International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)

International Labour Office

IPEC Evaluation

Contribution to the prevention and elimination of commercial sexual exploitation of children in Central America, Panama and Dominican Republic Sub-regional Project (Second Phase)

RLA/05/52/USA

P.260.08.200.050

An independent final evaluation by a team of external consultants

Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama and Dominican Republic

April 2009

This document has not been professionally edited.

IPEC/EVAL/2010/05

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 by a team of external consultants[1]. The field mission took place between 9 and 26 March, 2009. 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.

Funding for this project evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor. This report does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

[1] Claudia Ibargüen, as lead evaluator, and Mauricio Benito Dura, as technical expert

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

General

AP	Action Programme
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CSE	Commercial Sexual Exploitation
CSA	Union Confederation of Workers of the Americas
CSEC	Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DED	Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
ECPAT	End to Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Child Trafficking for Sexual Purposes.
FR	Foreign Relations
FSCSEC	Follow-up System for Commercial Sexual Exploitation
ILANUD	United Nations Latin American Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders.
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization on Migration
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
MCRA	Cyclical Model of Articulated Responses
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
ORIT	Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers
PARLACEN	Central American Parliament
RCM	Regional Conference on Migration
STC	Save the Children
TBP	Time-Bound Programme
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
USODC	United States Office on Drugs and Crime

BELIZE

DHS	Department of Human Services
NCFC	National Council of Families and Children
YES	Youth Enhancement Services

COSTA RICA

CEFEMINA	Feminist Centre for Information and Action
CMTC	Costa Rican Labour Movement Central
CONACOES	National Commission against Commercial Sexual Exploitation
CTRN	Rerum Novarum Confederation of Workers
PANI	National Children's Welfare Office

HONDURAS

APH	Honduran Press Association
CICESCT	Inter-Institutional Commission against Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Trafficking of Children and Adolescents
COHEP	Honduran Private Business Council
CUTH	Unified Workers Central Honduras
IHNFA	Honduran Family Institute

EL SALVADOR

DGME	General Office of Migration and Alien Status
CIPI	Children's Centre for Immediate Protection
CNETI	National Committee for the Elimination of Child Labour
ISDEMU	Women's Institute
ISNA	Salvadoran Institute for Childhood and Adolescence
MTPS	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare

NICARAGUA

CONAPINA	National Commission for the Prevention of Crimes of sexual exploitation
MIFAN	Ministry of the Family, Adolescence and Childhood

GUATEMALA

APG	Paediatric Association of Guatemala
SBS	Secretariat of Social Welfare

PANAMA

CNP	National Journalist Council
CONAPREDES	National Commission for the Prevention of Crimes of Sexual Exploitation
CONATO	National Council of Organized Workers
MIDES	Ministry of Social Development
PGN	Attorney General's Office
PTJ	Judicial Technical Police

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is the final independent evaluation of the Project "Contribution to the Prevention and Elimination of the Commercial Sexual Exploitation (ESC) of Boys, Girls and Adolescents in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic" (RLA/02/P51/USA). The Project has been financed by the United Status Department of Labor (USDOL) and executed by the International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) of the International Labour Organization (ILO) based in the sub regional office of San José in Costa Rica. The activities started in August 2002 with a budget of US$ 3.795.285, and in November 2005 it was extended (Phase II) for US$ 4.966.817, ending in April 2009.

The evaluation has been done by a team of evaluation consultants between the months of March and April 2009. It started with a desk review and telephone conversations with USDOL representatives in Washington and IPEC in Geneva. During three weeks, the team has visited Costa Rica, Guatemala, Belice, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras and Panama. It has produced 100 interviews amongst Project staff, state officials, members of the NGOs and implementing agencies, members of the trade unions, employers, independent consultants, journalists and beneficiaries and their families. The information extracted from the interviews has complemented the discussions and presentations of the stakeholder workshop, which was carried out in San José during the 24th and 25th of March 2009.

Overall, the counterparts interviewed expressed that in the seven years of the Project duration, the Project has had its important achievements in the fight against Commercial Sexual Exploitation. Amongst the most important achievements of the Project it is the role that the Project has in the awareness raising and recognition of the problem, the legislative reforms and changes observed the development of national plans and the strengthening of the interinstitutional committees against CSEC.

The Project defined as its global objective to "Contribute to the prevention and elimination of the commercial sexual exploitation in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic". At the same time, the Project established three strategic main pillars: 1. Horizontal Cooperation, 2. Institutional Strengthening or Capacity Building, and 3. Awareness Raising and Social Mobilization.

The second phase enlarged the number and complexity of activities. It included Belize and the three action programmes were expanded into six. As an exit strategy, efforts of coordination with other agencies of the United Nations and its cooperation were made. The search for partnerships to sustain and continue to follow up the activities that had been initiated by the Project was also intensified.

The design and conceptualization of the Project was assertive. It understood that being faced to such a complex phenomena, the response had to be integral and therefore include actions directed to prevention, sanction and attention. The people interviewed agreed that the regional arrangement was the right one for Central America since the distances are short and the environments can be easily comparable. The regional platform allowed to compare experiences and help to take advantage and enhance the resources available and was careful to adequate them to the national differences. Another achievement of the design was the conceptualization of the CSEC as children exploitation and the emphasis on the CSEC as a violation to the rights of the girls, boys and adolescents (NNA).

The first axis of horizontal cooperation established as objective to enhance the regional collaboration and the knowledge exchange to prevent and eliminate CSEC in the region. The principal products were centred in training, regional exchanges, the creation and dissemination of regional material, the support of agreements and regional networks and a system to follow up on the commitments.

The workshops, internships and exchanges contributed to achieving the general objective of gathering the responsible officials of the different areas (migration, police, judges, etc) to emphasize the importance of the coordination to make progress on the achievements in this issue. The activities left established the dynamics of mutual help of information exchange that, amongst the counterparts, have had tangible impact in the improvement of the prosecution of crimes in CSEC and trafficking.

The Project also achieved good work in collecting information generated in its different actions and systematising it for its further dissemination.The regional work done with men was highlighted as an innovation to improve the understanding on how the demand of CSEC is generated and the way to explore strategies to prevent it.

The Project supported the development of protocols of national repatriation as instruments to clarify the procedures and encourage the inter-institutional coordination in the cases of trafficking. At the moment of the evaluation, in the majority of the countries the application was an incipient. The Project established memorandums of understandings to make other institutions continue with the follow up of the protocols.

With the objective to achieve an information system that could strengthen the regional exchange and allow to follow up the achievements, the Project, together with other organizations, established DevInfoLAC CSEC. The training was given in all countries, although at the moment of the evaluation only Costa Rica was feeding the system. The use of the system for all the countries of the region will depend of its appropriation by the governments and its regular and proper use.

The second axis strengthening institutional capacity building was defined as an objective to support the formulation and execution of national legislation, public policies and programmes. At the same time, it defined its two sub-objectives: the creation of interinstitutional entities (commissions and committees) and the execution of pilot models of assistance to the victims.

The Project encouraged the development of national plans of action against CSEC in all the countries. The application of the national plans has fluctuated, with its highest achievement in the case of Costa Rica, in which the national plan against CSEC was integrated with the national action plan for development. The challenge for the future of the national plans will be dependent on the funds allocation and its integration into wider public policies, such as the plan to fight poverty or the development plan.

The creation and implementation of the interinstitutional commissions to define strategies and coordinate actions was one of the most important legacies of the Project. These commissions are key since they are responsible to give continuity and sustain the achievements made. The Project contributed to the creation and strengthening of the commissions in all the countries. However, the degree of functioning of these institutions varies from country to country.

The counterparts highlighted that one of the main achievements of the Project has been its contribution to the legislative reforms, including the support to the formulation of the laws according to the

international norms. Even if the support to the normative implementation has been highly valued, it has been seen that the effective application of the legislation is limited due to the prejudices of the justice operators and the ignorance of the laws. The Project has tried to face this issue through informative sessions, workshops and trainings.

One of its main purposes was to improve the response and attention to the victims through the relevant institutions. The Project Developed a cyclical model of articulated response that promotes the integral attention to the victims, based in the rights of boys, girls and adolescents. The execution of the programmes in all countries offered the opportunity to explore the model in practice. Each country conducted protocols, guides and manuals specified for the specificities of each country. The adoption of these protocols by the different national institutions still requires, in the majority of the countries, the support and sustainability for its future. The action programmes (APs) generated a great quantity of lessons about the attention of victims but it is important to increase the involvement of responsible public institutions.

The third axis of awareness raising and social mobilization was defined as an objective to the "increase in the individual and community action to prevent and eliminate CSEC and attend the victims in the region". The sub objective was "increase awareness raising on CSEC on boys, girls and adolescents and trafficking in key sectors of the population".

The Project achieved the target of generating more knowledge on the CSEC issue of children under age. The majority of the interviewees expressed that in a retrospective view, the main impact from the Project was the awareness raising of the problem and the generation of good quality material that can still be used by the main public institutions, schools and non governmental organizations (NGOs) for their own efforts to raise awareness. The approach of the journalists and mass media had its results since the research and journalistim have taken ownership of the subject in a much more responsible way. The relation with journalists has also been key to promote and eventually put into practice the legislation in some of the countries.

The information activities to the key stakeholders have contributed to the advance of knowledge in the subject in general and the specific responsibilities that the individuals have in their functions, such as the teachers or in the health sector. The Project permanently highlighted the criminal nature and hence the shared responsibility from the different sectors (including the general population) to denounce the cases. Hence, the information on how to denounce, to whom and where has been perceived as very useful.

The incorporation of the trade unions and the employers organizations took place in the second phase. It was perceived as a contribution to the integration of the two sectors, both for their contribution to their fight against CSEC and for being the natural counterparts for the ILO. In particular, with the trade unions the work has been done both at a national and regional level. However, although there was progress in the responsibilities of both sectors, the trade unions thought that their involvement in the Project was done at a later stage.

The final evaluation of the first phase highlighted the need to raise awareness of the subject through mass media. In the second phase, the Project reached the larger public in all the countries through the dissemination of TV spots and radio cuts.

Regarding sustainability, the Project was assertive in looking for alliances and memoranda of understanding with other institutions, NGOs and other organisms to consolidate the advances made by the Project. In this way, it lays out the future work with other institutions in the judicial sector of the countries of the region, the support to the repatriation protocols, and the concretion of the system DevInfoLac CSEC. Apart from the external support, the main achievement of the Project regarding sustainability is based on the national committees.

The main recommendations of the present report were made to the interinstitucional committees, regarding the follow up of the attention protocols to continue to provide a good service to the victims. At the same time, it requires a follow up and a periodical monitoring of the execution of the National Plans, establishing the degree in which each institution has to fulfil their responsibilities according to their National Plan. From a prevention perspective and the reality of the studies done by ILO/IPEC that show a high tolerant society for CSEC; activities that continue to disseminate and raise awareness amongst the civil society should be made a priority.

I. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Background of the Problem

Country studies carried out by ILO/IPEC before beginning the project, identified commercial sexual exploitation and human trafficking of children as a generalized problem in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic.[2] The types of commercial sexual exploitation of children varied strongly. The studies showed that it occurs in environments like brothels, massage parlours and dancehalls as well as in public places: parks, streets and street corners. They also pointed out the generalized use of intermediaries such as taxi drivers, truck drivers and workers of the tourist industry. Particularly in certain countries, including the Dominican Republic and Costa Rica, an increase in sexual tourism was identified. In countries like Panama, Nicaragua and Honduras, CSEC was identified in connection with drug-trafficking networks, making children and adolescents even more vulnerable. The study found human trafficking of children for commercial sexual exploitation purposes in all of the countries, but in particular into Guatemala which serves as a corridor and bridge to the North. In Honduras it was found that the presence of gangs (maras) who enslave children for sexual exploitation and labour purposes. At the beginning of the decade there were also indications of exploitation in the use of children for the production of child pornography, distributed more and more frequently through electronic media like the Internet. Therefore the situation in the region in 2002, when this project began, was one of high indices of CSE and extended social tolerance toward these practices.

B. Project Description

This document is the report of the final evaluation of the project: "Contribution to the Prevention and Elimination of Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic" (RLA/02/P51/USA). The project was financed by the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) and carried out by the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) of the International Labour Organization (ILO), with its sub-regional headquarters in San Jose, Costa Rica. The project began operations in August 2002 with a budget of US$ 3,795,285. In November 2005 an addendum was approved (known as Phase 2) with a duration of 43 months and a budget of US$ 4,966,817. Although the conclusions of this report are centred on the activities of the second phase of the project (from October 2005 till March 2009) the analysis of the project's impact cannot be separated from precedent from the first phase.

In the project document, the development objective is defined as: "to contribute to the prevention and eradication of commercial sexual exploitation of children in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic". As summarized in Table 1, to achieve the development objective, the project established three immediate objectives, which are in turn linked to specific outputs. The three immediate objectives coincide with the three main strategic axes of the project: 1.) Horizontal cooperation; 2.) Institutional strengthening; and, 3.) Mobilisation and awareness building. For practical purposes in this evaluation, the second axis, institutional strengthening, has been divided into

2 A study was conducted on the characteristics of CSE in each of the countries of the region. For a summary of the results see: Bente Sorensen and Maria Cecilia Claramunt, *Explotación sexual comercial de personas menores de edad en Centroamérica, Panamá y República Dominicana. Síntesis Regional., October* 2003, ILO/IPEC .

its two principal elements: i.) Institutional strengthening; including legislative adaptation; and ii.) Development of pilot projects on prevention and direct care for children.

The first phase achieved important results in the fight against commercial sexual exploitation, in terms of creating awareness among the national authorities, modification of laws in some countries; assistance and withdrawal of an important number of children in situations of commercial sexual exploitation; and generation of useful knowledge and research for orienting the strategies and increasing knowledge of the problem.

Upon completion of the first phase, the counterparts and ILO/IPEC concluded that commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents continued to be a deeply rooted phenomenon, and that there was still a need to provide support to the countries in their efforts to prevent and eliminate the problem in a sustainable manner. In the second phase, Belize was included in the project. This country has close ties with the English speaking countries of the Caribbean, however, being geographically attached to Central America and having similar problems with CSE, it was thought that the country would benefit from the experiences generated in the rest of the countries of the region. The addendum incorporated additional immediate objectives and therefore also new outputs and activities. The additional elements were complementary to the actions that had already been carried out during the first 40 months of the project.

Regarding direct action programmes (APs), the second phase increased their number and geographical extension. In the first phase direct action interventions were conducted in Guatemala, Costa Rica and Nicaragua. The second phase extended the activities to include Honduras, Panama and Belize. Phase I defined the withdrawal or prevention of CSE of 500 children as its objective, this increased to 2,220 for the period 2006-2009.

Table 1: Summary of Objectives and Outputs[3]

Development Objective: To contribute to the prevention and elimination of commercial sexual exploitation of children in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic
I/O 1 At the end of the project, there will be regional cooperation and shared knowledge to prevent and eradicate commercial sexual exploitation of children in the region. Sub I/O Formal and informal mechanisms of horizontal cooperation established and networks functioning between child protection institutions, NGOs, district attorneys, and policy coordinators to eradicate CSE and trafficking of children for CSEC.
Outputs: 1.1 Officials of public and private institutions trained in: police investigation, care of child victims of CSEC and trafficking and legislative reform. 1.2 Information on experiences and lessons learned generated in the different countries and disseminated regionally. 1.3 Informative regional materials created and disseminated globally. 1.4 Regional agreements and networks promoted and facilitated (new output) 1.5 Monitoring Systems on international commitments elaborated and promoted (new output) 1.6 Institutional capacities created through at least 21 exchanges and internships on lessons learned among the countries of the region (new output)
I/O 2 At the end of the project, national legislation, policies and programmes will have been formulated and measures will have been taken to put them into effect in six countries (HO, PA, NI, CR, BE, GU) Sub I/O 2 a) Inter-institutional coordination entities (commissions, committees) functioning in each country. Sub I/O 2 b) Pilot models in 6 communities preventing and eradicating CSE and assisting victims.
Outputs: 2.a.1 Policy Documents, programmes and proposals to improve and implement the legislation on protection of children from CSE and trafficking and on punishment of offenders created and disseminated. 2.a.2 Technical Experts and personnel of public and private institutions trained in the following topics: detection of cases of CSE and trafficking of children for CSE; police investigation; institutional and individual responsibilities of the officials of key sectors; working with the press and other topics 2.a.3 Public child care institutions strengthened for the care for child victims of CSEC and trafficking (new output) 2.b.1 Local models of prevention and assistance of children in effect in CR, NI, GU, HO, PA and BE.
I/O 3 At the end of the project there will be increased community and individual action to prevent and eliminate CSE and assist victims of CSE throughout the region Sub I/O 3 Increased knowledge and sensitivity among key sectors of the population about the problem of CSE and trafficking of children for sexual purposes (police, health, education, entities for childhood protection, tourism, churches, employers and trade unions) (New Immediate Objective)
Outputs: 3.1 Journalists and media personnel (including local media) and other sectors trained on the problem of CSE 3.2 Key Sectors (decision makers, child care institution officials, education and health sector, parliamentarians and authorities) informed through media campaigns, forums and meetings. 3.3 Employers' and workers' organizations informed about how to prevent CSEC (including sex tourism) and trafficking (new output) 3.4 General Population (children, adolescents, males and families) have knowledge on CSE, trafficking, laws and where to file complaints, and values for the prevention of CSE. (New output)

3 Extracted from the Matrix of Objectives, Products and Activities. Project Document. Addendum to RLA/02/P51/USA Project. October 2005.

II. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION AND METHODOLOGY

A. Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the final evaluation of the regional project on the fight against CSE is to examine whether the project achieved its objectives and the sustainable impacts that it has generated. It will analyze the design, strategies and models of intervention to establish which aspects worked best, in order to improve the design and performance of similar projects and initiatives. Finally, this evaluation is the opportunity to report back and obtain feedback from national counterparts, the sub-regional office and headquarters of the ILO and the donor.

The evaluation covers the interventions carried out by the project at the regional, national and local levels. This includes a general analysis of the project, as well as action programmes (APs), external consultancies, workshops, studies and other activities that have been developed as part of the project.

The specific purpose of the evaluation as described in the Terms of Reference is:

- To evaluate the validity of the project design and strategies, including its relevance in the national context.
- To revise the project activities and products and evaluate their relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.
- To document achievements, models of intervention and lessons learned.
- To provide recommendations to strengthen the strategies and future activities of IPEC in the subject area and to suggest possible directions for future work that can be incorporated into the strategies of the national commissions for the fight against commercial sexual exploitation.
- To document processes undertaken by the project to identify and cooperate with other initiatives and organizations working on the elimination of CSE and trafficking for CSE.

B. Methodology of the Evaluation

The evaluation team consisted of two persons with experience in conducting project evaluations in the area of ILO Convention 182, and generally in the region of Central America.

The methodology for the evaluation was based on the criteria of: a) relevance and validity of design, b) effectiveness and degree of compliance and c) sustainability. Validity explores the logic and coherence in the design process and in the objectives and assumptions. The criterion of relevance examines the degree to which the stated objectives were/are consistent with the requirements of the countries, the beneficiaries and the policies and priorities of stakeholders. Efficiency reviews whether the objectives of the intervention were achieved or will be achieved. Finally, sustainability analyzes the probability that benefits and achievements of the project will continue in the long term.

The instruments used to gather information were in-depth interviews, observation and the review of institutional documents. To reinforce reliability and veracity of data, the evaluation performed repeated inquiry and triangulation of arguments proposed by counterparts.

1. Data Collection Methods

The methodology of this evaluation focused on a collection of qualitative information from three main sources: documents generated by the project and the APs, individual and group interviews and information from the stakeholder workshop.

Desk review: Between 2 and 6 March, the team began reviewing documents. The documents were submitted from both IPEC headquarters in Geneva and from the sub-regional office in San Jose. Among the documents, analyzed in this first phase of the evaluation were: project documents, the final evaluation of the first phase, semester progress reports, technical reports from the implementing agencies of direct action programmes for victims and the systematisation of the first country studies.[4]

Individual and group interviews: The evaluation team developed an evaluation instrument based on questions and priority areas identified in the ToR. This data collection tool was adjusted during the first days of interviews.[5]

On 9 March the evaluation team began its field work in Costa Rica. On the first day, the team met with project staff. Later the team split up and one evaluator visited Honduras, Guatemala and Belize. The second evaluator visited Nicaragua, El Salvador and Panama.[6] Because of time constraints, the team was unable to go to the Dominican Republic and the information from that country was gathered through telephone interviews. Altogether, the evaluation team interviewed 107 persons on an individual or group basis.[7] As can be seen in Table 2, the interviews included victims who had participated in action programmes in the second phase. The evaluation team spoke to adolescents in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Belize, Nicaragua, and Panama. There was also an interview with the mother of a victim in Belize. These interviews were managed in an informal manner with general questions on how the project had affected their lives. It is important to highlight the fact that the information from these interviews cannot be generalized to all children who received services through the APs. This would have required defining and carrying out representative sampling, which went beyond the purposes and resources of this evaluation. The information gathered in these meetings has been incorporated as individual opinions on certain benefits of the AP, but in no way is it intended to presume that they are typical points of view of all participants.

On 20 March, the last meetings were held with project staff in San Jose and on 23 March telephone interviews were held with key actors in the Dominican Republic. Table 2 provides a summary of the population interviewed.

[4] For a complete list of documents reviewed by the evaluation team see Annex IV.
[5] The list of tools of the final evaluation can be found in Annex V
[6] See the agenda of visits included in the ToR in Annex I.
[7] A complete list of all individuals interviewed can be found in Annex II.

