EVALUATION

Preventing and eliminating child labour in identified hazardous sectors in INDIA (child labour component) INDUS.

IND/01/P50/USA
P.270.05.325.050

An independent joint mid-term evaluation by a team of external consultants.

PART I - Summary Report

India (selected States – Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, UT Delhi)
A Technical Cooperation Project of the Government of India (GOI) and the United States Department of Labour (USDOL)

February 2007

This document has not been professionally edited.

NOTE ON THE EVALUATION PROCESS AND REPORT

This independent evaluation was managed by ILO-IPEC's Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED) following a consultative and participatory approach. DED has ensured that all major stakeholders were consulted and informed throughout the evaluation and that the evaluation was carried out to highest degree of credibility and independence and in line with established evaluation standards.

The evaluation was carried out a team of external consultants[1]. The field mission took place in February 2007. The opinions and recommendations included in this report are those of the authors and as such serve as an important contribution to learning and planning without necessarily constituting the perspective of the ILO or any other organization involved in the project.

The report is provided as an independent perspective. The assessment is based on the information that the evaluation team could obtain in the period of the evaluation and under the parameters given by the evaluation. Factual information has to the extent possible been verified, although complete information has not always been available. Extensive feedback was received from stakeholders to the first draft and incorporated to the extent the evaluation team considered to be appropriate.

---

[1] **Zenda Ofir (Team Leader) Chaman Lal Shamshad Khan John Vijghen**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*NOTE THAT THIS SUMMARY REPORT IS ACCOMPANIED BY PART II: DETAILED REPORT ON THE
EVALUATION CONTEXT, METHODOLOGY AND FINDINGS*

Acronyms

AIM	Anna Institute of Management
AITUC	All India Trade Union Congress
APSO	Action Programme Summary Outline
ATI	State Administrative Training Institute
BCs	Backward Classes
BPL	Below Poverty Line
BTS	Beneficiary Tracking System
CAG	Core Advisory Group
CBO	Community Block Officer
CBWE	Central Board for Workers Education
CEDMAP	Centre for Entrepreneurship Development, Madhya Pradesh
CITU	Centre of Indian Trade Unions
CLMS	Child Labour Monitoring System
CMC	Central Monitoring Committee
CRISP	Centre for Research and Industrial Staff Performance
CSTARI	Central Staff Training and Research Institute
DED	Design, Evaluation and Documentation (independent section of ILO-IPEC)
DEEP	District Elementary Education Plan
DGE&T	Directorate General of Employment and Training
DGFASLI	Directorate General Factory Advisory Service and Labour Institute
DIC	District Industries Centre
DIET	District Institute of Education and Training
DOE	Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resources Development, Government of India
DPEP	District Primary Education Project
DPIU	District Project Implementation Unit
DRDA	District Rural Development Agency
DSTF	District Survey Task Force
DUDA	District Urban Development Agency
DVTO	District Vocational Training Officer
DWCD	Department of Women and Child Development, GOI
ECL	Elimination of Child Labour
EFI	Employers Federation of India
EGS	Education Guarantee Scheme
GOI	Government of India
IASP	Integrated Area Specific Project
ICDS	Integrated Child Development Scheme
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ILO-IPEC	ILO International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour
INTUC	Indian National Trade Union Congress
IPEC	International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour
ITC	Industrial Training Centre
ITI	Industrial Training Institute
MCED	Maharashtra Centre for Entrepreneurship Development
MHRD	Ministry of Human Resources Development, Government of India
MOLE	Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NRC	National Resource Cell
NCERT	National Council of Educational Research and Training
NCLP	National Child Labour Project
NCVT	National Council for Vocational Training
NFE	Non-Formal Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NIC	National Informatics Centre
NICSI	National Informatics Centre Services Incorporated
NIEPA	National Institute of Education Planning and Administration
NIOH	National Institute of Occupational Health
NIPCCD	National Institute of Public Cooperation and Child Development

NISTADS	National Institute of Science, Technology and Development Studies
NRC	National Resource Centre
NSC	National Steering Committee
NVTS	National Vocational Training System
PHC	Primary Health Centre
PMP	Project Monitoring Plan
PRIs	Panchayati Raj Institutions
PTA	Parent-Teacher Association
SCs	Scheduled Castes
SCERT	State Council of Educational Research and Training
SCVT	State Council for Vocational Training
SHGs	Self-Help Groups
SPD-SSA	State Project Director, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan
SPSC	State Project Steering Committee
SRC	State Resource Cell
SSA	Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan
STs	Scheduled Tribes
TEC	Transitional Education Centre
TORs	Terms of Reference
TPR	Technical Progress Report
UEE	Universal Elementary Education
UPAAM	Uttar Pradesh Academy of Administration and Management
USDOL	United States Department of Labour
VEC	Village Education Committee
VT	Vocational Training
VTC	Vocational Training Centre
VVGNLI	VV Giri National Labour Institute
WDACL	World Day Against Child Labour
WEC	Ward Education Committee
YASHADA	Yeshwantrao Chavan Academy of Administration

Acknowledgments

The Evaluation Team wishes to express our warmest appreciation to all who made this Mid-Term Evaluation possible and turned it into an experience that we will remember for a long time.

We are particularly grateful to

- Surina Rajan and the rest of the central INDUS Project Team who had the challenging task of coordinating our complex schedule while assisting with last-minute changes and frequent requests for additional data and information.

- All our hosts in the four states and eight districts we visited, including the State Resource Cells and others who organised the state level stakeholder workshops and meetings, as well as the District Collectors and district Project teams who with great care facilitated our exposure to all that is taking place at district level. We were made to feel very welcome.

- All the workshop and meeting participants - officials, social partners and community members - who were prepared to share their views with us, demonstrating a sincere commitment to INDUS and to those who did not have a voice.

- The staff, volunteers and partners in the field who went out of their way to show us the operation of the Transitional Education Centres, the Lead Schools and the Vocational Training Centres. We appreciated the efforts to expose us to the ongoing activities in a very short time.

We trust that this report will serve as a useful platform for debate and action among all stakeholders as INDUS moves forward into its final stages.

We also trust that the Government of India, the US Department of Labour and ILO-IPEC will find the INDUS experiences and lessons useful in furthering their efforts to eliminate child labour in India and across the world.

Zenda Ofir (Team leader)
Chaman Lal
Shamshad Khan
John Vijghen

Format of the Report

This Evaluation Report consists of two distinct yet complementary parts. It should be read as one document:

- Part I summarises the evaluation findings and conclusions, and highlights key lessons and recommendations.
- Part II sheds more light on the context of the evaluation, the methodology and the issues that informed the findings. It also contains all the relevant annexes to the report.

Summary Report[2]

1.1. Introduction

1.1.1. Child labour in India

Spurred on by the country's impressive economic growth and growing international profile, the Government of India (GOI) and its state governments are accelerating efforts to address critical social and economic ills that may hinder future progress. Over the past two decades the central government has progressively been creating an impressive enabling environment for the elimination of child labour. Several states are now following suit. A large number of policy and legislative arrangements have been grounded in a national programme, the *National Child Labour Project* (NCLP) Scheme executed through the Ministry of Labour and Employment (MOLE) and implemented across 250 of the most child labour endemic districts. Complemented by a series of government schemes aimed at reducing poverty and social inequalities and improving education, it encompasses a multi-pronged, integrated approach towards GOI's stated aim of eliminating child labour across India over the next few years.

In spite of noticeable progress, the challenge of effective implementation and enforcement on the ground, the imperative to use system-wide approaches to address the immediate, underlying *and* root causes[3] of child labour, as well as the need to change ingrained social and cultural mindsets have meant that progress has been slower than expected.

The GOI is now gearing up to expand the NCLP country-wide as part of the Eleventh Five Year Plan of India, using lessons learnt from its own and other interventions to give it the best chance of success.

1.1.2. The INDUS Project

In 2000 the GOI and the US Department of Labour (USDOL) entered into an agreement on joint action to assist India in its efforts to eliminate child labour. As a result the US$40 million, three-year INDUS Project was launched in February 2004 in partnership with ILO-IPEC and with ILO-IPEC responsible for the direct management and execution of the US$20 million provided by USDOL[4]. It is a comprehensive intervention of nine inter-linked components enhanced through convergence with appropriate bodies and government schemes. The most important are the NCLP and *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* (SSA) of the Department of Education through which universal elementary education is to be provided for all by 2010. This meant that complimentary components were under different management control, such as the Self-help Groups and school meals which were under the control of GOI.

INDUS has been designed to complement and address some of the critical gaps and challenges in these major national initiatives through a number of additional components referred to as 'NCLP Plus' and 'SSA Plus' (Part II; Chapter 2). It is to pilot-test these initiatives to determine their potential for

---

[2] For details on the issues and arguments underpinning each of these sections, refer to Part II of this report.

[3] *Immediate causes* – household income at poverty level; cash-flow crises; changes in family size and structure. *Underlying causes* - values and situations that predispose a family or community to accept / encourage child labour. These include traditions and cultural expectations, commercial employer interests, traditional gender roles and social exclusion. *Root / structural causes* – at the level of the larger economy and society which influences the enabling environment in which child labour can either flourish or be eliminated; 'national poverty'. Reference – ILO-IPEC report.

[4] INDUS has been funded with subsequent instalments since 1 September 2001 but was actually launched on 16 February 2004 only. At the time of writing of this report, the (revised) end date was set on 31 August 2007. The original start and end dates (as per the project document) were 30 September 2001 and 31 December 2004 respectively. Hence the remark that INDUS was a three-year project.

implementation on a larger scale. Its term was extended by one year to August 2007 and most recently to 30 September 2008.

1.1.3.   The Mid-Term Evaluation

In line with the agreement between the partners, this Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of INDUS was commissioned as a joint mid-term, formative, independent evaluation coordinated by the Design, Evaluation and Documentation (DED) section of ILO-IPEC acting as an independent entity. It was executed by an international four-person team of independent evaluation and child labour experts appointed by GOI (MOLE and the Ministry of Human Resources Development, MHRD), USDOL and ILO-IPEC.

The evaluation was designed with due cognisance of the systemic nature of child labour, the complex set of factors needed for long-term success, the phased, evolving approach of the GOI and the objectives of the intervention located within this context. Guided by stakeholder interests expressed in the Terms of Reference (Part II, Annex 1), the Evaluation Team essentially conducted an implementation evaluation underpinned by the Project logic (theory). The merit of the design and a look at the future were also addressed.

The MTE was focused through an evaluation matrix developed by the Evaluation Team at the start of the mission (Part II, Annex 2). Evidence to inform findings was obtained through triangulation[5] using a variety of methods[6] and sources for verification[7]. The evaluation was also designed to be forward-looking and to be used to inform Project improvements, complementary interventions and the international search for models that work.

Joint evaluations are by their very nature complex and often subject to prolonged negotiation and planning between the parties in order to reach an agreed upon framework for the evaluation. For this evaluation it was not possible for instance to decide on a team leader prior to field missions, which in line with normal practice, could negotiate a clearer focus and structure the methddology and field mission much earlier in the process. This would have dealt with some of the ethical challenges and technical constraints that hampered this MTE.

As a result the key constraints impeding the Team's work were (i) the lack of a structured process and time before and during the mission for the evaluation team to negotiate the methodology, develop a common style for systematic work and create understanding among stakeholders of the nature of the evaluation; (ii) the very limited time allowed for data collection within a fixed, fairly inflexible programme designed without consultation with the evaluation team; (iii) insufficient opportunity for the evaluation team to engage in consolidation of findings throughout the field mission; and (iv) lack of time for supplementary studies that could have provided valuable insights on key issues.[8]

In order to overcome the aforementioned constraints the Evaluation Team focused on conducting the evaluation with commitment and the best use of their respective areas of expertise.

---

[5] Triangulation: Consistency of different findings checked in this case (i) within the same method (triangulation of sources) and (ii) generated by different data and information collection methods (methods triangulation). The circulation and review of the draft report is part of this.

[6] Methods included a document study, observation through field visits to four participating states and eight districts, individual and group discussions and stakeholder workshops. Supplementary sub-studies on specific topics were in principle possible, but far various logistical reasons could not be included.

[7] The stakeholder workshops presented a good opportunity for closed question surveys to complement discussions with quantitative information, but this was executed only to a small extent during the national stakeholder workshop.

[8] Even though the possibility of this was noted in the Terms of Reference, the Team was not in a position to commission such studies given time and other constraints

The MTE was intended to highlight areas of achievement and progress as well as those in need of improvement. In view of the nature of a mid-term evaluation there may be a tendency to dwell on the latter. Furthermore, rather than provide final judgments, a formative evaluation should create new insights and debate and highlight issues for the stakeholders to study, address and use as they see fit. As an independent evaluation the draft report also present only one perspective on INDUS; there are many others based on the more detailed knowledge of the key stakeholders.

The Evaluation Team prepared this report with these two intentions in mind.

