Roadmap on Child Labour and legislative bills; it is seen as an important and strong contributor to issues of child protection but interviewees could not pinpoint any specific impacts on policy. Togo is waiting until the research phase is complete in order to integrate the findings from the psycho-social research study on its advocacy work. Tanzania reports that local officials, social workers and the police have greater recognition of CDWs as a result of the project's advocacy efforts.

Social mobilisation

32. In terms of social mobilisation i.e. whether or not citizens are being empowered to raise issues with government, most effects can be seen at the level of CDWs themselves. Child participation is a central approach of this project and impacts on individual children are readily visible. Children met by the evaluator in all three countries were able to describe the difference made by the project to their lives; they say it has given them more confidence and knowledge, and the skills to better manage relations with their families and employers. Partner staff confirm these types of changes in the children they are working with. Such effects are particularly widespread in Togo where the project is reaching children through the small grants scheme. Children there cited concrete changes to their lives as a result of the project, for example, one child said she was made to get up at 3am to do chores before becoming involved in the project, another said that her employers used to give her paracetemol whenever she was sick regardless of the illness and were now giving her the right medication, others said the project had given them increased chances to study. Children in Costa Rica also commented on positive effects, one girl said that she felt better able to handle the physical abuse she was suffering at home because of support from the project; another reported that she was better able to express herself, to understand her own feelings, and to make new friends. The children in India (Shillong), although they seemed more reticent, were keen to convey the importance of the project to them and the value they found in attending project meetings.

33. The project is providing effective moral support and having a positive impact at a psycho-social level; what is less evident is how far children are being mobilised to influence decision-makers. The participation of children at the International Labour Conference in Geneva as described above is one such instance, but more could be done to mobilise children at national level. Some good examples include a meeting between two adolescent domestic workers with the Peruvian Minister of Labour which led to promises of support, and the engagement of children in rallies, petitions, government meetings and press interviews in India. In Costa Rica, the children's groups are starting on this process having developed an advocacy plan which includes meetings with congress people, information bulletins, and

support to local groups. In Tanzania, the partner reports that matters have progressed one stage further as the children's groups have turned into a formal sustainable structure; the CDWs have formed an association with its own offices. The next two years of the project should see more such examples; partners had to start at a very basic level in terms of building the knowledge and confidence of children but aim to move to higher levels of participation.

34. In terms of influencing the public at large, some countries have carried out higher level awareness raising activities. Costa Rica has put on plays and photo exhibitions and India has conducted public rallies, marches and so on in various locations around the country. Peru also put on a large photo exhibition. They have all received press coverage for their efforts and in the case of Costa Rica, which monitored feedback after performances, a positive response from audiences. More systematic monitoring is needed to be able to track the impacts of such initiatives.

35. The project aims, through the small grants scheme, to build the capacity of civil society organisations on this issue. The small grants scheme has yet to take off fully. It is up and running in Togo and recipient organisations there appear to be familiar with the issue already so there is no sense yet that their capacities are increased or that they have been engaged in advocacy activities (although both training and joint advocacy are planned). There is not much evidence of civil society mobilisation as yet, at least in countries visited by the evaluator.

36. Community mobilisation, in the sense of group work with different sectors of the community such as parents, employers, schools, community leaders and members, is not very visible. This is not a feature of the project design infact and Tanzania (which was not visited by the evaluator) appears to be the only country taking a community-based approach which situates the issue of CDW within a broader discussion on child rights and child protection. During country visits, the evaluator saw few impacts on parents - there were only parents in one location (India/Shillong) who had some general knowledge of the issue and they were adult domestic workers themselves. Impacts on schools or teachers could not be ascertained as no such evaluation meetings were arranged in any of the visits. India (Shillong) reports some success in persuading schools to waive fees for CDWs on a case by case basis. Isolated impacts on employers were reported by children and staff in some places (Togo in particular) as a result of one to one interventions by project staff. India is trying different ways of engaging employers e.g. working in partnership with the government, or carrying out awareness-raising activities among employers using its adult domestic worker placement scheme. Tanzania appears to be the only place where effective group mobilisation has taken place as the partner reports that employers have formed an association to educate fellow employers on child rights; an interesting approach of leading by example and modelling good behaviour. Work with community leaders and community members seems intermittent, and apart from one or two committed individuals, most community members seemed disengaged and somewhat sceptical about the issue, even though the NGOs in question have been working on the issue for many years. Tanzania reports that communities have formed groups

for educating people on child rights which seems to be a very pertinent example for other country projects to follow.

2.3. Effectiveness

37. The project comprises four streams of activity (research; child participation; small grants scheme; advocacy) which relate to outputs 1 to 4 of the logframe respectively. The evaluation reports on progress in each of these intervention areas and then discusses the underlying factors which have influenced the overall effectiveness of the project.

2.3.1. Research

38. According to the project proposal, research on the psychosocial impacts of domestic work on children was to:

> *"provide the detailed evidential base both to inform and improve interventions on the ground, to reinforce the case for greater child participation, and to challenge the prevailing attitudes that child domestic work is a non-priority issue".*

Advocacy based on the findings of this research was to result in logframe output 1:

> *"measures have been promoted to reduce the treatment of CDWs that result in psycho-social or other harm to their health".*

In evaluation interviews, the GTF grant administrator emphasised that the research was not an end in itself but a means to an end[12] i.e. the important aspect being the extent to which it influenced or contributed to advocacy based changes.

39. The research study was carried out by the project partners with varying degrees of support from research centres (Psychosocial Support and Children's Rights Resource Centre – Philippines and University College London/Institute of Child Health[13]). It comprised of quantitative and qualitative elements to be carried out sequentially. The first phase quantitative research involved interviews with 400 children in each country (1000 in India) comprised of CDW and a control group of non-CDW (children from the same communities who were either school-going or in other forms of child labour). The research was so devised in order to give it academic credibility and in anticipation of finding evidence that would be useful in persuading a sceptical audience that domestic work is harmful to children and warrants action by policy-makers.

---

[12] KPMG email to ASI dated 26 May 2009.
[13] UCL/ICH was involved through the support of individual academics on an ad hoc basis rather than formally as an institution due to funding limitations.

40.   The quantitative phase of the research is complete and its findings written up in an interim report[14]. The data collected is a rich detailed resource which can provide useful insights for CDW practitioners and the process helped the project identify CDWs and learn about the situation of individual children. The local partners applied themselves to the task with great diligence and the thoroughness of the data collected was described as *"really good and impressive"* by those involved in the project.

41.   While the quality of the research and the inherent value in acquiring a better understanding of CDWs cannot be denied, the research has not proved so useful in terms of the advocacy objectives expected by GTF. Crucially, the findings have not found evidence across all six countries that CDW fare worse psycho-socially than children who are not in domestic work; in two out of the six countries (India and Togo) the CDW were worse off than the control group, but in the remaining countries[15] there was either no significant difference or in some cases the control group was worse off than the child domestic workers[16]. The project suggests various explanations for these unexpected findings e.g. the CDWs may have benefitted from support from the project, or the control group may have comprised children in worse forms of child labour etc. Alternatively, the findings may be valid and domestic work not as harmful as anticipated.

42.   These findings do not appear helpful in achieving the project's objectives. While they do not deny the need for the project altogether (CDW is an established problem and contrary to international policy), the research findings undermine project attempts to *"challenge the prevailing attitudes that child domestic work is a non-priority issue"* [GTF proposal] and appear to give fuel to those who deny the problem is worthy of attention. In the evaluator's judgement, the findings should be used with caution. The results from India and Togo can legitimately be used in national level advocacy but it is difficult to see how the other findings can be used – the project has committed itself to the integrity of an academic research process, and to use the findings selectively either at national level in the four remaining countries or at international level in an overview report would seem a mis-representation. The project believes that there is ample learning and data which can be drawn on for advocacy purposes, for instance, that schooling and social networks have a positive impact on CDWs. While such information may help shape the internal project approach, issuing selective data publicly could give the impression of cherry picking. On the other hand, publishing the whole report, although the most transparent approach, risks undermining the cause. The project's interim research report seems to downplay comparisons between CDWs and the control groups in the way it is presented raising further dilemmas about how the information should be used and conveyed.

---

[14] ASI Interim report, 30/0/10
[15] Peru Philippines, Tanzania found no significant overall differences between CDWs and the control groups. Costa Rica was also included in the study but since the respondents were children working for their own parents i.e. not falling in the project definition of CDWs as children who work in third party homes, the evaluator questions how helpful this is to the project's global advocacy position.
[16] Information from country research reports and interviews with project staff.

43. The local partners often expressed disappointment that the findings were not dramatic enough or useful for advocacy especially in light of the time and effort taken. Some felt it did not do justice to the issue; the methodology did not capture the reality of what they know about CDWs, *"many complexities were papered over"* and told them little they didn't know already. They expressed doubts about how useful this material would be for influencing policy-makers and even reluctance in sharing these findings with fellow practitioners.

44. The project design underestimated the risk that the research findings would not support the cause. The second version of the log frame does not acknowledge this risk (and the first version only does so fleetingly). The fundamental point that the objectives of academic research and advocacy are different and cannot be reconciled was missed; academic research is about the pursuit of knowledge for the sake of it, the nature of the findings do not matter, whereas they matter very much in a project interested in promoting a particular position.

45. The project design did not take account of the implications of carrying out academic research in an NGO context in terms of staff, skills, time, and budget. This type of research (equivalent to a postgraduate level research project) requires staff with the requisite skills, where partners were able to hire such staff (e.g. Togo) or outsource to local academics (e.g. Peru) the research side was manageable, but in other places, due to financial constraints, the task fell on project coordinators without specialised skills. In any event, the research in all countries took up an inordinate amount of time and resource – several months of one full-time staff position plus other staff in most countries and as much as 11 months in the case of Togo. The budget became stretched; there was little left for monitoring and guidance which had to be done remotely by skype and phone calls. Where meetings were arranged, there were logistical challenges and visa problems in bringing together people from three continents.

46. There were methodological issues also – the questionnaire was critiqued by all concerned for being overly lengthy and complex, it took an hour to administer – too long for children with precious little free time or a short attention span. The questionnaire had to be translated into ten languages, training given to local research teams, the data collected and entered into a database using specialised software, and then analysed and reported on. It missed key points e.g. breakdown by sex or family context; or asked questions which were inappropriate for certain contexts e.g. on sexual health or alcoholism. Some countries like Costa Rica had to adapt the questionnaire considerably to fit their target group. The sample size was very large and partners had difficulty in finding children willing to participate. Such methodological issues may raise questions about whether the report would stand up to rigorous academic scrutiny. As the peer reviewer of this evaluation report pointed out; bias could be an issue because some of the interviews were carried out by people known to the CDW; and it is not clear that methods of data collection and analysis were fully in line with exacting academic practice.