Table 2: Characteristics and Number of People Interviewed

Institution/position	Number of people interviewed	Characteristics of Person Interviewed
ILO/IPEC	14	Project staff, including the current CTA and the CTA of the first phase. Includes project focal points in each country visited.
ILO/IPEC in Geneva	3	Current and past project focal point and technical specialist in human trafficking from the ILO/IPEC Office in Geneva.
USDOL	1	Focal Person of the project at USDOL.
Project Consultants	7	External consultants that contributed to the project with studies, diagnostics, models and mini-programmes in the areas of education and broadcasting campaigns.
Child care institutions	10	Personnel of the leading agencies in protection and care to children. PANI in Costa Rica, DHS and NCFC in Belize, IHNFA in Honduras, MIFAM in Nicaragua and MIDES in Panama
Commissions on CSE and trafficking	7	Technical Secretariats and personnel of the Commissions
Local networks	3	Members of local networks serving as partners of the AP in Guatemala: responsible network of maternity and paternity, justice centres.
UN Cooperative Agencies	5	Personnel of UNICEF, IOM and ILANUD
Implementing NGO of APs/other NGOs	20	Personnel of the implementing agencies including directors, educators and facilitators. Costa Rican NGO PANIAMOR active in codes of conduct for tourism companies.
Journalists	4	Journalists involved in the processes of education, training, dissemination and lobbying for legislative reforms
Attorney General, , Migration, Police	12	Personnel of the specialized units of the Police and the Attorney General's Office. Representative of the Sub-office of Migration in Costa Rica.
Trade unions	5	Trade union representatives of Costa Rica, Honduras and Panama
Employers	1	Representative of the Honduran business sector
Other Ministries (Labour, Culture, Justice, External Relations)	3	Representatives of the Belizean Labour Ministry, the Guatemalan Ministry of Justice, the Costa Rican Ministry of Culture and the Salvadorian Ministry of External Relations.
Victims attended in the APs	12	Children who participated in the action programmes in Nicaragua, Guatemala, Belize, Costa Rica and Panama.
Total	**107**	

Stakeholder workshop: The workshop took place in San Jose, Costa Rica on 25 March and had the participation of over 40 national and international actors, involved in project implementation (see Annex IV). The main objectives of the workshop were: i) to present and validate the preliminary findings of the evaluation; ii) to discuss the sustainability of the actions and follow-up steps, from the perspective of the stakeholders; iii) to carry out a joint exercise of recalling the achievements and lessons learned during project implementation. The workshop was preceded by a closing event on 24

March, when the project team, as well as some consultants presented an overview of the second phase and the most recent studies.[8]

2. Limitations of the Evaluation

This evaluation faced various limitations, which are worthy of discussion. The first and most evident is the challenge of carrying out the evaluation of such a complex and extensive project in the time allotted. For each of the countries visited, with the exception of Costa Rica, the team only had a day and a half or two days to carry out the interviews. This meant, for example, that if a person was unable to attend the interview, because of other commitments, the margin for reprogramming the meeting was minimal. Similarly, the time limitations were the reason for which the Dominican Republic was not included in the programme of visits. This resulted in a reduced analysis of that country's progress. The interviews in El Salvador were also difficult to carry out since the visit was programmed for the day after the presidential elections which affected the availability of several actors.

The time limitation also affected the drafting of the final report. After the field work in the region, the evaluation team only had 5 days to systematize, write and present the first draft of the report. Considering the huge amount of information gathered, this resulted in a lower degree of detail and analysis.

It is important to mention that the present evaluation focuses on a general analysis of the achievements of the project and the lessons generated. It does not include an exhaustive review of the project's activities as would be the case of an analysis of the quality of the media campaigns, the workshop programmes and training sessions, the contents information and awareness raising material, as well as some of the by products, such as the academic quality and methodological criteria used for the studies.

[8] See Annex IV for the complete list of participants of the stakeholder workshop.

III. FINDINGS

The findings contained in this report are based on the information gathered in the fieldwork conducted in seven countries, telephone interviews, a stakeholder workshop and the revision of documents and project reports. The findings specifically seek to answer the questions contained in the evaluation instrument agreed upon between the DED and the evaluation team. The findings presented in the report are more extensive than the preliminary findings presented in the stakeholder workshop.

A. Validity of the strategy/design of the project

The original evaluation strategy and design of the project is important since the basis that guides and inform future implementation is established at this stage. The validity of the design is an assessment of the internal coherence, established at the beginning of the project and to what extent the project incorporated adjustments in the strategy, based on its own lessons learned, as well as on the recommendations of the evaluations. This section will first analyze the general elements of the project: regional design, the conceptual/theoretical basis. Following this, the strategic decisions and design of the project (first phase) and the validity of the adjustments introduced in the addendum (phase 2) will be assessed.

1. Regional Design

The project was defined as an initiative at the sub-regional level instead of an arrangement with seven national projects (eight in the second phase). Most of the interviewees asked about this considered that the regional design was adequate for Central America, since the distances are short and the realities relatively comparable. It was agreed that a clear benefit of a regional project is that it offers a platform for sharing experiences and lessons. It was also mentioned that this arrangement is useful for taking advantage of and using the available resources. The project was careful to point out the differences between countries from the beginning, such as the different levels of progress in the development of National Plans and Commissions. The concern for incorporating different degrees of progress can be found in the project document which distributed countries in three different categories depending, among other things, on the existence of public policies and the recognition of the problem on the part of the State. It was admitted that given these differences, the strategy in each country could not be identical. [9]

However, a regional design also presents challenges from which the project was not exempt. First are the difficulties in coordinating actions outside the headquarters in Costa Rica. Even with the presence of "National Consultants" acting as contact points for each country, those who were not ILO/IPEC personnel faced greater challenges in being received by institutional counterparts. Some of those interviewed mentioned that since the headquarters of the project (and of ILO/IPEC) are in Costa Rica there were, inevitably, more consultants and institutions from that country to carry out the different studies and diagnostics. This strengthened the capacities of a country that, in relative terms, already has more resources.

2. The conceptual basis of the project

Although the starting point for ILO/IPEC to approach the issue of commercial sexual exploitation is Convention 182 on the worst forms of child labour, the project has been clever in avoiding

[9] ILO/IPEC, Project Document, "Stop the Exploitation, Contribution to the Prevention and Elimination of Comercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic, p. 28, April 2002.

confrontations related with considering CSE as one of the worst forms of child labour. The conceptualization was progressively centred on the idea of child exploitation and violation of their rights, which allowed greater leadership and better communication with other agencies and organizations.

This conceptual basis has imbued the action and the discussion of the project over its 7 years of operation. In both the individual interviews and the workshop, partners stressed as appropriate giving priority to a focus on rights. This approach, it was argued, has contributed to promoting the doctrine of integral protection as opposed to the doctrine of irregular situation, and it has begun to permeate the perspective and language of some institutions with responsibility in the field.

Another good decision of the project was to incorporate a gender sensitive perspective. The project document explicitly establishes that the existence of commercial sexual exploitation of children can be largely related to gender inequalities so prevalent throughout the region. The understanding of the impact of gender roles in reproducing commercial sexual exploitation and its explicit presence in the design of the project allowed for exploring different problem areas of this complex topic. One result has been the study on masculinity, which, as will be seen below, is conceived by a large majority of interviewees, as one of the most valuable products of the project.

It was wise to conceive of and direct the actions of the project towards prevention, sanction and care. For prevention a strategy was developed, based on information, awareness building and education of key target groups. The project's approach to sanction was focused on improving the legal regimes and the application of laws. Regarding care provision, actions were oriented toward strengthening national entities for eradicating CSE and the elaboration and implementation of national plans. Programmes providing care to victims and the population at risk were implemented, which had the goal of functioning as pilot experiences that would contribute to the learning process of national institutions and give them a validated model for care provision.

3. The original project design (phase 1)

It is important to realize that the project began after a process of participatory design. In August 2001, ILO/IPEC organized the "Regional Workshop on the problem of commercial sexual exploitation of children in Central America and the Dominican Republic: Support for the definition of strategies and action plans". As one of the principal preparatory activities, this workshop incorporated the ideas of representatives of public and private institutions from all over the region. This workshop, along with the information generated in country studies allowed defining strategic lines and areas of action.

The decision to work on three principal strategies: i) awareness building and mobilization; ii) institutional strengthening and direct assistance; and iii) horizontal cooperation, was adequate since it responded to the situation prevalent in the region at the beginning of the project. Although with certain differences between the countries, in 2001 CSEC was not a priority topic in the region. It was explained as "child prostitution" which leads to blaming the victim. The problem was not present on the national agenda on children and State institutions mandated to protect children and adolescents had no articulated action, nor did they offer any minimally adequate care giving. On top of this, all of the countries, with exception of Costa Rica, lacked any legal structure that would make criminal prosecution of exploiters possible.

In its original design, the awareness building and mobilization component sought to reverse the prevalent ignorance regarding CSEC among the general population and key groups. At this stage, the group that was identified as the principal strategic ally for increasing awareness on the problem and

for changing perceptions were journalists.[10] The role attributed to journalists in the processes of legislative change indicates that it was a good choice to include them from the beginning.

The component on institutional strengthening was divided into two sub-components. The first sought to contribute to strengthening national capacities, policies and programmes. Its concrete objective was to strengthen the national entities for inter-institutional coordination around national plans and programmes and, in the second phase, the institutions for childhood protection. The second component was meant to contribute to the promotion of national programmes of care for victims through the implementation of action programmes. Said programmes, on the one hand, were of a demonstrative nature on the viability of withdrawing children from CSEC and on the other, they allowed state institutions to validate and establish a national programme of providing care to victims of CSE.

Joining institutional strengthening with direct assistance in the original design responded, therefore, to the logic of implementing action programmes like "laboratories" in order to understand the functioning of articulated institutional care responses.

4. Modifications of strategies in the second phase

For this second phase, no substantial changes were made with regard to the strategy established in the first phase or in the objectives. It was, therefore, an extension of the first phase with the expansion of some outputs and the inclusion of others. The most significant change was the inclusion of Belize into the project.

The main changes were: i) the inclusion of activities with employers and trade unions; ii) incorporating the topic of trafficking; iii) new players identified as key (trade unions and employers, local governments, youth associations, tourism sector); iv) adapting the materials produced to the language of vulnerable communities and groups; v) prioritizing the construction of a regional network; vi) strengthening the gender and rights perspective; vii) improving inter-agency coordination; viii) improving the effectiveness and impact of the APs; and ix) involving the local media and communications departments of key institutions.

Although a very positive evaluation was made in both the intermediate and final evaluation of the achievements of the first phase, the evaluations also indicated the need to follow-up on the process in order to consolidate the initiated processes and to reinforce aspects that had not been foreseen in the first phase.

Therefore, the first 4 years of implementation and the recommendations suggested in the mid-term evaluations of the first phase allowed modifying certain aspects of the design of the second phase.

A specific recommendation of the evaluation of the first phase was to include trade unions and employers as a priority target group. This was done and significant progress was made, especially with the trade unions, in incorporating the topic into their agendas.

The changes introduced in the second phase were appropriate. In particular, including the participation of trade unions and employers given the specific mandate of ILO, but also because of the potential contributions that these two sectors can offer in the fight against child labor.

[10] The importance of involving the media and the union of journalists had been suggested in a thematic evaluation made by ILO/IPEC in 2001. ILO-IPEC Thematic Evaluation of ILO-IPEC Programmes in Trafficking and Sexual Exploitation of Children, 2001

The mid-term and final evaluations of the first phase warned about the high number of target beneficiaries for the APs as well as their short duration. The project in the second phase ignored these recommendations and significantly increased the target population per AP (an increase of between 150% and 350%). It also reduced the duration of the APs from two years to one. In the cases in which an extension was granted to the same implementing agency to continue providing services, continuity was provided to victims but it was also necessary to include new beneficiaries who could only be assisted for one year or less.[11] The evaluators considered worrisome that even though the mid-term evaluation explicitly alerted on the difficulties of having high numbers of beneficiaries, these numbers were not reduced and in fact were increased.

B. Execution by Component: Achievements and Difficulties

The second phase of the project maintained the good pace of implementation that had been present in the first phase. The team in the Costa Rican headquarters changed very little, which helped provide continuity to the actions and the relationships that had been established. A good number of persons interviewed also pointed out the commitment of the implementing team, its respectful approach to national processes, and the excellence of its technical knowledge.

The second phase increased the number and complexity of the activities. Including Belize meant a learning process of the country's particularities and its institutional environment. The number of direct programmes was increased from three to six. In spite of the learning already generated in the first years, incorporating new implementing agencies of APs meant a new process of mutual accommodation. The efforts of coordination, with other agencies of the UN system and development agencies, were intensified as the project anticipated the end of the project and sought allies to sustain and continue giving assistance to some of the activities that had already begun, for example, the DevInfoLAC ESC information system.

Below is an analysis of the implementation of the three project components and the outputs contained in the PRODOC from the second phase, the measure to which the objectives of the intervention were achieved and their potential for sustainability faced with the end of the project.

1. Horizontal Cooperation and information exchange

The absence of cooperation and coordination between the countries of the region was identified as an obstacle for improving responses to the problem of CSEC. Horizontal cooperation, between officials and institutions with similar responsibilities in their countries, was seen as an opportunity for establishing dynamics of mutual assistance in their countries and the exchange of information.

To meet this demand as a first and immediate objective it was established that *"at the end of the project there will be regional cooperation and shared knowledge to prevent and eradicate commercial sexual exploitation"*.

The achievements in this component are very significant and are among the most highly valued by the national partners. In summary and ordered by output:

- *Output 1.1 – More than 240 officials from public and private institutions trained or informed.*

[11] Interviews with personnel of the executing agencies in Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua y Panama.

- *Output 1.3 - Regional materials created and disseminated worldwide.*[12]
- *Output 1.4 – Regional networks and agreements promoted and facilitated.*
- *Output 1.5.- Monitoring system for international commitments elaborated and promoted*
- *Output 1.6 - Institutional skills created through at least 21 exchange programmes and internships on lessons learned among the countries of the region.*

1.1. Training of officials from public and private institutions (Output 1.1)

In phase two, this output was extended to a greater number of individuals (240) and included the subject of providing care to victims of CSE and trafficking. The sub-regional workshops, organized, financed or technically supported by the project were the main activity under this output.

The project organized or supported 14 regional workshops during phase 2. Three of these workshops were organized only by the project, while the rest sought to boost efforts through joint workshops.

Table 3: Regional Workshops / Meetings supported by the sub-regional project on CSE.

Date & Place	In coordination with	Workshop
November 2008 Costa Rica	Government of Costa Rica, UNICEF, IOM, Save the Children, ILO/IPEC	Sub-regional meeting of Central American national coalitions against trafficking.
November 2008 Costa Rica	CSA	Seminar workshop: Trade union training and organization for the Prevention and Elimination of Child Labour in Central America (only technical assistance).
September 2008 Nicaragua	IOM, Save the Children, ILO/IPEC	Inter-agency meeting on trafficking in Central America
August 2008 Argentina	Government of Argentina, ECPAT, Save the Children, UNICEF, ILO/IPEC	Preparatory meeting of Latin America and the Caribbean for the III World Congress against CSEC
September 2007 Guatemala	ILO/IPEC	Strategies for an approach to child labour and the worst forms in Central America and the Dominican Republic
June 2008 Guatemala	PARLACEN, IOM, ILO/IPEC	Sub-regional workshop for collecting inputs from the PARLACEN Commission on Women and Children for the formulation of a regional Work Plan against human trafficking and CSEC
December 2007 Panama	ORIT-CLAT	Political – technical meeting: Prevention and Elimination of Child Labour with emphasis on the worst forms: CSEC, trafficking and trafficking underage children. (only technical assistance)
September 2007 Nicaragua	Commission of Central American police chiefs, ILO/IPEC	Regional technical meeting of District Attorneys, Police and INTERPOL to exchange information and training on the investigation of crimes of CSE of children, linked to the use of information

[12] Although product 1.2 (Information – articles, reports and other documents – on experiences and lessons learned, obtained in different countries of the region have been disseminated regionally) is not part of the second phase, its content has been absorbed by output 1.3

		technology
August 2007 Nicaragua	PARLACEN, IOM, Save the Children	VII Encounter of Women from Political Parties. Women united against trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation
June 2007 Panamá	ORIT	Conference "Development of capacities of trade unions to combat Child Labour (only technical assistance)
May 2007 Nicaragua	CCT, ILO/IPEC	Sub-regional encounter of the Central American Workers' Confederation "Prevention and Elimination of Child Labour and the Elimination of its Worst Forms" (technical and financial assistance)
February-March 2007 Costa Rica	ILO/IPEC	Technical follow-up meeting on programmes for providing care to child victims of CSE
August 2006 Costa Rica	ORIT, ILO/IPEC	Regional workshop: Development of capacities of trade unions to combat Child Labour and other forms of economic exploitation of children. Strengthening the implementation of the continental plan of ORIT for Child Labour . (technical and financial assistance)
April 2006 Costa Rica	ILO/IPEC	Technical meeting of District Attorneys and INTERPOL on investigating crimes of CSE.

Technical training to improve the prosecution of crimes of CSE, which was already done in Phase I, was repeated in two workshops. The District Attorneys and members of the police, interviewed by the evaluation team stressed the positive impact of these activities in the work of their organizations. This is clearly shown in the improved investigation capacities and more effective coordination. The specialized District Attorneys of Honduras, Guatemala, Panama and Costa Rica as well as the police of El Salvador mentioned that in recent years they have improved the quality of investigation, which has resulted in more convictions. Similarly they highlighted the fact that workshops had permitted a personal rapprochement resulting in actions of joint prosecution, something that had never happened before. Individuals interviewed in the District Attorney's office and police in Honduras explained that the project had been fundamental in introducing alternative methods of police investigation like the use of undercover agents. In the case of El Salvador, the police redirected its actions from "in fraganti" operations to investigations, achieving improvements in obtaining proof and consequently in opening processes. Unfortunately, people interviewed could not offer statistics or more exact figures on the increase of sentences.

Five workshops offering technical and/or financial assistance proved the interest in supporting the trade union sector and were in line with their incorporation as a new key player in Phase 2. These workshops, organized by ORIT and CLAT, basically constitute efforts by these regional trade union organizations to contribute to the elimination of Child Labour, especially in its worst forms. The trade union movement presented resistance to approaching the subject, because it does not consider it, strictly speaking, a form of child labour. The approach taken by the programme allowed the trade union sector to take on the problem, to integrate it into its agenda and to jointly develop different actions. For example, with the support of ILO/IPEC a document directed at the regional trade union movement was developed. It details the causes and consequences of CSE, the international judicial framework and, most importantly, a discussion on what and how trade unions can contribute in the fight against CSEC. As with the material directed at other sectors, the document underlines the importance of formal complaints. Nonetheless, trade union representatives in Costa Rica, Panama and Honduras coincided that their incorporation to the project was late.

In collaboration with the IOM two workshops were held seeking to promote the interest expressed by the PARLACEN Commission on Women, Children, Youth and Family to integrate the subject of CSE

and trafficking into their agenda.[13] At the meeting held in Managua, the parliamentarian women defined a Regional Work Plan. There is a positive assessment of the support given to PARLACEN. The follow up of its activities was taken on by Save the Children.

In the second phase, the issue of providing care to victims also received regional consideration. The technical meeting allowed to look back on how, in practice, the cyclical model for articulated responses (MCRA, care model) had been implemented, and identified some of the obstacles and lessons learned, as well as challenges that required a response. For example, it was shown that in those countries that already have institutional protocols for providing care, it is easier to achieve government commitment. The need for integrating proposals for generating income and jobs for fathers, mothers and adolescents over 15 years of age was also discussed. In addition, other critical aspects of the care model were looked at in more depth for example, adolescent pregnancy, CSE of boys and teenage boys and boys and girls in sexual diversity.

1.2. Regional Materials created and disseminated worldwide (Output 1.3)

The project has done a very good job of collecting the information generated through its actions and systematizing it for later dissemination. The most evident example of this is the document, "Principal Experiences developed for the prevention and elimination commercial sexual exploitation of children within the context of projects implemented by ILO/IPEC in Latin America". This study (pending printing) compiles not only the experiences from the sub-regional project, but also the Latin American experiences. This document is expected to serve as a valuable input for developing future interventions.

Another very important systematization was the research on masculinity and the work carried out with men in the course of the project[14]. The systematization covered the process of work and the instruments produced. It was translated to English to reach a wider audience. The work on masculinity was highlighted by a large number of interviewees as a major contribution to understanding how the demand for sex with children is generated in the masculine mentality. The studies on masculinity were generated with experiences from all countries of the region collecting the most effective inhibitory messages, which resulted in greater clarity in the development of certain strategies. The work on masculinity was innovative as it defined the "critical path" that takes certain men to engage in CSEC, This finding will help develop different strategies with different sectors for the prevention of CSEC, proposing ways to address men, who are the principal potential exploitative, clients directly

The mid-term evaluation noticed that the production of materials for a younger public was limited. This was resolved with the development of popular comic book-type stories. An example was a poster designed by adolescents from a school in Costa Rica and was distributed by different institutions. In Costa Rica it was done by unions; in Nicaragua, by the national pedagogic movement; and in Honduras by the secretariat of education. In El Salvador and Panama the posters were produced together with the national commissions.

[13] *Central American Parliament PARLACEN Commission on Women, Children, Youth and Family. Regional Work Plan I of the Commission to support the prevention and elimination of human trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation of children, 2008-2010.*

[14] José Manuel Salas and Álvaro Campos, *La Explotación Sexual Comercial, la Masculinidad y el trabajo con hombres en América Central: Repaso de una Propuesta para la Prevención*, ILO/IPEC , San Jose, 2008.

1.3. Regional networks and accords promoted and facilitated (Output 1.4)

As part of this output, the project supported the creation of national repatriation protocols, regional guidelines for the repatriation of children and support to the commissions on human trafficking. In addition agreements were reached with other agencies for following up the processes once the project finalised.

Together with IOM actions were carried out for setting up and technically strengthening national coalitions against trafficking (including trafficking for other motives besides CSE). At the regional level, a workshop was held with all of the national commissions. In addition to developing formal channels, it allowed for the constitution of informal processes of coordination between countries.

In the area of trafficking for CSE purposes, it was recognized that coordination between police, special prosecution offices and migrations agents of the different countries was needed. The project supported the creation of national repatriation protocols. These, in general terms, established competencies and offered, in a simple schematic, the procedure for the repatriation of children victims of trafficking. The need for these instruments, according to local players, had been demonstrated by a series of experiences in which the institutions lacked clarity in how to act and what care to provide for child victims of trafficking. Further, the Regional Conference on Migration (RCM) developed "Regional Guidelines for the Special Protection in Cases of Repatriation of Children Victims of Trafficking."[15] This is a regional instrument that complements the national protocols.