1.2. Evaluation Findings

1.2.1. The Project design

The Project design was well conceived and articulated, with sound arguments for the various components based on earlier experiences and a vision of the integrated systems needed for ECL in India. It was also relevant, fitting with the tactics and priorities of GOI and further enhanced by local and global evidence on what to do to combat child labour. It tried to address the immediate causes of child labour and used the concept of convergence to address underlying and root causes. Coordination mechanisms for convergence[9], oversight and implementation were provided through a cascade of multi-stakeholder committees, technical support structures and project teams.

Its relevance was further confirmed through extensive stakeholder consultation at national, state and district level once the Project Team was in place. This approach has continued throughout the Project lifetime, with the Team constantly responsive to stakeholder concerns and new opportunities – a particular strength of the implementation approach. Several elements were added as needs and tactics brought these to the fore, including a stronger focus on capacity building, social mobilisation with trade unions and employers, mainstreaming of child labour in other policies and programmes and occupational safety and health. NT Delhi was added as 21st district. There has been little change in the child labour landscape in India during the last few years – nothing severe enough to affect the value of the Project. The design has therefore remained relevant to date.

There was one major shift once field realities were tested and understood - following a sector-area rather than sector-based approach. This Evaluation Team supported this shift as it was based on an ethical approach, practical realities and greater chance for sustainable results. But it has had a marked effect on implementation and the achievement of targets as intended in the Project document. It changed the constitution of the target audience to include a significant percentage of children and adolescents from outside the ten hazardous occupations, including from non-hazardous sectors.

One of the design strengths is that it had from the start sustainability as a cornerstone - not in terms of the Project as such (it was designed to be absorbed into other national initiatives), but in terms of the larger system for the elimination of child labour. It devised several mechanisms to help achieve sustainability in the longer term, including (i) very strong state and district level engagement and ownership, as well as (ii) social mobilisation, the (iii) encouragement of state level action plans also in non-INDUS states, (iv) capacity building among key role players and (v) designing the Project 'on top of' the NCLP and SSA.

---

[9] The concept of convergence refers to the reorientation of resources, including human resources, funds and technical assistance under various developmental schemes and poverty alleviation programmes to benefit of the child and affected family in the best possible way. In other words, different schemes and programmes are designed and/or used to work together for the benefit of the intended beneficiaries.

The design had a good logic and was quite detailed in terms of activities to be followed and outputs and outcomes to be achieved, serving as a roadmap for Project implementation. Although a key goal was to field-test some new interventions in order to build upon the existing national programme – and hence the ambitious original timeframe of three years - its schedule and sequencing of actions were shaken by realities on the ground. This highlighted the need for a realistic timeframe in a Project such as this (in the opinion of the Evaluation Team this should be around five years with similar resources) when a project works with policy mainstreaming, institutionalisation, capacity development and ownership aimed both at long-term sustainability and up-scaling across the country.

Although the project lifetime is relative short the design would have benefited from emphasising a clear and effective exit strategy. Ideally there will be four clearly defined Project phases, each with its own results - negotiation and design, a carefully constructed preparatory phase, implementation and a well-timed exit strategy.

Inevitably there are points for strengthening. Some technical inadequacies were found (e.g. certain indicators which are not appropriate) and a few components could have been better designed (e.g. knowledge management). Certain omissions have weakened implementation, in particular the issue of migration (later addressed through a Child Migrant Addendum) and customisation to make better provision for differences between states, and more particular, between rural, urban and metropolitan areas. Early analyses of the nature, role and implications of gender and cultural considerations in the Project would have strengthened both the design and implementation. INDUS could also have been used more effectively to encourage public-private partnerships. The enforcement of anti-child labour measures is imperative for success in ECL. The focus on capacity building for this purpose may be the best contribution INDUS could make, but it is also well placed to find innovative ways to link enforcement with other ECL activities for greater effect. It is a pity that this element did not have a higher profile.

Building on and strengthening NCLP and SSA has in principle been a sound design strategy, but two issues have emerged. Firstly, careful attention should be given to the design details underlying implementation. For example paying the same salaries for larger workloads or more specialised skills may be counter-productive. Encouraging adolescents to embark on vocational training without a sufficient level of education that enhances their chances for success may be relegating them for life to a low societal status if they fail to graduate.

Secondly, the notion that INDUS would be more effective than NCLP is based on perceptions of a better design *and* better implementation. Including INDUS design elements (the "Plus" elements) into NCLP or SSA without sufficient attention to improving the implementation of these programmes using lessons documented and learnt in INDUS – in line with its purpose as pilot project - will be important in order to maximise the benefits from the INDUS support.

INDUS has tried to address the immediate causes of child labour, with some attention to its underlying and root causes (footnote 2) and through a somewhat unstructured approach to convergence. The latter is seen as a mainstay of the Project, but apart from the two main government departments has not yet yielded desired results. Relying on a somewhat ad hoc coordination between schemes without active planning, negotiation and management, as well as systematic information dissemination and monitoring, is fraught with potential problems and critical gaps may continue to exist. Unless convergence works well, even a multi-pronged intervention with all the INDUS components might in the end not make a long-term, sustained difference.

In the assessment of the evaluation team the design would in fact have been strengthened if the family rather than the child had been the point of departure. The family was recognised as an important target, but the centrality of the child meant that the key components aimed at the mothers and family were less

well conceptualised and implemented late. This has affected Project success but the evaluation team recognise that the Project was designed to focus on the children, with family-based interventions only supplementing the efforts. The Project management and implementers did not have the choice to change this focus.

These points in need of strengthening do not mean that the Project components should have changed in their essence, but long-term success will only be achieved if solutions are found to the underlying and root causes of child labour. Among others, tracer studies of specific children under a variety of difficult circumstances would have brought to the fore the impact of different interventions on the child and family and highlighted possible improvements.

1.2.2. Project implementation

Progress

In spite of delays a remarkable amount of work has been done over the two years since the official start of Project activities. Although certain targets have not been achieved the difficult circumstances under which progress has been made should be acknowledged. The demanding set of strategies and expanded set of components, the relatively short timeframe for a project of this size and complexity, the need for vertical and horizontal coordination across sectors and three levels of governance as well as working within bureaucratic systems and through sometimes demotivated implementers have all taken their toll.

There are good reasons for the impressive performance of the management and implementers. The main facilitating factors are the good enabling policy and legislative environment and political support for ECL interventions; an experienced, knowledgeable, hard working and responsive central Project Team supported by a good number of committed officials, implementing agencies and project staff at state and local levels; facilitating bodies such as the SRC and NCLP Societies, especially effective where the District Collectors play an active role; and the effective mobilisation of partners from a variety of sectors in society to support Project activities.

But implementation has been affected by a number of significant delays of which the most significant have been the identification of Project beneficiaries, the implementation of beneficiary monitoring systems, the public education and income generation components. Target achievement in the vocational training component also remains a challenge[10].

There are several reasons for these delays. Some of these were beyond the control of the Project while others were perpetuated by the Project design[11]. Their value is that useful lessons were learnt and are being documented to inform future action. On the other hand they have already impacted on Project performance (refer for example to 1.2.6, 1.2.8 and 1.2.9 in Part I and to the accompanying sections in Part II) and have the potential to severely affect the Project as disillusionment sets in among parents and Project beneficiaries. Several targets (such as those set for vocational training, SHG establishment, stipend and public education budget release – refer to component analyses below), have not yet been met and an obvious strategy to do so in the remaining timeframe is not apparent.

Achievements[12]

The many stakeholders consulted during the five stakeholder workshops were complimentary about Project achievements even though weaknesses were recognised and discussed. The views of all represented at the workshops were canvassed through group discussions[13] with verbal and written feedback from each.

Many of the individual opinions shared with evaluation team members confirmed that the Project design, the more active engagement and guidance from those in leadership positions in INDUS (at all three levels)

---

[10] Among others reports confirm that the enrolment in vocational training centres was done in batches (in line with the strategy of learning over successive batches) and also hampered by constraints of infrastructure and partner capacities.

[11] For example, the significant delay in the start up of the public education interventions was according to reports caused by working out a system for release of funds in a situation where the implementing partner identified by the Project Document (MHRD), preferred that the USDOL component of funds be released to their district SSA units through the district child labour project societies instead of a direct release to either the state or district SSA societies. This system for release of grants added another layer and led inevitably to delays in the funds reaching the point of utilization.

[12] For a detailed list of perceived achievements refer to table 5 in section 4.2, PART II

[13] Stratified according to interest groups

and in the different coordinating and facilitating bodies, as well as close monitoring of implementation have been key factors in the good results compared to similar interventions.

Interestingly the best achievements were highlighted by stakeholders to be at a qualitative rather than quantitative level. Achievements were thus not seen to be about numbers of beneficiaries, but rather about the way in which implementation has been conducted – the way things are done in the Project. This is reflected in the group choices of those aspects that according to them made the most difference – (i) successful awareness raising and social mobilisation campaigns; the (ii) provision of meaningful vocational training and opportunities for employment; and (iii) the provision of appropriate education with personal attention in a child-friendly environment.

These perceptions agreed with those of the evaluation team. In addition they were impressed by the Project's (iv) stimulation of action and influence on several strategies and action plans at national, state and district level including the fact that the Central Monitoring Committee (CMC)[14] has recommended scaling up the vocational training component country-wide as part of the NCLP, and (v) its ability to reach a large number of beneficiaries *and* mobilise an array of strategic partners. Other impressive achievements are (vi) the significant steps towards institutionalisation and mainstreaming; (vii) the level of ownership and acknowledged enthusiasm among many of those responsible for implementation; (viii) the evolving culture of monitoring, documenting and critical assessment; and (ix) the almost equal number of boys and girls benefiting from the interventions.

The broadening of the definition of beneficiaries for withdrawal and rehabilitation to include those from other sectors, including from non-hazardous occupations contributed to the fast achievement of the target of 80 000. The Evaluation Team supports the change from a sector to sector-area approach for practical and ethical reasons. Other contributing factors appear to be the community worker system, the availability of TECs in the area, the early awareness raising and social mobilisation efforts, the financial incentives and the sheer size of interventions in India through the mobilisation of existing systems operating at different governance levels. The fact that certain children continue to work in spite of official 'withdrawal' has also added to the number although the magnitude of this situation is not clear[15]. Greater in-depth understanding of the reasons, especially at family level will be useful to inform future interventions[16].

Although the Project Team with their partners have achieved a significant number of the intended objectives, one aspect has suffered. The INDUS Project was intended to be experimental and innovative, and the Project thus had to explore opportunities or strategies and study various approaches to address child labour in the national and local context. Unfortunately, the need to achieve has had virtual all the attention, leaving little opportunity for the exploratory nature of the Project.

The Project Team acknowledged that this has posed a challenge, as they had to be accountable for a fairly detailed set of activities and targets, leaving little room for experimentation[17]. This has been further exacerbated by the fairly short Project timeframe. While they felt generally unable to modify action or test

---

[14] Comprising of MOLE, GOI and the Labour Secretaries of all the 25 state governments; held on 5-6 June 2006; noted in TPR September 2006

[15] The evaluation team was told that the definition of withdrawal used in the Project can also refer to children working for lesser number of hours and/or in safer conditions. The team finds these comments intriguing as the term "withdrawal" in the context of ECL has only one universally recognised meaning – complete disengagement from of work of identified child and restoration of childhood to it.

[16] According to the Project Team a research study is already underway to understand the time use pattern of child labour withdrawn from work and enrolled in project interventions.

[17] This emphasises the need for an appropriate timeframe and the need for adequate resources. Targeting large numbers of working children in the field throws up issues, challenges and areas for exploratory work or varied responses. If the work is carried out at a very small scale it can be perfect but not a realistic model for replication.

new strategies, lessons have been recorded and some adjustments and innovations made[18]. Examples are the move to a sector-area approach, the two vocational training models, the expansion of the capacity building component, the attempts to address issues around migrant child labour, and the focus on occupational health and safety.

Unintended consequences
While this component did not receive due attention during the evaluation, stakeholders reported a significant number of mostly positive unexpected effects from the Project activities. These include but are not limited to the development of state action plans with INDUS advice and lessons, the transfer of lessons and in some cases, certain elements from INDUS to NCLP districts[19], the surfacing of latent talent among children in the arts, music, dance and other activities, and the building of confidence among girls and mothers.

A potentially negative effect may be that comparisons between NCLP and INDUS have become almost inevitable instead of stakeholders seeing one as complementing the other and providing opportunities for exploratory work. If this is not well managed, setting one project against the other may lead to miscommunication and misunderstanding, instead of a mutual learning process."

Gender mainstreaming
In spite of the surprisingly low profile of gender mainstreaming in the Project Document, implementation has brought an impressive balance between numbers of boys and girls benefiting from the Project. It is also encouraging that gender issues are not just regarded as ensuring equal numbers and disaggregated data collection. This is reflected in some special arrangements for girls and women, such as transport to vocational training centres and TECs, training to surveyors and emphasis on the identification of the girl child, self-help groups aimed at all mothers and trade unions' efforts to mobilise a significant number of women for training and engagement. The development of gender-sensitive materials is also an indication of efforts to ensure that a focus on gender is sustained after the Project ends.