47. Furthermore, it also seems that the research component was bedevilled with management and coordination difficulties: the absence of clear lines of authority, roles and responsibilities; and personal conflicts, fall-outs, and a lack of communication within the

research management team. All in all, the research component has been a time-consuming and costly effort, the budget was overspent and the first phase is only just drawing to a close (delayed from end of 2009). The project may say that this outcome was unforeseeable but the evaluator questions whether good management practice was observed, for instance, that evidence should be gathered prior to developing programme plans by doing the research separately and in advance; that the research model should be peer reviewed by a number of institutions and not only those enlisted to carry out the work; that the right skills should be in place (e.g. through more systematic linkages with local universities) and the budget fully costed etc. The research questionnaire was piloted in each country before being rolled out raising questions about how effective this piloting was given that it did not pre-empt the problems which later emerged. Advice should also have been sought from a broad range of experts before embarking on what was a new field of work for ASI and its NGO partners; the project says this did occur and that the research builds on the work of a number of leading academics.

48. The second phase of the research, the qualitative part, is yet to be done and preparations have been underway since June. There is a serious question about whether the project should go ahead with the research or divert these funds to other activities which are more likely to meet GTF objectives. The evaluator alerted ASI of her preliminary concerns about the research from the outset of the evaluation in July 2010 in order to avoid irreversible commitments being made before the evaluation was complete. As matters stand now £116,461 of the research budget has been spent and £170, 396 remains. While there may be arguments for completing the original research plan given the investment that has been made and the potential in-depth insights on CDWs which may come from the qualitative work, there are a number of arguments against continuation:

- Risk that the research will continue to dominate too much time, resource, and manpower to such an extent that other project components which better fit GTF objectives are neglected. Although the number of respondents involved in the qualitative research are more limited, producing this type of research of high quality will be very challenging; the academic view is that qualitative research requires a higher level of skill and relevant experience than quantitative research; long interviews which will have to be tape-recorded, transcribed (word for word), translated from several languages and then interpreted and analysed. The research risks spiralling out of control and consuming the time of the few full-time staff working on this project throughout the partner network.

- The first part of the research, the quantitative part, is standalone in academic terms. It is not undermined by not doing the second part i.e. there is no compulsion from an academic point of view to carry out the qualitative part now.

- The findings will be of limited use. Carrying out the second part now as part of the same study and integrating the findings into the same report as the quantitative research undermines its independence – the qualitative research cannot undo the findings from the quantitative part i.e. cannot show that CDW are worse in psycho-social terms than the control group. The findings for advocacy purposes will therefore

only have use in Togo and India; they cannot be used in the remaining four countries or at international level on a selective basis.

- Should the project need further information for advocacy purposes, it can draw on previous ASI publications which contain very useful information or gather new case studies if required through a more simple research process (without the academic rigour of recording, transcribing etc.). One idea, for instance, could be to interview a few children from the advisory committees - this could be an interesting task for the advisory committees themselves and help foster better child participation in the research process. There are other recognized methods for obtaining in-depth information. In the evaluator's experience, research by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and reputable NGOs such as Human Rights Watch and Amnesty does not involve classic academic research methodologies but is nonetheless known for its credibility. The ILO has developed rapid assessment techniques to find credible data on child labour in a relatively quick and cheap way[17].

49. In conclusion, it would be better to put the research on hold until other funding is found to do this at a future date. The tools and skills which have been developed can be utilised at that point. In the meantime, funds should be redirected to other activities which better meet the GTF objective of mobilising citizens around the issue CDW and influencing policy-makers. In terms of the research that has already been done; country reports for India and Togo can be used for national level advocacy; but given the dilemma in using the rest of the research (either being selective or being fully transparent and risking undermining the cause) – it seems best to retain it for internal learning purposes.

2.3.2. Child participation

50. The project proposal saw child participation as *"integral"* to all activities*:*

> *"...project advisory groups of children will be involved with all aspects of the project, including the development of the Small grant scheme, research and advocacy at local, national, regional and international levels, as well as outreach work".*

Child participation related activities were to result in logframe output 2:

> "*The situation of CDWs has improved and CDWs have been empowered, as a result of the identification of new good practices and the implementation of previously identified and new good practice models and the delivery of services".*

In terms of GTF objectives, the mobilisation of children and enabling them to have a voice is relevant.

---

[17] ILO Rapid Assessment Tools, http://www.childtrafficking.org/pdf/user/ilo_unicef_rapid_assessment_manual.pdf

51. The child participation component involved setting up advisory committees of CDWs in each of the partner countries. Such committees were in place by the end of 2009; there is at least one committee of approximately 15 CDWs in each country who meet on a regular basis (varying from three weeks or less to three months depending on the location). Meetings are facilitated by project staff and involve activities geared towards skills development and the provision of support. ASI issued detailed guidelines on how to set up advisory committees. Partners encountered a number of challenges in setting up advisory committees such as the high turnover of members as children come from transient population groups; the lack of free time available to the children and the difficulty in getting permission from parents and employers; as well as logistical and transport challenges in bringing together children from different project sites.

52. All partners have put much effort into establishing these committees and the child participation component is working well despite difficulties. In Costa Rica, various project staff have worked with these committees to enhance knowledge and skills on a diverse range of issues such as domestic violence and the environment. The process has been managed very carefully and systematically with minutes and records assiduously kept. This component shows demonstrable impacts on the children's lives as discussed in the earlier section. The way in which partners have worked with the children is impressive, gaining their trust and confidence and becoming a real source of support and guidance in these young lives. In all countries visited, staff displayed a sophisticated understanding of the children they were working with which was not based on simplistic sentimentality, recognising, when necessary, that the children are not automatically in the right when it came to conflicts with parents and employers, and that they too may be at fault in their behaviour or attitudes.

53. In addition to forming the advisory committees, the project sought to engage CDWs in all other project interventions. This has happened to some degree.

Research – children were involved as respondents or in helping to identify other children. They were not involved in designing the research or in carrying it out. One local NGO asked to help carry out the survey refused saying it was *"against child rights"*; this is a facetious remark but it makes a valid point that the research was not 'child-friendly' and a missed opportunity in terms of child participation.

Small grants scheme – the scheme is still in the process of being set up in most countries. In Togo and Peru where the small grants are up and running, children were involved in the selection of applications.

Advocacy - children were engaged in international advocacy at the International Labour Conference and in some national initiatives as mentioned in the last section.

54. Child participation is working well and there is some useful learning for the project to bear in mind as it moves forward:

- Impacts are notable but the project is only reaching very small numbers, usually a dozen or so in each country, for instance in Costa Rica. This is an intensive methodology which requires considerable resources. In Togo, the small grants scheme has been used to good effect to fund organisations to work with groups of CDW thus expanding the numbers of children being empowered to a few hundred. The same appears to be the case in Peru where 40 adolescent promoters working through eight small grants are reaching a few hundred children. It is a question of finding the right balance between quality and quantity. In India/Mumbai, the project is spread too thinly, individual project staff are trying to work with around 2000 children (500 from this project) and impacts are negligible. Perhaps one way of increasing quantity but maintaining quality is by working with children at different levels e.g. work with a core group more intensively through meetings, training and support; and reach a larger group through talks, events, participation in drama, song, dance etc. In addition, the project should look at methods used by other organizations which foster the effective participation of wider numbers.

- Another limitation seems to be the way child participation is conceptualised. The advisory committees are set up as advisory committees for project itself i.e. children will be engaged at all levels of the project. This is primarily an inward looking focus rather than an outward-looking one which aims to forge links between children with the wider society. Some local partners comment that they find the advisory committee concept difficult to understand and feel the idea of children's parliaments, which engages children with societal issues, is more relevant. Furthermore, because the design of the project does not foster the participation of other parts of the community (parents, employers, schools, community members) or encourage them to take ownership of the issue or be receptive to the demarches of children, it appears somewhat imbalanced. Without a holistic approach to working with communities, children are not really being prepared as a group to have a voice in their own day to day lives. The trip to the International Labour Conference in Geneva in a way leapfrogged over the need to enable children to be active citizens in their own surroundings and communities. Child domestic workers have made statements at ILO conferences as far back as 1999 which suggests that it is easier to facilitate a certain form of participation at international level and highlights the need for more focus on local and national participation.

- The small grants scheme could be used to promote child participation further by using some of the funds for micro-grants i.e. very small funds which can be given to groups of children to devise their own activities such as puppet shows.

2.3.3. Small Grants Scheme

55. The project proposal said the small grants scheme would:

> *"enable the adoption and delivery of good practice to permeate the NGO sector and provide support to institutions committed to the project's principles. It also enables child domestic workers to help and to organise themselves, autonomously or within broader structures".*

Activities in this area were to result in logframe output 3:

> *"The capacity of the NGOs and groups of CDWs involved (as partners or SGS recipients) to defined the rights of CDWs has been strengthened, notably to carry out research and advocacy [i.e. influencing statutory and other organisations] and to provide services and share the lessons learned about good practice with other organisations".*

In evaluation interviews, GTF grant administrators emphasised fiduciary issues, the management and monitoring of small grants and how the scheme would contribute to advocacy-based changes.

56. Each of the six country partners has a fund for small grants to be disbursed to other local organisations in order to build civil society capacity on CDWs. ASI developed management protocols to guide partners on this process. The small grant scheme is operational in two countries; Peru is the most advanced and initiated the small grant scheme at the outset; Togo is also on track. Tanzania's scheme is just in place and the remaining three countries have drawn on the small grants fund for other initiatives but have yet to roll out the scheme fully.

57. The following observations can be made from the places where the SGS has been implemented so far in order to provide learning for other project partners:

- The management of a dozen or so grants places a considerable administrative burden on the six local partners. It is not clear that management costs are properly considered in the project budget. In addition, although ASI issued management guidelines including a rather daunting guide on financial management[18], there are important gaps in terms of financial monitoring – at the moment there is considerable variation in how partners go about this e.g. Peru monitors monthly whereas Togo was monitoring six monthly (and is now monitoring every two months).