A counterpart in Honduras indicated that the repatriation protocols had already had a positive and tangible result because today the countries of the region request a passport for every minor crossing the border, hindering to some degree the trafficking of children. However, other stakeholders interviewed, concluded that application of the national protocols and the regional guidelines is still limited and weak, requiring further support on the part of cooperation agencies for its consolidation and full implementation. This was shown in a diagnostic prepared by the project and presented at the regional meeting of commissions on trafficking. It said, "the application of the protocols is incipient in all of the consulted countries. The main reasons are that they are still very new instruments and there are none or very few the cases of repatriation of children victims of trafficking that have been considered in their short span of their validity. But it is also argued that problems lie in the lack of knowledge, lack of training and the absence of will to apply the protocols."[16] The logic of presenting the results of the diagnostic at the regional conference was to establish the situation at that moment and jointly think through tactics for improving the effective use of the protocols and, thereby, improving the coordination between countries when finding cases of trafficking. Both the IOM and Save the Children (STC) participated in this process and have the intention of continuing to do so although with more limited resources.

Regionally, an important action of the project was the strengthening of institutions responsible for the investigations of transnational crimes. The project was able to include the topic in the agenda of the Commission of Central American Police. It supported the implementation of a regional workshop, together with INTERPOL and the technical assistance of the Spanish Police, to strengthen

[15] The drafting process had the technical assistance of UNHCR, IOM, ILO and UNICEF. These guidelines were approved in april 2007 in the framework of the XII RMC held in New Orleáns. ILO/IPEC, " Diagnostico de la Aplicación de los Protocols de repatriación de Niñillos, Niñas y Adolescentes Victimas de Trata" San Jose, Costa Rica, Paula Antezana, November 2008, p.8.
[16] Ibid, p.31.

investigations and cooperation in cases of transnational crimes and using new technologies for these investigations. In this same activity, participants, police and the district attorneys warned of the need of having an instrument to operationalize international cooperation for these crimes. Considering this request, the project began a process of formulating regional guidelines that would allow this operationalization. This activity was carried out jointly with the Commission of Public Prosecutors of Central America and with the technical assistance of ILO/IPEC, United Nations Latin American Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (ILANUD) and the United Nations Office on Drug and Crime (UNODC).

For Belize, the opportunity of being integrated into the project through regional activities and learn of the progress and challenges in other countries in facing commercial sexual exploitation of children has been very useful. As explained by an informant from that country, due to its small size, among other factors, CSE in Belize has very particular modalities. However, the experiences of other countries have shown that Belize is also vulnerable to types of CSE in tourist areas and CSE tied to criminal networks. "Having a regional perspective has allowed us to demonstrate that Belize is also vulnerable to these types of CSE and that we need to be proactive and prepared."

1.4. System for monitoring of international commitments (Output 1.5)

Considering the lack of information and regional databases for following-up on progress in matters of CSE, the need arose to promote a system for monitoring international commitments. In the follow-up meeting to the Second World Congress against CSE, held in San Jose, Costa Rica in 2004, the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean asked for support from the development agencies to establish a system that would allow them to monitor on the progress. In an inter-agency effort, DevInfoLAC ESC[17] was created, in collaboration with UNICEF and IOM and with the backing of ECPAT and Save the Children. It is a system of 19 indicators that allow monitoring the efforts and achievements of the countries in their fight against CSEC[18].

The project carried out several training sessions for potential users of the system and with institutions and organizations members of the national Commissions on trafficking and CSE. Together with UNICEF, in all countries except Guatemala, (where it is expected that the Ministry created by the law will drive it) trainings have been offered. The last regional training, with participation from the project is foreseen in April and will be directed towards the system administrators who were appointed by each country. To date, only Costa Rica, through the statistical section of the National Children's Welfare Office (PANI) is already feeding the system with its own data and data coming from other state institutions such as Migration.

---

[17] Dev Info LAC ESC is a system of indicators that allow for improvement in monitoring the International commitments assumed by countries on this specific topic. The initiative was carried out by ILO/IPEC and UNICEF with the collaboration of IOM, STC and ECPAT. This system of indicators uses DevInfo technology, developed by the United Nations System to follow-up on the compliance of the Millennium Development Objectives. .

[18] Dev Info LAC ESC classifies its indicators into two categories to facilitate systematization: compilation and analysis of the information collected: a) Objectives of the Stockholm Action Programme (coordination and cooperation, prevention, protection and recuperation and participation of children); and b) Sectors (situation, attitudes and practises, legislation and public policy, and application and capacities). And at the same time, the indicators are separated by: sex, age group and key sectors. The Stockholm Action Programme against commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents was adopted in the first World Congress against commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents, held in Stockholm, Sweden in 1996.

There was insufficient time for the project to accompany the adoption of DevInfoLAC ESC by the relevant Government agencies. The technological element always brings about reticence and delays, which explains why, it has been impossible to consolidate its application. The system still requires external support, precisely because of the technical element. Being a priority of UNICEF, the system will receive that support and therefore has a good possibility of becoming operational, if not in all, at least in some of the countries. The continuation of DevInfoLAC ESC will, therefore, require an external contribution to the project for it to remain installed and operational in most of the countries.

1.5. Regional Exchanges and Internships. (Output 1.6)

A new output for the second phase was the support for regional internships and visits. In 2006, the project had already established a team of committed persons, informed and interested in transmitting their knowledge to other individuals from their own sectors in other countries.

The first internships were mainly of Costa Ricans visiting other countries, For example the Public Ministry Attorney General's Office of Costa Rica shared the lessons and techniques of police investigation of its Special Unit on Sexual Crimes with District Attorney's from Panama, El Salvador and the Dominican Republic in a first phase, and with District Attorney's and investigative agencies in Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala in the second phase. However, this changed over the course of the project as capacities were also developed in other countries of the region and the exchange became more balanced. For example a Honduran journalist went to Guatemala to share experiences and to offer recommendations on the role of journalists in the process of legislative reform. This "South – South" support was appreciated by the counterparts interviewed.

One of the few events in which the employers sector could be attracted was with a visit of a Costa Rican employer of the tourism sector to Honduras to share experiences on the code of conduct and the advantages establishing a clear policy of no tolerance to CSEC as a hotel and the tourism sector. In Honduras, with the support of ILO/IPEC and UNICEF an alliance was made between the Tourism Board of Honduras (CANATURH) and 5 universities which incorporating the topic into the regular curricula of the tourism degree.

In spite of the positive assessment done by the persons interviewed of the internships and exchanges, it is important to note that given their high cost, and without the support of the project the possibility of replication will be limited. However, the internships contributed to the topic being inserted in the ordinary agenda of diverse national and regional organs and it is to be expected that it will continue to be discusses in other meetings and regional spaces.

Limited communication and coordination among countries had been identified as an obstacle for a more effective prosecution of trafficking and CSE crimes. One of the principal objectives of the project aimed at improving this situation. According to people interviewed during the evaluation, the workshops, regional agreements, internships and exchanges contributed in achieving this objective by bringing together the people responsible and emphasising the importance of coordination to achieve advances in the topic area. Moreover, the seminars and workshops offered practical information by specialists that also impacted in a positive manner working methods and approaches.

2. Institutional strengthening

The immediate objective of this component was defined as: "*At the end of the project, national legislation policies and programmes will have been formulated and measures will have been taken to put them into effect in selected countries"*.

This component was in turn divided into two sub-objectives with their own outputs:

2.1. *Inter-institutional coordination entities (commissions, committees) functioning in each country*
2.2. *Pilot Models of care provision functioning in six communities (Guatemala, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama and Belize).*

2.1 Inter-institutional coordination entities (commissions, committees) functioning in each country (immediate objective i)

In the second phase sub-objective 2.1 comprised two outputs:

- Create and distribute policy documents, programmes and proposals to improve the legal framework and its implementation.
- Strengthen child care institutions in their care to victims of commercial sexual exploitation of children.

2.1.1 National Plans and Commissions (output 1)

The logic of promoting the development of commissions is to have available an organ that can provide an adequate and sustainable national response to the problem of commercial sexual exploitation. The Commissions gather the different national institutions and organizations and coordinate their actions. In terms of sustainability, the ideal is for these Commissions, before the project ends, to have become the established reference point on the subject, and have acquired the capacity to provide technical support and maintain the issue of the fight against CSEC on the national agenda.

The project contributed to the creation and strengthening of inter-agency organizations on CSE in all countries except Costa Rica, where it had already been working before the project. The degree of operation and strength of these organisms however, varies greatly from country to country.

As detailed in one of the work sessions of the stakeholder workshop, the commissions could play an important role, as long as they have a structure recognized by the law that authorizes them to act at the political level and to be effective. Another crucial aspect for their permanence and influence is that the institutions that make up the different commission have their own budget that allows them to execute their responsibilities as members of the Commission.

Table 4: National Plans against CSEC and Commissions, Councils and Working Groups

Country	Commissions, Councils and Working Groups	Number of Institutions and lead organization	National Policy
Costa Rica	National Commission against CSE - CONACOES. (1996) 30 institutions Technical Secretariat (PANI)	30 institutions Technical Secretariat (PANI)	National Plan against CSE (2008-2010) integrated into the National Development Plan (2006-2010)
El Salvador	Working group against CSE 13 organizations Labour Ministry	13 institutions Ministry of Labor and Social Provision	National Plan against the worst forms of child labour (2006-2011)
Dominican Republic	Inter-institutional Commission against abuse and commercial sexual exploitation of children Secretariat of Labour and National Council on Childhood and Adolescence CONANI	More than 20 governmental, non-governmental, business and international institutions. Ministry of Labor and CONANI.[19]	Plan of the Dominican Republic for the elimination of abuse and commercial sexual exploitation of children
Panama	National Commission for the prevention of crimes of CSE CONAPREDES Attorney General's Office 16 institutions	16 institutions Attorney Generals Office	National Plan for the prevention and elimination of commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents (2008-2010)
Nicaragua	There is no Commission dealing with CSEC.		National Plan (2005-2008)
Honduras	Inter-institutional Commission against commercial sexual exploitation and trafficking of children	5 institutions District attorney and police	National Plan against CSEC (2006-2011)
Belize	National Committee for families and Children	National Committee for Families and Children (NCFC)	National Action Plan for Childhood and Adolescence (2004-2015)
Guatemala	Articulating Group for the National action plan against CSE (2001-2011) 2006- National commission on childhood and adolescence, Sub-commission against commercial sexual exploitation of children Secretariat of Social Welfare	Ministry of Social Welfare	National Plan (2001-2011)

Costa Rica shows the most progress in institutionalizing the issue of CSE in the region. The National Commission against Commercial Sexual Exploitation (CONACOES) has existed since 1996 and has a permanent technical secretariat that coordinates its actions with PANI.

In Honduras, the commission has not had a budget so far, and its dynamism is explained to a great extent by the leadership of the Attorney General's Office and the police, who have a much higher degree of continuity than the National Institute of Families and Children (IHNFA). The Commission in Honduras, however, could soon become more independent and sustainable, since there is presently a decree pending in Congress to provide it with a yearly budget allotment. It is also important to point out that institutions are integrating the topic in their ordinary agendas and with this they have obtained budgetary allocations for the execution of their activities.

[19] Plan de Acción de la Republica Dominicana para Erradicar el Abuso y la Explotación Sexual Comercial de Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes, 2006, p.3.

In Guatemala, institutional instability, the excessive turnover of personnel and the overload of functions for the SBS have resulted in an inactive Commission. The expectation is that the Secretariat, established by law, and soon to be designated by the vice-presidency, will inject new force into this organism. However, the history of institutional weakness in Guatemala and of politicization of the designation of positions makes it risky to bet on the continuity of activities in the fight against CSE, in this organism alone.

In Panama, Law 16 considers, in addition to a series of reforms to the old penal code, an ample set of measures for protecting the victim (Chapter IV) as well as a public policy on prevention (Chapter V) with the creation of the National Commission for the Prevention of Crimes of Sexual Exploitation (CONAPREDES), which occurred in 2005. Financial sustainability of the Commission is also contemplated through the creation of a Special Fund Against Commercial Sexual Exploitation[20], which shall be provided funds through the collection of US$ 1.00 from each foreigner leaving the country and 5% on the price of sale or rent of films with pornographic content (X-rated), among other sources. Similarly, the law establishes the provision of funds in the budgets of different ministries that belong to the Commission. To date, however, it has not been possible to set up the fund, so the technical secretariat of CONAPREDES has very limited human and financial resources, having been able to carry out an important number of activities due to the personal commitment of its members and technical and financial support from ILO/IPEC. During 2009, the functioning of the general secretariat of the commission will be possible with contributions from UNICEF that will cover the costs of payroll until 2010, when those costs must be taken over by the Attorney General's Office.

In El Salvador, the working group arose from within the National Committee for the Elimination of Child Labour (CNETI), coming together as a work group. It can be observed that, given the specificity of the issue to be dealt with, it was necessary to integrate the group with members who were not from the CNETI. In 2004, a letter of understanding was signed by Government entities and other institutions, to provide a minimum of institutional nature to this group. That letter of understanding was reformed in 2006 and extended in 2008. At present, an addendum to the letter of understanding has been signed for its extension to 2010.

The project has insisted and offered technical and financial support for the countries to develop National Plans to combat CSE. The logic of having Plans is that each country can establish its own priorities and lines of action. The adoption of the issue is going through an exercise of definition of responsibilities for each actor and of specific operational plans. The plans, therefore, are understood to be tools for following up on these contracted responsibilities, progress, achievements and pending tasks.

[20] Article 23: CONAPREDES will create a fund called the Special Fund Against Sexual Exploitation, with the taxes established in this Law, as well as the fines and moneys confiscated or obtained by auctioning the instruments, assets or goods confiscated, coming from sexual exploitation crimes. This fund will be destined to financing the plans and programmes for awareness raising, prevention, training, attention, treatment and rehabilitation of the victims of crimes of sexual exploitation, and shall be administered by CONAPREDES and regulated according to the accounting and management procedures established by the Comptroller General of the Republic.
Article 24: The commercial establishments dedicated to renting and selling X-rated films and videos for adults, shall pay a tax of five percent (5%) of the value of each video rented or sold. The same tax shall be applied to the cinemas that exhibit X-rated films. This tax shall be destined to the Special Fund against Sexual Exploitation.
Article 25: Any foreigner, upon leaving Panamanian territory shall pay an equivalent of one United States Dollar, which will be destined to the Special Fund Against Commercial Sexual Exploitation.

In Costa Rica, the Project supported the development of the Second Plan for combating CSE. The Third Plan (current) benefited from these prior experiences and has very clear targets and objectives and its own budget line. The Plan is fully institutionalized within the global targets of this country since it was inserted within the National Development Plan (PND). A number of stakeholders coincided that the support of the project was key to achieve the formulation of the Plan and its later integration into the PND. The narrative of the political, technical and logistical process that culminated in the integration of the Plan into the PND in Costa Rica was systematized by the project in a document: "an example of good practices in the instititutionalization and sustainability of the topic in national public policy." This document highlights the principal challenges confronted and the good choices throughout the way that resulted in the institutionalization of the issue in the national agenda. The lessons learned can be useful for similar processes in other countries in the region.

In Honduras, the Plan was developed with the participation of public and private institutions, competent on the issue, and with the support of the project. The National Plan I (2006-2011) explicitly defines the activities for each institution and has a detailed budget. Its implementation, however, has been weak due to a lack of resources for carrying out the activities.

In Nicaragua, the Plan expired in 2008 and its update is still pending. The extremely limited budget in the country suggest that this process is difficult without the technical and financial support of international cooperation. Specifically UNICEF has already committed funds for contracting a consulting firm that will coordinate a participatory process and elaborate a new Plan. The coordination of the Committee falls on the Ministry of the Family, Adolescence and Childhood (MIFAN), an entity suffering from serious institutional weaknesses.

2.1.2 Create and disseminate policy documents, programmes and budgets to improve the legal framework and its implementation. (Output 2)

In 2002, there was a legal vacuum regarding the classification of CSE as a crime, in all of the region's countries, except Costa Rica. Generally, an "exploiting client" could only be tried for connected crimes like procuring, sexual abuse or rape. Other legal lacunae existed in the absence of penalization for production and distribution of child pornography. During the first phase, El Salvador, Honduras, Panama and the Dominican Republic approved laws or modified their penal codes.

In the second phase, the efforts to improve the regulatory framework continued. The counterparts have stressed that one of the most important contributions of the project was the contribution to legislative reforms, including the support to formulating laws consistent with international norms. "The reform was successful because the ILO paid and coordinated consultants and specialists who followed up and promoted the initiative"[21]. Today, there is adequate legislation in all of the countries that participated in the project.[22] In Belize reform was not stipulated as a target, rather a diagnostic of the laws related to CSE and trafficking was established as a goal. In this sense, the project surpassed this planned goal by supporting a bill that is backed by important sectors of that country (including the First Lady).

In Guatemala, the project led a successful reform process that added efforts and achieved consensus. Strategic alliances were established with journalists, civil organizations and deputies, who helped to

[21] Individual Interview.

[22] In 2006, Nicaragua approved the "Reform of the Project for a New Penal Code for the Republic of Nicaragua", which comes into effect in 2008, and Guatemala approved Decree 09-2009 of the Law against Sexual Violence, Exploitation and Human Trafficking in 2009.

communicate the message of the law being urgent. Care was also taken to keep the effort low key, without questioning Congress or generating media scandals. The project played a key role, offering technical support regarding the minimal stipulations needed in the law and harmonization with international obligations, and serving as a bridge between different actors interested in the law. An encouraging aspect of the law, where the conceptual focus of the project can be appreciated, is in the explicit definition of the rights of the victim (among those who receive care and protection)[23]. The law also stipulates the creation of a Secretariat against Sexual Violence, Exploitation and Human Trafficking with its own budget. It is planned that general information campaigns and training for justice agents on the content and application of the Law shall be under the auspices of this Secretariat. However, persons interviewed also mentioned that there is a risk that this new institution will become politicized and will fail to fill the role that has been defined for it.

In 2006, Belize presented a legal vacuum regarding the definition of CSE. The project contracted a lawyer who managed to establish consensus among stakeholders and to draft a project for a law that was consistent with the needs of the country, and minimum international standards. The project knew how to differentiate the fact that, in that country, the process of support for reform would have to be different, with a less visible role for ILO/IPEC. The delays in approval are related to the change of Government in 2008. The legal project is in congress and seems to have the support needed for approval.

In Panama, Law 16 of 31 March 2004 seeks to harmonize the national legislation with the principals and sacred rights in international instruments of human rights, by defining the crimes of commercial sexual exploitation of children. There is ample recognition in the country of the leadership role of ILO/IPEC for the approval of the law. However, a setback can be seen in the reform of the Penal Code at the end of the first half of 2007 according to the opinion of the Attorney General's Office (PGN) and other institutions and ILO/IPEC consultants interviewed.

In the understanding of the PGN, the new penal code incorporates terms to define the criminal classifications that make investigation and characterization of crimes difficult (for example, to refer to CSEC, it says "remunerated non-consensual sexual relations"). Possession of pornographic materials with children that was penalized in Law 16, in the new code, becomes allowed for personal use, while being penalized for commercial use, which, obviously has to be demonstrated. The new penalties are rather mild. What was previously considered a crime with the same penalty for any person under 18, in the new code is punished with different penalties if the victim is under 14 or between 15 and 18 (in the second case, the penalty is lower).

In the case of El Salvador, the achievements in the first phase were complemented in 2008 by the approval of a law on organized crime that incorporates the subject of human trafficking. In the second phase, the activities were concentrated on training prosecutors and police with important results, such as the creation of specialized district attorney's offices and greater coordination between the district attorneys and the police.

Legal reform is a complicated process, but the effective application of the law is even more so. The project knew clearly that to overcome this, they would have to face two hurdles: ignorance of recent

[23] Care, for example, is defined as: the timely, integral and effective intervention of the competent authority that guarantees the victim, his or her physical and psychological recovery, as well as social and family reinsertion, with special concern for age, gender and cultural identity.

laws and poor application as a result of prejudice on the part of legal agents, including judges, who do not consider CSE as deserving of convictions. On the ignorance side, the project carried out informative sessions with the judges, prosecutors and police in all of the countries. In the most sustainable way it was possible to integrate the topic into the Judicature School in the Dominican Republic and in Nicaragua where it is part of the sexual violence module.

The problem of prejudice as a hindrance to application is harder to overcome with training. In this sense, the project conducted a study on knowledge, attitudes and practices of judges and magistrates, to gather more specific and corroborated information, which helps to develop strategies to reach that sector more effectively.[24] The report of this study was finalized in March 2009, so that its usefulness in designing training activities for the project is limited. Therefore, it is essential for the project to transfer this information to organisms that can use it strategically. One thing has become clear: some judges and magistrates, in spite of the work of awareness raising carried out by the project, still need more attention to improve the application of the law over the medium and long-term.

2.1.3 Strengthening of institutions for child protection (Product 2)

A new product of this phase was the goal of strengthening the institutions for children in their roles of providing care to victims of CSEC and human trafficking. This included the development of care giving protocols (in some cases called guides) and for reference, databases for the follow-up of cases and distribution of the lessons learned in the course of carrying out the action programmes, financed by the project.

Public institutions with the mandate of protecting children continue to be, in most of the region's countries, weak institutions with low budgets. The programme understood to use as a lesson learned in its first phase that to improve care provision to CSEC victims would require competent institutions, with human and material resources. Therefore the addendum included a new product with activities aimed expressly at strengthening these organisms.

Since the ratification of the Convention on Rights of the Child (CDN) by the countries of the sub-region, significant steps have been taken in setting up national systems for integral protection, based on children's and adolescent's rights, in detriment to the old practices, typical of the "doctrine of irregular situation."

Nevertheless, this effort has not been exempt from advances and reversals over these 30 years. Achievements in legal and institutional matters, have not happened hand in hand with ideological changes in deeply rooted cultural practices and this remains a challenge for sustainability.

ILO/IPEC had the good judgment to lead the debate on commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents from a perspective of access to rights, giving value to the importance of consolidating the changes in social perception and the necessary strengthening of public child protection institutions.

The project contributed to changes of focus regarding providing care to victims in children's institutions. For example, according to the staff of IHNFA, more importance is now given to the

24 It was found, for example that a high percentage (48%) of judges attribute the problem of CSE to the absence of moral values in the family, which transfers a sense of responsibility from the exploiter to the victim and his/her family. See ILO/IPEC and Institute of Judicial Studies and Research (INEJ), "Regional Investigation Project, KAB Study" Managua, March 2009.

concept of family reinsertion and internment in shelters is only contemplated in extreme cases. At least at the level of discourse, an approach based on restitution of rights has been adopted. The care model supported by the project tried to adapt to the legal and institutional reality of each country but without losing its basis in international human rights legal instruments, ratified by all the countries.