Less successful areas have been the stereotyping of trades and skills training for vocational training, although sensitivity to culture and traditions has been one of the reasons for this situation. In a few cases there have been successful efforts to break away from these stereotypes[20], but this will benefit from further attention as part of a stronger focus on removing the underlying causes of child labour. There is also a need to understand better what impact the gender of community workers has on social mobilisation efforts. The provision of uniforms in some cases to girls only may have had a negative rather than positive effect; this has to be tested on the ground. No effective results have been seen from efforts (including prescribed guidelines for equal representation on committees) to have balanced gender representation in committees and project teams at state and district level.

More needs to be done to understand what truly effective gender mainstreaming across all components will entail, especially within the limitations set by culture, tradition and convention. Studies that investigate more deeply how boys and girls are affected by and respond to these interventions and how mainstreaming could be promoted across these types of interventions will add significant value to the Project outputs.

---

[18] The INDUS Project Team produced a useful publication summarising good practices and lessons learnt that can serve as a good reference point for future interventions.

[19] In this the Project has exceeded expectations

[20] Although there are some examples of success - such as the case of 30 girls in Thiruvallur district of Tamil Nadu who have defied the local norm and received training in repair of home appliances and motor rewinding and who are now gainfully employed - the evaluation team's observation that this is an exception rather than a rule is based on a series of interactions with beneficiaries. We have seen no evidence to the contrary.

Knowledge management

In spite of the low profile of knowledge management in the Project Document, the Project Team has made strides in establishing monitoring, review and documentation systems for tracking progress and sharing experiences. By their own admission this could have been done more systematically at different levels, but given the time needed to establish the different components, it is now an appropriate time to refine the knowledge management approaches and start consolidating lessons towards the development of an improved model for ECL.

Major players in the knowledge management processes are the National and State Resource Cells. They are not all operating efficiently but have initiated review meetings, established systems to monitor and provide cross-checks on the ground, and collected (and in some cases created) child labour resources. They are potentially very effective vehicles for technical support to ECL interventions, but it is unclear whether they will be institutionalised once INDUS ends.

The Project has touched on all elements of the 'knowledge management cycle'[21] and results are beginning to show. State governments have included INDUS experiences in action plans and implementation activities. Events (although according to stakeholders too few) have helped to share experiences across district and state boundaries. Processes have been documented and 34 publications developed including guidelines, handbooks, training modules, sensitisation materials and a thoughtful volume on key lessons learnt to date. Several have been contextualised and translated into local languages.

Several aspects need improvement. Monitoring systems have shown weaknesses which have been affecting data integrity and usefulness[22]. According to some stakeholders, dissemination of materials has sometimes not been done adequately or at the right time and contextualisation for local conditions and translation may be more frequently needed. Stakeholders also found that committee review meetings may not encourage free expression of opinion when conducted in a too formal manner. Several stakeholders including District Collectors have asked for more exposure visits and information on international experiences that can inform their own. The Project has also commissioned at least two in-depth studies related to the carpet industry sector and occupational health and safety. Ideally more research and action research should inform Project action and models and it is encouraging that at least one of the SRCs (Maharashtra) includes a focus on process documentation and research in their priorities.

Sustainability

The INDUS design has been rooted in several sustainability strategies. These were reinforced and expanded during implementation. This emphasis on sustainability has already started to bear fruit as displayed in the recommendation to absorb and scale up the vocational training component country-wide as part of the NCLP. Two models for vocational training are available[23] and according to reports there is a good chance that service providers may continue to provide such training courses for unemployed 14-17 year old adolescents.

This places a major responsibility on the Project to document and transfer their knowledge to other applications. For example it would be a mistake to scale up the vocational training component without a thorough understanding of weaknesses, challenges and those factors which may affect success when the pilot project is scaled up at national level. The Project has already started to meet this challenge and will have to expand these activities during the exit phase.

---

[21] Creating, capturing, enhancing, disseminating, sharing, preserving and using knowledge
[22] Refer for example to sections 1.2.4 and 1.2.5 in Part I of this report
[23] Refer to section 1.2.7 in Part I, and section 9.0 in Part II of this report

The Project has implemented an impressive number of activities towards sustainability: (i) documenting and sharing lessons; (ii) creating opportunities for knowledge sharing; (iii) promoting the work of INDUS in a manner that espouses among partners a broader ECL vision rather than a project-based one; (iv) encouraging, informing and advising state action plans; (v) rooting interventions in government or government supported structures such as the SRCs; (vi) devolving responsibility to multi-sector coordination and monitoring committees and especially to District Collectors; (vii) using reputable national or state institutions with an influence on policy makers for training (even if additional resource persons are needed in the initial phase); (viii) encouraging community engagement and ownership through awareness raising and social mobilisation, engagement of community leaders through VEC/WECs and liaison with Panchayati Raj[24] Institutions; (ix) emphasising convergence and establishing structures to facilitate this between government agencies – although only the two key ministries appear to be adequately engaged at this stage; (x) implementing components so that they reinforce one another through a sector-area approach and an extensive array of partnerships that include trade unions, employers and NGOs (the potential to extend this to SHGs could be improved); and (xi) drawing key government agencies into the occupational health and safety study so that research is done for the first time on child labour in these organisations.

There are threats to sustainability. The most critical appear to be the following: (i) INDUS is significantly more expensive per beneficiary than the NCLP. This aspect has to be studied in greater depth. It is likely that the relatively high costs are due to those time- and expertise-intensive elements that are actually seen to be crucial for success, such as the processes aimed at creating enthusiasm and ownership, establishing good working relationships, coordination and convergence between different sectors and interest groups, capacity building, ensuring effective monitoring systems and mobilising communities and decision-makers around ECL. If budget interests are paramount, in the absence of a cost-benefit analysis these important elements may in future be watered down, endangering the success of the whole effort. (ii) INDUS should not be presented as an initiative in competition with NCLP. (iii) People and implementing institutions on the ground have been demotivated by the low honoraria and lack of overhead costs. (iv) For various reasons officials and contracted field level staff are changing frequently, requiring significant additional efforts to inspire them about the value and merit of INDUS. (v) Unless the root *and* underlying causes of child labour are effectively addressed no effort to eliminate child labour may prove to be sustainable.

Main factors affecting implementation

(i) The quality, commitment and management style of the Project leadership. Although the Project management was not a focus for the work of the Evaluation Team, stakeholders have praised the central Project team for their expertise, approachability, hard work and commitment, their encouragement of critical reflection and their capacity to drive implementation according to plan, yet retain a measure of flexibility. The SRCs, Project Directors and District Collectors have also been acknowledged for their critical roles where interventions are working. The roles of the District Collectors are seen as especially important.

(ii) The capacities, motivation and processes at field level. Interventions such as INDUS rely heavily on motivated individuals who are willing to go beyond the call of duty. While there are many such people engaged in INDUS, certain systemic obstacles and demotivating factors (discussed elsewhere) have had an effect. The strong focus on capacity building and guideline provision has tried to amend any lack of motivation or capacities in the field but this cannot fully compensate for this.

---

[24] Panchayati Raj" institutions are local self-government bodies in India

(iii) The enabling environment. Although the political will to enforce legislation or fill certain policy or strategy gaps has occasionally been questioned by civil society organisations in India as well as several INDUS stakeholders, the enabling environment of the elimination of child labour appears to be progressive and evolving. This is being supported by good media exposure, social awareness campaigns and more recently, the development of state-wide action plans. According to reports enforcement remains a key debilitating factor mainly due to systemic inefficiencies and the extensive use of family-based household units for labour which are difficult to regulate.

(iv) The need for convergence. Horizontal and vertical coordination and integration across government agencies and also within civil society is a cornerstone of INDUS but remains a challenge for effective implementation. The existence of coordinating bodies does not necessarily mean that convergence takes place on the ground. The commitment and capacities of District Collectors are critical. Although several states have been moving to make available convergence guidelines, there is a dire need for more strategic emphasis on the provision of consolidated information, and on ensuring effective training and monitoring that make convergence more effective. Obstacles such as the fact that most families do not fall under the BPL[25] need to be interrogated and solutions found, with a truly 'family centred' rather than (only) 'child centred' approach.

(v) The need for quality. Quality work is imperative for successful pilot interventions. The Project has implemented several strategies to address this issue, with varying levels of success on the ground. (i) Monitoring and tracking systems as well as reviews are to inform progress and achievement, but weaknesses have been found in the qualitative monitoring as well as capacities and buy-in to implement these effectively[26]. (ii) Credible processes have in principle been established to appoint staff, implementing agencies and service providers, but according to at least two sets of anecdotal information, meddling by higher authorities and certain inefficiencies have affected the recruitment procedure and consequently the quality of some staff."[27]. (iii) The development and execution of training courses and materials have been allocated to reputable institutions and capacities strengthened through additional expertise or partnerships where required. (iv) Evidence-based decision-making has been promoted through studies such as the baseline survey, the analysis of the vocational training systems in each state before finalising the interventions and the conduct of the occupational health and safety study to inform awareness raising efforts. It also informed the transitional education component[28], and labour market surveys were conducted in all the districts to assess the local labour market before skills were chosen.

(vi) The Project design and expansion over time. The holistic design with its several challenging and resource-intensive parallel components - with coordination at three levels of governance - has strained capacities, skills and timeframes. Delays were caused during implementation in part because there was no margin left for things to go wrong. In the experience of some of the international evaluation team members there is also an international tendency to underestimate the time needed in developing countries to ensure ownership, adequate capacities and policy mainstreaming – even though sustainability of interventions and/or their benefits is almost always a requirement. This also emphasises the need for early and timely start of ownership and capacity building processes.

The fact that INDUS was to test new approaches also meant that flexibility had to be there to incorporate solutions for specific problems or needs. This led to expansion of the Project which has severely tested

---

[25] The fact that BPL families are not included is according to the evaluation team members' knowledge a common complaint encountered in the execution of various developmental projects. The main reason appears to be the imperfect survey of poverty status of people in rural India. A large number of genuinely poor families can be found to have been excluded from BPL lists

[26] Refer among others to section 7.0, Part II of this report.

[27] Although these are only a few anecdotal cases, this might warrant closer scrutiny as respondents implied that this could be more widespread.

[28] State-wise analysis of curriculum, text books, teacher training facilities was carried out with the State Education Departments and convergence mechanisms established for the supply of text books and the use of training institutes by the implementing partners.

capacities. Including in the Programme aspects such as income generation and vocational training meant that these essentially private sector type initiatives required new types of partnerships which have not yet been well explored. Using NCLP as a base for the design (and to a lesser extent the SSA) has limited opportunities for creativity towards effective implementation and target achievement in these areas.

1.2.3. Project component: Identification of Project beneficiaries[29]

The crucial baseline survey was to be *the* instrument that defined and determined Project beneficiaries. The survey methodology was modified in consultation with local stakeholders. The survey was to be completed over two months in two stages under supervision of a District Survey Task Force (DSTF) led by the District Collector for increased local ownership and control, with final beneficiary selection in collaboration with NCLP Societies.

The results of the exercise differed substantially from Project expectations in two ways: (i) the consequence of the decision to shift to an area-sector based approach meant that children and adolescents were listed across 22 sectors, several of which were non-hazardous; (ii) a large number of potential beneficiaries were lost in lengthy delays between their identification and eventual withdrawal. The NCLP Societies also felt the survey list contained insufficient or incorrect details, for example no proper address where children could be located, children older than the targeted age group, doubly listed children and so forth.

Eventually only an estimated 40% of those participating in the Project were from the first baseline survey listing; others were selected based on far less rigorous secondary surveys and even through personal intervention (in the case if adolescents).

In spite of Project Team efforts for damage control, this situation has had serious repercussions for the target group: the children and adolescents enrolled included many from sectors other than the ten targeted for the Project. They were not necessarily identified through criteria in line with the Project intent as Stage II did not in essence flow from the results in Stage I. As Stage II in most cases also took an extraordinarily long time to complete, the survey covered a much more limited number of identified child labourers or children at risk than was intended. However, this was not due to the two stage design or cumbersome questionnaire, the methodology or debate about the survey objectives. The survey, if properly executed by the survey agencies and if carefully controlled by the guiding and monitoring bodies, could have provided a list of eligible beneficiaries within the given time. Unfortunately, execution and monitoring was often not done properly, resulting in inadequate beneficiary listings.

In conclusion, the two-stage identification process was of limited use and drained project resources without much effect or necessitated alternative identification processes. This is a lesson documented by the Project Team to inform future interventions.

For further details and substantiation of the statements in this section, refer also to section 5.0, Part II of the report.