- A key purpose of the SGS is to mobilise civil society. The grants appear mainly to be used for organisations which are organising groups of children and providing services to them. This serves the purpose of child participation but partners could consider selecting grants which aim at awareness-raising or changing mindsets. The recipient organisations themselves do not appear to be much engaged in advocacy or policy influencing during evaluation visits as intended by the GTF objectives, although it is reported that in Togo, grant recipients are planning to come together to form an advocacy strategy.

- Another key purpose of the SGS is to build civil society capacity but the training of recipients seems limited and tends to focus, by necessity, on financial management and reporting rather than the good programme practices envisaged in the proposal (there was no evidence during evaluation visits that earlier ASI publications on good practices were being used although ASI reports that small grant-recipients were selected on the basis that their approach built on the said good practices). In Togo,

---

[18] ASI 'Financial Management System for Small Grants' Manual 2, 2010

some training is planned on child rights, child participation etc. but it is not regular and intensive. There may be a lesson here about working with fewer partners more intensively. Peru reports that CDW promoters who run the small grants scheme received training on several issues.

- Much of the small grants money is in effect going on service delivery. This is a good compliment to the advocacy component; the project is working with children with dire needs and some sort of tangible support is important. Partners should be careful to use funds in a way that does not create individual dependency e.g. protracted individual support such as school scholarships where ongoing funding is not guaranteed. The India (Shillong) project has a good approach; funds are not offered to everyone but kept in reserve for specific needs and then given on partial basis with the recipient making some sort of contribution.

- Sustainability is an issue as most small grants recipients are working closely with groups of children. In Togo, grant recipients are doing painstaking work on a one to one basis with children, parents and employers. The project needs to plan for the continuation of such activities. The partner in Togo is looking ahead to help SGS recipients make links with other donors.

- The SGS can be a good way of achieving a sub-regional impact. The partner in Togo has used small grants to fund activities by partners in the neighbouring countries of Benin and Burkina Faso.

58. The SGS component is not working out everywhere. Some partners have found it a challenge to find suitable organisations to sub-contract. The Costa Rican partner can find few suitable organisations to work with and has used some of the funds for a drama production, photo exhibition, and a package distribution but two-thirds remains unspent. In India, government regulations limit the ability of one NGO to sub-contract another. In addition, the partner misunderstood the purpose of the SGS and used the funds initially to provide individual scholarships. The logic behind the SGS is rather hard to follow. ASI's original idea was to provide support to two specific types of organisations: funding for local organisations who had participated in a field exchange in a previous phase of the project so that they could test out good practices; and secondly, funds for fledgling organisations of CDW and DW. The idea has now broadened out to cover all NGOs with the aim of building capacity on CDW issues. In a rights-based project, which seeks to hold the government to account for the protection of CDWs, efforts to build the capacity of government providers might also be expected, but this is largely missing from most places, except for examples from Peru where the training of government officials has been promoted.

59. It is arguable whether this design is the best way of building civil society capacity. Partner time is consumed in administration and sub-contracting process, and organisations who do not necessarily have strong programme management skills themselves are being asked to develop these skills in others. It creates a layer of bureaucracy, diverts attention away from the issue, creates financial risks and dilutes the overall impact and coherence of the project by dispersing activities through a wide range of organisations.

60. The interest and capacity of other local organisations could equally be built in other ways. For instance, the country partner could hold workshops and training programmes for other organisations on CDW, best programme practice and wider related issues on child rights, human rights, advocacy (in order to draw interest) and then mobilise them in a campaign. They could use the money to test out and develop programme practice themselves or organise other community groups e.g. leaders, parents, employers. They could also sub-contract a more limited number of organisations, say one or two, to provide direct services to children which they themselves cannot provide. These activities would be in keeping with GTF. It doesn't seem worth pressing partners who are unable to find suitable local organisations to continue to try and do so; better that they have the freedom to mobilise civil society organisations in other ways.

2.3.4. Advocacy

61. The project proposal said:

> *"The advocacy work unites all the innovations introduced at the practice/implementation level, and targets legislative reform and attitudinal change; providing long-term impact far in excess of that which can be achieved by interventions alone".*

Advocacy strategies were to result in logframe output 4:

> *"Relations between employers and CDWs have improved".*

In evaluation interviews, the GTF grant administrator commented that the advocacy approach was too broad and that it was necessary to see specific change which could be attributed to the project.

62. As noted in the section on 'Impact', advocacy by ASI at the international level is working well; this is its strength and area of expertise. National level impacts on policy are more sporadic and community awareness-raising and mobilisation is missing in the project design. The local partners need to develop advocacy plans setting out the context and problem, identifying the relevant institutions, legislation, policy and targets and considering the pros and cons of different strategies, messages and approaches. Influencing government and/or changing attitudes is a long-term process, and subject to a variety of factors outside the project's control making it all the more important that efforts are properly tracked.

63. Partners referred to the many challenges they face including lack of political will, cultural attitudes, and vested economic interests. In India (Shillong), the State Deputy Chief Minister and other government officials have so much respect for the partner that they were willing to meet the evaluator on a public holiday but this still does not mean they are willing to support the project's demands e.g. minimum wage for adult domestic workers so that their children can be saved from going to work. In Peru, the partner highlights the difficulty of changing cultural attitudes among indigenous communities where CDWs are with extended

family (older sisters, aunts) or poor neighbours who feel they are helping out and see child labour as an educational activity.

64. ASI despite its own expertise is advocacy has not yet engaged deeply enough with national advocacy plans. This is partly because ASI has been so wrapped up in the research component and other management aspects that it has not been free to focus on what is its area of expertise. It has also been waiting for the research findings and progress on the other components, small grants scheme and child participation, before moving forward with the advocacy approach. A better understanding of the different country contexts and more specific advocacy targets continue to be necessary as reiterated by the grant administrator during start-up[19]. ASI could do more to help partners carry out advocacy in a systematic way and to test out and refine advocacy positions and approaches. A more robust debate within the network could help the partners develop more credible and sustainable advocacy positions, for instance:

> The project in Costa Rica defines CDW as children who are working in their own home for their own parents and advocates on this basis. This does not fit standard definitions which see CDW as children who are working in third party homes (including the project's recommendations document which state *"new standards [on CDW] may not apply to family members performing household work for their immediate family"*[20]) It is true that in reality distinctions are not so clearcut with children working for extended family etc. Nonetheless, there is much room for debate on whether this phenomenon should be defined as child labour problem or a different kind of child protection issue; which laws, institutions and mechanisms should deal with it; the pros and cons of one or other approach; and the role of the state in family life etc.

> In Togo, the partner alongside other organisations previously (under an earlier phase of the project) advocated for an outright ban on CDW under 18. The government responded by bringing in the necessary legislation. The partner has since had a change of heart and is now advocating for CDW to be permitted between the ages of 14 to 18 subject to a regulation of working conditions on the basis that CDW is at least preferable to other worse forms of child labour. It is naturally now difficult to persuade the government to change its position again. Whilst a discussion in the network might not have made the partner think differently in this particular case, one would assume that sharing different viewpoints with other practitioners in such circumstance would help to brainstorm and refine advocacy approaches.

---

[19] KPMG to ASI email dated 26 May 2009.
[20] 'Decent work for domestic workers: recommendations for ILO members regarding the law and practice report and questionnaire', Human Rights Watch and Anti-Slavery International, June 2009

2.3.5. Programme Management

65. The previous sections have considered the progress and challenges in the four intervention areas. The report will now bring together some of the underlying factors which have affected implementation. The real strength of this project is the strong dedication and commitment of the implementing organisations to the issue and to delivery of this project but this has been in the face of a number of constraints.

2.3.5.1. Design

66. The design of the project has some fundamental weaknesses. It is overly complex and ambitious for the level of capacity available in the implementing organisations. The design failed to take account of what it would take to implement each intricate component of the project (i.e. research, small grants scheme, child participation). These require specialised skills which neither ASI nor its partners have, and nor does the design make best use of the skills they do have and play to the strengths of the implementing organisations. The project is geographically dispersed across three continents (six countries) which poses considerable coordination, logistical, language and resource challenges for ASI, a small UK organisation without a field presence. Moreover, the country contexts are very different with partners who have varying skills, priorities and problems.

2.3.5.2. Internal management issues

67. Staff departures and absences in the ASI programme and fund-raising teams have disrupted the implementation of the project. The project manager responsible for developing the proposal left before funding was received and was not replaced immediately causing a three month delay at start-up. There were no management arrangements to ensure continuity in the meantime and the new staff member who arrived faced the very difficult task of developing detailed plans for a project idea she had not had but where the design, budget, geographic scope and partnership arrangements were already pre-determined. There appeared to be a lack of internal management support from ASI in this period though short-term external consultancy support was arranged.

68. The programme management leadership has seen a high turnover within the life of this project (the third head of programmes has just taken office) and the style has tended to be compartmentalised in the past with officers left to manage projects on their own. ASI recognises that there is a lack of capacity on programme management (from design through to results-based management, monitoring and evaluation). These skills are essential in an intermediary role such as this where ASI is managing local partners who are also not familiar enough with these techniques. ASI has traditionally seen itself as an advocacy organisation and although it has been working on development projects for over a decade, staff recruitment still tends to prioritise knowledge of the issue and advocacy experience rather than project and partner management skills.

69. The organisation has been going through a phase of financial difficulty and restructuring and upheaval which accounts for the lack of management oversight. With the new head of programmes in place, there are fresh ideas for moving ASI's programme work forward and to improve accountability to donors and beneficiaries. There is a realisation that ASI needs to

move from a project focus to a programme approach; and to provide capacity building and training to its staff and partners. With this in mind, a programme review process has begun and arrangements made to receive programme support from another GTF grantholder[21].

2.3.5.3. Partnership

70. Partners feel well-supported by ASI and say that project staff are very responsive and helpful. Collaboration and exchanges between the country partners is limited, aside from international meetings, they have not found an effective way of learning from each other. The partnership between the implementing organisations and ASI, developed over several years, is very collegiate, friendly and respectful. The downside of this is that there is hesitancy in taking difficult decisions or asking challenging questions. For instance, in submitting this proposal, ASI tried to keep all the partners on board rather than make choices between them, even if this would have better met the needs of the target group or suited the requirements of the fund. Costa Rica, for instance, is not working with children who fall within the definition of CDW used by the project; although it is not clear whether this is because such children do not exist in Costa Rica or because the partner lacks sufficient resources under the project to target such groups. In any event, while the partner has identified an important protection issue, questions might have been asked whether this was the right proposal for it.

71. There needs to be a greater sense of accountability on both sides; ASI has assumed financial responsibility for the success of this project and needs to exert more authority and leadership; and the partners likewise have a right to ensure that any commitments made on their behalf take proper account of their needs and capacities. The standard ASI partnership agreement is a thin document which does not fully set out the obligations of either side.