One of the main activities of this product was the development of protocols for providing care. The project paid for consultants that, together with staff from the public institutions, the executing NGOs and, based on the Cyclical Model of Articulated Responses (MCRA), developed an instrument with simple procedures to operationalize the steps to be taken when attending to victims of CSEC in the context of each country.

An evident achievement of the project is that Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Belize, Panama and Costa Rica now all have care provision protocols. In each of these cases the protocol was signed by the institution for child protection (or of social development), which implies an endorsement of the child rights focus. Moreover, these protocols were developed taking into account the lessons learned from applying the MCRA in each country.

In some countries protocols to guide the health sector were also developed. Workers from these sectors are often the first to have contact with victims of CSE. Therefore, it was deemed crucial to promote and develop, jointly with the sector, guidelines to orient an effective response of health workers and unify the care procedures. The Manual in Costa Rica defines the different steps, starting from detection, an analysis of the health status of the victim; recording and notification, the activation of the alert system and finally the development of a follow up plan.[25] In Guatemala the health protocol was developed in a participatory and inter-institutional manner but with the clear leadership and commitment of the health sector. According to one of the main actors involved in the process, the manual will have good dissemination and application even though the process began late. In general terms, the manual in Guatemala defines the legal framework, the how-to for detection of cases, and how and with whom to develop an integrated health care plan for the victim. Health manuals were also developed in Panama and in Nicaragua and the results of the process have come to be part of the national health care regulations on the issue of sexual violence.

Some of the persons interviewed by the evaluation team maintained the protocols have been adopted by the relevant institutions. But other voices claimed that the use of the protocols is incipient and they lack the participation and consensus of other Government institutions involved in integrated attention to victims. In Guatemala it is not applied by the SBS, although the health sector managed to develop a health protocol in conjunction with the project, which stipulates the steps for their officers to take when dealing with a victim. A problem for better applying the protocol lies in the ignorance of the tool, especially among officers in areas distant from the capital city (and who are likely to have contact with victims).

One of the main challenges to providing quality care is the ability to give orderly and reliable follow-up. The almost inexistent systematisation and registration of data on victims forced the project to develop a follow-up system as another axis of strengthening children's institutions. The Follow-up System for CSEC has individual registrations with the option of adding information and obtaining

[25] ILO/IPEC, "Manual de atención de niñas, niños y adolescentes victimas de explotación sexual comercial dirigido a funcionarios de salud," San José, septiembre, 2008.

social-demographic data. The Follow-up System for Commercial Sexual Exploitation (FSCSEC) was tried out in the action programmes with the intention of the system later being transferred to the institutions in charge of children.

The Project offered training on the FSCSEC for officers of NGOs and government institutions. The system is well integrated in PANI in Costa Rica since that institution already had an electronic system, and has used the CSEC System to adjust and improve case registration. In Honduras the system also has a person designated to maintaining the database in IHNFA although it is not clear should that person leave, whether the system is sufficiently institutionalized to continue. There are still many challenges for the system to become installed in government institutions. In spite of the system's merits, the officers are hesitant to assume their new tasks. Persons interviewed stated that the daily use of the system in public institutions is still limited.

2.2 Pilot models for prevention and elimination commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents and assistance to its victims

The project developed four action programmes in the first phase and eight in the second. The first phase was able to withdraw or prevent 539 children and adolescents from commercial sexual exploitation. In the second phase, preliminary numbers were of 2720[26] withdrawn and prevented children. Project personnel explained that numeric project goals had been surpassed.

In this second phase the project has continued applying the Cyclical Model of Articulated Responses (MCRA), which is based on a rights approach, as the framework of reference for carrying out all APs. The MCRA had practically unanimously positive feedback from all interviewees.

The APs have contributed to trying out different mechanisms for care provision from those that had been applied in the region in the past which, generally speaking, represented a re-victimization and turning a blind eye to their situation as victims. In this sense, the APs have become a valuable contribution for improving the care given to children and adolescents in situations of exploitation or risk. The project was also instrumental in getting the message across that providing care to these children and adolescents is not a matter of will but an obligation on the part of the State faced with a crime and a severe violation of rights. The contribution of the Project has been precisely to offer a response (MCRA) in conjunction with the opportunity to try out the model, so that in the course of each country's execution, particular obstacles were identified and adequate responses, depending on the context, defined.

The APs as well as the so called "miniprograms" offered opportunities to strengthen already existing local capacities. Various stakeholders underlined that the project successfully identified local public and private institutions with whom it was possible to work instead of creating new networks or organizations. For example Guatemala has an extensive network called "redes de victimologia" that take on all types of cases of abuse (mainly family abuse). These networks are made up of the Ministry of Labor, the Human Rights Ombudsman's office, hospitals, education departments, police local civil associations and municipalities. The project contributed to the work of these networks by encouraging a better understanding of the issue of CSEC and how to work in a coordinated manner to be able to offer better attention and care. In Guatemala the project also worked with the network of responsible maternity and paternity that is part of the Ministry of Health. The project was able to coordinate its

[26] Technical Progress Report, March 2009 (draft), p. 30.

actions with networks that already have widespread presence in far away rural localities. This network was strengthened and it improved its capacity to detect and refer CSEC cases they encountered in their daily work.

The APs have facilitated a greater understanding of the causes of CSEC, and the need to provide integrated care responses to the victim, the importance of the family in this process and, above all, have demonstrated, through practice, that it is possible to carry out direct action programmes for victims of CSEC.

The interviews with victims reported positively on the attention received and especially on the possibility of having "someone to talk to". One of the most appreciated aspects was the empathy and the time that the social workers offered. This help in developing self esteem and the support provided by personnel from the APs in helping children construct future life projects was mentioned in practically all of the interviews held with young people who had participated in the APs.

On the other hand, the APs have allowed for the specialization and strengthening of the NGOs that have implemented projects whom on many occasions were not familiarized with the subject. Today they have a valuable "know how", which may allow access to other sources of financing to continue bringing attention to victims.

In spite of the evident achievements of the APs, this was a component that generated the greatest amount of questioning and controversy. The most frequently repeated concerns during the interviews and the workshop included: i) the excessive emphasis given to the rescue of children and its quantification; ii) the difficulty of detecting children in view of the still undeveloped responsibility for reference and counter-reference of the state institutions; iii) the complexity of the mechanisms for registering the information requested in the reports; iv) the short duration of the APs (one year and in some cases two years); v) the artificiality of the indicators to measure the rescue from CSEC; vi) the difficulties transferring the APs to the State once they had concluded execution.

According to the persons interviewed, the emphasis on achieving numerical goals for the rescue of children and adolescents caused a large part of the time and resources to be used in "finding" those children and adolescents, precisely, in detriment to generation of strengths in the government. In the face of pressure to "get the numbers", some NGOs had to broaden their areas of attention or move to other geographic areas.

The reality faced by most of the NGOs was that of a weak and uncoordinated state institutional structure. Faced with the weak response of the state, and with the requirements to provide services to a predetermined number of children and adolescents, the NGOs assumed a role of substitution of duties, going against the logic established in the PRODOC*: "The role of the NGOs (AP executing agencies) was not to substitute the deficiencies of the public institutions, but to help those public institutions to create the skills necessary for the protection of children from commercial sexual exploitation"*.

The short duration of the AP was another of the problems identified. In the PRODOC it is stipulated that the AP should last 30 months, preceded by 6 months in which to carry out design. This time was considered necessary for the process of coordinated elaboration between ILO/IPEC and the public and private institutions. In the second phase, the AP lasted 12 months with the possibility of extending for another 12 months.

The executing NGOs faced double pressure: to achieve the rescue goals, and also to do so on a very tight schedule. In the interviews held by the evaluating team with the executing agencies, it was pointed out that the concern to meet goals of children and adolescents rescued was an element that stressed the AP from their beginnings (including in the first phase). For example, although in the cases in which the agency obtained a 12 month extension, it was necessary for them to move into new regions to find more victims and thereby meet their goals. Even though project staff offered permanent technical support for the preparation of reports, stakeholders from the implementing NGOs expressed that the search for children and the preparation of reports consumed a large part of their human resources and time.

The NGOs in their endeavour to offer individualized, integral and quality attention to the children and adolescents formed their own alliances instead of pushing the government to assume the responsibility (which takes a lot of time, which the NGOs didn't have). Furthermore in the effort to respond within the framework of the MCRA they sought private entities, given the lack of response and non-existence of public institutions (for example, programmes for young people with problems of drug addiction, or private schools when public schools did not accept the children and adolescents). It is clear the attention offered by the implementing agencies to the children during the duration of the APs cannot even closely be replicated by the state.

Almost every person interviewed agreed that the MCRA is a model that should be promoted, since it accentuates the right to integrated care. The MCRA was contextualized in each country through the so called care protocols. These protocols were developed with the participation of executing agencies and the institution of child protection, the Attorney generals office (for the part on formal complaints) and other institutions such as health and education (for the part on the process of referral and counter-referral). These protocols are the way in which in practice the NGOs and institutions defined how the protocol is executed in each country. Notwithstanding the effort to "nationalize" the MCRA in each country, some interviewees expressed that the MCRA is an ideal that functions in countries with more developed institutional environment, as is the case in Costa Rica. Related to this stakeholders of implementing agencies in Guatemala and Honduras mentioned the following: "the strategy is based in a context with state care institutions that respond in an integrated manner, but what happens when these institutions are absent? "the model is well conceived but for another reality." Other informants also expressed their frustration faced with the difficulties of applying the MCRA in places with a low level of working institutions but admitted that it was correct on the part of the project to establish high expectations as to what is the responsibility of the state.

The final evaluation of the first phase presented similar concerns as those expressed to this evaluation team. Based on a decision on the part of ILO/IPEC and the donor, the addendum increased the number of children and adolescents beneficiaries and reduced the duration of the AP from 24 to a maximum of 12 months. The reduction in time was made for administrative purposes and was solved by granting extensions. Although in practice these extensions were granted in almost all cases and allowed a follow up of beneficiaries they also served the purpose of permitting the APs to find "new" victims and thereby meet the stipulated goals.

Without a doubt, an effort was made in each country to involve the entity for child protection and to make a "transfer" of the individual cases to the state before the close of the AP. But results were highly variable. In Costa Rica, PANI expressed that it would take charge of continuing to provide services and care in the framework of the MCRA (the MCRA has been institutionalized in the PANI and this institution considers it as its care model), while in Guatemala there will be no transfer to the

chid protection authority at a centralized level since this authority (SBS) because of its weakness and instability did not assume this responsibility. Both ECPAT and APG find themselves in the dilemma of having to continue giving support under their own structures and resources to avoid abruptly cutting off care to these children and adolescents. What was achieved in Guatemala is the support of local government networks with which the project worked (red de maternidad y paternidad responsible of the Ministry of Health). This shows a marked differences in capacities and will among the child care institutions of the different countries in the regions to assume responsibility in the follow up of individual cases

Another problem expressed during the interviews was the lack of validity of the indicator on withdrawal, already discussed in the final evaluation of the first phase. It is unrealistic to attribute the motive of withdrawal to a single main factor (usually education) when one is aware of the multi-causality of the phenomenon and the need for integral and individualized responses. It is contradictory for the MCRA to emphasize that the response and attention must be "integral" since the causes are multiple, but then define withdrawal from such a narrow perspective as "withdrawn due to educational services" or "retired due to non-educational services." A person from an implementing agency mentioned "the criteria to define withdrawal are very light. You require many years of work to achieve withdrawal. You have to construct social web, restitution of rights, etc." Taking into account these "official" indicators, the executing agencies have established other indicators of their own. For example, based on these other indicators in the case of the Quincho Barrilete Association they have seen 60% withdrawal over three years of integral attention to the victim and his/her family, which is compared with the project indicator that established withdrawal after 30 days of the victim ceasing to be exploited, without considering the possibility of revictimization.

Although achieving goals has made it difficult to invest more time in strengthening activities, the execution of the APs has generated a huge flow of information that has made it possible to improve and adjust the attention model. The project, together with the executing agencies, carried out permanent exercises of self evaluation to get an understanding of what the obstacles and difficulties were that the MCRA had not anticipated. The findings of these main "knots", such as pregnancy, drug addiction and lack of income generation have been systematized.[27]

Among the achievements, the APs have been able to better understand the profile of CSEC victims and the different scenarios and modalities that this form of exploitation takes on in the region. Although there was the common preconceived idea of commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents being connected to the phenomenon of international trafficking rings, today it is understood that this is not the case in most cases. Although it is a reality that exists in the region and the most violent manifestation of CSEC, the APs have been able to prove the existence of a great majority of victims linked to more "domestic" modes, which are inter-related with other phenomena, such as incest, domestic violence, mistreatment, drug consumption and small-time trafficking, etc. It therefore involves different realities that require different responses. In the first case, the population is not easy for the NGOs to access, which could put both their officers and the victims at risk. This is why the population attended by the APs come mainly from the second group.

[27] ILO/IPEC, "Explotación sexual comercial de niños, niñas y adolescentes, Del Compromiso a la Acción, Lecciones aprendidas en torno a la atención directa de las personas menores de edad y sus familias", Cecilia Claramunt and Rogelio Pardo, San José, 2006. and, OIT/IPEC, "Sistematization of the experiences developed by the programmes for attention to underage children, victims of commercial sexual exploitation", Luis Felipe Barrantes, 2009 (draft)

The component of institutional strengthening included a wide array of products for the global objective of formulating and executing legislation, policies and programmes. The two specific immediate objectives supported the creation of entities of interstate coordination such as commissions and explore pilot models of care to learn how to improve care offered to victims. The products and activities of the project were able to sustain the creation of commissions in almost all countries. The importance of these commissions is that they assume the main responsibility in continuing to promote the advances achieved in the past years, negotiating inter-state coordination and searching for funds and support to continue the fight against CSEC. In this sense, even though strong, proactive and independent commissions were not achieved in all countries, there are active commissions in Costa Rica, Honduras, Panama, Dominican Republic and El Salvador.

The objective of executing APs in all countries of the region was achieved. The APs played a key role as a learning environment on the application of the MCRA. Applying the model in different countries and different realities also offered a wealth of suggestions on what worked and what did not work in victim's care.

3. Heightening awareness and social mobilization

The third major component of the project covered the aspects related to awareness raising and social mobilization campaigns. The immediate objective was defined as: "*an increase in individual and community action to prevent and eliminate CSEC and attend to victims in the region*". The sub-objective was: "*greater knowledge and awareness of commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents and human trafficking in key sectors of the population (the police, health, education, child protection, tourism, church, employers and unions)*".

In the first phase of the project, two products had been established:

- 3.1. Journalists and media personnel (including local press) and other players, trained on the problem of CSEC.
- 3.2. Key Players (opinion leaders, officers of public entities for attending to children and adolescents, health and education sectors, parliamentarians and authorities) informed through media campaigns, forums and meetings.

The second phase incorporated two more products:

- 3.3. Employer and Labour Organizations informed on how to prevent CSEC (including sex tourism) and human trafficking.
- 3.4. General Population (children and adolescents, youth, men and families) acquire knowledge about CSEC, human trafficking, penal laws and where to present denunciations.

The final evaluation of the first phase indicated that awareness building required a push at the mass and public level. The second phase made a systematic effort to establish tools for building general public awareness (such as comic books) and mass scope (through radio and television spots).

3.1 Training journalists and the media (Product 3.1)

From the beginning, the project approached journalists and the media as a crucial sector. It identified the need to change reporting practices, which until then tended to blame the children, and established journalists as an ally in disseminating the right message. Their collaboration in transmitting the urgency of legislative review and effective management was mentioned on several opportunities over

the course of the interviews.

According to different journalists interviewed, as well as project staff, the activities with this sector have had a clear impact on the management of the subject, principally in the printed press, and to a lesser degree on television. At the beginning of the project the subject of commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents was handled, almost exclusively, in the "current events" sections, with messages that appeared to blame the children and their families. Based on interviews with journalists in Honduras, Guatemala and Costa Rica today this is much less the case. There has been a learning process and a focus on investigation and exposing the exploiter rather than the victim as well as a more respectful handling of images. In Panama, the fact that the principal consultant was a journalist surely had an influence in the development of this component and its achievements. The awareness building campaigns brought about a change in the treatment of the news pieces by Panama City journalists, provincial correspondents, and institutional press departments, members of CONAPREDES, media owners, caricaturists, editorialists, the Panamanian Association of Tourist Press and the Association of Foreign Correspondents.

The project also involved Journalism Schools, and in Honduras and Panama there are plans to integrate the subject into the regular curriculum. In Panama, the CNP reiterated its commitment to follow-up on the training of its members as it did in 2006, when it gave a Diploma course in the University of Panama, with the backing of ILO/IPEC and the CNP on "Treatment of the subject of commercial sexual exploitation of underage children in the social media". The project involved journalism students holding different forums with students of social departments (law, psychology, social workers, etc.) coordinated by the project with the Faculty of Communications and the University of Panama newspaper. As a result of these activities, it was possible to constitute a network of Social Communications students, who trained local journalists. The project provided technical assistance to the network for carrying out these actions.

Although the scope of the project for individual journalists, associations and journalism schools appears to have been highly satisfactory, the training of journalists has its limits. In order to bring about major changes, it is necessary to reach the owners of the media and their board of directors. For example, the decision to offer free air time, or not to include classified ads for prostitution (in which there is no way to know the age) can only be made by the owner of the newspaper or its board of directors. The contact of the project with media owners was limited. In spite of the difficulty of involving businessmen, future projects must define, from the beginning, strategies for promoting greater commitment from the media entrepreneurs. It is vital to explore means for communicating to media owners, together with other organizations from civil society, that it is profitable to invest in social campaigns.

3.2 Activities for informing key sectors (Product 3.2)

At the conclusion of the first phase (some of the materials are from 2005) and the second phase saw the production of a vast amount of materials, guides and manuals, directed specifically at sectors with the responsibility for detecting and denouncing, such as teachers, police and health officers.

In Nicaragua, Guatemala and Costa Rica, manuals were created, outlining how teachers in their work environment could contribute to prevention, by identifying elements of risk and the steps to follow in case of detecting a case of CSEC. Several interviewees as well as interventions during the stakeholder workshop indicated that, although informing the education sector about its responsibilities is essential,

having information on the demand and therefore working on prevention, requires fundamental changes in the sexual education given to young people[28].

It is important to continue distributing this accumulation of knowledge acquired and materials aimed at defining functions and responsibilities of the social sectors.

As it was correctly noted in the final evaluation of the first phase, the project did not carry out a baseline study on general perceptions of the population. To correct this, in 2005 a first study on social tolerance was carried out to measure public opinion on the matter, through a survey (Cid-Gallup). The project repeated that study in 2008. In addition to being able to measure the changes in popular feelings on the sexual exploitation of underage children over three years, the tolerance studies have allowed a better understanding of the the preconceived notions that obstruct a reduction in social tolerance towards the demand and the common practice of blaming victims and their families. In the 2008 study it was found that the tolerance toward CSEC had practically seen no change since 2005. For example, the population continues to ignore the exploiter, panderer or intermediary as responsible for both the existence and the elimination of CSEC. On the other hand, the study did show an increase in the perception of people regarding the responsibility of the governments to put an end to the problem.

The 2008 Social Tolerance Study showed a discouraging situation. In spite of the project's efforts and those of its partners and allies, there is still a certain acceptance of CSEC of underage children by the population. There is still an immense social conformity, which reinforces the concept of deeply rooted cultural tolerance. Significant changes imply attacking the issue of gender equity, masculinity and sexuality. These are mainstay issues of the patriarchal system that rules the region. This reveals that the culturally deep rooted ideas are the slowest to change and that the efforts must be sustained over the long term. As indicated by a communications consultant for the project: "Things sell because they are advertised every day. To reverse a cultural practice of such magnitude, one must definitely invest in permanent campaigns, well thought out for different audiences, and that has a cost". Faced with the conclusion of the project, which has been financing the mass campaigns, the National Commissions, or in their absence, the organism with responsibility in the matter, should explore alternative ways to continue delivering the message. It is necessary to take short-term advantage of the flow of informative materials and of the awareness developed by the project (spots, posters, flipcharts, manuals). After a few years it would be worthwhile reviewing whether the messages are still valid and producing new material to continue awareness building at the mass level.

During the project's life cycle, a great number of training sessions and forums have been held and they have always made a point to alert on the cultural myths surrounding commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents and emphasizing information on the punitive aspect: CSEC is a crime and denouncing it is a responsibility. Through the work on masculinity it has been found that it is works to clarify the years of jail related to crimes of CSEC as a deterrent. Another approach that can be further explored is that of appealing to emotions. "Technical information is fundamental, but one must seek the human view to change perceptions".

28 A theoretical approach was made in: Álvaro Campos, "La educación de la sexualidad: un medio de prevención de la explotación sexual comercial", in ILO/IPEC, Thematic Bulletin No 7, San Jose, Costa Rica, December 2007.

3.3 Incorporation of the trade union and employer sectors (Product 3.3)

The second phase included trade union and business sectors as key components. Union representatives interviewed stated that the information sessions had been useful for dealing with the issue. Interviewed members of trade unions expressed that including them in activities was the right decision, although it arrived late in the project. The unions warned that they could not finalise actions due to the lack of time, while they also questioned why a project of the ILO, which should presumably look toward its three constituents, only did this in the second phase. There is a sense within the union sector that they were included, they were offered materials, informative sessions, but that this was not a complete integration.

The project in the second phase managed to approach workers organizations linking initially through awareness building processes as an introduction to the topic. These were important in the sense that the regional activities were promoted by ORIT and CIOLS and later by the Union Confederation of Workers of the Americas (CSA), with the technical support of ILO/IPEC. The fact that these activities were financed by the union movement is a sign of commitment and they greatly facilitated the activities carried out in the national sphere. As a product of these two processes, activities were conducted to form facilitators, which created a multiplier effect of awareness building toward different professional categories. The topic was incorporated, specifically, as a priority in the Action Plan of the CSA in the countries, such as the case of Costa Rica, where teachers were subject to awareness building.