1.2.4. Project component: Withdrawal and enrolment of Project beneficiaries[30]

A critical accomplishment of the Project has been the surpassing of the target of withdrawing and rehabilitating 80 000 working children and adolescents from the ten targeted hazardous occupations long before the end of the Project lifetime. This is in part due to the accelerated success brought about by the

---

[29] For more details refer to section 5.0, Part II of this report.
[30] For more details refer to section 6.0, Part II of this report.

change to a sector-area approach. However, while the commitment and efficiency in achieving a high level of success within limited time is highly appreciated, the Evaluation Team has come to the conclusion that this careful scrutiny of the processes and numbers may lead to a revision of this important number based on the following:

- It is very likely that a substantial number of the target group were drawn from occupations other than those targeted by the Project, including from non-hazardous sectors. The repercussions of this deviation from intent will have to be considered, especially in view of the reasons for a sector-area approach versus a focus on only ten hazardous occupations.

- Numbers of children and adolescents in all three age groups are not (yet) being tracked efficiently through the Beneficiary Tracking System (BTS); the percentage whose progress have been tracked is significantly lower than 100%. Data on retention are thus not available and a claim that more than 100% have been rehabilitated can therefore not be made.

- A number of children have not been 'withdrawn' according to ILO-IPEC guidelines, as they continue to work while getting education. It is difficult to determine the extent of this situation, but even if the numbers would be low it is a matter that deserves serious attention. This phenomenon was observed in Mumbai Suburban districts and confirmed in Aurangabad by one of the key stakeholders, estimating that 20-30% children were working in households after school hours[31].

- The situation of migrant children is of particular concern. Since they are enrolled for short periods only before dropping out again, without apparent project strategies for systematic follow-up in their districts of origin, the effect on the total target number should be assessed. The Evaluation Team recognises the difficulty to include these children through a sector-area based approach, but they could have been included applying a special strategy in INDUS, or through a different intervention[32].

In spite of these reservations, it remains a significant achievement to have established within a limited time the infrastructure, and mobilised and capacitated the implementing agencies and coordinating institutions to achieve a high number of withdrawn child labourers.

For further details and substantiation of the statements in this section, refer also to section 6.0, Part II of the report.

1.2.5. Project component: Beneficiary monitoring and tracking[33]

The development of a sustainable monitoring system to follow the progress of targeted child workers, adolescents and their families is essential for success, particularly if it provides a reliable mechanism to determine the effect of the Project on individual beneficiaries and their families. The Project document envisaged the engagement of a recognised institution for the implementation of a system for both the beneficiaries and their families. Instead, a card based Beneficiary Tracking System (BTS) has been implemented by the Project Team itself. Introduced only in January 2006, the system has not yet stabilised either in card or electronic form. The uploading of the card-based data is proceeding well, with 85% of nearly 65 000 cards already uploaded in spite of practical challenges related to staff and volunteer

---

[31] Although based on a single observation and anecdote, the Evaluation Team's comments regarding the combination of education and work detected in Mumbai Suburban and Aurangabad is too serious a matter to be dismissed lightly. This strikes at the very basic philosophy of ECL. The team was told that these mainly migrant children go back to the same employer after work, implying that they continue to be engaged in (most likely) hazardous work.
[32] The Evaluation Team was informed that the project had identified the migrant issue in late 2004/early 2005 and had developed a strategy to deal with this (with additional USDOL funding). We are unable to assess the extent to which this accommodates the expressed concerns.
[33] For more details refer to section 7.0, Part II of this report.

capacities, and infrastructure. A community-based Child Labour Monitoring System (CLMS) is currently undergoing field trails.

It is too early for an evaluation of these systems but it is likely that they need simplification if credible data are to be gathered by staff and volunteers. The quality of the data gathered also needs some form of cross-checking. In principle they are welcome additions to the Project as they can provide accountability and reliable information and increase community ownership. An efficiently functioning community-based CLMS will be crucial for sustainability and as part of the Project exit strategy. However, there is a need to make ECL interventions (including INDUS) *truly* family-centred. One way to do this is through a monitoring system that centres on the families and not only on individuals. Such a system should be devised and tested as soon as possible.

As with the PMP it is imperative that the design of these systems includes the correct indicators that provide a qualitative understanding of how implementation is going, besides providing quantitative data on targets. For example, one of the current indicators, "the percentage of parents participating in community groups for promoting education of children" may seem to measure success as PTAs have been formed at all TECs, yet records show that these PTAs are often not really promoting education[34].

For further details and substantiation of the statements in this section, refer also to section 7.0, Part II of the report.

1.2.6.   Project component: Transitional education[35]

Proper functioning of TECs will play a major role towards effective rehabilitation of withdrawn children. Sometimes this is the only education children will get. When they are 14 years old they are legally qualified to work. As this component is also important in the NCLP, the strengths and weaknesses of the INDUS approach needs to be well understood.

Although the absence of data on enrolment of dropped-out or migrated children limits full insight in project achievements[36], during the field visits an impressive number of individuals and discussion groups at district and state level stressed the relative superiority of TECs over the special schools managed under the NCLP Scheme. Better quality of teaching and a greater sense of involvement of teachers, timely finalisation of the curriculum, timely disbursement of honorariums to staff, a regular supply of textbooks, better co-ordination and convergence, more intimate contact with parents, greater involvement of civil society through the community NGOs, better attendance and lower drop-out rates, the concept of Resource Centres, better supervision by the state headquarters and State Project Steering Committees (SRSCs) were frequently mentioned if compared to the NCLP. Efforts at income generation and the strengthening of public education were also commended, somewhat offset by the slow progress in delivering the intended benefits.

There were almost unanimous demands among stakeholders for institutional or overhead allocations for NGOs, especially for social mobilisation activities; higher allocations for rent of TECs; increase of honorarium paid to TEC staff; and flexibility in the release of stipend money in distress situations.

Although permissible under the Operational Guidelines, premature mainstreaming (in some cases in less than six months and at low level in Classes I to III) was a deliberate and major departure from NCLP

---

[34] Although this may of course vary significantly by PTA.

[35] For more details refer to section 8.0, Part II of this report.

[36] Please refer to section 6.3, Part II of the report. Omission of dropped out migrant children does not mean exclusion of some beneficiaries; in fact, it is not correct to treat of this category as beneficiaries in a strict sense. The high but unrecorded drop-out rate had resulted in selection of additional beneficiaries with consequent swelling of figures of claimed withdrawal and rehabilitation.

norms. The Evaluation Team believe that the results of mainstreaming could have been far better if the TECs were run in accordance with these norms[37]. Mainstreaming at lower levels may cause poorer attendance and higher drop-out rates (although this could not be established as a fact). A further problem was the late establishment of some of the TECs and the opening, closing and re-opening of some at different locations, without giving the children the full opportunity of 24 months education over the Project lifetime (this in itself less than the normal 36 months in NCLP), resulting in mainstreaming at Class V or VI level.

Other issues of concern include the low number of stipend payments and delays in the release of stipends to mainstreamed children[38]. It is difficult to understand why this issue has not attracted earlier and more serious attention from the SPSCs or Project Team. The initial interest in teacher training seems to have abated over time, with a fairly high number of untrained teachers in TECs. It was also found that health coverage statistics listed in the TPRs did not indicate actual improvement; and spot verification indicated that health care may be functioning effectively only in those districts where private doctors have been engaged using the available Project budget provision. Scrutiny of individual health cards did not present an encouraging picture (almost all observed by the Evaluation Team were blank).

The mid-day meal for TEC attendants was noted by stakeholders as operating well[39] although some pointed out that this was one area where the budget per meal may not yield equivalent value in food quality and nutrition. It was also reported to the Evaluation Team that Ferozabad (Uttar Pradesh) had suffered large and recurring interruptions in this programme, but this was not reported in the TPRs; the possibility of such interruptions in other project areas can therefore not be ruled out.

The pre-vocational training should not remain confined to life skills, but should also provide some creative skills which fit the local customs where this has not been done[40].

The experiences in this component provide significant scope for replication in the larger Government scheme of NCLPs. These include:

- Development of teacher training strategy and modules specific to the requirements of transitional education teachers.
- Development of life skill modules and training pre-vocational education teachers in their use.
- Resource centre initiatives as a strategy to prevent children combining work with education.
- Strategy for effective mainstreaming and retention.

1.2.7. Project component: Vocational training[41]

The vocational training component may be among the most successful and sustainable elements of the INDUS Project.[42] The usefulness of this component has been emphasised by state and district level stakeholders throughout the field mission. There is a general consensus among stakeholders that the component should continue irrespective of whether this is under INDUS or another government scheme. A large majority of respondents at the National Stakeholders Workshop (79%) fully agreed with a

---

[37] Please also refer to Footnote 101113 of section 8.3 of Part II of this report

[38] The Evaluation Team was told that districts had difficulties in opening bank accounts for the stipend payments and on account of children migrating at short notice, and that these issues are being addressed by the Project

[39] For example, Uttar Pradesh had a college of medicine develop a nutritious menu with appropriate calorie content, within the approved budget. The menu was adopted by all the districts in the State.

[40] The Evaluation Team found instances where this was not the case

[41] For more details refer to section 9.0, Part II of this report.

[42] It is also viewed as such by most stakeholders present at the national stakeholder workshop

statement that the vocational training component should be replicated in the NCLP. However, any wider implementation should not be done without a very careful assessment of those factors that will make such an intervention a success. In line with its purpose, the INDUS experience is highlighting lessons from certain weaknesses in design and execution.

A total of 57% of those graduated are now 'gainfully employed', while the target was 40%. Cases presented to the Mission during the field work indicate that trainees are not being tracked efficiently during and after graduation and data for self-employed graduates from the training do not indicate part-time/full-time work or income levels. Migrant worker adolescents may not be in a position to complete their training, or it may be irrelevant in the context from which they come. Furthermore, although exact data is not (yet) available the Evaluation Team was informed that the proportion of migrant adolescents included in the vocational training component is insignificant. Another issue that needs further explanation is to what extent controls are in place to validate the data provided by employers.

One of the critical secrets of success for this component is how effectively truly marketable skills are being identified and imparted. This component introduced the concept of conducting labour market studies before deciding the skills to be imparted. This is a systemic change that the Project induced in the vocational training provision in the target districts and states, and is well appreciated. However, some stakeholders expressed concern about the quality, appropriateness and usefulness of the market studies conducted in their areas. The Evaluation Team is concerned at the apparent lack of attention by service providers to the ramifications for trainees when training strategies are not based upon market studies, especially given the low education and experience level of the trainees[43].

The quality levels and extent of the vocational training was often found to be low[44]. In some instances the lack of competent service providers delayed progress. In most districts training is done only over six months instead of a year or more. Some employers were reluctant to accept Project graduates due to this short training period, their lack of work experience or no apparent labour discipline. The requirement, listed in the Project Document, that basic literacy, numeracy and life skill education should be included in the vocational training has overall not been met and this was also regarded by some employers as a drawback. The Evaluation Team observed in certain districts that the service providers have limited capacities and experience in this field, and operate without a professional body to provide technical supervision.

The issue of 'gainful employment' requires attention in terms of definition and implementation. In spite of the fact that the majority of graduates are reported to be earning up to four times more than before their training, the Evaluation Team met several graduates who were still unemployed or earned less than the customary daily rate. As the Project could not (yet) provide accurate statistics about the number of graduates who earn 'decent' incomes for a prolonged period the extent of this situation and the inherent vulnerability of the former child labourers is not known. Data on self-employment was found to be insufficiently indicative for the income situation as figures did not distinguish for part-time or full-time occupations. It is not clear what criteria or income levels define success in this category. Starting entrepreneurs rarely receive training in starting a business, and little if any technical support or start-up funding (for example access to micro-finance) for equipment and materials[45].

---

[43] The Evaluation Team is aware that the role of training providers or the executing agencies in this respect is limited and that the choice of adolescents needs to be respected. The training providers are responsible for seeing that the training curricula of the skills of choice takes into account the specialized needs of the market.

[44] More information on these aspects can be found in section 9.3, part II of this report.

[45] However this is in large part due to constraints that are not under the control of the Project: Access to micro-finance is not permissible for those under 18 years of age per the Government of India regulations. This is a significant problem as those that have been trained or are ready to start their own enterprise do not legally have access to micro-credit or other forms of micro-financing. USDOL also does not allow projects to

Unless these issues are strategically addressed, the aim of providing 'gainful employment' to these young people may for many not be achieved.

1.2.8.   Project component: Income generation for families of child workers[46]

The usefulness and importance of the concept of SHGs has been generally endorsed across India – where the concept existed already for a long time - as an effective measure for the empowerment of women. However, in INDUS the SHG formation started late and has made slow progress since[47]. Many mothers have not yet been reached through well functioning SHGs and according to reports and observations staff members seem insufficiently equipped to set up and manage this important component. Project incentives are not immediately accessible, for example the stipend is released after six months in the bank and is not at the disposal of the parents, and people hear from others that even after six months stipends are not deposited (due to delays in disbursements). This indicates an urgent need to analyse the role of the GOI guidelines for release of stipends, and the impact when this is not done.

