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Abstract

Commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC), considered as one of the worst forms of child labour and a form of modern slavery, remains rampant across India. The International Justice Mission (IJM), a global organisation working to protect people in poverty from violence, is implementing an intervention with the objective of strengthening systems to protect CSEC victims and sustaining freedom. The programme is being implemented in the state of Maharashtra.

In this context, this report is the first of a two-part learning exercise designed to critically review the IJM intervention and generate lessons and insights that are of practical utility for a wider audience. The ‘First Look’ case study essentially acts as a snapshot of the current status of the project and seeks to understand the extent to which the project is in line with its articulated theory of change. It also documents the progress made, if any, at the preliminary stages of the project. Findings suggest that progress is on track for the first phase of the project, despite COVID-19 related delays and modifications to the project plan. Given that it is still early in the project execution phase, the bulk of evidence will be assessed in the ‘Second Look’ case study which will offer a deeper, more comprehensive overview of the intervention and its impact.

---

1 Child Protection Information Sheet, UNICEF.
Introduction

Context
Sex trafficking, a form of modern slavery, is pervasive in India, particularly in states such as Bihar, Maharashtra, Telangana, Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, and West Bengal. Fuelled by poverty, gender discrimination, and harmful social and/or cultural practices, women and children are the primary victims of this grave violation of human rights. Prior studies and surveys conducted by the Ministry of Women and Child Development (MWCD) have estimated that three million sex workers live within Indian borders, of which approximately 40 percent are children.

Commercial sexual exploitation of children, one of the worst forms of child abuse, exists in many shapes and forms in India. According to the United Nations estimates in 2006, trafficking of women and children for CSE in Asia had victimised over 30 million people. In India, a 2014 report of the MWCD estimated that 3 million women and children are trafficked each year. More importantly, in India significant inter-state trafficking is accounted in which 89% are CSE. According to Joffres (2008), the biggest CSEC supply states include: Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, West Bengal, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, and Uttar Pradesh. There is a high demand for CSEC in Maharashtra, West Bengal and Uttar Pradesh. There is an urgent need to strengthen the systems and institutional arrangements to prevent sex trafficking and promote recovery and rehabilitation of existing victims.

The Global Fund to End Modern Slavery (GFEMS) is a transformational multi-donor fund that works to forge public-private partnerships and catalyse a comprehensive global strategy to end modern slavery. GFEMS, in an agreement with the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), has funded projects in three target areas – Ethical Recruitment, Apparel, and Commercial Sexual Exploitation. GFEMS selected the consortium of Athena Infonomics and Itad (henceforth, Athena-Itad) to support its review and learning activities for this set of projects.

Scope of study
GFEMS is funding International Justice Mission (IJM) to strengthen systems to protect CSEC Victims and sustain their freedom in Maharashtra, India. In this project, the IJM team is working towards strengthening the institutions in place for the care and protection of CSEC victims across 10 districts in Maharashtra. GFEMS has partnered with Athena-Itad to review the intervention in the context of its Theory of Change (ToC), with an objective to measure its progress towards a sustainable model for the reduction of modern slavery. The learnings from the project will be used to guide the scalability and efficacy of the intervention.

---

3 UNODC & MCWD, 2008.
4 According to the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, a “child” is defined as a person who has not completed eighteen years of age.
A case study approach has been followed, allowing a longitudinal perspective to be gained across all earmarked components of the project. As these enquiries cannot be formally considered to constitute a traditional and comprehensive baseline-end line assessment, the terms ‘First Look’ and ‘Second Look’ case studies have been introduced. Apart from desk reviews, key informant interviews have been conducted with the implementing partners and relevant stakeholders (wherever possible) to gain an in-depth understanding of the project and assess its progress. The project has been evaluated against the Better Fit Approach (BFA) and the Systems Change Framework (SCF) to ascertain the a) quality of the innovation against a diverse set of factors, described below, and b) nature of the improvement to the status quo of the system.

**Project overview**

IJM aims to strengthen the institutions that bolster and facilitate protection and rehabilitation services for CSEC victims in order to prompt redressal and reintegration outcomes for CSEC victims in Maharashtra. This is a systems-focused intervention being implemented in four administrative divisions (Pune, Aurangabad, Amravati, and Nashik regions), which cover 10 districts of Maharashtra (Figure 1). The intervention is planned to be implemented in 3 phases in the selected districts in order to build capacity among the primary government institutions mandated to care for CSEC victims. Using a multi-pronged approach, the intervention focuses on 3 major aspects – upgrading Child Welfare Committees (CWCs) to a child-friendly model, strengthening Legal Aid Clinics (LACs), and supporting a Survivor Care Centre (SCC).