The project and the unions jointly defined guidelines on how the groups might contribute in the battle against commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents. In Costa Rica, the unions have assumed the need to develop a strategic plan which allows them to have a structured proposal from that sector.

The working strategy with unions and businessmen in the PRODOC stipulated that "together they would define the role they could play in the battle against commercial sexual exploitation." The project worked with these two sectors separately. Various people interviewed indicated that with the business sector less cooperation was achieved. Despite the difficulties of working with this sector, the project did achieve three concrete activities. The visit of a businessperson of Costa Rica to Honduras was very useful because, in the words of a representative of the Honduran Private Business Council (COHEP), "he talked to businesspersons in the same language and underlined the advantages in the business sense of confronting the topic of CSEC." In Nicaragua the project worked with the Women's Business Council, who developed awareness raising actions. In Panama a working relationship was started with the Tourism Board of that country.

Apart from the information, training and awareness building for the unions and employers, future projects could suggest the possibility of integrating these two sectors at a more macro level, as allies in promoting ILO National Plans for Decent Work (PNTD)[29] and in the hemispheric agenda, where countries from the region commit to eradicate the worst forms of Child Labour by 2015. It is important to highlight that the topic of CSE has been integrated specifically in the DWCP of a number of countries in the region.

[29] To date the Dominican Republic, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Panama have decent work agendas.

3.4 Awareness in the general population (Product 3.4)

With different language and simpler materials (large flipcharts) an effort was made to relate the same messages to the general public as to key groups: information on what is (and is not) CSEC and human trafficking; who are the victims and who are the exploiters; the "myths" about commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents; and what one can do (where and when to report it).

The final evaluation of the first phase had warned that it was necessary to make the issue visible in the media. The project reached a wider audience in all of the countries with the running of radio and television spots. Even in Guatemala the spots were produced in Mayan language, so it would reach that monolingual population. The project established alliances that allowed for free air time on popular radio stations. However, several persons interviewed said that an authentic request for mass media campaigns would have to depend on permanent spaces on television and radio to transmit social messages, which is not common in the countries of the region.

The project expanded the type of mass products targeted for adolescents and mothers. For example, in Nicaragua, in conjunction with one of the executing agencies, it developed a comic book story with drawings, that were later adapted for Honduras and Guatemala. The story explained, in a pleasant and simple way, how to detect CSEC and where to report it (stressing that the report can be anonymous). In Panama and Belize another type of short stories were developed that were widely disseminated. For example, in the case of Panama the comic strip was included in a popular newspaper of wide circulation. In Costa Rica and Panama the national lottery was used to disseminate the message on the importance formal complaints when faced with cases of CSEC.

In the adaptations care was taken to "nationalize" the product, using slang from each country. Although the evaluation team could not prove the degree of impact of these stories in the general population, the material seems to be useful for achieving the goal of reaching the public with less technical and more popular messages. In all three cases, the campaign was developed in conjunction with the executing agency in its country (ECPAT in Guatemala, Casa Alianza in Honduras and AQB in Nicaragua) as well as with the institute for child protection (SBS, IHNFA, MIFAN). Therefore, it is important that this material, which has already been developed, continue to be reprinted and distributed; a responsibility that now falls on the Government entities and the Commissions.

The study on masculinity transcended academic circles with work in groups of men ("man to man"), teachers, public sector workers, trade union members and community groups. Similarly, instruments were produced (manual) to facilitate work with groups. In the case of El Salvador a Diploma course was developed on the topic of masculinity that included the issue of CSEC and masculinity. In the majority of the countries reflection groups on masculinity were established. According to the consultants and other people interviewed, this dynamic was very valuable in achieving processes of internal questioning. The project was innovative in integrating this type of approach; however, like the final evaluation of the first phase warned the scope, in terms of numbers of men, is limited. A key group for this type of work would be adolescent men, since it is easier to influence their mentality in a permanent manner.

The project, together with the Costa Rican Ministry of Culture, ventured into an unconventional area but with the potential for touching consciences: the National Dance Company created a show on CSEC, presenting it in the capital city and in 17 outlying communities, all considered high risk areas. The modality included the production and later, a space for discussing and asking questions, directed by a facilitator. This activity is being replicated in 2009 but now with funding of the Ministry of

Culture of Costa Rica and as part of the National Plan against CSE. The experience generated interest, especially among young persons, indicating that alternative approaches are appropriate for this generational sector, so important in the battle against CSEC.

A letter of commitment was signed with the National Council of Journalists (CNP), that is, with the owners of the newspapers, the PGN, and the technical secretariat of CONAPREDES, based on which a broad based awareness raising campaign lasting three months was developed in mid-2006. It was possible to repeat the campaign in 2007 for a similar length of time. The letter was shared with other countries and other journalist organisations assumed the responsibility vis a vis national commissions on CSEC. This was the case in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala. The main message transmitted focused on informing the population that CSEC is a crime and that the guilty party is the exploiter and not the child or adolescent and his/her family. It was not possible to repeat the initiative in 2008, mainly because of the start of the electoral campaign and the wish of the CNP to distance itself from any joint activity with the Government, as well as changes in the orientation of its new board of directors. A campaign was carried out with CONAPREDES and MIDES albeit with a smaller media impact.

The Project fulfilled the objective of generating more knowledge on the topic of CSEC. The majority of those interviewed expressed that, in a retrospective balance, one of the main impacts of the project had been to make visible the problem and develop good quality material that can continue to be used by public institutions, schools, NGOs in their own awareness raising efforts.

IV. PERSPECTIVES FOR SUSTAINABILITY

In view of the imminent close of the project, some important efforts have been made to leave behind structures that will provide for continuity in the actions and to seek strategic alliances in order for certain activities, already begun, to be followed up for following up certain activities already begun, and which require additional external support.

In conjunction with IOM, the project worked with the commissions on human trafficking to develop protocols for repatriation. As mentioned earlier, these protocols are currently not being applied, in spite of the fact that the governments themselves have expressed the need for a document guiding the actions and for establishing the steps for trans-national coordination. IOM and STC have declared that they will follow up on the protocols. STC has also promised to maintain a directory of institutions at the regional level, working on the issues of CSEC and human trafficking. With ILANUD a convention was signed so that this agency will continue backing the training of operators in the judicial sector. This element is essential for achieving the application of the legislative reforms. An accord was reached with UNICEF giving continuity to the efforts of the DEVInfoLAC ESC follow-up system.

Regarding the care model, the work of the project over these 7 years has contributed to changes in attitude that seem to have been absorbed by public sector workers in all of the countries. The degree to which this translates to permanent changes in the care given to CSEC victims is variable and still uncertain. In Costa Rica, sustained improvements in providing care to victims is foreseeable. The MCRA has been adopted by PANI (they consider it to be *their* model). At the same time MCRA is included in the National Plan for the fight against CSEC and the National Plan has been integrated, in turn, to the National Development Plan.

On the other extreme, the application of the Cyclical Model was not adopted by the child care agency (SBS) in Guatemala. In spite of the development of a protocol for the detection and integrated attention of children victims of CSE this institution, according to those interviewed, does not apply the protocol and has not adopted changes in the way that it cares and attends to child victims of CSE. Sustainability in Guatemala had to be sought in other places. On the one hand the health sector of Guatemala, through the San Juan de Dios Hospital, has been very active; to the point of developing its own protocol for this sector. Given the support and commitment of the hospital's staff it seems likely this protocol will be applied in the future. However the person interviewed recognised that keeping the issue on the agenda is not in the direct mandate of the health sector. At a more local level, sustainability of activities in Guatemala can be foreseen by its successful integration in local networks (for example the network of responsible maternity and paternity) and in the Justice Centres that work throughout the country and that are taking on the responsibility to continue beyond the Project.

In Nicaragua the MIFAN approved a protocol and trained its entire staff in the model and the protocol (it is a binding protocol). However, Nicaragua also shows an important institutional weakness that risks the effective application and continuity of the care protocols.

In Honduras the IHNFA expressed its desire to offer care to victims based on an integrated and rights based approach. Staff from IHNFA followed up on the families and victims together with the implementing agency. Nonetheless, this commitment is depends on the political swaying of the government, which affect the composition and priorities of the IHNFA.

In Panama there have been advances in the sense that a protocol exists, it is applied and they have the staff dedicated to attending cases and following up on victims that participated in the APs. As part of the activities of the MIDES, training on the care protocol has intensified. The model was easily replicated and has the possibility of being adopted since the child protection institution, even before the APs, already applied a rights approach in their work.

In all countries a transformation process in the quality and approach of care to victims has begun. Interviewed stakeholders in all countries commented that the project worked solidly in promoting and supporting improvements to the care offered by governments to victims of CSE. The development, together with public institutions, of manuals, protocols and care guidelines responded to the attempt of consolidating these advances even after the exit of the project. Talking about real and sustainable changes in the quality of care to victims is variable between the different countries that participated in the project. Despite the efforts, in Guatemala, more than in other countries, the reality is that sustainability is still subordinated to changes in the government and the instability and weakness of institutions.

Certain activities begun by the project require additional support from external institutions to achieve a sustained contribution. Faced with the closing of the project, agreements were established with partners of international cooperation and agencies of the United Nations system. An interviewee indicated that the project improved the capacities of the district attorney general's office to persecute trafficking offences but it was necessary to go deeper in the issue area of mutual judicial cooperation, something the project would no longer be able to carry out. "There is a complementarity of interests and UNODC will continue the effort." Interviewed public prosecutors were categorical in the positive contribution of project activities to coordinated activities. However faced with the question on how to continue this communication there do not seem to be of yet any concrete options, the response in various countries was that "support is currently being searched for from other cooperation agencies."

The hope for sustainability of actions and achievements of the project lies in the National Commissions. The intention of these commissions is for them to have sufficient authority to coordinate and define future actions and to monitor the efforts of the participating institutions. The degree of strength of these Commissions also varies. The Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Panama and Honduras, can be expected to continue following up on the actions begun. The Commission in Costa Rica already has its own budget and that of Honduras seems imminent. As a key stakeholder from the Commission in Honduras explained, "with the support of the Project a proposal was drafted to get our own funds for the Commission. It has been done and it will be achieved." By having its own resources, the Commission is going to be much capable of continuing to work on the topic. There will be resources for sustaining the Commission and a budget for each of the institutions so they can work on activities related to the fight against CSEC" Panama will need to apply Law 16 for its Commission to finally get resources that will allow it to work independently. Belize has no Commission yet, but the hope is that the issue will receive more penetration into the agenda of the public institutions, given the interest of the country's first lady.

Future sustainability of care being provided to children and adolescents who participated in the AP is also uneven. The original idea was that when the AP closed the implementing agency would transfer its cases to the government to secure follow-up from the state agencies. In Costa Rica, Panama, Belize and Honduras the state will take on the cases but it is very possible that the degree of care will be less personalized. In Guatemala the SBS, the central authority dealing with child care, does not have the structures nor has it assumed the responsibility to continue giving attention to the victims that were

attended by the APs. However in more global terms sustainability of efforts to improve attention to CSEC victims in Guatemala will depend in the local protection networks continuing to work with an integrated and rights based approach.

Some activities of the project valued by counterparts such as internships and regional workshops that were able to establish personal linkages, inform and raise awareness peer to peer and promote the exchange of information and experiences have limited sustainability as they are difficult to replicate due to the high costs. Nonetheless, interviews with counterparts established that the contribution left over from these linkages are so evident that even with less intensity, continuity will be sought either with their own resources or those of external cooperation or taking advantage of regional fora. At the moment of the final evaluation, commitment from national counterparts exists to sustain the advances in the regional cooperation generated by the project.

V. CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Conclusions

1 General: Achievements and future challenges in the fight against CSEC

According to the participants in the workshop for interested parties, and in agreement with the rest of the interviews made:

- The greatest achievements in recent years, in the fight against CSEC, has been the manner in which the problem has been made more visible, legal reforms and the development of National Plans.
- According to the participants in the stakeholder workshop the greatest challenges for the future will centre on continuing to strengthen the capability of providing care to victims, assigning budget and improving the application of the law.

2 Validity of the Project Design and Strategy

- The original design of the project was backed by a participatory exercise and country studies, which helped in understanding in each country of the region, the main gaps and priorities in the fight against CSEC.
- The regional focus made it possible to boost resources and share experiences and lessons learned. The project respected the different stages of development and context specific situations of the countries.
- The project defined CSEC as "a severe violation of the human rights of children and adolescents". This was a correct strategy, since presenting CSEC as the worst form of child labour had taken away the ability of other participants to become involved.
- Promoting this issue to a perspective of rights, and restoring those rights, to underage victims, right from the design stage, was repeatedly mentioned by the counterparts as an undeniable achievement that has allowed this focus to be promoted among the organizations involved in this project.
- It was correct to accentuate that CSEC requires efforts at the levels of prevention, sanction and care giving; and to develop activities designed to improve the responses of each of these elements.
- The project design conceived a gender sensitive perception. This allowed for exploring the subject of perceiving men as reproducers of CSEC.
- The project integrated some recommendations from the two previous evaluations: the incorporation of the workers and business sectors; the emphasis on strengthening the institutions of child protection and working with local and community networks on the action programmes.
- The design of the second phase did not incorporate the recommendation of the final evaluation of the first phase, to reduce the numeric goals of children to be withdrawn, in the APs. This omission resulted in difficulties that have already been identified.
- Several persons interviewed indicated that the modalities of CSEC in the region are changing, becoming more invisible (through the use of technologies such as cell phones) which should be taken into account for the design of future projects.

3 Horizontal Cooperation

- The project surpassed its defined goal of six workshops for the second phase, by organizing, offering technical support for or financing 14 workshops.
- According to prosecutors and police, the impact of regional trainings was a better coordination between specialized entities, actions of joint prosecution and the use of novel methods, such as undercover agents. The regional workshops with the women of PARLACEN responded to an express interest of this organisation to become more familiarised with the issue, integrate it into its agenda and develop a work plan of its own. Some stakeholders expressed concern on how such an ambitious project could be implemented although many of the planned activities do not require a specific budget but coordinated action in the already established functions of PARLACEN.
- The project did an excellent job of compiling and systematizing its experiences: especially impressive is the extensive document on lessons learned all over Latin America with ILO/IPEC projects on CSEC and the systematisation of its work on masculinity. This will be a valuable input for defining and designing future projects. In view of the need expressed by the national players themselves, the project, in conjunction with the IOM, developed national repatriation protocols that define competencies for each country and explain the steps to be followed for the repatriation of a child that has been the victim of trafficking. Despite expressions of will to apply the protocols their use is still incipient and ownership on the part of governments is uncertain. The project negotiated agreements with other institutions so that they will give follow up to the protocols.
- According to reports from Belize, regional cooperation has influenced a better understanding of the modalities of CSEC that exist in the region, which has contributed to making public institutions more proactive.
- The project attained good inter-agency cooperation with UNICEF on the specific issue of initiating DEVInfoLAC ESC, the follow up system for international commitments. Good follow up can be expected from this activity, since it is a high priority for the UN in general and UNICEF in particular.
- The emphasis of the project on developing skills through internships and exchanges, emphasizing greater efficiency of knowledge sharing when it is “one on one”, was highly valued.

4 Institution building

- The adaptation and formulation of national legislation, policies and programs was achieved. In the application of legislation there is great variability among countries.
- The project contributed to the development of national plans for the fight against CSEC in Honduras, Dominican Republic, Panama and Costa Rica. Only in Costa Rica, and to a lesser degree in Honduras they are “live” documents in the sense that they assign resources for its execution.
- The project was able to combine interests and persuade groups (such as journalists) to support the processes of legal modification. The project contributed to the successful legislative reform in Nicaragua and Guatemala (and a bill in Belize).
- After the legal modifications the challenge lies in an effective application of the new laws. The Project promoted information activities and awareness building with justice operators, however it is well known (by the project and its counterparts) that the job of training in this sector needs to be maintained and extended.
- The frequent changes in operational and management staff in the child protection agencies resulted in a low profile and low level of leadership among those institutions (except in Costa

Rica).

- Protocols or guidelines for the health sector were developed in some countries (Guatemala, Panama and Costa Rica) which have contributed to define responsibilities in this sector on the issue of CSEC.
- In Guatemala, the expectations now lie in the Secretariat, created by law, which will be in charge of promoting actions related to CSEC. It is possible to anticipate that its activities will be more aimed at sanctioning/punitive aspects and less toward attention and prevention. Guatemala is a country where ILO/IPEC still needs to play a key role in continuing to strengthen the public child protection entities and in improving coordination in child care provision for victims.
- Protocols for providing care were generated, establishing procedures for giving care to victims in each of the countries. Their potential for helping to order and define responsibilities in caring for CSE victims is recognized by the counterparts. However, (and also with national variations), the incorporation of these protocols in the daily activities of the institutions for child protection is still incipient.
- The protocols or guides for providing care were, in every case, developed and validated together with the child protection institutions. The focus of the project on rights and integrated attention has been established within the institutions. This is a big step, considering that prior to the project almost all countries of the project used the "irregular situation response".

5 The conduct of Action Programme (APs)

- According to the criteria defined the APs, as a whole, 2720 children were withdrawn and prevented. This fulfilled the goals of withdrawal and prevention of children defined by the project. [30]
- The application of the MCRA by the APs is perceived as a success, since it has contributed to establishing new parameters for providing care to victims, based on a rights approach, integrated attention and favouring the reinsertion into family rather than institutionalization of the children in shelters.
- The care giving models have been adopted by almost all of the child protection institutions. At least at the discussion level, personnel of these institutions maintain that the rights based approach will be adopted and will spill over into the future actions of the agencies with regard to the attention of CSEC victims.
- The APs carried out important work at the level of institutional strengthening. Nonetheless, the high numbers of children established as goals of the project subtracted time and resources to deepen the work of institutional coordination and strengthening.
- In view of the lack of time and the need to achieve such high numeric goals, the executing agencies, in many cases, assumed the responsibilities of the state, even seeking out private players to offer services to the victims.
- In general, although with differences between countries, the technical transfer of cases (victims) was done toward the end of the APs. There is concern that the transfer was no more than a transfer of data bases or technical specifications, rather than a prolongation of the care provided.
- In Guatemala, the care giving to victims will continue thanks to a commitment from the executing agencies, since it has been impossible to transfer the responsibility to the SBS.
- Twelve months is a very short time frame for such a complex project. Detection was complicated and the children were integrated in a scaled up manner, so in many cases the care

[30] Technical Progress Report, March 2009 (draft), p. 30.

given covered less than a single year.

- In the majority of cases the projects were 12 months in duration but immediately afterwards another phase would continue that allowed giving follow up to the children from the previous AP. Nonetheless, many children included in the second phase of 12 months will not have follow up. Less than 12 months of attention and work is little time and there is the real risk of generating counterproductive effects as high expectations are developed among the victims.
- It was found that the coordination for providing integrated and individualized services to CSEC victims is easier to promote from local spheres. The persons in the institutions know each other and are more willing to join efforts.
- The work with local networks in Guatemala was successful, since these networks already know how to get the local institutions moving.
- The project was very proactive in promoting self-evaluations of how the MCRA operation was doing. Options were identified and discussed, adjustments were made and obstacles as well as lessons learned were systematized. (Drug addiction, pregnancy, income generation, transsexual populations, HIV-AIDS).
- The limited approach, in the MCRA, to employment options for youth and income generation opportunities was identified by the project itself as one of the main weaknesses of the Cyclical Model. This prompted the development in the second phase a document that brought together what had been learned and positive experiences from the APs.

6 Mobilization and awareness building

- According to the counterparts interviewed, one of the greatest achievements of the project was to increase the recognition of the problem by the governments and to give it greater visibility.
- The quality of the information materials and awareness building was a point that was consistently mentioned by the counterparts. It was stressed that the materials provided made it possible for persons trained by the project to be able to replicate it in an informal manner, through talks and informative sessions.
- The work of the project to the media and journalists resulted in better management of the issues through the printed press. This is proven by a greater emphasis being placed on the exploiter and a more respectful treatment of the victims.
- The effects of training sessions for journalists are obvious. However, it was argued that it is necessary to have greater contact with editors, members of boards of directors and media owners.
- In the second phase, the project stressed the creation of informational materials for key audiences, teachers, police and health sector officers, as well as the public in general.
- The project generated useful materials for mass distribution, explaining in simple terms, what CSEC is: its criminal nature, and the steps that any person may take in reporting the activity (promoting the ways denunciations can be done anonymously)

B. Recommendations

To IPEC and USDOL

1. Reduce the numeric goals for rescuing children and adolescent CSE victims or balance them with the indicators of institutional strengthening. The difficulties in identification and in using reference systems that do not work, resulted in the use of many resources and time invested in "seeking" victims to meet the goals, instead of focusing the efforts on strengthening institutions and promoting inter–agency relations.

2. Review the way beneficiary children are counted. Be more flexible and define jointly with the implementing agencies criteria to be used when counting a child as "withdrawn." Explore new indicators and reporting formats that satisfy both the needs of the donor without representing an excessive workload for the APs or local counterparts.

To ILO/IPEC

3. At the moment of design, recover the role of direct APs as "laboratories" for attention models. Highlight the learning and institutional strengthening aspect of public institutions with child care responsibilities.
4. Incorporate more closely the institutions that provide care for children during the length of execution of the AP. Stipulate the technical transfer of data and files as the final step in a long chain of joint collaboration.
5. An AP should only start if there is an express commitment from the children's administration entity and the executing NGO to work together. If this doesn't happen, the risk is for victims being rescued, but later no capacity for replication and follow up is left behind except in the NGO. Although it is useful for the NGOs to also develop skills for providing care to victims, only when this integrated care is assumed and applied by the state, can we think of long term sustainability.
6. Conceive APs of at least three years duration. Include a prior phase of at least six months to understand the local institutional context, negotiate the modalities of joint work with the administrating entity, and establish agreements on which victims will be referred to after the AP ends. Only after that can individualized services to the victims begin.
7. In order for the AP to become a space for construction and validation of a model for a national programme for providing care to CSEC victims, it should have been starting in the design phase the participation of the public and private institutions that will be responsible for its execution. If there is no clear and manifest political will from the Government, the AP will not become a sustainable initiative. Within the framework of the MCRA, ILO/IPEC cannot place more resources at the disposition of the AP than what the national counterparts can assume upon concluding the transfer.
8. During these seven years the Programme has made very important achievements; a broad recognition of both national and international players and a recognized authority and leadership in the process. However, to consolidate these achievements ILO/IPEC presence in the region is still essential to reinforce advances that have been made. A large scale project such as the one that is finishing is not necessary, however it would be very beneficial that ILO/IPEC continue its support in specific areas such as:
    - Care giving: Continue the support to strengthening child care institutions in Guatemala and Nicaragua, and to a lesser degree in Honduras, Belize, Dominican Republic and Panama. These institutions, due to excessive personnel changes, limited budgets and politization of their activities, still lack the technical skills to offer the integrated care, identified in the MCRA.
    - Sanction: Continue promoting information, awareness and training of justice agents, especially judges. The detection of the crime has become more difficult and criminal networks are always one step ahead. Therefore it is important to continue offering technical support and continue to emphasize the usefulness of repatriation protocols in particular and interstate coordination in general.
    - Prevention: Support mass media campaigns and socialize the results of studies on tolerance and masculinity. The studies on masculinity and social tolerance on the issue of CSEC have been adopted by other public and private institutions in the

region; however the wider dissemination of how to use these findings and this learning for prevention still requires the support of ILO/IPEC.