Only a very small proportion of SHGs have earned eligibility for receiving a revolving fund grant (a matching grant for the savings that their members have started making). Unfortunately, release of the revolving funds is inadequate and slow which might have a negative effect on the SHG formation. Loan facilities have been provided in very few cases. Skills training programmes have been conducted with many participants, but no evaluation has been made of their effectiveness. It is therefore unknown whether these loan facilities have actually assisted their target audience.

Moreover, little has been done to innovate and empower these groups in additional ways, for example by establishing closer linkages with other INDUS activities. The SHG members could be engaged in the running of TECs by watching over Resource Centres or preparing the mid-day meals. These are obvious areas of engagement for such groups to create greater ownership and commitment to the intervention. Furthermore, the fact that most families of withdrawn children and adolescents are not formally included in the Below Poverty Line (BPL) list also complicates efforts to capitalise on the potential for convergence with various government schemes.

The potential of the institutions and infrastructure that have been put in place for this component remains largely untapped. It is disconcerting that in nearly all districts it has had as yet little or no effect on families, except for a few pockets in Tamil Nadu (which can serve as example for others). This component, so crucial to any attempts towards the sustainable elimination of child labour, needs urgent and special attention to determine exactly where the problems with implementation lie, and whether any other policy, social and conceptual changes should be made to address the poverty status of these families more effectively.

1.2.9.   Project component: Strengthening public education[48]

Experience around the world has shown that improving the quality of education in public schools requires a well-designed strategy and patient approach. It can take a significant time before yielding sustainable

---

provide any beneficiaries with "start up funding". The purchase of tools and equipment is allowable, but not the provision of funds to beneficiaries.

[46] For more details refer to section 10.0, Part II of this report.

[47] The Income generation component of the project was financed by the Government of India. Any disbursements to the districts for this scheme and then on to finance the SHGs was under GOI control. The task of improving the link with the SHG scheme is therefore much broader than the control by any one particular project.

[48] For more details refer to section 11.0, Part II of this report.

results. Where schools have to serve 'at risk' children or those who have already entered the world of work, even more special capacities and efforts are needed. It is therefore crucial to understand how best to accommodate and serve their interests effectively while executing a long-term strategy in the public education system. It is often the qualitative aspects – the manner in which things are done - rather than the achievement of quantitative targets that make the most difference.

Implementation of this component started late and progress has been slow, with a very large part (74.0%) of the budget allocation which is managed by the SSA Societies still unspent. This unfortunate situation is largely due to a lengthy process of negotiation and planning to get everything in place. Achievements in strengthening selected Lead Schools have been quite limited, without any visible results; the other elements have not yet started.

In this component retention figures are critical, and the relatively low rates recorded may be due to the lack of a tracking system for enrolled children in the 5-8 years age group. In the 9-13 age group, the attendance rate of mainstreamed children was found to be approximately the same as that of non-Lead schools; the drop-out numbers were not available[49].

The Evaluation Team is the opinion that accelerated results will be achieved if there is concerted attention on the selected Lead Schools - removing practical obstacles, developing an appreciation of the practical implications of the differences between TECs and regular schools and addressing the crucial need for teachers with empathy who will build children's confidence; ensuring that the children do not experience discrimination from teachers or peers. The Evaluation Team supports the view expressed by some stakeholders that this component could be fully accommodated in the SSA *if* lessons learnt are taken on board and if there is a clear commitment and understanding of how to address the special needs of children at risk or withdrawn from work. The Lead Schools is aimed at attracting and retaining all children – including those mainstreamed from TECs – and all the elements of this important component should be given time to develop before they are finally assessed for uptake on a larger scale.

1.2.10. Project component: Social mobilisation[50]

In the absence of monitoring information and adequate time for suitable evaluation methods the Evaluation Team could not assess the results of the work on this component - especially as child labour has recently become a national topic with the introduction of government regulations. But there is little doubt that there has been some impact, especially in line with the first objective of the Project – raising awareness among society at large. The strategy to focus on three types of target audiences[51] in stages is in principle sound and with further work should continue to yield results, especially if executed within the framework of a more holistic and systematic campaign.[52]

According to anecdote and stakeholder comment the initial social mobilisation activities funded by INDUS very early in the districts not only contributed to parents' awareness but also mobilised other Project stakeholders at ground level. In districts said to have managed successful campaigns these activities are perceived as having instilled a feeling of ownership which permeated through other activities in support of the Project objectives. Government partners have been motivated to conduct an increasing number of social mobilisation campaigns in Project districts. There has been increased local media coverage on child labour issues and key political role players have showed high profile interest.[53]

---

[49] For more details refer to section 11.0, Part II of this report

[50] For more details refer to section 12.0, Part II of this report.

[51] Communities and parents; trade unions; employers

[52] With the caveat that government at the various levels are also an important target group; we assume that many of the key officials have been covered through other Project efforts, for example capacity building.

[53] For example the Chief Minister of Maharashtra.

National trade unions and employer organisations have at least to some extent been motivated to participate in Project activities and parents have been motivated to send their working children to school or for training. The Project reports that "86% of mobilised families have changed their attitudes."[54] The validity of this finding may be challenged as it is difficult to measure changes in attitudes without a systematic approach, yet the fact that so many targeted beneficiaries were enrolled in school or vocational training may support the claim.

Similarly it is difficult to assess the merit of district-wise organised campaigns and the more holistic approach through the commissioning of a central campaign strategy. Drawbacks have been the significant time that has elapsed although more than 30 tools have already been developed to facilitate implementation of the campaign. The strategy and these tools are only now being distributed. This implies that much still has to be done in this component before the Project ends. Translation into local languages been done only in some locations; for impact on the ground this has to be a focus.

It is timely that the Project is now developing ways to monitor the impact of social mobilisation activities and developing monitoring tools for different target groups and community structures. The impact related to the second objective[55] of this component is even harder to assess. Project partners and stakeholders have varying capacities and the evaluation team was unable to assess whether these are due to Project efforts or the result of ongoing processes.

The five central trade unions confirmed that INDUS has helped them to acquire good capacities in strategies to help eliminate child labour, particularly at the national level. Child labour issues have been mainstreamed into their agenda and they are engaged in systematic capacity building of their office bearers through a system of 'training of trainers'. As yet only a small percentage of their members have been mobilised in the fight against child labour, but the representatives are quick to point out their potential for mobilising communities for large scale campaigns in spite of the fact that their influence in the informal, family unit based work environment is somewhat limited.

The Project has been active in trying to seek employers' support yet the latter were represented only at one workshop. The Evaluation Team could therefore not verify the effect of the purportedly large number of employer participants in Project seminars and workshops (said to be 96.0% or 1 926 employers or 'organised employers' organisations). It is reported that as a result of the mobilisation efforts, employers in several districts have partnered in campaigns and released child workers from hazardous work. Several have accepted trainees graduating from vocational training programmes. But much still has to be done engage and influence employer organisations in an effective way.

The ongoing studies on occupational health and safety and their proposed use to influence parents and employers is a welcome strategic addition to the Project, with the potential for several spin-off benefits as long as improvements in working conditions are not used to justify the employment of children.

---

[54] The target was 75%; TPR September 2006.

[55] Social partners and communities have an increased capacity for joint and separation action against child labour.

1.3.   List of Key Findings

Project design

1. The Project was generally timely and well conceived as a holistic and integrated approach to ECL, and has remained relevant to date. It fits with the tactics and priorities of GOI, has a national and international evidence-base and is managed in a flexible and responsive manner (to the extent that the pre-determined and agreed Project framework allows) using stakeholder consultation and openness to comment. In a few instances Project requirements were altered due to new insights and stakeholder demand.

2. Insufficient understanding or attention to certain realities on the ground weakened the design in some respects. More consideration could have been given to
    i.   the complexities brought about by migration patterns;
    ii.   the need for customised interventions to accommodate differences between states as well as between rural, urban and metropolitan areas;
    iii.   the impact of culture and tradition on ECL interventions;
    iv.   innovative approaches to supporting enforcement;
    v.   which indicators would be crucial to measuring success (such as retention rates of children; improvements in circumstances of adolescents after vocational training);
    vi.   a systematic approach to convergence and the removal of systemic hindrances (such as gaps or conflict in policies and regulations, and process inefficiencies);
    vii.   a more realistic timeframe given the need for up- and downstream work with limited human resources.

Implementation and progress

3. Impressive progress has been made in implementing a complex project requiring a wide array of skills, partnerships, strategies and approaches, and horizontal and vertical coordination across sectors and three levels of governance. This is in large part due to the good roadmap provided by the Project Document, the expertise and commitment of the Project Team as well as the guiding structures and field project teams, the extensive array of partnerships and a good enabling environment at national level.

4. Although the components are being implemented in line with the initial plan, several will not meet their targets or yield the expected results within the available time, even with the extension until August 2007. The delays started with an underestimation of the time needed for the preparatory phase and flaws in the baseline survey. These had a knock-on effect, exacerbated by the ambitious scope (further expanded during the Project) and insufficient capacities on the ground.

5. Delays have had a negative effect on Project results and may affect participants' motivation, but have also led to valuable lessons in line with the nature of a pilot project. With some further extension (proposed until March 2008) targets could be achieved.

6. Six key factors - external and internal - have had a significant influence on implementation: (i) the quality, commitment and management style of the Project leadership; (ii) the capacities, motivation and processes at field level; (iii) the enabling environment; (iv) the need for convergence; (v) the need

for quality assurance; and (vi) the Project design. Several of these had both positive and negative effects, the latter often beyond the control of the Project.

7. The vast majority of stakeholders consulted concur that INDUS has had significant achievements to date which will increase over time. They are in line with the Evaluation Team's observations and focus in particular on the components for awareness raising, social mobilisation and capacity building, the provision of meaningful vocational training and employment opportunities, and the provision of appropriate education in a child-friendly and personalised environment.

8. The work in INDUS has had an influence on the development of state action plans, moving stakeholders to look beyond the project to an understanding that child labour is a larger development issue. At national level success has been achieved through the recommendation by the CMC to scale up the vocational training component across the country as part of the NCLP.

9. Several positive unintended consequences of INDUS were identified, but one of concern is the notion that INDUS is in competition with the NCLP.

Identification of Project beneficiaries

10. Stakeholder concerns led to improvements in the initial baseline survey methodology, yet implementation showed several shortcomings including delays caused by a lengthy preparation phase to get infrastructure and people in place, insufficient capacities to manage and conduct the survey (in particular Stage II) and lack of ownership of the results by those responsible for implementation. These contributed to the inclusion of children and adults from outside the ten targeted sectors among the beneficiaries.

11. The initial baseline survey provided only 40% of the targeted (more than 80 000) beneficiaries. Additional informal surveys conducted in all the districts could not have met the thoughtfully fixed norms of selection laid down in the survey design. Beneficiaries were included from non-targeted sectors and it is therefore unlikely that the targets for withdrawal and rehabilitation are being met in line with the Project intent. However this is not necessarily a negative result.

12. The decision to extend the target group beyond the ten hazardous sectors as part of a sector-area based approach was based on practical and ethical considerations and stakeholder demand. It is therefore in principle acceptable but changes the nature and objectives of the intervention.

Gender mainstreaming

13. In spite of inadequate attention to gender mainstreaming in the Project design, the Project Team has improved this situation by moving beyond disaggregated data. More can be done to develop a better understanding what gender mainstreaming means for such interventions. Stereotyping and cultural obstacles are challenges that have not yet been adequately addressed.

Knowledge management

14. Effective knowledge management is critical to the success of a pilot project. In spite of its initial low profile, attention has been paid during implementation to nearly all components of the 'knowledge management cycle' (focusing on lessons formulation, monitoring and tracking, learning and sharing opportunities, releasing guidelines, handbooks and sensitisation material including some in local languages, and conducting relevant research and action research studies). More needs to be done especially during the exit phase of the Project.

Sustainability

15. INDUS was designed to yield sustainable results and this notion has been expanded during implementation. At least 11 strategies for sustainability have been used but challenges remain, including (i) upscaling without full cognisance of the lessons learnt or in-depth understanding of the complexities of larger-scale application; (ii) a focus on minimising cost in future interventions without considering the value addition of resource-intensive elements; and (iii) attempts to eliminate child labour based on immediate causes without adequate attention to the underlying and root causes.

Withdrawal and enrolment towards rehabilitation

16. The withdrawal and enrolment for rehabilitation of a large number of beneficiaries has been a significant achievement and facilitated by the shift to a more holistic area-sector based approach, early social mobilisation efforts, the community worker system, the guiding and monitoring committees led by the District Collectors, the availability of TECs nearby, the financial incentives and the sheer size of interventions in India. However, the figure of 82 032 may require revision for the following reasons

     i. a large number were withdrawn from sectors other than those targeted;
    ii. retention data as well as beneficiary tracking are inadequate;
   iii. children are defined as 'withdrawn' when they continue to work while receiving education; and
    iv. migrant children were included although they are available for only a short time each year.