The ‘First Look’ case study will focus on the first aspect, i.e., a child-friendly CWC model. Building on the successful establishment of this model in CWCs in Mumbai, Pune, Nagpur and Sangli, the IJM team is now planning to take this model to 10 other districts (Satara, Solapur, Kolhapur, Amaravati, Beed, Latur, Ahmednagar, Jalgaon, Jalna, and Nashik) with the GFEMS grant.

![Study locations-international Justice Mission (IJM), Maharashtra](image)

**Figure 1: Study location - Selected districts for the IJM intervention**

Source: Author’s own computation, 2021

CWCs are quasi-judicial district-level bodies that have sole jurisdiction on decisions related to a child in care of need and protection (CNCP). While the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015,

---

7 KII s have been conducted with the Project Team and a CWC member (Government level stakeholder).
and the Model Rules of 2016 make provisions for child-friendly procedures, in reality, CWCs face many difficulties in executing these in their daily operations. It is important to build their capacity and transform them into child-friendly agencies that are able to offer quality services to the children for whom they are responsible. This is where IJM steps in with their series of innovations that can contribute to making CWCs child friendly spaces and ensuring child-centric processes.

To build the capacity of the CWC, the IJM team has planned a three-fold programme:
- Train CWC members to build their capacity and conduct quarterly CWC coordination meetings.
- Provide qualified support staff such as counsellors and secondments.
- Upgrade CWC facilities to be child-friendly and victim-centered including infrastructural enhancement

The training programme is focused on building the technical knowledge of CWC members and in helping them understand legal procedures and requirements. For example, preparing better case documentation, making a comprehensive individual care plan, and knowing which documents are required at different stages. To help the CWC staff, the IJM team is providing qualified personnel on secondments, who can take care of administrative roles and responsibilities, and counsellors who can provide better mental health support at the CWC. Lastly, the IJM intervention has an infrastructure enhancement component to ensure the CWCs are child-friendly and have adequate facilities like toys, restrooms, waiting areas, and water, etc.

The IJM intervention also has a strong coordination aspect and plans to provide a platform for distinct system stakeholders such as – local police, shelter homes, the District Child Protection Units, the District Office, CWCs, and NGOs to come together for case discussions and to support each other in order to improve outcomes for the victims.

The basic Theory of Change (ToC) states that:

| If | - child and victim-friendly spaces are created, medical service providers undertake suitable treatment of victims; Individual Care Plans are prepared in compliance with the law; CSEC victims complete counselling sessions at Survivor Care Centre; human resource positions are filled; and CSEC victims are routinely rescued, AND - there is stakeholder coordination and key stakeholders remain engaged in project initiatives while CSEC victims are routinely rescued, AND - there is stakeholder coordination and key stakeholders remain engaged in project initiatives while CSEC victims are routinely rescued, |
| then | - minors will use the upgraded facilities at the CWCs and Government Shelter(s); AND |

---

8 These activities are funded by the US Department of State.
9 These activities are funded by the US Department of State.
- CSEC victim care and rehabilitation will improve

resulting in
- CSEC victims enrolling in educational and vocational services

leading to
- CSEC victims being able to sustain their rehabilitation in educational and vocational services

**Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic**

- Because of the lockdown restrictions, project operations had to be conducted entirely online. This resulted in delaying on-ground implementation of the project till December 2020.
- The pandemic also resulted in a donor-mandated hiring freeze for field staff and delays in getting approvals from district officials. Communication with government officials was very challenging during this period since it was not possible to meet in person and officials were actively prioritising COVID-19 response as a policy decision. However, the IJM team managed to establish lines of communication with these officials virtually to get the project moving along.
- The IJM team experienced delays in conducting the physical situational assessment of the CWCs as they did not want to rely only on virtual assessments. Hence, the team had to wait for lockdown restrictions to lift before hiring a district coordinator to conduct the situational assessments in person.
- Onboarding contractors and vendors for infrastructure enhancement also presented challenges due to the pandemic. However, while conducting physical assessment all individual precautionary measures as per government COVID-19 protocols were followed.
- Since physical meetings were not possible, the IJM team conducted an online training session\(^\text{11}\) for the CWCs via Zoom. However, they experienced connectivity issues with the interior districts and discovered that many members were not tech-savvy. Despite this, the team put in efforts to ensure maximum participation. The IJM team made multiple reminder phone calls to CWC members; conducted test runs; and helped members with the registration process. These measures ensured high participation, ultimately making the training session a success.
- Quarterly coordination meetings with the CWCs, shelter homes, the District Office, and NGOs could not be conducted during the lockdown period due to the lack of technological infrastructure in these districts. Zoom and WhatsApp were not viable options and therefore, meetings for Phase I and Phase II are being planned for the next quarter.