9. Both evaluations (the mid term and the final evaluation) concluded that the targeted numbers of beneficiaries of APs were too high, resulting in excessive workloads in terms of human resources and materials and negative impacts on the other goals of the APs. It is essential to establish an open and critical discussion that allows ILO/IPEC to propose more reasonable alternatives to USDOL in terms of numeric goals of withdrawn children.

10. Attend to the demands established in the National Plans for Decent Work adopted in Panama, El Salvador, Honduras, Dominican Republic and Nicaragua, which establish the fight against CSEC as one of its priorities. To ensure that this issue is also incorporated into the NPDW, currently being drafted in Costa Rica.

1 For future projects in the fight against commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents

11. Condition start-up of the AP to the active and full participation of the child administration entity. Otherwise the final goal of serving as an instrument for validation of methodologies and appropriation of the knowledge by the national institutions for child care is lost.
12. Consider APs of longer duration and a much smaller number of beneficiaries.
13. APs, when they are doing the institutional mapping should look into the local job market and develop lists of appropriate employment options for youth.
14. Include studies on masculine perceptions of CSEC and preventative work with men, in the design of future CSEC projects in other regions. The work carried out on masculinity complements a gender focus and has demonstrated the need to understand this aspect, in order to give responses aimed at reducing the demand for CSEC.
15. In light of the highly extended tolerance, and in order to influence demand, future projects must think about how to affect the messages that are reaching children and young people. In this sense, teachers from the education sector must be included as key players.
16. To integrate business people in future projects, delve deeper into the concepts of corporate social responsibility and the type of messages and language the business sectors are willing and open to respond to.
17. Integrate the business and labour union sectors from the beginning of a project.
18. Develop closer strategic alliances with women's movements that in the majority of countries have experience working on the subject of CSEC.
19. Give greater priority from the start, to a tripartite focus. Promote joint efforts with unions and employers in areas where joint efforts are viable and possible, for example awareness building campaigns backed by both sectors.
20. Pay special attention when drafting future regional projects, to the combination of regional activities with national activities oriented toward achieving the particular objectives for each country, based on each country's institutional starting point.
21. Even though it cannot always be controlled by a project (since it is institutions who decide the individuals that will participate) for each training decide if what is sought is to raise awareness in general terms or rather have an impact on decision making processes within institutions. For the latter it is necessary to more proactively get decision makers to participate in trainings.
22. Just as the project did, try to gauge whether institutions want, and believe they have, the ability to integrate database information systems. If it is perceived as a prefabricated package, pushed upon

them by outside cooperation agencies, it is destined to fail.

To the inter-agency Commissions in the fight against CSEC.

In light of the project's conclusion, the Commissions for the fight against CSEC will be the organisations that should spearhead any future activities and coordinate the inter-institutional efforts begun in recent years. Their presence, leadership, convening power is irreplaceable for empowering and sustaining the achievements gained.

23. In cases where it has not yet been done, promote the Commission's legal standing and budgetary allotment.
24. Establish a secretariat that possesses leadership and the power to convene. Ensure that the dynamism of the Commission does not depend on individuals or on a few institutions.
25. Conduct periodic monitoring of National Plan performance. Establish the degree to which each institution is fulfilling its responsibilities according to the Plan.
26. In light of the still very high social tolerance to CSEC among the general population, prioritise awareness activities with the gradual but sustained purpose of changing perceptions.
27. The care protocols for CSEC victims are very valuable instruments that were achieved with the support of the project. Knowledge and use of the protocols by government staff offers greater degree of certitude that they will receive integrated attention based on human rights. In those countries where these protocols are not known or are not being used, it is an obligation of the Commissions to assume the challenge of their complete incorporation. This will demand coordination with the child care entity. In those cases, such as Guatemala, in which the entity is so weak and cannot play a coordinating role, the Commission will have to continue a dissemination work of the care protocols with other public institutions and other local and community networks that have contact with victims.
28. The repatriation protocol was another instrument supported by the project and that has the potential to help in internal and external coordination in the fight against trafficking of children. It is part of the Commissions' responsibility to give follow up to the protocol and drive its adoption on the part of the relevant institutions. The suggestion to do this in a joint manner with a dissemination of the regional guidelines since they complement the protocols. In some countries (such as Guatemala) the issue of trafficking has a lot of notoriety and a high profile. The connection of this protocol in the fight against trafficking should be taken advantage of.
29. Faced with the results of the KAP study the high priority group to direct information and sensitization efforts, over the short and medium term, is judges.
30. Continue building national programmes for providing care to victims, based on a rights based focus, offering responses to a multi-causal phenomenon and considering the specific requirements of each victim. CSEC victims have particular characteristics, distinguishing them from other modalities of exploitation, contemplated in Convention 182, which require differentiated responses.
31. Develop strategies that balance the normative progress (more affordable in punitive societies and that do not require financial commitments) with the support for implementation and execution of laws, changes in social perception of the crime and programmes to provide care to victims. Being unable to accomplish this might extend social tolerance of the crime by showing the failure to comply with the norm as a blessing (by omission) of the justice operators.
32. Attempt to integrate the National Plan for the fight against CSEC into broader poverty reduction development plans, decent work country strategies and education.

VI. Lessons Learned and Good Practices

A. Lessons Learned

- The project had the opportunity to enjoy a short (conceptual) pause, between the first and second phases, to reflect on what had to be adjusted. One of the main lessons that were integrated into the second phase, and which became very successful, was that the APs work more closely with local and community networks and organizations. The MCRA works better through local systems of protection that respond to the particular realities of that community.
- It is essential to work with men to find a solution to the problem. Understand that there is a "critical path" of men towards CSEC and there are risk factors to become an exploiter. This helps towards the development of strategies for the prevention of CSEC.
- Studies on masculinity found two messages that function as preventative deterrents: 1.) that the practice brings with it jail sentences, and to a lesser extent 2.) through empathy: if they have daughters of the same age as their victims, rejection may be achieved.
- The messages must strongly emphasize the possibility of jail sentences. However, modifications in conduct cannot be achieved only in cognitive terms; one must work at the subjective and affective levels.
- Teaching and sensitization work better "peer to peer". The journalists speak the language of journalists and lawyers that of the lawyer.
- To achieve adoption, it is important to respect established systems. For example in the case of the Follow-up System for Commercial Sexual Exploitation (FSCSEC) the project's system was adjusted to PANI's already existing system. Thus, it avoids the danger of generating stress on the officers, who could potentially perceive them as additional tasks.
- In Belize and Costa Rica the APs found the support teams in schools to be a highly useful resource. When the schools have them, the psychologists and counsellors are well aware of the family situations and can serve as a bridge to place a child in the project.
- The executing agencies learned that case identification rarely happens through the help of the "logical actors" (police denunciations). Every AP had to find alternative means for identifying victims; some through the schools, other cases were integrated into their community, generating confidence prior to approaching the victims. The detection process is long and that was unforeseen in the MCRA.
- It is necessary to give constant and personalized follow-up (to obtain an effective rescue) and this is very expensive and time-consuming.

B. Good Practices

- Repeat in every informational piece of material, regardless of who the audience is, that the children and adolescents are not the criminals. Transfer the guilt to the client exploiter.
- Include work on masculinity and with men. This helps in the understanding of the phenomenon from the masculine point of view and of strategies for preventive measures against CSEC. Work on masculinity offers conceptual clarity on practices and deeply rooted cultural perceptions that hinder in the reduction of demand.
- Convert the media into strategic allies to maintain the subject on the public agenda and to impulse legislative reform.
- Attempt to establish the issue of CSEC within courses in journalism schools, tourism students and schools for lawyers and judges.

- Alternative prevention tools, from the cultural point of view. This includes, the dance show, together with roundtables on reflection to get the message across, especially to young people.
- Promote horizontal cooperation between the APs. It is very useful to share experiences to help resolve the common problems they face.
- Promote the development of National Plans that establish the responsibilities of the different institutions over the coming years. This is a fundamental contribution, since, although it is only on paper, it signifies a certain commitment and assignation of resources by the state (even if the resource is only time).
- A continued effort to systematize experiences.
- Test the functionality of the care provision model "on the ground". Applying the model in the different countries generated knowledge for improving and adjusting it.
- Customize the care provision model through protocols and guides that respond to the situation of each country.
- When promoting legislative reforms, create a Technical Committee with varied participation. Important in the adoption of the reform process.
- Identify existing networks having similar interests (such as the Responsible Maternity and Paternity network) for them to include the subject of commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents in their agenda.
- Support the creation of specialized units for the fight against CSEC or sex crimes in prosecutor's offices. These have contributed to stronger sentences, more professional investigations and awareness of sex crimes through computerised media.
- The creation of informational bulletins on specific themes having an additional space for academic reflection.

VII. ANNEXES

Annex I- Terms of Reference
Annex II- List of persons interviewed
Annex III - Documents consulted
Annex IV - Agenda of the Workshop for Interested Parties and the list of attendees.
Annex V - Evaluation Instrument

Annex I – Terms of Reference

International Labour Organisation- International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour

ILO/IPEC

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Final TOR for circulation

Independent Final Evaluation

For ILO/IPEC Project:

"Contribution to the Prevention and Elimination of the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of boys, girls and adolescents in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic"

ILO Project Code	RLA/05/52/USA
ILO Project Number	P.260.08.200.050
ILO Iris Code	100235
Country	Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, Dominican Republic.
Duration	42 months
Starting Date	1 November 2005
Ending Date	30 April 2009
Type of Evaluation	Independent Final Evaluation
Date of Evaluation	March – April 2009
Project Language	Spanish and in Belize English
Executing Agency	ILO-IPEC
Financing Agency	United States Department of Labor US DOL
Donor contribution	USDOL: US $ 4,966,817

I. Background and Justification

Background

The aim of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour, IPEC, is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially its worst forms. The political will and commitment of individual governments to address child labour - in cooperation with employers' and workers' organizations, non-governmental organizations and other relevant parties in society - is the basis for IPEC action. IPEC support at the country level is based on a phased, multi-sector strategy. This strategy includes strengthening national capacities to deal with this issue, legislation harmonization, improvement of the knowledge base, raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour, promoting social mobilization against it, and implementing demonstrative direct action programmes (AP) to prevent children from child labour and remove child workers from hazardous work and provide them and their families with appropriate alternatives.

From the perspective of the ILO, the elimination of child labour is part of its work on standards and fundamental principles and rights at work. The fulfilment of these standards should guarantee **decent work** for all adults. In this sense the ILO provides technical assistance to its three constituents: government, workers and employers. This tripartite structure is the key characteristic of ILO cooperation and it is within this framework that the activities developed by the project should be analyzed.

ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) are being introduced in ILO to provide a mechanism to outline agreed upon priorities between the ILO and the national constituents partners within a broader UN and International development context. For further information please see http://www.ilo.org/public/english/decent.htm

The DWCP defines a corporate focus on priorities, operational strategies as well as a resource and implementation plan that complements and supports partner plans for national decent work priorities. As such DWCPs are broader frameworks to which the individual ILO project is linked and contributes. DWCPs are beginning gradually introduced in various countries' planning and implementing frameworks and for the majority of the countries in which the project is active, either a DWCP exists already or is currently being drafted in consultation with constituents based on the model in execution in Central America.

The support that IPEC provides to the countries is based on a multi-sector strategy that is being developed by phases. This strategy consists of the awareness raising about the negative consequences of child labour, the promotion of social mobilization against the child labour phenomenon and the strengthening of national capacities to fight against child labour; the implementation of direct action programmes (AP) to prevent and withdraw girls, boys and adolescents of hazardous occupations and to provide their families with suitable working alternatives.

Background to the Project "Contribution to the Prevention and Elimination of the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of boys, girls and adolescents in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic".

The project "Contribution to the Prevention and Elimination of Commercial Sexual Exploitation of boys, girls and adolescents in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic" is implemented IPEC and initiated its activities in July 2002. The first phase of the project concluded on the 30th of April 2006. The second phase of the Project started in November 2005. The project in its second phase counts on a budget of US$ 4.966.817, besides the local contributions. It is scheduled to end in April 2009.

Despite recent initiatives, commercial sexual exploitation (CSEC) of girls, boys and adolescents and continues to be a major issue in Central America and the Dominican Republic. The girls, boys and adolescents are still trapped in inhuman situations, similar to slavery. The trafficking of boys, girls and adolescents occurs also within the region, from Honduras, Nicaragua and El Salvador to Guatemala and also from the whole region to other countries. Moreover, the countries also have to fight against the fact that they can become a place where sexual abusers of other parts of the world hide and promote sexual tourism. The sexual tourists come to the region believing that the chances to get caught and sanctioned are minimal in comparison with their home countries that have a better police. In addition, an unfortunate social tolerance exists towards the commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents. The national adults, particularly the men, represent a significant part of the "customers" of the industry of child commercial sexual exploitation (spectacles of sex, brothels, and child pornography). The root lies in the "patriarchal" cultural norms in Central America and in the minor status of boys, girls and adolescents in the society. The girls, boys and adolescents in the region are also used for the production of child pornography, which is often distributed via Internet around the world. The most vulnerable, the children and adolescents before the sexual intercourse are those that come from the poorest families, excluded from the school system and with experiences of domestic violence. The children undergo terrible physical and psychological consequences after having been treated like merchandise and sexual slaves in the commerce of illegal sexual business.

On this basis, the project has had a significant impact. Although commercial sexual exploitation of boys, girls and adolescents was considered a severe violation of their rights, ten years ago it was an invisible problem that was still denied at a world-wide level. With the exception of a few isolated initiatives, about seven years ago there was no significant awareness on taking measures to stop the problem in the region. At present, acknowledgement of the problem has been made and the regional governments have included the issue in several work agendas. An example of this was the inclusion of the issue as a central subject in the Latin American Conference of Ministers and Civil servants that took place on November 18-19, 2004 and the most recent participation of representatives of all the governments of the region, including Belize, in the III World Congress against the commercial sexual exploitation of girls, boys and adolescents in Rio de Janeiro in November 2008.

The countries of the region also have created forums that are necessary to discuss strategies how to eliminate commercial sexual exploitation. The existing forums are:

- in Costa Rica, the National Commission against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Boys, Girls and Adolescents - CONACOES;
- in Nicaragua, although the inter-institutional group that is in charge of the problem is the National Council of Care and Integral Protection to the Childhood and Adolescence (CONAPINA), at the moment the Coalition against Trafficking in Persons is the organization that coordinates the analysis of the subject in the country;
- in El Salvador, the working table against Commercial Sexual Exploitation is the specialized instance, which also works in close collaboration with the Commission against Trafficking in Persons;

- in Guatemala, the Sub-commission against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Girls, Boys and Adolescents already exists;
- in Honduras, the Inter-institutional Commission Against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Girls, Boys and Adolescents and Women;
- in the Dominican Republic, the Inter-institutional Commission against the abuse and commercial sexual exploitation of girls, boys and adolescents;
- in Belize the subject is integrated into the work of the National Committee of Family and Childhood; and
- in Panama the National Commission for the Prevention of Crimes of Sexual Exploitation (CONAPREDES), which is an organization that, according to Law 16, is in charge of studying the mechanisms to prevent and eradicate the crimes of sexual exploitation.

The 8 countries of the region have a plan of action specifically directed to prevent and eliminate commercial sexual exploitation of girls, boys and adolescents or directly related to this issue (as in the case of Belize where it is integrated in the national Plan of Childhood); many of them have been prepared in the context of national policies of childhood and the adolescence. Specifically, Costa Rica has already developed its III National Plan against the CSEC of girls, boys and adolescents (2008-2010); El Salvador has a National Plan against the Worst Forms of Child Labour 2006-2009 (extended until 2011) that includes a specific chapter on CSEC. Guatemala has been developing a Plan of National Action against the Sexual Exploitation of Girls, Boys and Adolescents since 1998. In 2006, the Dominican Republic prepared the "Plan of Action of the Dominican Republic to eradicate the abuse and commercial sexual exploitation of girls, boys and adolescents". In November 2003, Nicaragua officially presented its National Plan against Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Girls, Boys and Adolescents for 2003-2008. Honduras counts on a Plan of National Action against the CSEC 2006-2011 and Panama approved the National Plan for the prevention and elimination of CSEC 2008-2010. In Belize the National Plan of Action for girls, boys and adolescents 2004-2015 includes the subject of CSEC. The preparation of these documents has meant that each country is in the process of recognizing the problem, carrying out important discussions on how to eliminate CSEC and finding an integrated way to do this without blaming the victims. A great number of public and private institutions have participated in these discussions, and the process has created synergies amongst the institutions which are now closely working together on the subject of human rights of the victims. Moreover, it also meant the sensitization of a great number of officials in government on the subject. In addition, the project has propelled several institutions to take action and initiate activities at their own costs.

The strategies defined in the plans are vast and include legal, preventive, and repressive or penal contexts, as well as attendance to the victims. Nevertheless, the main weakness lies in the difficulties to assign the resources that are required for effective implementation. This means that the actions taken in many cases have depended on the financial support of international agencies and NGOs, and also on the insistence of some government officials who were worried about the serious forms of violation of the girls', boys' and adolescents' human rights. At the moment, two paradigmatic cases constitute the experience of Costa Rica, which integrated the national Plan against the CSEC in the National Development Plan (and in this way allocated ordinary public funds for its implementation, as well as monitoring and evaluation of the achievement of the goals of the country); and Honduras, that through the operative plans of the institutions has given resources for the implementation of the Plan, reducing in this way, the dependency on external funds.

The countries of the region have also ratified several international treaties related to the subject, such as the Convention 182 of the ILO on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour, the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention of the United Nations against the Organized International Crime, amongst others. When ratifying these international treaties, the countries of the region have developed an important process of adaptation of their national legislation in order to be able to prosecute the individuals that commit these crimes against girls, boys and adolescents. In addition, they must create a national legal frame that guarantees the

rights of the minors in general, as well as their particular rights to receive protection and immediate care in the case of becoming victims of sexual exploitation.

Within this framework, the region has undergone a process of adjustment; nevertheless, some important challenges still remain. In fact, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras and Panama have managed to implement specific reforms on the sanctioning of commercial sexual exploitation of minor people. The legislations are quite complex concerning the different related crimes, and the sanctions are severe. The Guatemalan Congress approved the reform to article 194 of its Penal Code that deals with people, adapting this text to the contents established in the protocol treats. Nevertheless, Guatemala still needs to reform its legislation related to the crime of commercial sexual exploitation. At present, in addition, Belize and the Dominican Republic are in a process of legal reform to adapt their penal codes to the minimum standards established by the international conventions. Specifically, in 1999, Costa Rica was the first country in reforming and adding articles to its Penal Code by means of the "Law 7899 against Sexual Exploitation of boys, girls and adolescents". Also in 2007 it approved a law to build capacity on the fight against CSEC by means of which important penal and procedural reforms were included in the Costa Rican legislation. Therefore, today Costa Rica has one of the most complete procedures in place for the fight against CSEC. On November 25, 2003, El Salvador approved the Decree no. 210, that reforms the penal code related to CSEC. The sanctions and the types of violations were modified and additional types of crimes were added in the chapter that defines the crimes against the sexual exploitation. All the crimes that violate the sexual protection and/or the integrity of girls, boys and adolescents include the sanction of CSEC in all its diverse forms and ways. Also in this country, in 2004, the Penal Procedural Code was reformed. Two decrees, 457 and 458, were reformed to allow the improvement of national capacities to persecute these crimes. Panama, in March 2004, approved the Law no. 6, which "dictates to standardize the stipulations for the prevention of CSEC, modified and added articles to the Penal and Judicial Codes", and modified and included new articles in both codes with the purpose of processing and sanctioning commercial sexual exploitation of boys, girls and adolescents; and also stipulated the creation of specific related investigation organizations in 2008. In Nicaragua, a new Penal Code has been ratified to eliminate CSEC. In the case of Panama, the new Code put up to date the crimes that had been identified in the reform of 2005.

Honduras, El Salvador, Costa Rica and Dominican Republic are in national processes of integral reform of the Penal Codes and in all these countries forums of dialogue have been created to work on the new reforms. In the case of Guatemala, Belize and Dominican Republic, there are specific processes in place to introduce the present reforms in the penal code. In spite of those important progresses in the legislation of the region, impunity of the violators is still the rule. Some of the organizations and police that are in charge of the investigation and persecution of the criminals apply methods that are not very effective to sentence the violators. An additional problem is that very few cases are reported to the authorities.

Recent Activities and Outcomes

Considering the above mentioned context, the immediate objectives of the project are the following:

IO.1: At the end of the project, there will be regional cooperation and shared knowledge to prevent and eradicate CSEC in the region

IO.2: At the end of the project, there will be national legislation, policies and programmes formulated and in effect in selected countries.

IO.3: At the end of the project, there will be increased community and individual action to prevent CSE and assist victims of CSE throughout the region.