2.3.5.4. Fit with GTF

72. The project does not fit neatly within the fund objectives of improved governance and transparency. Firstly, the project as it was originally conceived, was not only about addressing this problem through governance, it had other objectives too which built on previous experience and were concerned with disseminating good practice and learning about CDW, particularly within the NGO community, and in providing support and services to CDWs. The previous phase concluded with internal lessons learning but no external evaluation. The original proposal was submitted to the Oak Foundation who agreed to part fund it but called on ASI to find match funding. The GTF funding opportunity came up, and the project was adapted to fit GTF criteria: activities like the research and SGS were refocused to show greater links with advocacy, and plans were scaled up significantly to take advantage of the funds on offer. It remains an uneasy fit, as one interviewee put it, *"it's been like fitting a square peg into a round hole"*. Problems were compounded once the GTF programme logic was developed after funds had been disbursed to grant-holders; ASI reports that the first real opportunity to engage with the GTF model was in the first grant holder meeting in December 2008. The net effect is that the project is being measured against GTF objectives which it doesn't fully meet, whereas other objectives are discounted. This is an

---

[21] Oxfam staff member, who is also an ASI trustee, has agreed to provide support and mentoring the programme management team.

unavoidable consequence of organisations trying to shape proposals to meet donor requirements rather than being able to find funds to implement their ideas in their entirety.

73. The second reason the project does not fit so well is because the problem itself is not about a discrete area of governance. Government clearly has a leading role to play in tackling this issue and in some countries has been willing to put laws and policy in place. But the issue is also about policy implementation. Child labour is a problem which has socio-economic and cultural dimensions requiring action across a range of policy areas such as economic growth, taxation, employment, welfare, education, international relations, fair trade etc. The supply side of the governance equation falls down with developing countries unable to deliver all that is required. Public attitudes and behaviour towards child labour also need to change if existing laws and policies are to have effect. Project activities geared towards public awareness-raising aimed at changing individual behaviour are therefore relevant, even if they do not perfectly fit GTF intentions.

74. Some interviewees commented that the GTF appraisal process, both for this and other GTF grants, was not rigorous enough; they expressed surprise at the ease with which the funds were given. GTF criteria and guidelines say that detailed appraisals were carried out through a two stage process, an expression of interest and full proposal, which allowed for comments from DFID country offices and contact with the applicant if issues needed clarification. ASI was asked to revise the budget before funding could be recommended and given detailed feedback on how the logframe should be improved in terms of objectives, indicators and risks[22] with the option of addressing these concerns immediately or with the inception report due six months after the start of the programme. ASI does not recall any other exchanges on the proposal prior to funding.

75. This left a lot of the detailed planning until after the grant was awarded. Retrofitting a logframe proved a particularly challenging exercise; grant administrators gave feedback to ASI on several occasions, including in a visit to ASI offices, to help support its development. ASI was thrown by requests for project planning documents such as the inception report, baseline, and annual report and struggled to deliver these in a timely way. Some staff found the process *"very difficult, challenging and time-consuming", "very bureaucratic"* and a distraction from the substance of the work. Others viewed the information and guidance given through the GTF process more positively and said that delays on the administration side gave grant recipients several extra months to refine their proposals. It seems that the project documents required were standard to most institutional donors working with public funds and the difficulty appears partly a reflection of internal management issues in ASI, the lack of programme management capacity in particular and the challenges of trying to implement an unmanageable design.

76. On the question of DFID priorities on equity and inclusivity (gender, HIV, environment, and disability), these do not appear to be integrated in a systematised way. It's a hit and miss

---

[22] KPMG email to ASI dated 29 April 2008.

approach with partners focused on their own priorities which may or may not match those of DFID. In some parts, such as India (Shillong), there are laudable attempts to work with the most vulnerable children and to focus on HIV. On the whole, the project does not consider inclusivity priorities as much as it should and appears to rest on the assumption that working with a vulnerable group is enough; gender issues were not sufficiently highlighted in the psycho-social research questionnaire, despite protestations by the partner in Peru. GTF is also actively looking for innovation in projects. The activities carried out thus far, may be new to some of the project implementers and important learning in terms of their approach to this issue, but they cannot be said to be innovations in international development. The child participation techniques which have been much of the focus of this first half have been used before, for instance, other agencies have organised youth groups or brought child victims of trafficking to testify at high-level government meetings. A child domestic worker from the Philippines made a statement before the International Labour Conference in Geneva way back in 1999 during discussions on the prospective ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour.

2.3.5.5. Monitoring and evaluation

77. Project monitoring has mainly occurred in response to GTF reporting requirements. The grant administrators are concerned about the quality of the annual report and the lack of regularity, detail and accuracy in financial reporting. ASI has found it difficult to gather quality information from partners in a timely way. Partners have not always understood what is wanted and have been stretched by implementation on the ground. ASI needs to play more of an analytical role with respect to the information received; some of the reporting documents (e.g. the inception report) are a compilation of country responses rather than an analytical overview. The ASI project officer has carried out monitoring visits to all the project countries. The visits have resulted in useful insights and ASI has a good sense of strengths and weaknesses on the ground. Reporting and follow-up to these visits could be improved – a monitoring report should be done after each visit which reports progress and challenges against the four main output/ intervention areas, and enables follow-up with partners to be tracked. Currently reports are only done after some visits and appear to be written as rough notes.

78. The logframe continues to be problematic. The recommendations for improvement made by the grant administrators before the grant was made are still valid[23]. It still doesn't capture the commitments made in the proposal in an accurate or concise way, it is awkwardly worded, the indicators are sometimes unrealistic and unachievable or too loose and non-committal, the outputs overlap, and links with the overarching GTF logframe are not clearcut (see annex 1 for further comments on specific items). Reporting against the Achievement Rating Scale sometimes muddles up different outputs and activities e.g. Annual Report 2010. These types of discrepancies made it difficult for the evaluation to know what should be used as a measure.

---

[23] KPMG email to ASI dated 29 April 2008

79. At national level, there are some good isolated attempts to try and capture impacts e.g. the project in Costa Rica collects comments from people who watch theatre performances, in India (Shillong) children's groups are asked to think what difference participation in the project has made to them, and in Togo, small grant recipients are doing a good job of monitoring and recording the progress of the individual children they are working with. ASI could draw on such initiatives and develop standardised (but simple) tools to help partners track impacts. ASI agrees that monitoring and evaluation has been a challenge and is trying to find ways to strengthen its approach e.g. by learning from other GTF grant-holders.

2.3.5.6. Sustainability

80. It is early days to speak about sustainability and replicability with the project still moving towards implementation of all its components. The project will need to consider the question of sustainability in the next phase and look to simplifying its approaches if they are to be replicated. Some partners are finding ways to sustain specific initiatives e.g. the partner in Costa Rica managed to secure government funds to continue the drama work put on by the project and is looking at long-term options such as the use of volunteers. The legislative impacts at international level if they come to fruition in a new convention on domestic work will be sustainable in the long-term and provide a lasting framework for international and national work on CDW. Legislative and policy change at national level should also sustain. The key area where the project needs to focus plans for sustainability is in its work with beneficiaries. The effects of the project on individual CDWs will hopefully leave some lasting effects but it is important to see how support structures can be maintained without project support.

2.4. Efficiency

81. The grant administrator expressed concerns in a meeting in September 2010 with ASI about irregular and inaccurate financial reporting. These issues again appear to be due to the lack of internal capacity in ASI and staff turnover as described above. Some budget problems stem from the development phase; implementation was not thought through sufficiently and costs were not itemised in detail, they were described as *"guesstimates"* by one interviewee. Consequently, once the project started, key items were found to be missing altogether e.g. budget for partner coordination, translations, baseline etc. The budget was re-allocated to make up for these shortfalls but led to problems elsewhere e.g. money set aside for research coordination and monitoring was diverted to partner management which solved one problem but led to the research being inadequately supervised. Partners also complain that the allocation does not take account the cost of living in each country; all were awarded the same amount and set the same tasks, despite significant variations in costs between countries. ASI thereby avoided the complexity of allocating on the basis of need but at the cost of realistic budgets and achievable results. The budget required better planning at the outset; it should have been based on a standardised checklist/template so that essential costs were not forgotten. The current underspend in the project may be due to this lack of planning and inflated budget estimates or it may be because of general lack of progress in implementation.

82. The global budget is still rather broad and insufficiently detailed, yet by this stage the project should have a much better idea of what its activities will cost. The local partners are not using a standardised template and a detailed breakdown of expenditures was not always available to the evaluator on her visits. This is not to suggest that partners are not keeping such records and infact in some places like India (Shillong), partners are keeping meticulous lists of each and every penny spent – it is rather that the accounting approach is not harmonised.

83. Nor is it clear whether the budget formally covers partner coordination costs sufficiently. There is a lot of administration involved in implementing each of the project components, and either the costs are not covered or they are hidden in activity costs. This needs to be dealt with more transparently and the salary costs of all key staff involved in the project should be itemised in the budget (on a pro rata basis) alongside other administration expenses. The project should be alert to overlaps with other sources of funding as well. While some cross-over is bound to occur and the evaluator saw positive benefits in the way staff from different projects were supporting each other, some clearer budget lines are necessary. In one location, a staff member said to be fully funded by this project was working with 2000 children but only 500 of these were ascribed to the project itself - putting aside the fact that this is too many children for one person to work with in a meaningful way, the implication here is that most of the project funding is going on non-project activities.

84. The overall efficiency of the project is undermined by the research component of the project. It has a budget of around £300,000 and has taken up most staff time and resources to date as compared to the other components and led to few tangible outcomes which are useful to GTF. It is certainly the case that the project could have gathered information on the situation of CDWs suitable for advocacy purposes (even if not academic standards) more cheaply and quickly. The risks pertaining to the research component were not recognised at the outset or mitigated when they emerged.

85. In other ways, at a grassroots level, the project is very efficient, the costs incurred are sometimes not a reflection of the true value given – the partner in India, for example, is implementing the project at very low cost and managing to find enough resources for 11 full-time staff across the country – this does not represent real costs and is due to the ethos of volunteer and devotional service of many of the staff working there. ASI's global advocacy work is also run very efficiently; external counterparts remark that "*it packs a heavy punch for such a small organisation*".