**Current status (First Look, Mid-February 2021):** In the wake of the pandemic, the first phase of implementation for the CWC project experienced delays. However, work resumed in July 2020 in the 3 districts selected for Phase I, namely, Solapur, Kolhapur, and Satara (Pune division). After processing the relevant approvals from government officials in Solapur, Kolhapur, and Satara, IJM began the recruitment process and hired a district coordinator (overseeing all 3 districts), as well as secondments and counsellors for each district\(^\text{12}\). Presently, only the counsellor position in Solapur remains vacant but the team is in the process of finalising a qualified candidate for the same. Situational assessments for the first three districts

---

\(^{11}\) This was a virtual training session organised for the CWCs in Phase 1 (Solapur, Kolhapur, and Satara) on the topic ‘How to use the Individual Care Plan’.

\(^{12}\) The secondments and counsellors are funded by the US Department of State.
have been completed and the IJM team has initiated the situational analysis for the following 3 districts, namely, Beed, Latur, and Amravati (Aurangabad and Amravati Division). Infrastructural work at the CWC in Solapur is close to completion while vendors for the Satara and Kolhapur CWCs have been identified and will begin working shortly. For the second phase, infrastructural development is expected to take place from April to June 2021. Implementation of the last phase of the project in the 4 remaining districts is expected to be completed during the month of September 2021. Currently, baseline data collection with relevant stakeholders is ongoing and the stakeholders involved in the first phase have been consulted for the purpose of this case study.

Methodology

Research Design

Each ‘First Look’ case study focuses on

a) understanding the project’s theory of change as articulated by implementing partners, which may or may not be written down

b) some evidence on specific standards for the services provided by the implementing partners

c) providing contextual information of the current situation before or during an early stage of implementation.

The ‘Second Look’ case studies will focus on assessing evidence of change, different pathways to change, and other determining contributing and contextual factors. Enquiries into the ‘Second Look’ case studies will seek to unpack observed behavioural change of stakeholders at the target community and system levels. However, given the timeline of the First and Second Look, the bulk of evidence is likely to be at the output and immediate outcome level, rather than the longer-term outcome and impact level.

The study has used remote data-collection methods to address the following learning questions for the project:

1. How and to what extent is the intervention expected to provide improved care and rehabilitation to CSEC victims?
2. How do CWCs change outcomes for victims?
3. How sustainable are these systems-change interventions and what investments are required to maintain them and replicate them across Maharashtra?

Evaluation Framework

The *Athena-Itad* case study has taken the project ToC as the main entry point into discussions and will look at which change pathways are working well, which change pathways are potentially challenging or lack up-to-date programming evidence. This **theory-based approach** was followed to design a case study

---

13 The ‘before implementation’ information is often problematic in reality, as typically, the intervention will build on some previous work that has been done by the subrecipient, or work that has already begun. In either case, the ‘First Look’ still provides a point in time against which to assess change in the ‘Second Look’.

14 Due to the pandemic, in-depth interviews with all stakeholders were conducted over Zoom.
that aims to test, with evidence, the assumed causal chain of results with what is observed to have happened, checking each link and assumption in the process to verify the foregrounding theory.

The theory-based approach is accompanied by **contribution analysis**, which provides a systematic way to arrive at credible causal claims about a programme’s contribution to change. By verifying the ToC and taking into consideration other factors that may have influenced outcomes, contribution analysis provides evidence about where and how the grantees did (or did not) make effective programme objectives.

The observations in this report showcase the expectations from the project based on the information available during the ‘First Look’ stage, and not the status of the project at this stage. It is important to note that with further progress in the project and with better availability of information, the goal is to develop an accurate as-is picture during the ‘Second Look’ stage.