Beneficiary monitoring

17. The BTS and CLMS have the potential to be important elements in an ECL strategy, but need to be simplified to be practical and in line with the skills of data capturers and community users.

18. Progress with the filling of the Index and Progress Report Cards for transitional education beneficiaries has not been satisfactory, but computerisation has proceeded well in spite of impediments related to capacities, attitudes and infrastructure.

19. Major omissions have been the lack of focus on the monitoring of the retention of beneficiaries between 5 and 13 years, and whether gainful employment has been achieved once adolescents complete their training.

Transitional education

20. The transitional education component, the largest INDUS intervention, has made satisfactory progress but initial delays[56] have caused too early mainstreaming of some children as well as mainstreaming within periods as short as six months (in a departure from NCLP norms) and as low as Classes I-III. This should have been avoided.

21. The design and implementation of the transitional education component is generally judged by stakeholders to be more successful than the corresponding NCLP approach, said to be due to the more hands-on engagement, commitment, coordination and monitoring by institutions and implementers across the system; more timely action; and more effective participation by civil society. The resource centres, and the efforts to improve income generation and public education as part of the overall approach also receive significant stakeholder support in spite of the slow pace of implementation.

---

[56] The establishment of some of the TECs has been slower than expected with several closing down and re-opening elsewhere

22. Service delivery and results in the TEC component are hampered by inadequate NGO overhead costs and TEC hire charges; the slow release of stipends and a lack of flexibility in their release in emergency situations; untrained TEC instructors; slow implementation of pre-vocational and life skills education; and inadequate health care.

23. Parent-teacher associations have been formed but many do not fulfil their envisaged role.

24. One of the most critical inefficiencies in the Project is the low number of stipend payments and the delays in the release of the stipends to mainstreamed children.

25. TEC staff / teacher honoraria are low and cast doubt over the Project's ability to attract persons of the calibre needed to work with children with special circumstances and sensitivities.

26. Several public / private partnerships have yielded good results albeit on a small scale. There has been inadequate emphasis on establishing these types of relationships which are becoming more and more common and effective in other parts of the developing world.

27. Although statistical data may indicate that interventions are effective, more careful scrutiny of numbers as well as more careful monitoring of *qualitative* details of the interventions are needed to understand more deeply what works and what does not.

Vocational training

28. The vocational training component is regarded as an asset to INDUS and a good model for scaling up to more districts. However this should be done in a circumspect manner that considers lessons learnt and financial implications. In spite of good progress in meeting significant challenges during implementation, the component has also highlighted weaknesses and issues for improvement before further application.

29. The lack of focus on systematic tracking of trainees before and after graduation[57] casts doubt over the claim that the intended outcomes of this component will be achieved. While the numerical targets have been achieved, the outcome is to be sustainable income generation and determining the extent to which the Project is contributing to this requires more attention than is currently given.

30. Despite successes there are still constraints and shortcomings in both achieving the targets and the quality of the training and services. Of particular importance is the after-training support towards gainful employment. Many self-employed graduates need funds and materials to be able to start businesses, yet struggle to get access to financial institutions or micro credit. They do not get any effective technical or other support to become successful in their new activity in spite of some efforts to arrange financial assistance.

31. There has been significant placement and gainful employment of trainees in line with and even exceeding the expectations for this type of intervention, but care should continue to be taken to optimise this aspect. Lack of real opportunities might have a negative effect on those young people whose expectations after training are not met.

---

[57] The Evaluation Team has been told that tracer studies are being conducted in Jabalpur. These trace every trainee physically using video material.

32. A few employers have noted that they are reluctant to accept Project trainee graduates because their training period is too short, the skills learned are less appropriate for what they need to do, and most importantly they may lack the work experience and discipline employers want to see in employees. The issue requires further investigation to determine the extent to which this might be a more general perception.

33. The inclusion of a basic numeracy, literacy and social skills training element in the vocational training has been neglected.

34. It has been a major challenge in many project areas to overcome a stereotype gender approach to training. Although some inroads have been made by the Project, this complex situation is brought about by society and parents adhering to cultural norms and conventions. Perceptions are that social mobilisation has helped to change prevailing attitudes and examples of changing attitudes can be found in certain areas, but opinions differ on the extent to which this has been achieved.

Income generation for families of child and adolescent labourers

35. The income generation component has been slow to make progress. Although SHGs have been formed in most districts, savings are being made as instructed and skills training programmes have been conducted, as far as the Evaluation Team could determine no financial benefits have yet reached the targeted mothers except in a few pockets in Tamil Nadu.

36. Convergence between INDUS and government schemes is, together with SHGs and vocational training, *the* mechanism through which increased incomes are to become a reality for the families of child labourers. It is therefore of concern that in most cases this mechanism is ineffective as most of the families do not live below the poverty line.

37. No efforts have been made to engage the SHGs in innovative ways in the running of the TECs, or to draw them closer to any of the other INDUS activities, thus losing good opportunities to give them more ownership and insight, and empower them in ways other than financially.

Public education

38. The evaluation team found that the implementation of the public education component started late and is slow in showing any visible result. A lot of time was lost in negotiating and planning the utilisation of budgeted funds and deciding the mechanism of their routing through NCLP Societies to SSA Societies. Only 26% of the available budget has been spent to date.

Social mobilisation

39. The social mobilisation component is seen as one of the most successful and has contributed to mobilising parents and other Project stakeholders at community level - although this is certainly not *only* due to Project activities.

40. Although impossible to verify, reports that 86% of mobilised families have changed their attitudes towards child labour may be supported by the fact that many children were sent to school or training as part of INDUS.

41. The five central trade unions have acquired good capacities on child labour through the Project, particularly at the national level and in some states. Child labour issues have been mainstreamed into their agenda and they are engaged in capacity building of their office bearers.

42. The NCLP Societies have not all been successful in effectively engaging stakeholders from different sectors and interest groups such as trade unions, employers, NGOs and Panchayati Raj.

43. The Project has been actively trying to engage employers, yet it is impossible to verify the results in spite of reports that employers in several districts have partnered in campaigns and released child workers from hazardous work. Private-public partnerships are not yet operating to any significant extent.

Benefit to NCLP and SSA

44. With very few exceptions stakeholders agree that INDUS has the potential to add significant value to NCLP and SSA and national efforts at the elimination of child labour, should it be scaled up or integrated with existing initiatives.

1.4.   Conclusions

The INDUS Project is an impressive effort by the Government of India to work in conjunction with its international partners towards improving its strategies to eliminate child labour. INDUS has been developed by incorporating lessons from both national and international experiences – an important consideration for a project of which the primary aim is to contribute towards a better model for national action.

This approach – learning from own and other experiences, piloting for improvement – is bearing fruit. With very few exceptions the stakeholders consulted at state and district levels believe that INDUS is an improvement over existing national efforts. As complementary effort to NCLP and SSA[58], INDUS has been designed based on their framework and in line with their objectives, aiming to address important gaps and deficiencies. Its challenge has therefore been threefold: to achieve the normal outcomes of these schemes; enhance their impact; and establish mechanisms that will ensure that it is able to contribute to a more effective and sustainable model for large-scale ECL in India.

In the absence of an opportunity to make a direct comparison between INDUS and any other intervention[59], the Evaluation Team was dependent on stakeholder perceptions and an assessment of those components specific only to INDUS. The results have led the Team to conclude that although an ambitious idea, INDUS was well conceived and designed as a further step in creating a more conducive environment and increasingly effective action towards the progressive elimination of child labour. It may not be the ultimate solution, but it has significant strengths over existing efforts.

In the opinion of the Evaluation Team, the elements that make INDUS a more holistic, practical and useful scheme are (i) the economic rehabilitation and support of child labour families and adolescent workers; (ii) the sensitisation and capacity development of the government machinery as well as workers' organisations and employers; (iii) the drawing together of different government agencies and social partners at both state and district levels to actively engage in planning, monitoring, coordinating (converging) and innovating around common goals under the leadership of key officials such as District Collectors; (iv) social mobilisation involving all sections of society; (v) community engagement in monitoring and supporting ECL interventions; (vi) its efforts to create through the TECs a more effective approach to 'joyful learning' through personalised teaching and support systems (e.g. mid-day meals, transport, health care), stimulation of creativity and inculcation of life skills among child workers and adolescents, resource centres and parent-teacher engagement; (vii) its efforts at piloting innovations that will help the education system bring the required focus to children at risk; (viii) its attempts at evidence-based yet responsive decision-making and action; (ix) its focus on quality processes, services and products.

---

[58] 'Also described in Part II; Box 2: *NCLP Plus'* - Social mobilisation through awareness raising and involvement of the community in monitoring and striving for ECL; beneficiary tracking and monitoring; capacity building of all government departments as well as key civil society partners; income generation activities for affected families; resource centres and tuition support to TEC and mainstreamed children; vocational training for 14-17 years age group; State level structures for planning, coordination, monitoring and capacity building – the State Project Steering Committees and State Resource Cells

'SSA Plus' - Structured convergence between TECs and the formal schools under SSA in the Project area; the concept of Lead Schools; strengthening of public education.

[59] The Evaluation Team could not refer to a previous evaluation report of NCLP or SSA, for example, nor did it have the opportunity to visit NCLP sites.

The MTE of INDUS confirmed that the mere identification, withdrawal and enrolment of working children will not make any appreciable dent on the child labour problem unless the affected families are economically supported. But the INDUS experience has yielded another related important insight – that the support to child labour families and adolescents workers should be furthered by initiatives with a good chance to lead to *sustainable* poverty relief among those families. Interventions should focus on addressing the root and underlying causes of child labour through a family-centred and not only child-centred approach. Even in a conducive macroeconomic policy environment this will need (i) building *appropriate* skills and capacities of families and adolescents at different stages of their development, (ii) facilitating opportunities and giving them initial material support to go down new income generation routes, (iii) continuing for a realistic period with monitoring progress and giving technical guidance, and (iv) removing systemic obstacles such as those based on the neglect or exclusion from opportunities of certain groups, criteria that exclude needy families from appropriate convergence schemes and inadequate regulation and enforcement of legislation.

The Evaluation Team is of the view that the INDUS design could have been stronger in this respect. It should also have included strategies to deal with migrant families and communities; facilitate customisation of interventions per state and between metropolitan, rural and urban areas; determine and address the role and implications of perceptions and traditions around gender and culture[60]; improve qualitative monitoring of progress and quality; and establish more systematic, coordinated and monitored convergence efforts. On the other hand these additional elements could have overburdened already stretched project teams and implementing agencies. They may be addressed more substantively in the next phase of implementation of NCLP and related interventions, using the pilot project methods devised by INDUS.

It is also clear that shortfalls in achievement are due more to challenges in implementation than to initial design issues. Progress and achievements have been impressive given the diversity and scope of the components, and no truly damaging unintended consequences of INDUS have been identified. Yet the timeframe for achieving qualitative outcomes was ambitious and did not allow for a good full preparatory phase, learning by doing, challenges in implementation or the intended significant emphasis on upstream work and capacity building (the latter two essential elements for sustainable interventions). The identification of potential Project beneficiaries has yielded significant lessons, but delays in their withdrawal affected the effort. The social mobilisation and vocational training have yielded some success (although more can be done to mobilise specific sections such as the youth, community leadership and employers / the private sector); the income generation component requires further emphasis to get started, the public education component still requires significant strengthening to deliver on its promises; the monitoring systems have to be improved; certain coordinating and guiding structures need to become more active; and the NGO sector is still struggling with capacities and means (and in some cases the commitment) to run effective special schools. The early achievement of the main target for withdrawal and rehabilitation has been an impressive development, yet the numbers need to be scrutinised carefully in view of changes in strategy[61].

Extending the Project period by another 7-8 months[62] should go a long way towards the achievement of the envisaged quantitative targets and qualitative outcomes[63]. It should be accompanied by a systematic

---

[60] In other words focus on the underlying causes of child labour in addition to the immediate and root causes

[61] As discussed in section 1.2.4, Part I and section 6.0, Part II.

[62] The proposed timeframe is based on the scrutiny of the utilisation of the budget and balance available and targets in the pipeline. The proposed period should enable the effective utilisation of the balance of funds without any need to incur extra expenditure on components where targets have been achieved. The main reference in this regard is to the Vocational Training, Income Generation and Strengthening of Public Education activities. This timeframe is also in line with the views of the Project staff.

[63] This implies extension of the period for the Project as a whole and not for specific components only. The budget allocation should be utilized in the best possible way to ensure that the Project is concluded as successfully as possible.

exit strategy that focuses on documenting and transferring information for use in future interventions and achieving intended results to the extent possible within the timeframe and resources.