86. A global figure of how many direct and indirect beneficiaries the project is working with is also missing (although it is available at country level in some countries like Peru). Direct beneficiary numbers both for the main project and SGS are important in showing value for money especially on the basis of cost per head. Partners should consider whether the benefits received by individual beneficiaries are value for money in the given context e.g. in one site visited by the evaluator, the children were being given two hourly computer lessons every Sunday, but the computers purchased with project funds were being used for non-project purposes for the rest of the week. Sometimes numbers didn't add up; in one place, a small

grant allocation worked out to US$500 per beneficiary for which the CDWs in question were receiving part-time training sessions costing US$100 and a loan of US$40 - aside from the unexplained discrepancy of US$350, the cost did not compare well to standard local costs e.g. full time attendance at university (US$400/year) and secondary school (US$200).

87. The net effect of the lack of precision in budgets and beneficiary numbers is that it is hard to determine whether the project is cost effective. ASI was permitted by DFID/GTF to report against a summary budget but this does not mean that ASI itself should not keep a more detailed working budget and check partner activities in terms of cost effectiveness and fit with GTF. In conclusion, the budget clearly requires further revision, itemisation and standardisation and costs may need to be reassigned from one component to another and possibly from one partner to another.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

88. The evaluation concludes that the project is highly relevant; it is deemed a priority among those working on child labour at the international level, and national stakeholders, including government ministers in person, confirmed the importance of this issue to the evaluator during country visits. The project is working within existing structures; it enjoys high level contacts with policy-makers and the ability to contribute to evolving legislation and policy.

89. Although it is early days in terms of impacts, the project can claim credit for influencing international policy on child domestic workers. ASI has been active within the International Labour Organisation and has ensured that child domestic workers are prioritized in ILO's key planning document on child labour, the 'ILO Roadmap on the elimination of child labour by 2016'. It has also advocated for the inclusion of CDW in the proposed new international Convention on Decent Work for Domestic Workers which will be discussed by the International Labour Conference in 2011. Impacts at the level of governance at national level are more sporadic. In Peru, the project can demonstrate an influence on government; CDW is included in national policies and regulations and training programmes for government officials have been planned. In terms of social mobilization, the projects in India and Costa Rica have received press coverage for their advocacy activities; in India, the partner has organised rallies, demonstrations, petitions, ministerial meetings etc, in Costa Rica, the project has put on a drama production and a photo exhibition on the issue of CDW.

90. Impacts are readily visible on the child domestic workers with whom the project is working; children across the board testified that being involved in the project's group activities had given them greater confidence and skills, led to improved relations with employers and family members, and resulted in tangible changes such as decreased working hours or increased opportunities to access schooling. The project at this stage is focused on providing moral support to CDW but aims to take this participation to higher level by

organizing and mobilizing children to engage with decision-making structures. This is beginning to happen; in an offshoot initiative funded by the Oak Foundation, six child representatives were taken to the International Labour Conference in Geneva in June 2010 to express their concerns to delegates. At the national level, partners in Peru and India have organized meetings between CDWs and officials and in Costa Rica, children have developed their own advocacy plan.

91. Despite these encouraging outcomes, the project has not been working at optimum level and has been constrained from achieving maximum effect by various project management issues. The project is not yet living up to the promise shown in the original proposal; the project summary, for example, suggested energetic and widespread campaigning and mobilisation:

> *"The programme will make concrete progress on the effective prohibition of worst forms of child labour, and improvements in the prevention, protection, release and rehabilitation of child workers and children at risk. It will build capacity within grassroots local partners and set up lobbying and advocacy campaigns involving the formation of national, regional and international alliances; supported by awareness-raising activities through the media. The campaigns will press for law reform, greater implementation of existing laws, and new independent monitoring bodies. They will be reinforced by training for NGO and statutory service delivery staff."*

92. The four components of the project have been implemented with uneven success:

- Psycho-social research. The study is half-way complete; it has been carried out with great diligence by local partners and resulted in a rich database of information of interest to practitioners. One of the main purposes in setting up this study was to "*challenge the prevailing attitudes that child domestic work is a non-priority issue*" [GTF proposal]. However, the findings have not adduced across the board evidence that child domestic workers fare worse in psycho-social terms because of the work they do as compared to non-CDWs. Only two of the studies, India and Togo, confirm project assumptions about the harmfulness of child domestic work, and are useful in national advocacy. It is difficult to see how findings from the other countries can be used at all – the project has committed itself to the integrity of an academic research process, and to use the findings selectively either at national level in the four remaining countries or at international level in an overview report would be a mis-representation. To issue the full report, on the other hand, although better for transparency, risks undermining the cause and giving ammunition to sceptics who deny this problem exists. The findings weaken project arguments which call for more priority attention to this particular group of children (although they do not extinguish the need for the project altogether as the issue of CDW is recognised in international policy). Given this dilemma, it seems best to use the findings from the India and Togo reports for national level advocacy and retain the rest of the research findings for internal learning purposes.

- Child participation. This component involved setting up children's advisory committees of CDWs and in engaging children in other project activities. This is working well despite challenges. There are two issues for consideration as the project

moves forward. The intensive nature of the methodology means that very small numbers are being reached, sometimes a dozen or so per country. Some partners have effectively used the small grants fund to engage wider numbers. The model of child participation adopted by the project is somewhat inward looking and focused more on the project itself; it would be desirable in the coming two years to take a more outward looking approach and enable children to become active citizens in their own surroundings and communities. Without a holistic approach to working with communities, children are not really being prepared as a group to have a voice in their own day to day lives. Taking children to the International Labour Conference in Geneva in a way leapfrogged over the need to them to be active citizens in their own surroundings and communities.

- Small grants scheme. This component has been slow to start and is only fully operational in two countries, Peru and Togo where it has enabled outreach to larger numbers of children. As the project moves forward, partners should bear in mind the key purpose of this component which is to disseminate good practices and to mobilize civil society organizations on the issue of CDW. Some countries have not found it easy to identify potential grant recipients, either because of low levels of civil society organization or because government regulations impede sub-contracting in this way. It is arguable whether the SGS design is the best way of mobilizing civil society; it imposes a considerable administrative burden on local partners, diverts attention from the issue, creates financial risks and dilutes overall impact by dispersing activities too widely. The mobilization of local organizations and community groups can be done more directly in other ways through awareness-raising activities, training, workshops etc. by the local partner or by working closely with one or two service providers.

- Advocacy. This component is having some positive results at international level but less effect at national level. ASI needs to engage more closely with partners in developing targeted advocacy plans which map out the context, institutions, policy frameworks, targets and strategies. Advocacy should encompass high level policy-makers, public awareness-raising as well as community mobilization aimed at engaging parents, employers, teachers, community members and others on the issue of CDW (at the moment, only the project in Tanzania appears to have success at this level).

93. There are a number of programme management issues which have constrained the project from having maximum effect. Its real strength has been the strong dedication and commitment of the implementing organizations to the issue and to the delivery of the project. However, this enthusiasm is unable to surmount the challenges faced. At the core of these difficulties is the fact that the project design is overly complex and ambitious for the level of capacity available in the implementing organizations. Each project component is very intricate and requires specialized skills which the partners do not have; at the same time the design does not make best use of the skills they do have. In addition, it is geographically dispersed across six countries (three continents) and involves partners with varying skills and priorities which poses considerable coordination and logistical issues.

94. There are a number of internal management issues at ASI which have impeded the project including a high turnover of senior managers resulting in inadequate oversight and support, and a recognized lack of capacity in programme management (design, monitoring and evaluation). A recent change in leadership at programme management level brings with it new ideas and plans for tackling these underlying difficulties. Nor does the project fit so well with GTF objectives. It was originally designed with other objectives in mind and has struggled to mould itself into the requirements set by GTF. Moreover, the issue itself is not one which can be addressed solely through improvements in governance and transparency. The efficiency of the project has been considerably undermined in this first half of the project term by these factors and in particular by the research component which has consumed an inordinate amount of project time, resource and energy. The policy impacts at international and national level described above have infact been achieved at very little cost.

95. The expectations of what this project can achieve in terms of GTF must be tempered in the long run; the shortcomings discussed here run deep and cannot be easily resolved; the project fit with GTF is not as close as it should be; and the project is quarter funded by another donor who has an interest in other types of results also. It is forseeable that the project will have some important outcomes when it is complete; it should achieve governance impacts of interest to GTF, (for instance, through the important global advocacy work being carried out by ASI), but it will also touch the lives of individual children and bring greater insights to practitioners working on these issues – these impacts can be seen as having an inherent value which go beyond what GTF is looking for.

96. The aim in the remainder of the project must be to streamline and simplify the design as far as possible so that the implementing organizations can focus on the core objective of influencing governance (policy, legislation, programmes) by mobilizing public opinion, civil society and communities on the issue of CDW. With this in mind, the evaluation report makes a number of key recommendations, these are listed below. Readers should refer to the full evaluation text for further ideas and suggestions for improvement.

Recommendations

97. The evaluation report concludes with the following recommendations which aim to help facilitate implementation for the remainder of the project and to bring it as far into line as possible with GTF objectives:

Research

> ➢ Defer the planned research component to a later time when other funds are found to complete the work and divert the research budget to other project components. This is subject to partners developing alternative plans for activities which directly fit with GTF objectives.
>> o Should the project require additional material for advocacy purposes, this can be drawn either from previous research carried out by ASI, partners or other

organizations e.g. ILO or by producing new material using quicker and easier research methods.

➤ Decide how the research done so far should be used taking into account the ethical considerations and risk factors discussed in this report.

Child participation

➤ Enhance the child participation component through efforts to involve more children and by seeking greater engagement with decision-making structures.
  - o The child participation component should focus on making stronger links between CDWs and decision-makers at all levels (national, local, community).
  - o The project should try and engage larger numbers of children while at the same time maintaining the quality of interventions.

Advocacy
➤ Strengthen the advocacy component through the development of more holistic advocacy strategies:
  - o Detailed national advocacy plans should be developed by partners with the close support of ASI which encompass all levels of mobilization including high level policy makers, public awareness and communities.
  - o Community mobilization i.e. engagement and participation of wider groups in the community including parents, employers, teachers, community members etc. should be a stronger focus of the project. The project may consider adding this as an additional output and would need to build partner capacity accordingly.
  - o The 'supply' side of governance could be better addressed by the project, for instance, training on best programming practices for CDW could be delivered to government officials such as social workers and labour inspectors.