**Better Fit Approach**

The case study framework integrates the Better Fit Approach (BFA) methodology to help determine the degree to which an initiative is ‘innovative’ and locally responsive. BFA seeks to either apply a new solution to a given problem, or innovatively adapt a solution from a different context to fit the programme context. It usually involves doing something differently from how it is currently being done and seeks to make the outcome or experience better, particularly in a complex and/or rapidly changing programming environment. BFA is not necessarily evaluative as it may be too early to conduct interventions during the planning stages or early trial stages of an intervention. The elements of the BFA pathway are presented in Annexure 1. In principle, BFA provides an ‘innovation audit’ to understand the following aspects of the implementation process:

- **Transformative**: To what extent and how the programme is flexible to be able to offer intended services more effectively
- **Inclusive**: To what extent and how the programme is trying to serve excluded groups
- **Adaptive**: To what extent and how the programme is collecting and using results for decision-making
- **Economically viable**: To what extent and how the programme has maintained cost-effectiveness and shaped itself as acceptable and scalable

**Systems Change Framework**

Wherever applicable, a theory-based approach will assess how the intervention helps improve system-level capacities and connections that aim to bring forth changes in outcomes at an individual level. The Systems Change Framework (SCF) will appraise the challenges achieving of pathway effectiveness, including structural barriers, and strategies employed for improving overall structures. The SCF scale is presented in Annexure 2. The assessment of SCF expectations for the project was accomplished through a detailed review of the project theory of change and/or logframe, as well as through KIIIs with key stakeholders to assess:

We have tried to assess:

- **The capacities of**:
  - the project to provide the requisite services, and identify and address risks at the beneficiary level
  - government service providers to provide holistic services and affect systems-level change
● Connections and coordination with other relevant stakeholders in providing holistic services and improving the decision-making process; and in identifying and addressing the risks associated with CSEC.

While BFA focuses on the design aspects of the project, allowing it to achieve its identified primary and secondary targets, SCF aims to understand how well the project impacts or influences the existing systems and their services and capacities. To assess these capacities of the stakeholders, we explore:

● Capability (ability to provide intended services): How well does the project deliver its services and how do the system and other actors respond to it? How scalable are the activities to other services and target groups, with quality measured and maintained?
● Incentive model (ability to serve interests of a diverse group of stakeholders from demand as well as supply side): How well-designed is the project to ensure incentives for the associated stakeholders of both the demand and the supply side to continue? How well does the project identify and address mismatches between the services intended and the services received by the target audience?
● Sustainability (evidence or indications of buy-in for offering intended services): How convinced are the partners to continue the service model? What evidence or indications do we have to prove stakeholders’ willingness to replicate the model or continue post-project period?
● External Linkages (linkages with government or apex bodies): Is the project connected to or aligned with programmes or schemes in the sector and locality that will help ensure long-term success and viability of the project?

Sample of Stakeholders
The 'First Look' exercise started with an extensive desk review of the project documents, including the project proposal, ToC, log frame, and other project-related documents. Since this case study mainly focuses on the CWC aspect of the IJM intervention, there is limited scope for data collection from stakeholders at this stage. Given the early planning stage of the project, only two active groups of stakeholders could be identified in consultation with the project team. However, it is expected that other groups of stakeholders\(^{15}\) will be onboarded in the future and will be discussed in the ‘Second Look’ case study.

For the 'First Look', in-depth interviews were first conducted with the team responsible for the design and implementation of the project. In addition, separate in-depth interviews were conducted with two members of the implementation team – the project manager and the district coordinator. The review team also engaged with a CWC member from the Solapur district to gather a deeper understanding of the project activities. Semi-structured questionnaires and checklists were used to collect information\(^{16}\) and the findings were analysed and compared against the updates reported by the project. To the extent possible, similar questions were asked to different stakeholders for triangulation and to explore different perspectives.

List of stakeholders interviewed during the ‘First look’:

---

\(^{15}\) The stakeholders are counsellors/secondments, guardians and other relevant stakeholders expected to onboard in the near future.

\(^{16}\) KII guides were developed in consultation with the IJM team.
● Project team which included members responsible for management, design, implementation, and other aspects of the project
● Project Manager
● District Coordinator
● CWC member of Solapur district

Key Results/Findings

Summary of results against key learning questions
(Findings are as of mid-February 2021)

1. How and to what extent is the intervention expected to provide improved care and rehabilitation to CSEC victims? The IJM intervention works closely with the system actors and relevant civil society stakeholders in order to prompt change in outcomes for CSEC victims in the target districts. Strengthening the capacity of the primary government institutions mandated to care for CSEC victims and improving coordination among systems stakeholders is expected to improve victim care and rehabilitation. However, since the project is still at an early stage, this will be discussed in an in-depth manner in the ‘Second Look’ case study.