In order to reach these objectives, a variety of activities has been initiated for each of the objectives:

According to Immediate Objective 1, at the end of the project, there will be regional cooperation and shared knowledge to prevent and eradicate the CSEC in the region. At the beginning of the project, it was determined that the problem of commercial sexual exploitation of girls, boys and adolescents is present in all countries of the region and that there are similarities amongst them with respect to CSEC. For example, there are girls, boys and adolescents who are taken from one country to another within the region and which must be repatriated in a safe way. Networks of sexual operation exist that command activities in the region. In addition, the sexual tourists visit the region to participate in illicit sexual activities which they would not dare to practice in their own countries. They come to Central America because they think that they will not be persecuted in the region. Moreover, it has been seen that in spite of this connection, there is little contact between the institutions to prevent the problem and to offer effective care to the victims and to persecute the offenders. In order to support the countries of the region so that they find answers to this situation, the project to eliminate CSEC has planned several activities with the aim to obtain greater regional and institutional coordination and to place the issue of CSEC in different contexts of discussion in the region. The project has also produced a variety of information and materials for key sectors and has developed regional activities to coordinate policies and standardize the legislation between the countries of the region. Among others, the project has planned the following activities:

- Creation of a data base for the exchange of information at regional level; Development of the Web site of the project: www.oit.or.cr/ipec/esc with information on the project, as well as international and national legislation related to the subject that is in use at present. In addition, publications, institutional data bases, bonds of interest and others have been created;
- Development of a regional directory of institutions that work on the elimination of commercial sexual exploitation (it can be accessed through a printed copy and a data base through the Internet and in CD-ROM);
- Creation of a new information guide with the strategies of prevention of CSEC; Support to the strengthening of those institutions that protect and offer services to the boys, girls and adolescents, as well as to the people in charge to stop and to sanction the offenders;
- Development of a software programme "System of monitoring of commercial sexual exploitation" to give follow up to the victims of CSEC within the framework of direct action programmes from the project to eliminate the CSEC;
- Development of the guide "Commercial sexual exploitation: working guide for providers and managers of services directed to the girls, boys and adolescents victims of Commercial Sexual Exploitation (2003)";
- Exchange of lessons learned between the institutions that protect the children in two regional workshops;
- Development, publication and distribution of documents and newsletters;
- Preparation of a regional technical meeting to exchange information and to share lessons learned and experiences.

According to the Immediate Objective 2, at the end of the project, legislation, policies and programmes will have been formulated and national programmes will have taken measures to put them in use in selected countries.

- The Project to eliminate CSEC has organized diverse activities to achieve this objective in all the countries. ILO/IPEC has organized national studies, working jointly with national researchers, and has managed to collect data on the socio-economic situation of the victims, and on some of the characteristics of the offenders; as well as taking institutional actions to stop the problem.

- In the countries involved in the project, ILO/IPEC has supported the institutional capacity building by means of providing technical advice; the creation of a better institutional coordination and the qualification of key civil servants, such as civil servants of health and education, agents of migration, police, administrators of justice and other officials. In several countries ILO/IPEC has supported the process of adaptation of the national legislation to international norms, which has been possible through the creation of discussion forums and the formulation of proposals to change the penal codes. ILO-IPEC also has supported the countries of the region in the preparation and application of manuals and guides directed to different sectors. This has been made with the purpose of clarifying and promoting the capabilities and responsibilities of each organization involved in the fight against CSEC. These tools try to develop the government capacity to combat CSEC.

- In the region, more than fifteen thousand professionals of key sectors (police, judges, migration agents, professionals in the health sector, education and civil servants in charge of the protection of the childhood, etc.) have participated in workshops to obtain qualifications. These have been organized by the project.

- Finally, the project has supported Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, Panama, Belize and Guatemala, along with public and private organizations, in their efforts to develop programmes of direct action for the victims of commercial sexual exploitation. In addition, while offering protection and services to the victims, these programmes are directed towards the compilation of lessons learned that could inform the local and national policies on the subject. An innovative element of these programmes is the set of developed strategies to obtain the social reintegration of the victims in their families and social environment. At the same time, tools for the application of the adequate model of intervention to the reality and institutional structure of each country have been developed at national level (protocols). Until now, more than 2500 boys, girls and adolescents have been withdrawn or prevented from CSEC.

According to Immediate Objective 3, at the end of the project, there will be major communal and individual action to prevent CSEC and to help to the victims of CSEC in the region.

- ILO/IPEC has organized training workshops for mass media communication, in each of the strategic partner countries so that media recognize its important role in the fight against this social phenomenon. These workshops were extended in many of the countries to schools and universities, building on the human resource and training them on the subject, building their capabilities from their own learning process.

- In addition, it has been possible to increase the awareness on the issue by means of the development of a great variety of activities to sensitize, to inform and to mobilize the public and key sectors for taking measures to prohibit, prevent and eliminate the commercial sexual exploitation.

- Amongst these activities one needs to highlight the great number of forums, round tables and other public activities executed in each country to share the knowledge amongst government officials, national and local politicians, key professionals, organizations of citizens, employers and workers, among others, on the CSEC and how they can support the fight against this social flagellum. These activities have proven to be one of the strengths of the project. In addition, the preparation and massive dissemination for these same groups of sensitization materials include announcements in radio and television as well as written publications. The materials include documents such as the one containing recommendations for mass media, videos and materials for dissemination.

Recommendations from the evaluation of Phase I

A mid-term and a final evaluation of Phase I of the IPEC project on CSEC in Central America have been carried out. The final evaluation of March 2006 made a number of recommendations to IPEC, the Project team and USDOL. Among others, it was recommended:

- to strengthen inter-institutional mechanisms in several of the target countries, such as commissions, committees, coordination groups etc. in order to legally formalize them;
- in the second phase of the project, to put a particular focus on creating awareness on CSEC of legal workers (in particular judges) at the national level and their efficient coordination with other authorities of the legal system (such as Sate Prosecutors, police) in order to enhance prosecution of exploiters of children.
- to link the project's actions against CSE to other existing national strategies;
- to study more in depth the design of CSE community prevention systems and to promote the inclusion of a local plan against CSE within the local government plans;
- to implement an analysis of the offer of public institutions dealing with CSE prior to commencing direct action programmes in an area;
- in the second phase, to draw up a mass media strategy for awareness raising, that clearly defines the actions' objectives, content, means and target populations.

Background to the final evaluation of Phase II

In ILO/IPEC evaluations of its projects are carried out to enhance organisational learning. As per IPEC procedures, a participatory consultation process on the nature and specific purposes of this evaluation was carried out three months prior to the scheduled date of the evaluation. The present Terms of Reference are based on the outcome of this process and inputs received in the course of the consultative process.

It has been agreed with the donor to only carry out a final evaluation of this project. No midterm evaluation has taken place.

II. Scope and Purpose

Scope

From a conceptual point of view, the evaluation will cover all the interventions carried out by the project in the region, at regional, national and local level. This generally includes an analysis of the project as well as of the action programmes, mini programmes, external consultancies, workshops, studies and other activities that have been developed as part of the project.

Purpose

The purpose of this final evaluation is to:

- assess the validity of the project's design and strategies, including its relevance in the country context.
- review all activities and outputs of the project and to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of IPEC efforts in relevant Central American countries to eliminate commercial sexual exploitation of children and child trafficking.

- document achievements, models of intervention and lessons learned.
- assess the process of implementation by IPEC and its implementing organizations and the ability of project management at the country, regional and HQ levels to execute project strategies and activities according to the project work plan.
- provide recommendations that will inform strategies and activities for possible future activities and suggest possible directions for future work in CSEC that will feed the strategies of the national commissions against CSEC.
- document processes undertaken by the project to identify and cooperate with other initiatives and organizations working to eliminate the worst forms of child labour, such as learned lessons and the accumulated knowledge regarding the elimination of CSEC.
- provide a feedback to the stakeholders involved with regarding the process and the achievements;
- To analyse the achievement of the project in terms of sustainability.

The main users of the evaluation will be the governmental and nongovernmental organizations involved directly and/or indirectly in the intervention, workers' and employers' organizations, the international members of ILO/IPEC, USDOL and other organizations in the countries that are executing the activities towards the Elimination of Child Labour. As far as possible, the evaluation should include the active participation of the above mentioned users and beneficiaries of the project.

III. Suggested Aspects to Address

The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability as defined in the ILO Guidelines on "Planning and Managing Project Evaluations," 2006. These concerns are further elaborated the "Preparation of Independent Evaluations of Projects," 1997. For gender concerns see: ILO Guidelines on "Considering Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation of ILO Programmes and Projects," 2007.

The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, ILO Guidelines, specific ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

In line with the results-based framework approach used by ILO-IPEC for identifying results at global, strategic and project level, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analysing results. This should be done by addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns as well as the achievement of the programme's immediate objectives using data from the logical framework indicators. These results are also intended to contribute to the understanding of ILO/IPEC contributions at the global level, in projects of prevention and elimination of commercial sexual exploitation and trafficking in persons, or other broad-based national projects, effects can include institutional strengthening, the development of sustainable organizations, and partnering networks.

The following suggested aspects to address were identified during the process of formulating the current terms of reference. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluation team in accordance with the given purpose and in consultation with ILO/IPEC Geneva's Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section. It is not expected that the evaluation address all of the questions detailed below; however the evaluation must address the general areas of focus. The focus will be on the contribution of the ILO/IPEC Project for the prevention and elimination of CSEC in the region. The evaluation instrument, which is to be prepared by the evaluation team, and will be shared with and reviewed by DED before field work begins, should indicate if there

are other specific aspects to be addressed. Below are the main categories that need to be addressed:

a. Design and planning

b. Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness)

c. Relevance of the project

d. Sustainability

The suggested aspects to be addressed within these categories are in ANNEX I. Therefore, the evaluation will have to include a valuation of the global impact of the project at regional, national and community level, including a revision of the main results of the same in relation to its objectives.

IV. Expected Outputs of the Evaluation

The expected outputs to be delivered by the evaluation team are:

By International Team Leader

- Desk review
- Evaluation instrument
- Evaluation field visits including interviews and consultations with key stakeholders of the project.
- Preparation and facilitation of the project's stakeholder evaluation workshop, including workshop programme and background note.
- Debriefing with project staff and key national partners
- Draft report
- Second and final version of report, including any response to consolidated comments
- Notes on the experience of the evaluation and suggestions for the further development of the standard evaluation framework

By National Evaluation Consultant

- Desk review
- Background report of relevant information after discussion with evaluation team leader
- Evaluation field visits including interviews and consultations with key stakeholders of the project. Participation in briefing meeting with local partners
- Support to international team leader during evaluation phase
- Co-facilitation of national stakeholder evaluation workshop
- Input and support to the preparation of the final evaluation report

The final evaluation report should include:

- Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
- Clearly identified findings
- Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations
- Lessons learned

- Potential good practices and effective models of intervention.
- Appropriate Annexes including present TORs
- Standard evaluation instrument matrix

It is recommended to structure the final report along the lines of the elements in the core questions that will be provided and at minimum with the following headings:

- Linkages of the projects of CSEC across the region.
- Process of development and design of
  - Phase II of the project
  - Action Programmes
- Implementation Process
- Performance and Achievement
  - Support to CSEC activities in other projects. Creation of synergies
  - Enabling environment
  - Targeted Interventions
  - Networking and Linkage
  - Evidence of sustainability and mobilisation of resources

The total length of the report should be a maximum of 40 pages for the main report, excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated. The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.

All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided both in paper copy and in electronic version compatible for Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO-IPEC and the consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of ILO-IPEC. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

The final report will be circulated to key stakeholders (project management, ILO/IPEC, ILO Regional, all participants present at the stakeholder evaluation workshop, donor and others as identified by DED) for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED) of ILO/IPEC Geneva and provided to the team leader. In preparing the final report the team leader should consider these comments, incorporate as appropriate and provide a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated.

The National consultant carrying out the research concerning CSEC in the region is expected to provide a report with the synergies and linkages of all the CSEC projects of IPEC in the region. IPEC Headquarters and DED will provide the consultant with all relative information of projects that are no longer active.

V. Evaluation Methodology

The following is the proposed methodology for the final evaluation. While the evaluation team can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by DED provided that the research and analysis suggests changes and provided that the indicated range of questions is addressed, the purpose maintained and the expected outputs produced at the required quality.

Desk Review

The evaluation will be carried out using a desk review of appropriate materials, including the project documents, progress reports, outputs of the programme and the projects (action programmes), results of any internal planning process and relevant materials from secondary sources like for example national plans or documents regarding the project in the different countries. At the end of the desk review period, it is expected that the evaluation consultant will prepare a document indicating the methodological approach to the evaluation in the form of the inception report and evaluation instrument, to be discussed and approved by DED.

Field visits by evaluation team

The evaluation team leader, assisted by the national evaluation consultant, will conduct evaluation missions in-country that will consist of the following:

- Working sessions with ILO/IPEC staff, national consultant
- Interviews with key national stakeholders and informants
- Field visit to selected project sites in the different countries (see Schedule), visits to the NGOs that have executed the actions programmes and the national counterparts related to this process and interviews with beneficiaries and their families as appropriate.
- A stakeholder evaluation workshop

The international consultant and national consultant will work together as a team, particularly during the field mission, including a division of work when talking to key national stakeholders. The evaluation team will prepare the final report.

The evaluation team will interview the donor representatives, ILO/IPEC HQ, and ILO/IPEC regional staff either in person or by conference calls early in the evaluation process, preferably during the desk review phase.

The evaluation team will be asked to include as part of the specific evaluation instrument to be developed, the **standard evaluation instruments** that ILO/IPEC has developed for documenting and analyzing achievements of the projects and contributions of the Action Programmes to the project.

The methodology for the evaluation should consider the multiple levels involved in this process: the framework and structure of the national efforts to eliminate the CSEC in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic and IPEC's support to this process through this project. Data gathering and analysis tools should consider this methodological and practical distinction. Through interviews, focal groups and other information gathering tools the evaluators should collect the opinion of a vast group of beneficiaries including the girls, boys and mothers and fathers of the beneficiaries, teachers, government representatives, legal authorities, child labour monitors, professionals linked to the priority sectors, trade union representatives and employers organizations, implementing agencies, members of national coalitions against CSEC/child labour/trafficking and other stakeholders including the donor.

The evaluation methodology includes a two day stakeholder workshop in Costa Rica to be attended by all stakeholders. The objective is to present the lessons learned and identified good practices, the preliminary conclusions of the evaluation and its recommendations; to obtain feedback and comments, as well as additional information.

The workshop will be attended by IPEC staff and key partners, including the donor as appropriate, in order to gather further data as appropriate, present the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations and obtain feedback. This meeting will take place towards the end of the fieldwork. The results of the meeting should be taken into consideration for the preparation of the draft report. The consultant will be responsible for organizing the methodology of the workshop. The identification of the number of participants of the workshop and logistics will be under the responsibility of the project team. Key project partners should be invited to the stakeholder workshop. The project will propose together with the evaluation team leader a list of participants.

Composition of the evaluation team

The evaluation will be carried out by an international evaluation team leader and a national evaluation consultant that previously have not been involved in the project. The evaluation team leader is responsible for drafting and finalizing the evaluation report. The national evaluation consultant will support the team leader in preparing the field visit, during the field visit and in drafting the report. The evaluation team leader will have the final responsibility during the evaluation process and the outcomes of the evaluation, including the quality of the report and compliance with deadlines.

The background of the **evaluation team leader and the national evaluation consultant** should include:

International Team Leader (evaluator 1)	
Responsibility	Profile
• In-country to brief local partner agency and policy impact study and support in the design of a possible future project document. • Provide comments and feedback on the research studies (direct impact and policy) including feedback on the designed instrument and questionnaires for the interviews) • Briefing with IPEC DED • Telephone Interviews with donor and IPEC HQ • Desk review • Prepare evaluation instrument • Conduct field visits in selected project sites in the different countries of the project. • Facilitate the stakeholder workshop with the support of the national consultant • Draft the evaluation report • Finalize the evaluation report taking into consideration comments from key stakeholders.	• Relevant background in social and/or economic development. • Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institution building and local development projects. • Experience in evaluations in the UN system or other international context as team leader • Relevant regional experience preferably prior working experience in the region. • Experience in the area of commercial sexual exploitation and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework are highly appreciated. • Experience at policy level and in the area of education and legal issues would also be appreciated. • Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience including preferably international and national development frameworks in particular PRSP and UNDAF. • Familiarity with and knowledge of the specific thematic area of the project. • Fluency in English and Spanish. • Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings.
Evaluation team member (evaluator 2)	
Responsibility	Profile
• Prepare desk review in coordination with the team leader • Conduct site visits • Support the team leader in facilitating the stakeholder workshop • Provide inputs to the team leader in drafting the evaluation report • Provide inputs and clarification for the team leader in finalizing the evaluation report.	▪ Extensive knowledge of development in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic, preferably on child labour issues ▪ Experience in evaluations conducted at the multi-bilateral level in development ▪ Experience in facilitating stakeholder workshops and preparation of background reports

The team leader will undertake a **desk review** of the project files and documents, undertake **field visits** to the project locations, **and facilitate the workshop.**

The evaluation team leader will be responsible for **drafting** the evaluation report with support from the national evaluation consultant. Upon feedback from stakeholders to the draft report, the team leader will further be responsible for **finalizing** the report **incorporating** any comments deemed appropriate.
The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the IPEC-DED section and with the logistical support of the project office in Costa Rica with the administrative support of the ILO sub-regional office in Costa Rica. DED will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting it to the team leader.
It is expected that the evaluation team will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct and follow the UN evaluation standards and norms.

The tentative timetable is as follows:

Phase	Date	Activity
Desk review	2 to 6 March	Desk review, telephone conference with ILO/IPEC DED, ILO/IPEC HQ and the donor
Field visits	9 to 23 March	Field visits to selected project sites within the eight project countries (see calendar underneath)
Workshop & debriefing	24 and 25 March	Stakeholder Workshop divided into 2 sections: First Part: Presentation of the principal lessons learned and identified good practices /IPEC team. Second Part: Presentation of the preliminary results of the final evaluation and stakeholder discussions/EVALUATION TEAM.
Draft report	27 March to 3 April	Preparation of the draft report by the evaluation team
Stakeholder comments	2 weeks in April	Draft report circulated by DED to key stakeholders for their comments. DED consolidates the comments and forwards to evaluator.
Final Report	End of April	Evaluation team finalizes the evaluation report taking into consideration the consolidated comments

The proposed field visits are as given below.

Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings

Available at HQ and to be supplied by DED	• **Project document** • **DED Guidelines and ILO guidelines**
Available in project office and to be supplied by project management	• **Progress reports/Status reports** • **Technical and financial reports of partner agencies** • **Direct beneficiary record system** • **Good practices and Lessons learnt report (from TPR)** • **Other studies and research undertaken** • **Action Programme Summary Outlines Project files** • **National workshop proceedings or summaries** • **Any other documents**

It is proposed to have consultations with:

- Project management and staff
- ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials
- Partner agencies
- Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups
- Boys and Girls
- Community members
- Parents of boys and girls
- Teachers, government representatives, legal authorities etc as identified by evaluation team
- National Steering Committee
- Telephone discussion with USDOL
- USAID and US Embassy staff in the different countries of the project.
- Interviews with national partners: Minister of Labour, President of employers' organization, President of trade union/workers' organization, President of civil society network,
- ILO National Project Coordinator if there existed in the different countries,
- Representatives from UCW, UNICEF, and other relevant NGOs and International Organizations working to combat child labour

Final Report Submission Procedure

For independent evaluations, the following procedure is used:

- The evaluator will submit a draft report to **IPEC DED in Geneva**
- IPEC DED will forward a copy to **key stakeholders** for comments on factual issues and for clarifications
- IPEC DED will consolidate the comments and send these to the **evaluator** by date agreed between DED and the evaluator or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders.
- The final report is submitted to IPEC DED who will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including the donor.

VI. Resources and Management

Resources

The resources required for this evaluation are:
For the evaluation team leader (evaluator 1):

- Fees for consultant for 31 working days
- Local DSA in project locations for maximum 21 nights in various locations in Honduras, Guatemala, Panama, Costa Rica as per ILO regulations and rules
- Fees for local travel in-country

For the evaluation consultant (evaluation team member – evaluator 2):

- Fees for evaluation consultant for 29 days
- Local DSA in project locations for a maximum 21 nights in various location in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Belize in line with ILO regulations and rules
- Fees for local travel in-country

Other costs:

- Fees for local travel in-country
- Stakeholder workshop expenditures in Costa Rica
- Translation of the final evaluation report
- Any other miscellaneous costs.

A detailed budget is available separately.

Management

The evaluation team will report to IPEC DED in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with DED should issues arise. IPEC project officials in Costa Rica and the ILO Office in Costa Rica will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission.

Suggested Aspects to be Addressed

Design and Planning (Validity of design)

- How relevant was the project design to the current child labour and political situations in the respective countries? How well did the project design take into account local efforts already underway to address CSEC and child trafficking and promote educational opportunities for target children and existing capacity to address these issues?
- Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent and took into account the institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders. Were lessons learned from past IPEC interventions incorporated into the project design?
- Assess the internal logic (link between objectives achieved through implementation of activities) of the project and the external logic of the project (degree to which the project fits into existing mainstreaming activities that would impact on child labour).
- Analyze whether available information on the socio-economic, cultural and political situation, (this includes local efforts already underway to address CL and promote education opportunities for targeted children and existing capacity) in the executing countries of the project was taken into consideration at the time of the design and reflected in the design of the

project. Did the project's original design fill an existing gap in services that other ongoing interventions were not addressing?

- To what extent were external factors and assumptions identified at the time of design? Have there been any changes to these external factors and the related assumptions and, if, so, how did this impact project implementation and the achievement of objectives?
- Assess whether the problems and needs were adequately analyzed and determine whether the needs, constraints, resources and access to project services of the different beneficiaries were clearly identified taking gender issues into concern.
- Was the time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities logical and realistic? If not, what changes were made to improve them?
- Was the strategy for sustainability of achievements defined clearly at the design stage of the project?
- What lessons were learned, if any, in the process of conducting baseline survey for the identification of target children?
- Were the objectives of the project clear, realistic and achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)? Were the provisional targets realistic?
- Did the action programmes designed under the project provide clear linkages and complement each other regarding the project strategies and project components of intervention? Specifically regarding:
    - Project strategies:
        - Policy, awareness raising, law enforcement,
        - Piloting model interventions on direct support to children and families
    - Programme Component of Intervention:
        - Legal framework for addressing child labour
        - Knowledge base on child labour
        - Strengthening institutional and technical capacity for addressing the child labour problem and coordination, M&E
        - Awareness raising, advocacy and social mobilization
        - Improvement of Education and skills training
        - Reducing vulnerability to labour exploitation

Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness)

- Has the project achieved its immediate objectives? Has the entire target population been reached? Please distinguish between beneficiaries as reported to receive educational services and beneficiaries that have received non-educational services.
- Assess the process of NPA formulation and the role of the project in supporting its formulation and eventual implementation including mobilizing resources, policies, programmes, partners and activities to be part of the NPA/CSEC.
- How effective was the project in terms of leveraging resources? What process was undertaken by the project to identify and coordinate implementation with other child labour-focused initiatives and organizations including the USDOL-funded World Education's Options Project, the Winrock's CHES project, ILO-WEDGE project, the World Bank, WFP, UNESCO and UNICEF, ILO WEP, etc?
- Were the selected agencies the most relevant and appropriate for carrying out the activities?
- Was the project successful in terms of raising awareness on the child labour problem and on promoting social mobilization to address this issue?
- Assess the effectiveness of the education and non-education services being provided to beneficiaries.