Small Grants Scheme

➤ Review the focus and purpose of the small grants scheme:
  - o The small grants scheme needs a greater focus on building the capacity of small grant recipients on best programming practices and in mobilising them in advocacy campaigns.
  - o Partners who are unable to find suitable local organizations to partner with in the small grants process should be given the freedom to directly use these funds themselves to mobilize civil society groups.
  - o The project implementers should make better use of previous ASI and partner work and publications on best programming practices and findings from children's participatory research.

Project management

➤ Review project plans, budgets and accounting procedures:
  - o Project needs to take stock and plan ahead carefully for the remaining two years to ensure optimum achievements in line with GTF objectives. Planning should not be rushed and the project should consider asking for the no cost extension available under GTF if necessary.

- Partners, with the support of ASI, should develop detailed plans for the activities they wish to carry out in the remaining two years. These activities should be properly costed and in line with the objectives set out in GTF.
- Budgeting and accounting procedures need attention:
  - Budget should be revised on the basis of a realistic estimate of costs for future activities which takes into account differences in cost of living in partner countries as well as ASI and partner management and administration costs (within GTF limits).
  - Partner budgeting and account-keeping for this project should be harmonized using standard straightforward templates. This means more detailed cost estimates from partners with staff and administration costs more fully and transparently itemized. ASI's own budgeting should also be more specific.
  - Budget should be reallocated between components i.e. from research to advocacy, small grants and child participation. The reallocation should be based on a competitive process whereby partners' proposals for the use of these funds are assessed in terms of their fit with GTF objectives, the likelihood of success, and realistic and reasonable costings. The budget which is already allocated to other project components i.e. small grants and advocacy should also be open to reallocation between partners if necessary.

➢ Strengthen project monitoring:
  - ASI needs to be more systematic and analytical in its monitoring and reporting;
  - Partners need to report ASI in a timely way or bear some consequences e.g. delays to further disbursements;
  - Common tools should be developed for measuring the impact of advocacy initiatives;
  - The logframe should be revised to better capture the project's potential in a realistic and achievable way and to better align itself to the overall GTF objectives.
  - The project should draw on learning from other GTF projects.[24]

➢ Bring in specialized external expertise to help project staff revise the logframe and budget in quick and effective manner given the challenges posed in the past by project planning.
➢ Facilitate greater exchanges and communication between partners in the network in order to optimize cross-learning and opportunities for support and guidance.

ASI Programme management

➢ Strengthen overall programme management at ASI. Although this is a matter beyond the scope of this evaluation, a few suggestions for improvement can be made:

---

[24] Learning from DFID's GTF: Tools, methods and approaches, June 2010, http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/funding/gtf/GTF-learning-paper-1.pdf

- o Provide training for all programme staff on basic project management techniques and concepts;
- o Re-organise the work of the programme team so that there is greater shared ownership and more common knowledge of projects;
- o Develop standardized tools and approaches for proposal development e.g. greater scrutiny and testing of proposals within ASI to check manageability for the organisation; set up a process for consulting partners prior to the submission of proposals; consider how its work on specific issues fits with its broader mandate e.g. ensuring that the focus on child domestic work is balanced against its concern about other forms of child labour; use of checklists for estimating project costs.

Annexes

Annex 1   Achievement Rating Scale

1 = fully achieved, very few or no shortcomings

2 = largely achieved, despite a few short-comings

3 = only partially achieved, benefits and shortcomings finely balanced

4 = very limited achievement, extensive shortcomings

5 = not achieved

Please complete this template in summary form to provide a uniform assessment of progress against your stated objectives.

Objective Statement	Achievement Rating for year being assessed	Logframe Indicators	Baseline for Indicators	Evaluator's comments on progress against objectives (in red)
Purpose To enhance the protection of CDWs in 6 countries by promoting and implementing best practice and encouraging the adoption of legislation for the protection of CDWs, based on psychosocial research on the effects of domestic work on children.	4	1) Better evidence available about the psycho-social impact of child domestic work becomes available; and 2) Evidence of effective advocacy to enhance protection of CDWs; and 3) Evidence that organisations involved are incorporating lessons learnt from experience into their activities; and 4) Evidence that CDWs have better access to protection, either in the forms of specific services or as a result of interventions which remove	As stated in inception report table.	**This is starting to happen to some degree with the policy impacts at international level and in certain project countries.**

		them from domestic work into a situation which they regard as an improvement.		
Output 1) Measures have been promoted to reduce the treatment of CDWs that result in psycho-social or other harm to their health	5	1.1 Evidence of increased awareness about impact of domestic work on psycho-social well-being of children, through public statements, policy commitments and strategy changes, and other actions that reflect report findings and recommendations 1.2 Involvement of CDWs in both the development of the report and the advocacy it supports, organised via the six Advisory Committees of CDWs.	As stated in inception report table.	**The research is half-way complete but in the evaluator's judgement, is only potentially useful in two countries, Togo and India, where it shows adverse psycho-social impacts of child domestic work on children. Its usefulness elsewhere appears limited. The research has not been integrated into advocacy plans so far. This output will be partially achieved once advocacy based on the research is carried out and when external stakeholders in Togo and India recognise these effects and respond accordingly. It seems unlikely that it can ever be fully achieved in all countries because of the nature of the research findings.** **The wording of this output (which was revised following a request by grant administrators[25]) puts the bar unrealistically high as not only do policy-makers have to respond to the issue of CDW, they have to do so in a very specific way in response to the research findings - this seems unlikely.**
Output 2) The situation of CDWs has improved and CDWs have been empowered, as a result of the identification of new good practices and the implementation of previously identified and new good practice models and the delivery of services*.	3	2.1.a) Evidence of increase in the involvement of CDW in efforts to end abuse, promote their rights and improve their conditions of employment. 2.1.b) Evidence of the introduction of good practice in services provided to CDWs.		**This is happening across the board, children have been organised into groups and report improved circumstances and feeling empowered. The project needs to move to the next level, beyond being a support group for children, to an organised structure for engagement with decision-makers.** **The wording here is too loose in the commitments it makes, no numbers are mentioned and the numbers**

---

[25] KPMG email to ASI dated 26 May 2009.

		2.2) CDWs contribute evidence and analysis to the report; organised through the Advisory Committees of CDWs – including feedback on how their situation has changed since inception. The process of monitoring change by the Advisory Committees will be undertaken annually; with CDWs reporting progressively greater levels of participation & greater relevance of services and interventions		**being affected in this way so far are rather limited. This output also brings in wording on good practices which is not supported by activities linked to this component.**
Output 3) The capacity of the NGOs and groups of CDWs involved (as partners or SGS recipients) to defend the rights of CDWs has been strengthened, notably to carry out research and advocacy [i.e., influencing statutory⁺ and other organisations] and to provide services and share the lessons learned about good practice with other organisations	4	3.1 Evidence that the grant recipient has implemented some form of good practice which it would not otherwise have been able to implement without the grant; 3.2 Evidence of efforts by programme partners or grant recipients to share one or more new models of good practice with others (statutory or other organisations) and persuade them to implement such practice.		**The SGS is only operational in Togo and Peru. The small grants recipients selected already appear to have a good knowledge of the issue so capacity building has been limited (a few trainings are planned). Organisations are not yet mobilised into a campaign. The use of ASI publications on best practices is not evident. However, grant recipients have evolved some good methodologies themselves which should be shared in due course.**
Output 4) Relations between employers and CDWs have improved.	4	4.1.a) More employers of CDWs allow CDWs time off work to attend school (formal		**Children report instances of individual employers treating them better but there is no systematised analysis by the project about how widespread this**

		or non-formal) [NDWM, WAO & DNI]; OR 4.1.b) Other changes in attitude of employers of CDWs which enable CDWs to exercise their human rights more effectively; [VF, AGTR & Kivulini]		**occurrence is. The evaluator's impression is that these are isolated examples. The project is only directly interacting with employers on a one to one basis in a few places (e.g. Togo) and there is no group work with employers except in Tanzania. The indicators are not quantified.** **The wording of this output seems unrealistic - changes in policy which eventually impact relations between employers and CDWs is indeed a long-term goal but may not happen everywhere in the life of this project. The advocacy activities appear targeted at more intermediate outcomes such as changes in policy, which in themselves are hard to achieve. More could be achieved perhaps through localised community level activities but then the project needs to work in this way and better track its effects.**
Activities 1.1 Prepare a research plan; 1.2 Collect and analyse data; 1.3 Write 6 country reports, plus interim/final international reports; 1.4 Disseminate results; 1.5 Launch a global website on CDWs 1.6 Develop/implement advocacy strategies at local, national and international levels. 2.1 Mainstream children's participation across the programme, and amongst other initiatives, via Advisory Committee meetings; 2.2 Produce a report on				**Completed activities 1.1. to 1.2. but not the rest. 1.3 has been partially achieved, 6 country reports and an interim report have been written. The final report will come after the next stage of the research** **Made progress on activity 2.1. which is ongoing. The remainder are not tackled yet.**

children's participation; 2.3 A peer learning report is prepared for each region; 2.4 Information materials published on the situation of CDWs; 2.5 Prepare a child friendly international report on CDWs;				
3.1 Develop financial and management protocols and train SGS recipients on how to use them				**3.1is completed;** **3.2. is done in 2 countries only, 1 is underway and 2 countries are struggling, and no information on 1 country.** **3.3 and 3.4. are not happening yet.**
3.2 Each of 6 partners allocates small grants once per year, monitors the use and results of small grants and associates grant recipients with its agenda for learning about good practice				
3.3 Develop local, sub-regional and international networks to create and implement advocacy strategies				
3.4 Peer Learning reports and meetings				
4.1 Develop and implement advocacy strategies at local, national and international levels, encouraging statutory agencies and others to improve protection for CDWS and employers to respect the human rights of their CDWs				**4.1. This is happening very well at international level but more needs to be done at national level.**

Annex 2　　　Evaluation Schedule

A broad outline of the timetable is as follows – schedules for country visits are not attached but a list of respondents is included in annex 3

	Jan-June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
ToR	X						
Country visits			X	X	X		
MTR meeting						X	
Interviews in Geneva, the UK and elsewhere		X					
Documentary review		X	X	X	X	X	
Partner self-assessments			X	X	X		
Drafting of the report					X	X	
Draft to Anti-Slavery						X	
Report to DFID							X

Annex 3   List of contributors

General

Anastasia Anthopoulos, Oak Foundation
Jonathan Blagborough, former ASI staff member
Romana Cacchioli, ASI Programmes and Advocacy Team Manager
Audrey Guichon, ASI project manager
Mike Dottridge, ASI project consultant
Blanca Figueroa, local partner in Peru (self-assessment questionnaire)
Hans van de Glind, Senior Technical Officer, ILO
Sam Gurney, Trade Union Congress
Therese Hesketh, Professor of Global Health, University College London
Rod Leith, ASI staff
Masesa Makomba, local partner staff in Tanzania (self-assessment questionnaire)
David V. Smith, Triple Line Consulting