2. How do Child Welfare Committees change outcomes for victims? Being the highest quasi-judicial district-level body solely responsible for children in need of care and protection, the CWC is the most important decision-making authority in the system. It is the responsibility of the CWC to keep track of CNCP, their placement, the services being provided to them, and so on. This makes it imperative to strengthen the capacities of CWCs and ensure they offer victim-friendly services. The IJM intervention upgrades CWCs to the child-friendly model in the three districts part of Phase I – by providing infrastructure support, additional staff, and training sessions for CWC members; to improve their decision-making abilities for the children under their care. While it is too early for impact to manifest, interviews with the project team have revealed that the project is moving in line with the ToC. It is expected that:

   ● Training CWC members on roles, responsibilities, and decision-making frameworks will improve their ability to provide victims with at least the minimum standard of care.
   ● Additional support staff would ensure the CWC can offer quality services (such as counselling and trauma-alleviating services) and function smoothly.
   ● Infrastructural enhancement will ensure these spaces are child-friendly and conducive to the care and rehabilitation of children in need

17 Government stakeholders such as the CWC, the Probation Officer, the District Women and Child Development Department, District Child Protection Unit etc.
19 The Minimum Standards of Care is a concept coined and crafted by the field implementers of IJM. It refers to services that all survivors should receive such as: Linking survivor to 1) professional counselling (government counsellor or local NGO-provided, person with a professional degree in clinical counselling), 2) educational services/vocational services, 3) for whom a Care plan has been developed by the home probation officer/social worker. (Logframe, IJM. 2021. Internal Project Document). This component is supported by another donor not FCDO
20 This component is funded by the US Department of State.
The ‘Second Look’ case study will offer more insights into this particular aspect and present a more nuanced picture once the evidence-mapping process is complete.

3. How sustainable are these systems change interventions and what investments are required to maintain them and replicate them across Maharashtra? Interviews with the project team revealed that the reason behind choosing a systems-focused approach was to ensure sustainability and a wider impact at the end of the project. IJM’s constant engagement with government and civil society system stakeholders to get their buy-in would ensure continued support even after the intervention ends. As mentioned above, the success of the child-friendly CWC model in other districts reflects its potential to be replicated across Maharashtra as well as other states, with appropriate contextualisation. Co-funding modalities for the project are unclear at this stage and will be discussed in the future.

Framework-based findings
Better Fit Approach

The ‘First Look’ assessment focuses on the design aspect of the interventions and outlines the expected impact of the programme across the dimensions of Transformation, Inclusivity, Adaptability and Economic Viability (Annexure-1). The learnings from this section will dovetail into the larger picture view provided by the Systems Change Framework.

Image 1: Better Fit Approach – Design innovation in strengthening the institution works for CSEC victims

Transformative: To reduce the prevalence of CSEC and provide adequate care and rehabilitation facilities to victims, it is imperative to have strong systems and institutions in place. The CWC is the highest district-level body with quasi-judicial powers which can be exercised over any child in need of care and protection. As part of the intervention, the IJM team is working closely with the CWCs in each district to provide them infrastructural support, skilled human resource, and training to strengthen their capacity\(^\text{21}\). IJM is also focusing on building a platform to improve coordination among relevant stakeholders such as the District

\(^{21}\) The components like human skilling and training are supported by the US Department of State.
Office, the shelter home(s), the CWC, and other line departments in order to provide better services to victims present in the system.

**Inclusive:** By design, the IJM intervention focuses on some of the most vulnerable and marginalised individuals and groups in the country. The objective of the intervention is to focus on the needs and requirements of victims of CSEC, the largest proportion of which are women and children. Interviews with the project team also revealed that the 10 districts chosen were the most vulnerable – in terms of being in need of attention and development and were on the priority list of the Government of India. To a certain extent, design aspects as part of the infrastructural enhancement have also considered the needs of children with disabilities. Regardless of gender, ethnicity or regional profile, disability, etc. the CWC is mandated to serve any child brought into the system.