The assessment of the Evaluation Team is reinforced by stakeholder perceptions. Of the 19 working groups in the four state level stakeholder workshops, all agreed that INDUS is adding value to NCLP, while 17 agreed the same with respect to SSA. In summary the following reflect the key elements that have convinced stakeholders of INDUS' strong potential to contribute to the next phase of ECL interventions.

The Plus components are all seen to have some merit for incorporation in national efforts. The vocational training component; awareness creation, social mobilisation and capacity building among a variety of target groups; and the Resource Centre and the Lead School concepts receive strong support. The income generation component has significant support but insufficient implementation is seen as a real obstacle.

The other elements perceived by the stakeholders as the major differences between INDUS and existing national efforts all relate to the manner of implementation. They also tend to reflect the typical differences between pilot projects and large-scale interventions, where some of these may be much more difficult to achieve:

- The perceived higher level of motivation and enthusiasm ('missionary zeal', according to some) of implementers on the ground as well as among some higher level authorities;
- Less bureaucracy and more flexible, sensitive and responsive planning and follow-up actions - apparently due to the involvement of the ILO-IPEC, the SRCs, the exposure of officials to the grassroots, and/or the direct leadership of the District Collectors supported by capable project teams in the field;
- Personal involvement and attention to children, adolescents and mothers by staff and volunteers, helping to "give more voice to the voiceless";
- Engagement of a wide variety of strategic partners from government and civil society, both in committees and in individual interventions, and their better coordination supported by the institutional arrangements cascading across three – even four governance levels if the community leadership (which has recently become a focus) are included;
- Better and more regular reporting and monitoring in the field by both state and district level authorities.

In line with the Evaluation Team concerns, the stakeholders caution against a number of less visible implementation weaknesses that might severely diminish the effect of any improved ECL design. These include

- the need to accommodate or deal with severe inefficiencies and vested interests on the ground;
- overburdened staff and volunteers coupled to insufficient salaries, overhead costs and facilities rental;
- slow implementation of key components and implementation in name but not in effect, for example where PTAs are formed but not guided to be functional and useful;
- an overly strong fixation on channelling children according to distinct age groups rather than based on the needs of the child;
- the very rudimentary understanding of the effects of the interventions on the child or adolescents and their families;
- inadequate recognition of the need for tailor-made, customised interventions; and

- insufficient monitoring and follow-up that otherwise might expose key weaknesses in either design or implementation.[64]

All these issues have major implications for the vision that sustainable benefits and action should flow from INDUS. Given the above, should a few elements of INDUS be absorbed into NCLP and SSA? Or should NCLP in particular be transformed to reflect much more the character of INDUS? Can SSA fully accommodate the relevant elements of INDUS? The stakeholders are somewhat divided, and the Evaluation Team also does not feel informed enough to make a strong recommendation either way. We conclude with the following observations:

- There is not one component, or part of a component, that seems to be irrelevant or inappropriate for inclusion in future national ECL interventions. If well implemented, in line with the thoughtful and responsive design, all can bring benefits and improvements to current interventions.

- The way in which these elements are implemented as part of existing national efforts will be critical to their success. The chances for success will be multiplied if the approaches typically seen as the reasons for success in INDUS can be applied in larger efforts.

- A major consideration should be cost-effectiveness measured against the value added through resource-intensive components – capacity building, social mobilisation, personalised service and attention, upstream work, specialist engagement, quality assurance e.g. through intensive monitoring, knowledge management.

- Inclusion of INDUS elements in NCLP and SSA have to be accompanied by a very good understanding of what makes them work, what could diminish their effectiveness when absorbed into a larger project, and the implications of scaling up all these components.

---

[64] Examples include the continued exploitation of adolescent workers or the lack of retention of those enrolled in the long term.

1.5.   Lessons

1. If **evaluations** are to be well executed and used, all stakeholders should from the beginning understand its purpose, methods and potential use. Methodology according to accepted international norms and standards should be developed in consultation with and by the evaluation team, and the evaluation style, timing and ethical and technical standards agreed upon within the team and with all the key stakeholders. In the process a balance has to be struck between protocol, cultural and political sensitivities and sound evaluation methodology. This should be resolved before the start of the evaluation - even if it would require more time and resources. A scoping mission by at least the team leader is a very useful mechanism to this end.

2. In spite of solid project conceptualisation and logic, **less visible design elements** may pose major challenges. This could be especially relevant when components are built 'on top of' existing interventions, with diminished flexibility in design *and* in implementation. Unless addressed in time, weaknesses in existing interventions may also affect the effectiveness of the expanded or reinforced intervention when pilot projects are scaled up.

3. **Project timeframes and implementation sequences** are usually designed based on perfect circumstances which to do not account for realities on the ground in developing countries. A carefully phased approach is needed for projects of this nature. They should have four clearly defined phases:
    a. negotiation and design, including adequate consultation with stakeholders;
    b. preparation; including geographic identification of sites and establishment of infrastructure, institutional arrangements and people (expected period for a and b could be around 18 months);
    c. implementation (including identification and withdrawal of potential beneficiaries), which should then be based on a realistic timeframe to implement activities and meet targets (expected period could be around 3 years;
    d. enough time for a good exit during which transfer of skills and knowledge (which should take place throughout the project lifetime) is consolidated, and lessons are finally documented and synthesised for the development of models for future (up-scaled) interventions (expected period could be six months).

From approval to exit, the time for implementation of a project of this nature and magnitude (which goes beyond quantitative targets for direct beneficiaries) should be no less than five years within similar allocations of human and financial resources.

4. Demographic information determining the withdrawal and rehabilitation strategy for ECL target groups should be used immediately to avoid **loss of potential beneficiaries**. Thoughtful planning and efficient execution that avoid a time lapse between identification and withdrawal are imperative for success. The agencies that have to work with the beneficiaries should ideally be part of the whole initiative so that they have ownership of the processes and results.

5. Pilot projects should be allowed substantial **freedom to be responsive** to stakeholders and to experiment as long as any deviation is well justified, based on evidence and lessons learnt. A rigid project logic and preconceived notions of realistic targets may hamper efforts to find the 'secrets of success' of successful development interventions.

6. Given the realities on the ground, the ethical and practical merit for long-term success of a **'sector-area' rather than 'sector-based' approach** should be recognised and accounted for in project plans and targets.

7. The **quality and commitment of people** - whether officials, managers, instructors or community workers - are very important factors in the success of ECL interventions. If the design and implementation of an intervention do not encourage people with the right expertise and attitudes to join or give support, the implications should be clearly understood. It may be counter-productive to pay people or organisations lower than market rates when special skills or facilities are critical for success[65].

8. A cascade system of **institutional arrangements** from national to state to district level work well in creating awareness, understanding and better ownership of child labour as a key development intervention. The **engagement at state level** seems particularly important for cohesive action and improvements in the enabling environment at state level, while the engagement of key **district role players under leadership of the District Collector** seems imperative for effective action on the ground.

9. Carefully constructed **monitoring of progress towards targets** for withdrawal and rehabilitation should be done to reflect an accurate picture. For example unless retention figures, 'gainful employment' results and migrant children movements are fully understood, progress towards achievement of targets may well be incomplete.

10. For **reliable information and conclusions** on progress and achievements, quantitative data *as well as* qualitative information need to be cross-checked in the field where the action takes place. This should reflect key qualitative aspects that give an indication of real progress and quality of services and processes, instead of focusing only on numbers and outputs.

11. **Beneficiary monitoring systems** are essential for reflecting a true picture of the effectiveness of ECL interventions. Yet they should be relatively simple, in line with the skills of those who have to manage and use them, especially where communities have to take ownership of such systems. Monitoring systems that are too 'heavy' with required information need to be avoided.

12. Ideally systems should monitor the effect of an intervention and efforts at convergence on the whole family, and not only on the individual child or adolescent. This is complicated to implement due to perceptions of interference in household affairs, unless a truly **family centred approach** is the basis for ECL interventions.

13. A holistic, coherent ECL strategy aimed at sustainable success ideally needs to target the **immediate, underlying *and* root causes of child labour[66]**. Such a strategy also has to be effectively implemented. This means that for permanent solutions, national or state-wide economic growth has to reach across social, cultural, class and other conventional barriers, and that systematic, monitored convergence between diverse role players has to be a primary focus. Unless these factors are accounted for in planning and implementation of new or expanded initiatives, enhancement of the NCLP (or SSA) with some tested INDUS (or "Plus") components may still not yield improved long-term, sustainable results.

---

[65] The Evaluation Team was told by a number of stakeholders that this is the case but could not independently verify this. The rates were based on those specified by GOI which the Project was obliged to follow instead of creating a parallel and higher payment schedule

[66] It can be argued that there is good justification for direct action work which helps indirectly in focussing on the need for strategies that lead to solutions of root causes – but this does not eliminate the need to focus on the latter.

14. As **income generation for families** is fundamental to the success of ECL and essential for any sustainable ECL intervention, this component should receive special strategic attention since its design and implementation requires different skills sets to those of regular development programmes. Among others market, business and social understanding is needed, as well as empathy with the plight of women and budding entrepreneurs and a commitment to addressing not only the root but the underlying (often cultural) causes of child labour. There are many elements in this component that can very quickly neutralise any obvious gains towards target achievement.

15. A **vocational training component** is in principle an excellent addition to ECL interventions, and should be replicated or scaled up with very careful consideration of systemic hindrances or weaknesses in design and implementation approaches that may affect results. These include (i) conduct of appropriate market studies, (ii) training period to be fixed in consultation with employers and provision of work discipline, literacy and numeracy), (iii) ensuring (well-defined) gainful employment after training, (iv) adequate monitoring to be certain of real success, (v) strategies to ensure that exploitation does not continue during and after training, and (vi) adequate follow-up as well as technical and material assistance to those who are to be self-employed.

16. Effective **campaigns for social mobilisation** are a crucial component in creating an enabling environment for ECL activities. Such campaigns should have at least four distinct target groups - (i) the community, with special focus on leadership structures, powerful social (such as faith-based) organisations, parents and unemployed youth; (ii) government decision- and policy-makers; (iii) trade unions and (iv) employers. They should also reflect tailor-made strategies for local contexts (at least by state) and each key audience.

17. A variety of contextualised and localised methods and tools should be used to **engage stakeholders in ECL interventions** beyond pockets around TECs. Ideally ownership should reside with government and social institution decision-makers at both district and state levels and among communities on the ground, but the role of the District Collector is crucial and innovative approaches can make a real difference. Trade unions can be powerful allies even though they do not have extensive footholds in the informal household-based employment sector. They have the capacities to mobilise large audiences and networks.

18. It is a challenge to engage **employers** effectively in child labour elimination efforts. Awareness raising in this sector has to be accompanied by special strategies based on public-private sector partnerships and even then success may be limited if appropriate incentives are not available.

19. **Knowledge management strategies** covering as many elements as possible of the 'knowledge management cycle'[67] should be implemented as early as possible in a project lifetime for the sake of sustainability and the development of appropriate models for replication and scaling up.

20. Basing a pilot project on the foundation or **framework of an existing intervention** has to be done with circumspection, as success may be limited if weaknesses from the old are carried into the new. On the other hand it may also expose weaknesses in existing initiatives that otherwise may have remained concealed.

21. It is difficult to have an **innovative, exploratory and responsive intervention** if managers and implementers are held accountable for detailed strategies and clearly stipulated expected targets and

---

[67] This is not really a cycle but the concept is often used in knowledge management theory. The 'cycle' consists of creating, capturing, storing, adapting, using, preserving and sharing knowledge. It includes knowledge sharing and learning as primary foci.

outcomes. If the intervention is to be experimental, this flexibility should be clearly stated in the project theory and included in the indicators of achievement.

1.6. Recommendations

1.6.1. For maximum results in INDUS

1. More results and improved quality will be achieved if the Project period is extended by another 7-8 months until early 2008. This will give a more realistic Project period and could be done within the existing budget. It will be essential for INDUS to achieve its objectives and effectively inform future interventions in India and internationally. It will allow an appropriate exit strategy during which final adjustments can be made and tested, all components can be completed, capacities built and expertise transferred for long-term sustainability, and lessons and good practices synthesised towards an appropriate model for large-scale implementation. The nature of this type of project clearly indicates the need for more realistic timeframes. Similarly, the lifetime of the Migrant Child Addendum should be extended from June 2007, ideally by another 12 months, in order to do justice to the challenges.

2. Find innovative solutions for the fact that the age of children cannot always be determined, and that implementation of interventions strictly according to age grouping may not be feasible.

3. Build more links that can effectively strengthen convergence and build on synergies between different initiatives based on identification of potential weaknesses in the current system.

4. Focus in the remaining time on the following improvements:

With respect to tracking and monitoring

4.1 Initiate immediate strategies to improve the comprehensiveness and credibility of the monitoring data, especially those aspects that are essential for understanding real progress and sound implementation. Improve the PMP and include for example efforts to monitor the *quality* of services, retention figures across all age groups and the economic advancement made by vocational training graduates towards gainful employment. All data should be disaggregated by gender and reasons for differences in trends investigated.