Costa Rica

Partner staff
Virginia Murillo, Executive Director
Karin Vanm Wijk, Deputy Director
Sandra Lopez, Project Coordinator
Eneisel Diaz Lopez, Animator

Community members/Local Officials
Carpio community - Leonila Obando Ruiz (1 person)
Alajuelita community – Marco Ibarra; Silene Montero Valerio (2 persons)

Children
Francesco Zeledon (spontaneous interview during walkabout)
Group meeting Carpio – Marie-Therese, Adela (2 persons)
Group meeting Alajuelita – Jocelyn, Kimberly, Manfred, Javiera (4 persons)

Other stakeholders
ILO - Jesus de la Pena, Virginia Elizondo (2 persons)
Ministry of Labour - Esmirna Sanchez
CMTC Union – Dennis Cabezas, Jonathan Monge (2 persons)
Congresswoman, Damaris Qunitana (plus official)

Togo

Partner staff
Cleophas Mally, Director
Adjakly Djatougbe, research coordinator
Dotse Abra, project coordinator

Small grants scheme partners
Asfodevh-Benin - Roch Maforekan (1 person)
NGO AIDE – Tsolenyanu Kaffi Dotse, Director; Nyagbe Adzo Kekeh, Project manager; Toyieleagbe Akosiwa, Joint director; Apeto Komla Foly Eden; Dzahini Ahon Adzowa, project assistant (5 persons)

NGO MARS – Ametepe Dout Lewis, project manager, Tsozenyanu Kodzo William, Executive Director; Motjey Yao Sonyo, psychologist (3 persons)
NGO Commission Femmes et Enfants de l'eglise – (6 persons including project manager and director)
NGO CTM – (3 persons including project director, project assistant, accountant)

Children
Group meeting of AIDE SGS children –(25 persons)
Group meeting of MARS SGS children –(15 persons)
Group meeting of Commission Femmes et Enfants de l'eglise SGS children – (15 persons)
Group meeting of WAO SGS children and advisory committee – (12 persons)

Other stakeholders
Minister of Labour (himself) – Nikoue Broohm
ILO/IPEC – Mouiero Mer Adeye, Principal technical adviser
Nana FM Radio – Ferdinand Affognon, Director
Forum de la semaine – Konambyia Gabin, publishing director; Norbert Apeto, marketing manager (2 persons)
Relutet – Felicite Koublanou, Coordinator
BICE – Emile Kodjo Edeh, Director; Avegno Koffi Edem, legal assistance programme (2 persons)

India

Local partner
Christy Mary
Hema Amburose
Ashish Shignan
Anita Nanage
Therese Joseph
Agnes
Merydom
Martina

Community members
Mumbai Bondivali Hill, Jogrowari (West) community - adult's group (17 persons)
Mumbai Madh-Malad community - adults group (25 persons)
Shillong - Employers group (3 persons)
Shillong - Parents group (7 persons)
Shillong - Community members (7 persons)

Children
Mumbai Bondivali Hill, Jogrowari (West) community - children's group (31 persons)
Mumbai Madh-Malad community - children (individual interviews with 3 girls)
Shillong shelter home – children's group (14 persons)
Shillong - children from advisory committee and other groups (28 persons)

Other stakeholders
Lona N. Jyruu, Additional Director of Social Welfare, Social Welfare Department, State of Meghalaya [Shillong]
Rosan Lyngdoh, Child Welfare Committee [Shillong]
Bindo M. Lanang, Deputy Chief Minister, State of Meghalaya [Shillong]

Annex 4   Mid-term evaluation terms of reference

anti-
slavery

today's fight for tomorrow's freedom

Terms of Reference for the Mid-term Evaluation of the 'Slavery and child labour: governance and social responsibility' project

June 2010

1) Background

Anti-Slavery International, founded in 1839, is the world's oldest international human rights organisation and the only charity in the United Kingdom to work exclusively against slavery. We work at local, national and international levels to eliminate all forms of slavery around the world by:

- Supporting research to assess the scale of slavery in order to identify measures to end it;

- Working with local organisations to raise public awareness of slavery;

- Educating the public about the realities of slavery and campaigning for its end.

- Lobbying governments and intergovernmental agencies to make slavery a priority issue and to develop and implement plans to eliminate slavery;

2) Project Background

The project addresses the situation of child domestic workers and the particular vulnerability, exploitation and abuse they face as a result of their lack of status as children, the lack of recognition accorded to domestic work as an occupation, and the prevailing social and economic background from which most child domestic workers are sourced.

The rights and protections normally accorded to citizens are seriously eroded in the case of child domestic workers, with the result that for a great many the domestic work context is an effective form of slavery. Social groups which are particularly vulnerable, excluded or powerless require specific support from their governments, who in turn need to influence the actions and attitudes of civil society. Constitutional prohibitions against slavery, a commitment to universal education, minimum working age, minimum wage and other employment legislation can all exist in countries where child domestic labour is nevertheless extremely widespread, and socially accepted.

The scale of the problem, which is manifested globally, is impossible to address in its totality. However, progress achieved in individual localities can help to influence developments elsewhere, both regionally and more widely. The project focuses on six countries where a pronounced problem exists: Costa Rica, India, Peru, the Philippines, Tanzania, Togo; also linking to relevant local partners in other regional locations. Anti-Slavery International has well established relationships with local partners in each of these countries and this project builds on previous work delivered by the same

partnership and in particular, the findings contained in the following project publications: *Child Domestic Workers: A Handbook on Good Practice in Programme Interventions* (2005) and *They respect their animals more: Voices of child domestic workers* (2008).

The **overall purpose** of the project is to enhance the protection of CDWs in these six countries (and beyond where possible) by promoting and implementing best practice and encouraging the adoption of legislation for the protection of CDWs, all based on psycho-social research on the effects of domestic work on children.

The **specific outputs** of the project as agreed in the latest version of the logframe are:

1) Measures have been promoted to reduce the treatment of CDWs that result in psycho-social or other harm to their health.

2) The situation of CDWs has improved and CDWs have been empowered, as a result of the identification of new good practices and the implementation of previously identified and new good practice models and the delivery of services.

3) The capacity of the NGOs and groups of CDWs involved (as partners or SGS recipients) to defend the rights of CDWs has been strengthened, notably to carry out research and advocacy [i.e., influencing statutory and other organisations] and to provide services and share the lessons learned about good practice with other organisations.

4) Relations between employers and CDWs have improved.

The project is organised around three main streams of activities which are:

- a research on the psycho-social impact of domestic work on children,
- a small grant scheme, and
- advocacy at local, national and international levels.

The methodological approach will focus on increasing and sustaining the involvement of child domestic workers themselves. This will occur at all levels: within the programmes and interventions being conducted on the ground, within the structures of the implementing organisations, and within advocacy, public education and related outreach initiatives undertaken by project partners and other NGOs and rights organisations locally. This will be achieved mainly by organizing advisory committees of child domestic workers in each country.

The project is funded by DfID and Oak Foundation.

DfID's funding comes from its Governance and Transparency Fund (GTF). To date, we have worked together with DfID on establishing the basis of the M&E mechanisms and objectives for this project, namely:

- February 2009: first meeting of the GTF grantees – discussion of annual report
- March 2009: Inception report with a revised logframe, a baseline data, and a M&E plan
- June 2009: first annual report
- March 2010: logframe and baseline data are agreed with DfID

3) Purpose and scope of evaluation

These ToR will be used to produce the mid-term evaluation of the project, which will be followed by a final evaluation upon completion of the project, as required by DfID's GTF rules.[26]

DfID produced guidance notes in relation to what is expected from the mid-term evaluation.[27] According to this document, the general purpose of the MTE is "to provide an independent assessment on the progress and performance to date, to measure and report on achievements and early signs of change and impact, and to indicate adjustments that may need to be made to ensure the success of your programme".

The evaluation should address issues of project design, implementation, management, lessons learned, replicability and provide recommendations for current and future projects. The questions to be addressed in the evaluation (provided below) are organized to provide an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and (to the extent possible) impact on the target population.

The **purpose** of the mid-term evaluation is more specifically to:

1. Assess how the project is progressing towards achieving its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so;
2. Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the countries of operation and internationally;
3. Assess progress made towards intended and unintended outcomes and impacts of the project
4. Provide emerging lessons learned from the project design and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future projects; and
5. Assess prospects for sustainability at the local and national level and among implementing organizations.

With a view of trying to improve the success and impact of the project for the rest of its duration, the MTR should answer the following questions in accordance with DFID guidance *to the extent feasible within the timeframe and resources available to the evaluator*:

a) **Relevance:** Details of the programme's significance with respect to increasing voice, accountability and responsiveness within the local context.

- How well does/did the programme relate to governance priorities at local, national or internal levels?
- How well does/did the programme relate to DFID's country assistance plans

b) **Impact:** Details of the broader economic, social, and political consequences of the programme and how it contributed to the overall objectives of the Governance and Transparency Fund (increased capability, accountability and responsiveness) and to poverty reduction. The articulation of the CAR framework within the GTF is through the GTF programme logframe as set out in Annex 2 of the Inception Report guidelines. The project's inception report (Section 3)

---

[26] An addendum to these Terms of Reference will be produced after the MTR to be used for the final evaluation

[27] *Guidance on Commissioning a Mid-Term Review and Final Evaluation for GTF Grant Holders*, 7th April 2009.

identified how the programme or portfolio of projects was likely to contribute to this framework and therefore the evaluation will look at the following aspects.

- What was the programme's overall impact and how does this compare with what was expected?
- Did the programme address the intended target group and what was the actual coverage?
- Who were the direct and indirect/wider beneficiaries of the programme?
- What difference has been made to the lives of those involved in the programme?

c) **Efficiency:** How far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time, other resources and procedures contributed to or hindered the achievement of results.

- Has value for money been achieved in the implementation of programme activities? Could the same results have been achieved for less money?
- How well did the partnership and management arrangements work and how did they develop over time?
- How well did the financial systems work?
- How were local partners involved in programme management and how effective was this and what have been the benefits of or difficulties with this involvement?
- Were the risks properly identified and well managed?

d) **Effectiveness:** Assessment of how far the intended outputs and results were achieved in relation to targets set in the original logical framework.