“**The CWC has 12 types of children that are brought to the CWC. We’re mindful of every child being brought, disability friendly ramps are also built, and other interventions have the focus on all the children being brought to the CWC. Special needs are also being addressed to the children.”**

*Project Manager, IJM.*

Interviews revealed that the project design plan had certain mechanisms to engage with stakeholders, particularly victims to get their buy-in regarding the project. For example, the project has a Community Feedback Mechanism (CFM) where feedback activities are organised with different stakeholder categories. The IJM team conducted a CFM activity with the children at a shelter home in Mumbai to understand their perception of an ideal CWC and elicited interesting insights from this activity. For instance, children wanted more furniture and greenery, some even suggested that CWC members should not attend phone calls during the sessions. These insights were incorporated into the programme and served as recommendations for the planning of the CWC infrastructure upgradation and project team and field people-initiated work as per government regulation guidelines on COVID-19.

**Adaptive:** Although still in the initial phase, the project has identified the milestones and activities that are important to achieve intended results. There are several relevant long-term outcome indicators that track the achievement of clearly identifiable results that further the programme objectives. After multiple iterations with GFEMS, the IJM team has clearly articulated the outputs, outcomes and impact expected in the short- and long-term in a log frame which will be used to monitor and track the progress of the project. Progress along these causal pathways will be reviewed on a quarterly basis to ensure real-time adaptations are implemented. Additionally, IJM receives daily progress reports from the field staff which are summarised for reflection and reporting processes.

**Economically Viable:** IJM’s systems-focused approach which utilises existing government services has the potential to be applied to other geographies and sectors with appropriate contextualisation. The IJM team is advocating with the MWCD to increase the scale of the intervention. Interviews reveal that capacity-building activities are planned on being held across all 36 districts in the state, and not just the 10 intervention districts to ensure that benefits are spread across Maharashtra. While at this stage, co-
funding modalities for the project are unclear, it is highly likely that successful CWC components of the intervention are sustainable since the CWCs are funded by the Government of India and state governments.

**Systems Change Framework**

SCF attempts to explore the elements of the intervention from the aspects of sustainable and long-term impact and improvements in the existing systems that govern the sector targeted by the intervention. This framework identifies the ability of the intervention in affecting system-wide change and how advanced the project is in the pathway-model described in Annexure-2.

**Systems Change Framework indicator table:**

Since the project is still in its initial phase, the SCF analysis outputs could only identify the expectations or indicate the projected state of the intervention once it is fully implemented.

*Image 2: Systems Change Framework – Expectations from the project to support CSEC victims*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Incentive Model</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>External linkages (Government / Apex)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Can provide the intended services to primary target groups. All the partners are experienced and are expected to implement their roles efficiently.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Able to ensure incentives for stakeholders. Focus is on building capacity of service providers. Future incentive structure yet to be determined.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Make the model their mainstream practice. Can be replicated across the country with appropriate contextualization.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Linkages provide well defined support and incentives for intervention success. Partners have established close ties with government and apex bodies.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capability:** IJM is an experienced player in the sector and has worked with CWCs before. It has a proven track-record of conducting similar projects in other districts in Maharashtra such as in Mumbai, Pune, Nagpur, and Sangli. It is evident that the IJM team has vast sectoral knowledge, in addition to being well-versed with the local context in which they are operating.
Leveraging this credible track-record has helped IJM get approvals from government officials and other relevant stakeholders, enabling them to operate smoothly in the intervention districts. This has also helped the IJM team in establishing direct lines of communication with the district officials and build a good relationship with them.

To ensure the quality and effectiveness of the intended services, the IJM team has put in great effort to recruit qualified field staff, as this is critical to the success of the intervention. Interviews revealed that a rigorous recruitment protocol was followed while hiring staff for the project, and almost all the positions have been filled.

**Incentive model:** The intervention is designed to serve the interests of a diverse group of stakeholders mainly on the supply side. A major focus of the intervention is to strengthen the systems in place to help CSEC victims. IJM has chosen a systems-focused approach, involving all relevant stakeholders, and has aligned the intervention to the government’s focus and priorities to ensure sustainability and a bigger impact, not necessarily limited to the targeted districts. IJM has engaged with key local system stakeholders and hopes to establish more partnerships in the future.

**Sustainability:** So far, IJM has shared components of this model including training with four other states (Arunachal Pradesh, Odisha, Kerala, and Madhya Pradesh), showcasing the potential of the child-friendly CWC model to be replicated across the country with appropriate contextualisation. It is reflected in the system focused approach adopted by IJM. Interviews revealed that the IJM team plans to continue its advocacy efforts with the MWCD in terms of scalability and providing capacity-building support to CWCs. Buy-in at the government level is a positive reflection on the sustainability of the project and the government’s willingness to replicate this model in other states.