With respect to the public education component

4.2 Use the large amount of funds still available for this component in the remaining period to ensure that this component has some impact during the Project lifetime.

4.3 Unless all withdrawn children are accommodated in special Lead Schools, for high retention aim to strengthen *all* formal schools admitting working children under the SSA and INDUS.

With respect to the transitional education component

4.4 For the transitional education component an improved mainstreaming model should be devised. A special effort is needed to prepare children now accommodated in TECs for mainstreaming at the level of Class IV and above. They should be given the opportunity to obtain a full complement of 24 months education until all the children are mainstreamed in a class that is correct for their age. This should be done even if it means that the TEC component should be further extended beyond the rest of the Project.

4.5 Find solutions for the demotivation of NGO implementing agencies as well as community workers whose Project expenses are not adequately met. Determine the extent to which overhead and transport costs can be paid. Also launch studies to determine to what extent low rental rates for school facilities have prevented the children from studying in pleasant surroundings, and the effect of too low salaries on the specialist skills needed in the Project.

4.6 Consider flexibility in the payment of stipends even before mainstreaming in special cases where these are justified by the child's welfare.

4.7 Given the near completion of the Project, put untrained teachers through a crash course to enhance their most important capacities.

4.8 Give urgent attention to ensure that the following are improved or completed before the Project ends:

- The critical issue of the low number of stipend payments and delays in their release to mainstreamed children. This situation should be resolved before the Project ends.

- The training of *all* TEC instructors and the strengthening of the instructor training component (possibly using modules such as those adopted in Madhya Pradesh).

- The health care services (for example engaging honorary doctors wherever the PHC cover is found to be inadequate).

- The strengthening of the Resource Centres as a strategy to prevent children from combining work and education, supported by well designed activities such as after school tuition by TEC instructors.

- The functioning of the PTAs.

- The strengthening of the pre-vocational education component, including implementation of the life skills component together with more innovative creative work suited to each specific area's traditions and strengths.

- The provision of free school uniforms to all TEC children under existing government schemes, by making suitable budgetary provisions or by forming public-private partnerships (In Kanpur this support has been provided by employers' organisations through NGO efforts - a promising model for replication).

With respect to the vocational training component

4.9 Take urgent steps to ensure that the vocational training targets are achieved. Mechanisms can include increasing the target number in successful districts and/or extending the implementation period in districts that lag behind. The budget on 30 November 2006 still had a balance of Rs.49.3 million. This amount should be fully utilised to cover additional beneficiaries by increasing target numbers in successful districts and if necessary, extending the Project period in others. Working adolescents who currently cannot afford to enrol in the training program could do so if they would get financial compensation for loss of income or coverage of costs for reaching the training facility.

4.10 Employers are generally reluctant to accept Project trainee graduates because their training period is too short, the skills learned are less appropriate for what they need to do or they may lack work experience and discipline. Consider what can still be done to standardise for at least one year training courses that also include literacy, numeracy and social skills (Tamil Nadu approaches may serve as a model).

4.11 Many self-employed graduates need to start businesses, yet struggle to get access to financial institutions or technical / business expertise. Focus on overcoming these problems by establishing partnerships that facilitate access to micro-finance and financial institutions, and provide technical or business support.

4.12 Devise strategies that can help break training stereotypes affecting girls in all states with careful consideration of the consequences, and appropriate strategies to avoid unintended consequences. Muslim girls need special attention in the post-training support phase.

4.13 Determine and implement strategies to improve the capacities and processes needed to identify marketable skills, especially as skill demands change over time and adjustments are needed for urban and rural environments. This will help adolescents to stay close to home to find gainful employment.

With respect to the income generation component

4.14 Urgently give the income generation component a much higher profile, investigating why it has not had the desired effect. Determine for example what can be learnt from other SHG models and improved for greater impact. Action is needed not only to accelerate SHG progress, but to understand whether this component has been properly structured and advised.

4.15 Urgently ensure that SHGs who have made progress with savings receive the benefits due to them.

4.16 Determine whether those who have to work with the mothers in SHGs have the necessary empathy and skills, including social sensitivity as well as the skills needed to impart business understanding and innovative approaches to income generation.

4.17 Find ways to draw the SHGs closer to the TECs, for example by helping to prepare mid-day meals or improve the environment and atmosphere in the TECs. We have found examples of TECs beautified by instructors in collaboration with children. The same can be done with the assistance of the SHGs.

4.18 Focus on improving convergence through negotiating opportunities with all different potential partners, making information available to stakeholders in a systematic manner, and ensuring and monitoring implementation.

With respect to the social mobilisation component

4.19 In order to make social mobilisation efforts among communities and parents in the districts more effective and sustainable:
  ▪ Engage and support NGOs and other community-based civil society organisations to continue working to assist in mobilisation activities and training, supervising and improving payment to community workers in the long term. Expert organisations can be used to build their capacity and develop materials.
  ▪ Use and support agencies experienced in dealing with migrant families and adolescent migrants to conduct social mobilisation among this interest group;
  ▪ Allocate significant resources to enable social mobilisation materials in local languages;

- Tailor-make strategies for different target groups and community structures, including in local languages;[68]
- Develop a system to improve the monitoring of this component.

4.20 Provide funding to those districts that have demonstrated their commitment to raising awareness through innovative methods, and encourage other districts to learn from them, for example through exchange visits of district stakeholders to model locations.

4.21 Further encourage, accept and follow up on ideas for collaboration at state and district levels with trade unions and other partners in civil society to campaign for ECL. Facilitate their participation in the planning of child labour initiatives.

4.22 Increasingly emphasise and give incentives for effective public / private partnerships to assist with the implementation of services and facilities that can strengthen ECL.

With respect to knowledge management

4.23 Ensure that documentation and transfer of knowledge and support that can inform scaling up is done, including as part of a systematically planned and executed exit phase.

1.6.2. For maximum results *after* INDUS

1. Despite challenges in implementation, *all* the INDUS components – 'Plus' and otherwise - have shown enough merit to warrant their consideration for inclusion in national child labour interventions such as the NCLP and SSA. This includes the important capacity building component which has not been covered by the MTE, but which according to many stakeholders and Evaluation Team observations has already made a contribution and is imperative for the long-term success of ECL. However in view of the need for cost-effective interventions, the cost implications of specific elements compared to the value that they add to the results should be studied in greater detail before final decisions are made (see below).

2. It is imperative that INDUS and the NCLP should be integrated in a manner that ensures that those elements responsible for the successes in INDUS are indeed incorporated into the NCLP, including the 'soft' approaches such as more personalised attention to the children and families, critical institutional arrangements (although these need to be studied in sufficient depth – see below) such as the SRCs, SPSCs and the direct engagement of the District Collectors, and effective on the ground monitoring. At the same time solutions have to be found that will allow new components to complement existing interventions while eliminating existing inefficiencies that might otherwise diminish their impact. It will be beneficial if the key INDUS role players will be allowed and utilised to provide technical support during the integration and upscaling processes.

3. Six of 21 districts are already covered by NCLP. In view of the continuing presence of child labour in sizeable numbers in all these districts, the GOI should consider *at least* bringing the remaining districts also under the NCLP if it is decided not to extend the INDUS Project beyond its current term.

4. For effective elimination of child labour there should not only be a focus on NCLP and SSA. The efforts started by INDUS to mainstream child labour issues across all relevant government policies,

---

[68] This was proposed in the 2005 Review meeting but not yet fully implemented

legislation and schemes should be continued and capacities built as the master strategy for the permanent elimination of child labour.

5.   Focus on capitalising on potential convergence and synergies between policies, programmes and interventions that can enhance the impact on the target groups. It may be necessary to institute training on how to best make use of convergence opportunities in each of the states after negotiating such opportunities through the right channels.

Specific recommendations include:

6.   Keep the 5-8 year age group for the time being as an integral target for ECL interventions, based on a clearly defined objective for their enrolment and retention in formal schools. They should be tracked and monitored until any notion that they may drop out prematurely is removed. This should take place within the strengthening of the formal school system, with the specific aim that they should eventually also discharge this special responsibility using the lessons learnt through INDUS. The special skills and mechanisms used to deal effectively with this group should not be lost within larger efforts to provide universal primary education for all.

7.   The INDUS lessons should inform a strategy to deal effectively with migrant child and adolescent labour, and such strategy should inform all future ECL interventions.

8.   It will be essential for an effective systems approach to scan and scrutinise the enabling and enforcement environment at national and state levels – policies, legislation, schemes and interventions - to eliminate any conflicts and gaps that might exist and or negatively affect opportunities and incentives (for example the BLP / convergence scheme conflict for child labour families; insufficient enforcement capacities), and to determine effective strategies to deal with systemic social and cultural complexities in this context.

9.   Retain the NRC and its state mirrored SRCs as part of the efforts to enhance sustainability and effectiveness through the institutionalization and mainstreaming of ECL across national and state policies and programmes.

10.   As scaling-up efforts for the integration of INDUS with the NCLP, SSA and other schemes should be in synergy with the Eleventh Five Year Plan, the phasing out period of INDUS should ensure maximum learning to inform such efforts, especially since the MTE was limited in scope and opportunity. While the MTE together with an end-of-term evaluation can be used to give independent views on key issues, an alternative or complementary strategy is to use the extensive internal expertise in the Project.

11.   The central Project Team can therefore lead an effort with selected stakeholders to conduct certain critical studies as part of the exit strategy. They have a critical mindset, an overall view and are by now very experienced in a range of child labour interventions. They have also been tasked with identifying lessons and models for the future and are therefore very well positioned to conduct or coordinate systematic studies that elucidate and synthesise all the INDUS lessons over the past three years.

In such studies the Evaluation Team would like to see emphasis on the following:

- The 'secrets of success' (and of failures) in INDUS, and the implications of these when scaling up across states or the country. Included in this will be a special assessment of the institutional arrangements in INDUS as well as the role of the intensive capacity building efforts.

- Further work on documenting the "Plus" components in NCLP Plus and identifying specific issues for attention in the final evaluation.

- The identification of critical issues that need to be addressed when interventions are scaled up, and potential obstacles or bottlenecks that may arise.

- The cost-effectiveness of the INDUS interventions in view of the significantly higher cost per beneficiary compared to NCLP for example, but with due recognition of those elements that are imperative for long-term, sustainable success.

- The extent to which ECL interventions need to be contextualised and tailor-made for example per state, sector or per rural, urban and metropolitan areas.

- A focus on how to ensure maximum benefits from the potential that convergence between different policies, programmes and organizations offers to target audiences, and from which INDUS type interventions can benefit.

- In view of the recommendation already made to scale up the vocational training component, ensuring that INDUS lessons are included to address current weaknesses and omissions, and determining the implications of these for scaling up efforts.

- The strategies through which high quality processes and products for ECL can be ensured. For example investing more and improving systems in order to attract the right calibre of person might yield more cost-effective results over time.

- Drawing together its experiences to determine to what extent child labour interventions can push the gender boundaries in society and how any negative effects on beneficiaries can be avoided when doing this

- A short study to ascertain what can be done in a project of this nature to engage and influence employer organisations in an effective way

- Understanding better what impact the gender of community workers has on social mobilisation efforts.

- Confirming the merit of a sector-area rather than a sector-based approach as a basis for ECL programmes given the realities on the ground.

- Adjustment of the intervention strategies to be more family-centred and rights-based, with due attention to the underlying and root causes of child labour - and how this can be ensured and monitored during implementation.

- Analysis of the reasons and impact of the fact that most of the child labourers were found not to be from BPL families.

- Understanding better the effect of all the interventions on the attitudes, prospects and lives of the child and families. How do they really experience the challenging move from TECs into mainstream schools, for example? What are the effects of cultural and traditional biases on experiences and decisions? Do these interventions really change the lives of the children and families in the long term? Case studies as well as longer-term tracer studies may be useful additions to the body of knowledge produced by the Project and could help improve a holistic approach to ECL by identifying hitherto unknown reasons for failure or success.

12. In the opinion of the Evaluation Team INDUS has significant lessons to be shared with other countries and regions engaged in ECL. It is therefore recommended that ILO-IPEC work with GOI, USDOL and the Project Team to ensure that this is done in the most effective way. Such lessons include for example (but are not limited to)

- ECL requires a holistic approach that goes well beyond quantitative targets, with well designed and sequenced components and a realistic timeframe and resources that allow for experimentation, adaptive management, evidence-based decision-making and careful documentation and transfer of information;

- ECL interventions should focus on the root and underlying causes of child labour through a family-centered rather than child-centered approach.

- Income generation for the families is fundamental to the success of ECL.

- There is a need for a special strategy for migrant children - taking the absence of parents or custodians into consideration.

- The convergence principle is critical for enhanced effectiveness and should be well conceptualised, designed and implemented.