- Have interventions achieved or are likely to achieve objectives?
- How effective and appropriate was the programme approach?
- With hindsight, how could it have been improved?

e) **Sustainability:** Potential for the continuation of the impact achieved and of the delivery mechanisms following the withdrawal of DFID support.

- What are the prospects for the benefits of the programme being sustained after the funding stops? Did this match the intentions?
- How has/could collaboration, networking and influencing of opinion support sustainability?

f) **Value for money:** Has value for money been achieved in the implementation of programme activities

- Could the same results have been achieved for less money?
- Were salaries and other expenditures appropriate to the context?
- Are there obvious links between significant expenditures and key programme outputs?

g) **Equity:** Discussion of social differentiation (e.g. by gender, ethnicity, socio-economic group, disability, etc) and the extent to which the programme had a positive impact on the more disadvantaged groups.

- How does/did the programme actively promote gender equality?
- What is/was the impact of the programme on children, youth and the elderly?
- What is/was the impact of the programme on ethnic minorities?
- If the programme involved work with children, how are/were child protection issues addressed?

- How are/were the needs of excluded groups, including people with disabilities and people living with HIV/AIDS addressed within the programme?

h) **Replicability**: How replicable is the process that introduced the changes/impact? Refer especially to innovative aspects which are replicable (good practice)

- What aspects of the programme are replicable elsewhere?
- Under what circumstances and/or in what contexts would the programme be replicable?

Finally, it will be helpful to look in more detail at the following:

- Appropriateness of the approach and methodologies to the existing context.
- The degree to which programme partners have been involved in implementation as envisaged in the original proposal and inception report.
- The effectiveness of the programme's inter-partner management systems (e.g. steering committees, working groups, communications).
- The effectiveness of the programme's M&E systems, including the quality of internal systems and annual reports.

4) Evaluation Methodology and Timeframe

The evaluation methodology will comprise of a variety of activities such as documentary review, interviews, focus group discussions, including with members of the advisory committees, observation and stakeholder meetings. The methods used will largely be qualitative but may also include an analysis of pre-existing quantitative data collected by the project if any exists. A preparatory desk review will be carried out from the evaluator's home base consisting of meetings with Anti-Slavery International, DFID and other UK-based stakeholders, possible phone conversations with project partners, documentary review and analysis, and preparation of evaluation tools and methodologies. This will be followed by country visits to three of the six project countries which will take place by end November 2010 and before the mid-term review meeting.

Document Review

The following types of documents will be reviewed:

Project document and revisions, Induction and Annual reports, reports from partner to Anti-Slavery International, reports from country monitoring visits, project logical frameworks and monitoring plans, minutes of meetings, work plans, correspondence between Anti-Slavery International and partners, research or other reports undertaken (baseline studies, previous evaluation reports, monitoring reports etc.), and project files as appropriate.

Documentary review will take place at all stages of the evaluation: there will be extensive review of documents prior to country visit, further onsite collection and verification of documentation, and analysis of documentation during report-writing.

Interviews

Interviews will be carried out with a range of project stakeholders. As a preliminary, DFID will be consulted on their expectations of the evaluation as well as views on project performance. The itinerary and evaluation objectives will be discussed with Anti-Slavery International in advance. During country visits, face-to-face interviews (both individual and group) will be carried out with staff, current and former child domestic workers of the advisory committees as appropriate, representatives of other international organizations and civil society groups, and child protection/slavery/human rights experts, local and other government representatives, service providers, associations of employers and more as relevant. Interviews will also be carried out with stakeholders in the UK and Geneva (ILO).

Focus groups

Focus group discussions will be an important feature of the evaluation methodology. Focus groups will be the primary methodology used for soliciting information from project beneficiaries including children as well as other relevant stakeholders such as parents and other family members, community members etc. This is a preferred methodology for these groups over individual interviews in order to enable the participation of as wide and representative a membership as possible and also to avoid unduly intimidating individual beneficiaries. The evaluation will endeavour to hold focus group discussions in each country site visited. There will be a focus on ensuring child participation in the evaluation process given the emphasis of this strategy in the project itself. This will probably be organised around the advisory committee meetings.

Observation

Observation will focus on aspects of the project that may not be recorded in reports, including the general health and wellbeing of the children, interactions between them, their confidence, lifeskills etc.
Observation will also look at how the partnership is moving working and progressing in addressing the situation of CDWs.

Field site selection

The project covers a wide range of partners, countries, locations, interventions and sectors. As such and given the limited time available, the evaluator will visit half of the project countries (i.e. 3 out of 6) at mid-term stage and the remaining three countries at final evaluation stage. The three countries selected for the evaluation are Tanzania, India and Costa Rica as they give a regional spread. Progress made by the 3 country programmes which the evaluator is not visiting at mid-term (Philippines, Peru, and Togo) will be reviewed by documentary review and face-to-face and phone interviews with key stakeholders if and when possible. The choice of countries will be reversed in the final evaluation i.e. those which are not visited at mid-term will be visited next time.

Additional methods

The evaluator will attend the project's mid-term review meeting to be held at the end of 2010 and use this as an opportunity to interview additional partner staff/collaborators and to observe proceedings.

Confidentiality

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality with regards to the information elicited. To ensure that implementing partners, stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries are able to express themselves freely, interviews and focus groups will be held in confidence and without the presence of project staff or any other persons who may influence the discussion by their presence. However, project staff may accompany the evaluator to make introductions whenever necessary, to facilitate the evaluation process, make respondents feel comfortable, and to allow the evaluator to observe the interaction between the implementing partner staff and the interviewees.

Other Ethical considerations

The evaluation will in particular pay heed to the UNICEF guidelines on ethical reporting standards with regards to children. In fact, ethical standards (e.g. Social Research Association, British Psychological Association, University of Birmingham/School of Education, USDOL TORs etc.) will apply to all respondents, recognizing that they may face professional and political vulnerabilities. Specific care will be taken to avoid conduct that may immediately harm projects, their participants and staff. If, however, any abusive practice is noticed, this will immediately be reported to Anti-Slavery International. Although all efforts will be made to put respondents at ease, the reality is often that some people (particularly children) may be suspicious of outsiders and wary of speaking openly. Assessment of data will be cognizant of these problems.

Evaluation Instruments

A guide or aide-mémoire for use during interviews and focus group discussions will be developed incorporating key areas of concern. The interviews and focus groups will take a semi-structured form which ensures some key questions are raised on each occasion but also allow the discussion to be adapted by the evaluator or the respondent as appropriate.

5) Timetable and Work plan

A broad outline of the timetable is as follows:

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Preparatory work/ToR	x	x	x	x	x	x						
Country visits							X	X	X	X	X	
MTR meeting						X	X		X			
Interviews in Geneva and the UK												
Drafting of the report										x	x	x
Draft to Anti-Slavery International												x
Report to DfID												x

The reports will be made available to Anti-Slavery International before it is due to DfID in December 2012.

6) Expected outputs/deliverables

A draft evaluation report will be prepared and shared with Anti-Slavery International for comments before finalization. The total length of the report should be approximately 30 pages, excluding annexes.

The format for the MTE report suggested by DfID is as follows:

1. Title Page including Programme Identification Details
2. Table of Contents
3. Abbreviations / acronyms page
4. Executive summary (maximum 3 pages)
5. A short introduction to the programme
6. The evaluation methodology
7. Findings in relation to standard review criteria
8. Summary of recommendations.

Common annexes may include:

- Achievement Rating Scale
- Terms of reference for the MTR / Final Evaluation
- Evaluation schedule / timetable
- List of people met
- Documents consulted
- Detailed statistical data such as updated baseline surveys, etc.

7) Evaluation Management and Support

Anti-Slavery International and its local partners will provide logistical and administrative support, including travel arrangements (e.g. plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing *per diem*) and all materials needed to provide all deliverables.

Annex 5   Self-assessment questionnaire

Mid-term Evaluation of the 'Slavery and child labour: governance and social responsibility' project

Child Domestic Workers programme

Self-assessment Questionnaire

This is a self-assessment questionnaire to be completed by the three country programmes not being visited by the evaluator during the mid-term evaluation process i.e. Peru, Philippines, and Tanzania. Project partners are asked to consider the following questions and submit written responses **in English** by **Friday 17th September 2010**. The replies should be sent directly to the evaluator, Asmita Naik at asmitanaik.consultancy@gmail.com

Any questions about completing this form should be sent by email to the address above or by calling the evaluator in the UK on phone number + 44 (0) 208 558 7578.

All replies will be treated as confidential for the attention of the evaluator only. The replies will form a basis for further analysis and discussion and the evaluator may follow-up with additional questions and phone calls.

Name of country programme and partner organisation:

Name and contact details (phone and email) of project partner staff:

RELEVANCE

1. What new information have you found out about the problem of child domestic workers since the start of the project?

2. How does the work you are doing fit with other initiatives on child domestic workers at national and local level?

EFFECTIVENESS

3. 'Research' component of the project :

    (a) What have been the main achievements to date of the 'research' component? What is working well?

    (b) What is not working so well? Why? What are the constraints?

4. 'Advocacy' component of the project :

    (a) What have been the main achievements to date of the 'advocacy' component? What is working well?

    (b) What is not working so well? Why? What are the constraints?

5. 'Child participation' component of the project :

    (a) What have been the main achievements to date of the 'child participation' component? What is working well?

(b) What is not working so well? Why? What are the constraints?

6. 'Small grants' component of the project :

   (a) What have been the main achievements to date of the 'small grants' component? What is working well?

   (b) What is not working so well? Why? What are the constraints?

EFFICIENCY

7. How is project management functioning at country level in terms of human resources, financial management, coordination etc. – what is working well, what needs to be improved?

8. How is project management functioning at global level in terms of relations between your organisation, Anti-Slavery International and other country programmes? Consider issues of human and financial resources, coordination, capacity building support etc. – what is working well, what needs to be improved?

IMPACT

9. What difference has the project made so far to the government's response to the issue of child domestic workers? What efforts have you made to impact on legislation, policy or procedures? Has the project contributed to any changes at national or local level? If so, give examples to illustrate your point.

10. What difference has the project made so far at individual and group level? Consider impacts on the following categories and give examples to illustrate your point:

    a. Children and adolescents (consider those who are involved in the project through children's committees, as well as those who are less involved or not involved at all)

    b. Parents

    c. Community members

    d. Schools/Teachers

    e. Employers

    f. Civil society

OTHER

11. Are there any other issues you would like to raise?

12. What recommendations would you like to make for the remaining period of the project?