**External linkages:** The programme has engaged relevant government officials in its design and implementation. Working with the system has ensured buy-in from important government bodies such as the MCWD, District Offices, and the CWC, as well as government child-care institutions and shelter homes. Interviews revealed that the 10 intervention districts were chosen since they were high on government priority, and components such as the Individual Care Plan (ICP) were incorporated into the intervention after consultation with government officials. This has ensured government support for the present intervention and will be imperative for the smooth functioning of the project in the future.

“Even though we might be working in these districts for the first time, this is not our first time working with the CWCs. We have done this before in Bombay, Pune, Nagpur and Sangli. We have shown the child friendly CWC model and that is why we have permission right from the Commissionerate of the DWCD which is in Pune, to actually go ahead and do work in these 10 districts...It’s because of this credibility, because they have seen us on the CWC training, the mentorship program and the work that we have done.”

*Project Manager, IJM.*
Implications and Recommendations

Success stories
Even though the project experienced delays due to the pandemic, the IJM team continued to work remotely to keep the project moving forward. To keep up the momentum, IJM organised a virtual training session for the CWCs of the three districts part of Phase I. Despite technical difficulties, the team was able to get good participation. The team has been in constant touch with the district officials, albeit virtually. As soon as the lockdown restrictions were lifted, the team started the approval process from the district officials. Hiring for the field staff and the infrastructure-related work also commenced simultaneously. Interviews revealed that the infrastructure enhancement for Solapur is complete and that the CWC was inaugurated in mid-February. Based on interview with IJM project manager, he revealed that the Commissioner of WCD and other CWC officials were impressed by the progress the IJM team had made.

Another success story was revealed in the interview with a District Coordinator. During the needs assessment, it was realised that the CWCs lacked clarity on important aspects of the Juvenile Justice Act. With the help of the IJM team and the mentor in survivor care center, a training session was organised for the CWC members on the Act and with practical applications in the daily operations of the CWC. This small step highlights the commitment and pro-activeness of the team.

Enabling factors (Strengths)
IJM has significant sectoral experience and a well-established presence in Maharashtra. Both these factors have worked in their favour and helped in the smooth functioning of the current intervention. Since IJM has prior experience in this field and is adept at navigating the complex rules and regulations of the system, they enjoy the trust and acceptance needed to work in these areas. Without this credibility, it would have been difficult to execute a project at this scale. Moreover, IJM’s biggest value addition is providing the relevant government bodies with the expertise, resources, and facilities that they otherwise lack.

Challenges
- The team had to adapt the implementation design as a result of budget reductions and practical complications following the COVID-19 pandemic restrictions, which limited the scope of the initial plan and led to implementation delays.
- The IJM team faced difficulties in establishing contact with the district authorities due to limited availability during the pandemic period. The approval-taking process was also challenging and time-consuming.
- IJM staff revealed a unique challenge faced during implementation of the project in that the CWCs in the first three intervention districts did not have an independent office or place to sit. A big challenge then was to advocate for the allocation of adequate space for the CWCs to be able to take the project further.
- Another challenge was hiring qualified ground staff for the project. It was essential to hire people with prior experience who had knowledge of the sector, could travel and were familiar with the local language. However, due to the interior nature of these vulnerable districts it was difficult to hire staff, especially, qualified counsellors.
● Zoom-fatigue has been a real challenge, especially, for the district authorities who weren’t very comfortable with technology and working remotely. This also had an adverse effect on online training sessions or meetings being conducted during the pandemic period. Further, many district officials had limited resources in terms of internet access, laptops etc., making it even more difficult to connect remotely.

● The pandemic period made it difficult to connect with vendors, organise visits, and plan training and coordination meetings which caused a delay in the infrastructure component of the intervention. Moreover, vendors have been struggling to get supplies to these districts and to complete the work within project timelines.

● The quarterly coordination meetings, which represent an important aspect of the intervention, could not be held during the pandemic period because of the remoteness of the districts and connectivity issues. These meetings present a platform for different stakeholders like the CWCs, shelter homes, the District Office and NGOs to come together and discuss the different interests, necessities, and opportunities that should be given to survivors of trafficking and CSEC victims and for CNCP. These meetings for Phase I and Phase II are now being planned for this quarter and the next.

**Key Recommendations**

The recommendation section is divided into two sub-groups, (i) recommendations for IJM and (ii) recommendations than are relevant also for CSE stakeholders more broadly, such as donors and government institutions.

**Recommendations for the IJM project:**

● Addressing the needs of children with disabilities in a more comprehensive manner may strengthen the project’s ability to address inclusivity.

● Language can often act as a barrier in situations related to CSEC since many cases are registered from migrant families making it difficult for the victim to communicate effectively. In addition to support staff such as secondments and counsellors, working with qualified translators and interpreters to support such families may help improve the community-level penetration and success rate of the CWC’s efforts.

**Broad Recommendations for CSE stakeholders (government, donors, implementers):**

● As the project progresses and the team is able to collect more information and observe outcomes, updates may need to be made on existing monitoring and learning systems. Given the potential for growth of the program and the expected influx of information, the scale and level of detail to be captured by the monitoring system for effective learning will grow.

● In addition to current system-strengthening activities, there may be additional benefits through technological approaches such as the development of a collaborative online Management Information System (MIS), which could simplify and streamline documentation and reporting activities as well as support coordination and collaborative efforts amongst the various stakeholders. The pandemic demonstrates the benefits of such online platforms that can streamline administrative processes, secure and safely make available child protection data and
information, prevent loss of records due to damage of paper files, prevent duplicity of efforts, ensure transparency, and encourage innovative strategies/best practices. For example, Documenting the best practices in handling cases of sexual exploitation since POCSO has come into effect will help serve as a guideline for future cases.

- Since the project already has a strong focus on supporting children and communities at the local level, it may be of interest for GFEMS or IJM, to explore engaging with other stakeholders who have strong community-level linkages to the at-risk individuals. IJM’s activities could be complemented with a community education and awareness programme targeting the vulnerable regions.
## Annexures

### Annexure 1: Better Fit Approach

| Transformative | Maintains status quo | Would improve an existing service  
*It is expected to improve the existing services being provided by CWCs* | Would create a new service, or substantially improve an existing service | Would radically improve a service or create a new service – and could unlock change in other services |
|----------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Inclusive      | Serves one group within the community | Considers the needs of excluded communities  
*focuses on vulnerable sections such as poor and marginalised women and children* | Creates a clear role for excluded groups | Creates a role for excluded groups in leadership, planning and accountability |
| Adaptive       | Does not offer effective measures of change monitoring | Offers some opportunity to measure and monitor change  
*It focuses on changing the lives of the CSEC victims and other children by providing a friendly and conducive environment* | Offers an opportunity to measure change, and takes this measurement into account for decision making | Results can be measured and incorporated directly into targets and a system established for results-based decision making |
| Economically Viable | Identifies potential resources and sources only.  
*no information about the cost and upscaling at this moment* | Explores alternative resources and sources to make implementation more economic and may apply in some other communities.  
Co-funding is promising | Negotiates effectively to make the deals economic and timely to make it widespread and uses approaches which are likely to be widely acceptable.  
High likelihood of co-funding | Has been implemented in an economic and timely manner.  
Co-funding pipeline is strong |
## Annexure 2: Systems Change Framework

| Capability | Can provide the intended services to primary target groups  
(though the project is at an early stage, IJM and partners have the required experience and expertise to provide the planned services in an efficient manner) | Can offer additional services related to the intended services with quality  
Can offer the intended services beyond the primary target groups with quality | Offers additional related services with quality beyond the primary target groups with quality  
Other competitors/similar service providers are offering similar services | Other competitors/similar service providers are offering similar services |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Incentive model | Able to ensure incentives for stakeholders  
(able to ensure incentives for stakeholders. Focus is on building capacity of service providers. Future incentive structure yet to be determined) | Additional gaps in service delivery for the targeted groups are minimised to ensure more incentive for both demand and supply side | Other competitors/similar service providers are showing interest in ensuring both demand and supply side incentives | Other competitors/similar service providers are ensuring both demand and supply side incentives |
| Sustainability | Try out the model for wider groups and recognises the model as a comparatively viable one | Make the model their mainstream practice  
(make the model their mainstream practice. Can be replicated across the country with appropriate contextualization) | Other competitors/similar service providers are recognizing incentive from the new model | Other competitors/similar service providers are making the model their mainstream practice |
| External linkages | Linkages closely monitor the progress and impact of the intervention | Linkages provide well defined support and incentives to ensure programme/intervention success.  
(has established close ties with government and apex bodies) | Linkages encourage similar programmes/interventions or linkages with other similar programmes/interventions | Linkages have made the intervention model a system norm |