- What was the quality and how effective were the APs, and how did they contribute to the project meeting its immediate objectives? Examine the capacity constraints of implementing agencies and the effect on the implementation of the designed APs. Consider the particular role of Government as Implementing Agency.
- How has the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners (including government and social partners) to develop effective action against child labour been enhanced as a result of project activities? Has the capacity of community level agencies and organizations in the countries of the project been strengthened to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate actions to prevent and eliminate child labour?
- Were the expected outputs being delivered in a timely manner, with the appropriate quantity and quality?
- Assess the efficiency of the project i.e. compare the allocated resources with results obtained. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?
- Assess the participation of different relevant actors in the National Steering Committee (e.g. How are these structures participating in project implementation? Examine the relationship between the NSC and the implementing agencies, what is their collaboration. How did this contribute to progress toward project's objectives? How did these bodies contribute to building local capacity and promoting local ownership of the national programme?)
- Examine any networks that have been built between organizations and government agencies working to address child labour on the national, provincial and local levels. Assess the project's partner linking and networking strategy.
- Assess the level of government involvement in the project and how their involvement with the project has built their capacity to continue further work on future programmes
- Which are the mechanisms in place for project monitoring? Please assess the use of work plans and project monitoring plans (PMPs), DBMR processes or systems.
- How were recommendations from the evaluations of phase I acted upon by the project and to what effect?
- How did factors outside of the control of the project affect project implementation and project objectives and how did the project deal with these external factors?
- Assess the progress of the project's gender mainstreaming activities.
- How were the strategies for monitoring of child beneficiaries implemented and coordinated? Assess how the project monitored both the work and education status of all direct beneficiaries, discussing whether or not the system was appropriate and efficient in monitoring each child to ensure that he/she was no longer working and/or that work conditions were no longer hazardous, and were attending education programmes regularly. Assess how project staff and implementing partners understand and use the DBMR forms and database.
- How effective was the project in raising awareness about child labour and in promoting social mobilization to address this issue?
- Identify unexpected and multiplier effects of the project.
- How successful was the project been in mainstreaming the issue of child labour into ongoing efforts in areas such as education, employment promotion, poverty reduction and data collection?
- Assess the process for documenting, disseminating and replicating/up-scaling pilot projects. To what extent are good practices, as documented by the project, replicated and mainstreamed?
- Assess to what extent the planning, monitoring and evaluation tools have been promoted by the project and by other partners.
- How much continuity existed between the Phase I and addendum projects?

- Did local management structures meet on a regular basis? How did they contribute to the programme's goal and immediate objectives?
- Assess the participation of different actors, such as the relevant ministries, trade unions, employers' organizations, private sector, etc.
- What criteria were used to select Action Programme regions and sectors and the implementing agencies that carry out the direct action?
- What is the status of the development of a National Child Labour Monitoring Systems (CLMS)?
- How effective was the project in withdrawing children from CSEC? What challenges did the project face in ensuring that beneficiaries did not return to CSEC?
- How effective has the project been in building the capacity of government ministries and agency personnel to combat CSEC and child trafficking?
- The final evaluation of the first phase of the project noted that social tolerance for CSEC is still widespread. How effective has the project been in raising awareness about CSEC and child trafficking and reducing social acceptance of the phenomenon? How effective has the project been in promoting social mobilization to address this issue?
- How effective was the project in engaging private sector actors, employers, and trade unions to join efforts to combat CSEC and child trafficking? What are some concrete examples of these actors' commitment?
- How well did the project promote regional cooperation? What are specific examples of this cooperation across NGOs, the justice system, policymakers, private sector, unions, and employers?
- How effective was the project in creating synergies across its diverse efforts, such as awareness raising, research, policy advocacy, and direct action (for example, using research to inform efforts in awareness raising and direct action)?
- What lessons have been learned from the Action Programmes? What possibilities are there for effective replication of efforts?

Relevance of the Project

- Assess the validity of the project approach and strategies and their potential to replicate.
- Assess whether the problems and needs that gave rise to the project still exists or have changed.
- Were the Action Programmes well-rooted within the communities in which they operated?
- How does the strategy used in this project fit in with the NPAs under development and national education and anti-poverty efforts, and interventions carried out by other organizations in the region?
- Did the strategy address the different needs and roles, constraints, access to resources of the target groups, with specific reference to the strategy of mainstreaming and thus the relevant partners, especially in government?
- Did the service package promoted by the project respond to the real needs of the beneficiaries? Do children/families/communities get the support they need to protect children from WFCL?

Sustainability

- Assess to what extent a phase out strategy was defined and planned and what steps were taken to ensure sustainability. Assess whether these strategies had been articulated/explained to stakeholders as well as the actual efforts to phase out activities or to transfer responsibilities to

local partners as a means of promoting sustainability, particularly in areas where Phase II will not continue operations.

- Assess what contributions the project has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the project to partners.
- Assess the long-term potential for sustained action and involvement by local/national institutions (including governments) and the target groups.
- Examine whether socio-cultural and gender aspects endanger the sustainability of the programme and assess whether actions have been taken to sensitize local institutions and target groups on these issues.
- Assess project success in leveraging resources for ongoing and continuing efforts to prevent and eliminate child labour in the context of the NAP. Based on the project's experience: which are some of the factors that might impact on the likelihood of the NAP being taken further?
- How effective was the project in promoting local ownership of the programme and promoting long-term sustainability. Did the project develop a phase-out strategy?
- What are likely to be the gaps in the sustainability of the projects efforts in combating CSEC and child trafficking following project close (in the areas of national level policy, national plans and care protocol implementation, judicial branch capacity, and direct action programmes)?
- Please comment on countries' harmonization of legislation with ILO Convention 182. What were the project's primary successes and areas of weakness?
- How successful was the effort to implement monitoring systems within public institutions? Are they likely to be sustainable?
- The project has noted that the DevInfo LAC system will continue to be implemented after the project ends. Is this effort likely to be sustainable?
- What are the long-term commitments and the technical and financial capacity of local/national institutions (including governments) and the target groups to continue delivering goods and services begun by the project once it ends?
- Provide concrete examples of the steps the project has taken to promote local and national institutions' capacity and will to address CSEC and child trafficking. What is the evidence that local and national institutions have increased their capacity and therefore the project's sustainability? Have the resources been committed by these institutions enough to ensure that the services begun by the project can continue after it ends?
- One area of weakness identified at the end of the first phase was the sustainability of the care model in public institutions. To what extent have public institutions adopted and implemented care protocols? How well did public institutions coordinate with local NGOs in providing services to child victims of CSEC and trafficking?

Proposed field visit schedule

Lunes 2 marzo	**Martes 3 marzo**	**Miércoles 4 marzo**	**Jueves 5 marzo**	**Viernes 6 marzo**	**Sábado 7 marzo**	**Domingo 8 marzo**
Desk review	Desk review	Desk review	Desk review	Desk review		Field Visit starting in Costa Rica
Lunes 9 marzo	**Martes 10 marzo**	**Miércoles 11 marzo**	**Jueves 12 marzo**	**Viernes 13 marzo**	**Sábado 14 marzo**	**Domingo 15 marzo**
AM	**AM**	**AM**	**AM**	**AM**	**AM**	**AM**
Evaluator 1	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 1:

Evaluator 2: Meeting of evaluators	Evaluator 2: Interviews with regional stakeholders / San José	Interviews with stakeholders/ Costa Rica Evaluator 2: Interviews with stakeholders / Costa Rica	Travels to Costa Rica – Honduras Interviews with stakeholders / Tegucigalpa Evaluator 2: Viaja Costa Rica – Nicaragua Interviews with stakeholders / Managua	Interviews with stakeholders / Tegucigalpa Evaluator 2: Interviews with stakeholders / Managua	Travels to Honduras – Guatemala Evaluator 2: Viaja Nicaragua – El Salvador (am) Consolidación de resultados	Guatemala Evaluator 2: El Salvador
PM	**PM**	**PM**	**PM**	**PM**	**PM**	**PM**
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 2: Meeting with Management team IPEC / San José and ILO	Evaluator 1 Evaluator 2: CONT… Interviews with regional stakeholders / San José	Evaluator 1 CONT. Interviews with stakeholders / Costa Rica Evaluator 2: CONT. Interviews with stakeholders / Costa Rica	Evaluator 1 CONT. Interviews with stakeholders / Tegucigalpa Evaluator 2: CONT. Interviews with stakeholders / Managua	Evaluator 1 CONT. Interviews with stakeholders / Managua Evaluator 2: CONT. Interviews with stakeholders / Tegucigalpa	Evaluator 1: Guatemala Evaluator 2: El Salvador Consolidation of results	Evaluator 1: Guatemala Evaluator 2: El Salvador
Lunes 16 marzo	**Martes 17 marzo**	**Miércoles 18 marzo**	**Jueves 19 marzo**	**Viernes 20 marzo**	**Sábado 21 marzo**	**Domingo 22 marzo**
AM	**AM**	**AM**	**AM**	**AM**	**AM / PM**	**AM / PM**
Evaluator 1 Interviews with stakeholders / Guatemala Evaluator 2: Interviews with stakeholders / San Salvador	Evaluator 1 Interviews with stakeholders / Guatemala Evaluator 2: Interviews with stakeholders / San Salvador	Evaluator 1 Travels to Guatemala – Panamá (am) Interviews with stakeholders / Panamá Evaluator 2: Interviews with stakeholders / Belice	Evaluator 1 Entrevistas con contrapartes Panamá Evaluator 2: Interviews with stakeholders / Belice	Evaluator 1 Interviews with stakeholders / San José y entrevistas telefónicas pendientes Evaluador 2: Entrevistas telefónicas pendientes + República Dominicana	Evaluator 1: Evaluator 2: Costa Rica / Results Consolidaton	Evaluator 1 Evaluator 2: Costa Rica /
PM	**PM**	**PM**	**PM**	**PM**		
Evaluator 1 CONT. Interviews with stakeholders / Guatemala Evaluator 2: CONT. Evaluador 2: Interviews with stakeholders / San Salvador	Evaluator 1 CONT. Interviews with stakeholders / Guatemala Evaluator 2: Travels to El Salvador – Belice (pm)	Evaluator 1 Interviews with stakeholders / Panamá Evaluator 2: CONT. Interviews with stakeholders / Belice	Evaluator 1 Travels to Panamá – Costa Rica Evaluator 2: Travels to Belice – Costa Rica	Evaluator 1 Evaluator 2: Team Meeting IPEC San José		

Lunes 23 marzo	Martes 24 marzo	Miércoles 25 marzo	Jueves 26 marzo			
AM	**AM**	**AM**	**AM**			
Evaluator 1 Evaluator 2: Results Consolidation	Evaluation Workshop and Sharing of Preliminary Findings of the Evaluation Results with the counterparts and the IPEC/San Jose team First Part: Findings on lessons learnt and good practices / IPEC team	Evaluation Workshop	**End of the Workshop**			
PM						
Evaluador 1 Evaluador 2: Results Consolidation ---- Arrival of stakeholder participants of the Evaluation Workshop						

Annex II – List of persons interviewed

Geneva

1. Lars Johansen, focal point of the project
2. Hans van de Glind, Senior Technical Specialist, human trafficking of children and adolescents, children in slavery and illicit activities and migrant children.
3. María José Chamorro, previous focal point of the project

Costa Rica:

1. Victoria Cruz, Main Technical Advisor
2. Bente Sorensen, Main Technical Advisor first phase.
3. Adriana Hidalgo Flores, Programme Officer, ILO/IPEC
4. Nidia Zuñiga- Programme Officer, ILO/IPEC
5. Virginia Elizondo, Communications Programme Officer, ILO/IPEC
6. Jhonathan Monge Loría, Secretary of Education, CMTCN
7. Tyronne Esna, Secretary of Education, CTRN
8. Luis Fernando Centeno, Lawyer/Consultant
9. Ronald Woodbridge, Advisor for International Cooperation, ILANUD
10. Ana Lucia Calderón Saravia, Consultant
11. Thais Aguilar, Consultant
12. Montserrat Sagot, Consultant
13. José Manuel Salas, WEM Institute / Consultant
14. Eugenia Salazar, Adjunct Prosecutor for sex crimes and domestic violence, Judicial Branch
15. Jorge Arias, Consultant
16. Xinia Sossa, Sub-director General; General Office of Migration and Alien Status
17. Mario Víquez, Ejective President, PANI
18. Mauricio Medrano, Technical Manager, PANI
19. Elizabeth Ballesteros, Technical Secretary, CONCACOES
20. Ana Hidalgo, Project Officer, IOM
21. Norma Pereira, Project Coordinator CSEC, CEFEMINA
22. David, Participant in CEFEMINA Project
23. María, Participant in CEFEMINA Project
24. Sheila Rosales, Representative of the Ministry of Culture in CONACOES

Honduras

1. Rosa Corea, National Coordinator, ILO/IPEC
2. Amanda Mejía, Legal Council, COHEP
3. Carlos Rubén Ortiz Ruiz, President APH
4. Félix Antonio Molina, Journalist
5. Suyapa Prudot, Ejective Director IHNFA

6. Ángel Zelaya, Commissioner for the Prevention and Elimination of Child Labour and CSEC, CUTH
7. Nora Urbina, Special Children's Defender, Public Ministry
8. Mirna Suazo, Commissioner General, Strategic Director of Planning and Coordination of the National Police.
9. Marisol Rodríguez, Coordinator of Children's Special Defence, Public Ministry
10. José Manuel Capellín, National Director of Casa Alianza (Covenant House) Honduras
11. Ubaldo Herrera, Casa Alianza
12. Gloria Juárez, Educator, Casa Alianza
13. Patricia López, Educator, Casa Alianza
14. Jocelyn, Participant in de Casa Alianza Project
15. Gladis Rodríguez, Technical Assistance Manager, IHNFA
16. Araceli Estrada, Chief of Sub-programme: Restitution and Protection of Rights, IHNFA

Guatemala

1. Karina Javier, Consultant ILO/IPEC
2. Maria Eugenia Villareal, Director of Guatemala, ECPAT office
3. Lisseth Castro, field facilitator, ECPAT
4. Saraí, Ex-participant in a care providing programme
5. Alba Trejo, Advisor on the Topic of Femicide, Private Secretary to the Presidency of the Republic
6. Sandra Monzón, Field Facilitator, Guatemalan Paediatric Foundation
7. Aura Marina Cuevas, Coordinator Local Network on Derivation of providing care to victims, Public Ministry Villa Nueva
8. Elisa Iriarte, Field Delegate, Guatemalan Paediatric Foundation
9. Mirna Flores González, Technician, Network on Responsible Paternity and Maternity
10. Myrna Ponce, Advisor to the Fifth Secretariat of the Congress of the Republic
11. Ángeles Reyes, Guatemalan League of Mental Health
12. Heidi Rojas, Guatemalan League of Mental Health
13. Roxana Morales, Resident Magistrate of the Chamber for Children and Adolescents
14. Juan Carlos Reyes, San Juan de Dios Hospital
15. Guillermo Salazar, Consultant on the subject of masculinity
16. Astrid Yurritia, Coordinator, Sacatepequez Justice Centre.
17. Alexander Colob, Chief of the Unit on Human Trafficking of the DA's office for Organized Crime, Public Ministry

Belize

1. Starla Acosta, Consultant- ILO-IPEC
2. Kendra Griffiths, Journalist/Consultant in Communications and Journalism
3. Denbigh Yorke, Director National Organization for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (NOPCAN)
4. Inda Wright, Advocacy and Outreach Coordinator, Youth Enhancement Services
5. Chelsea, Beneficiary of Direct Action Programme

6. Kinesha, Beneficiary of Direct Action Programme
7. Jennifer, Mother of beneficiary
8. Liliani Arthurs, Human Development Coordinator, Department of Human Services
9. Deborah Lynch, Children's Services Officer, Supervisor II Department of Human Services
10. Hertha Gentle, Department of Labour
11. Diana Shaw, Director Child Development Foundation
12. Pearl Stuart, Director National Committee for Families and Children (NCFC)
13. Maggie Patchett, Development Advisor Youth Enhancement Services (YES)

Dominican Republic

1. Ellys Coronado- National Judicature School

Nicaragua

1. Sonia Sevilla, Consultora OIT/IPEC
2. Eloy Izaba, Secretario Coalición Nacional contra la trata de personas, Ministerio de Gobernación
3. Karla Landero, Programa AMOR, Ministerio de la familia, Adolescencia y Niñez, MIFAN
4. Arle Martíniez, Director General de Atención Especial, MIFAN
5. Santos Jímenez, Coordinador del Eje 6, Programa AMOR
6. Odett Leyton Fiscal, Ministerio Público
7. José Angel Bermudez, Secretario Ejecutivo, Frente Nacional de los Trabajadores,
8. Ana María Bermudez, Director Ejecutiva, MAIS, ONG
9. María Consuelo Sánchez, Directora Ejecutiva, Asociación Quincho Barrilete
10. Sagrario Valenzuela, Representatne INPHRU
11. Fátima Payán, Representante INPHRU
12. Rosa María Sánchez, Asistencia Técnica Convenio Violencia y Trata Centroamérica, Save the Children
13. Ana Lucía Silva, Oficial Protección de Derechos, UNICEF

El Salvador

1. Ada Cecilia Lazo, Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social, Secretaría Comité Nacional de Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil
2. Mario Enrique Hernández Escobar, Moderador de la mesa de trabajo infantil contra la ESCNNA, Ministerio del Trabajo y Previsión Social. Unidad de erradicación del trabajo infantil
3. José Noé Ayala, jefe del Departamento de trata de personas, Ministerio de trabajo y previsión social, Unidad de erradicación del trabajo infantil
4. Doris Elizabeth Rivas Polanca, Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, Directora de Política Migratoria, Secretaría del Comité Nacional contra la Trata de Personas
5. Vilma Guadalupe Portillo, Consultora OIT/IPEC
6. Silvia Saravia, Jefa de equipo multidisciplinario de la Fiscalía General de la República

Panamá

1. Iris Mezquita, Coordinadora de Programa, Casa Esperanza
2. Ariel Guevara, Director de Programa, Casa Esperanza
3. Carmen Taitt, Representante del CTRP, CONATO
4. Javier Ho, Miembro Delegado, CONATO
5. Briseida Barrantes, Coordinadora Nacional, OIT/IPEC
6. Carmen Gerald, Coordinadora de Programas, OIT/IPEC
7. Jorge Giannareas, Oficial de Programas de Políticas Públicas, UNICEF Panamá
8. Begoña Arellano, Oficial de Protección, UNICEF-TACRO
9. Zulima Fernández, Consultora, OIT/IPEC
10. Liz Vásquez, Fiscal, CONAPREDES, Ministerio Publico
11. Marcelino Aguilar Fiscal, CONAPREDES, Misterio Público
12. Greta Marchosky, Secretaria Técnica de CONAPREDES, CONAPREDES Ministerio Público
13. Ana Matilde Gómez Ruiloba, Procuradora, Ministerio Público
14. Rosario Correa, Secretaria, Secretaria de Atención a la Niñez-Ministerio de Desarrollo Social-MIDES.
15. Astrid Salazar, Consultora OIT/IPEC
16. Yadira Carrrera, Ministerio de Salud

Estados Unidos

Katie Cook,USDOL/ILAB

Annex III - Documents Consulted

Commission on Women, Children, Youth and Family, Central American Parliament, "I Regional Work Plan of the Commission for support of the Prevention and Elimination of Human Trafficking and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Adolescents (2008-2010), July 2008.

Inter-institutional Commission against commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents in Honduras, CA, "National Action Plan against commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents in Honduras 2006-2011. June 2006.

Union Confederation of Labourers of the Americas, ILO/IPEC, Module on Union Formation, commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents. Educational action from the perspective of labour organizations, Sao Paulo, 2008.

CONACOES, "National Plan for the Elimination of Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Adolescents (2008-2010)", November 2007.

ECPAT, Overall Scheme, "Protection and Care for Underage Children, victims of Sexual Exploitation in Guatemala".

ILANUD, ILO/IPEC, "Proposal of Guidelines for making international coordination, of investigation of the crimes of CSEC and human trafficking operable".

ILO/IPEC, "Thematic Bulletin 1, Programmes of direct care giving with a focus on human rights for underage children, victims of commercial sexual exploitation", May 2003.

ILO/IPEC, "Follow-up System for Commercial Sexual Exploitation, User's Manual," April 2004.

ILO/IPEC, "On the commitment for action: Lessons learned about direct care giving for underage children and their families," Cecilia Claramunt and Rogelio Prado, San Jose, Costa Rica, 2006.

ILO/IPEC, "Decent work in the Americas: a hemispheric agenda, 2006-2015 Report by the Director General", XVI Regional American Reunion, Brasilia, Geneva, May 2006.

ILO/IPEC, "Proposed Strategy for Generating Income in the Context of the Programmes for Providing Care to Children and Adolescent Victims and their Families," Felisa Cuevas, San Jose, Costa Rica, June 2008.

ILO/IPEC, "An example of Good Practices for the institutionalization and sustainability of the issue in national public policies: The integration of the National Plan against Commercial

Sexual Exploitation of Children and Adolescents 2008-2010 of Costa Rica into the National Development Plan," Milena Grillo, San Jose Costa Rica, 2008.

ILO/IPEC, "Proposed Strategy for Generating Income in the Context of the Programmes for Providing Care to Children and Adolescent Victims and their Families," San José, 2008.

ILO/IPEC, "Diagnosis on the application of the protocols for repatriation of children and adolescents, victims of human trafficking", Paula Antezana, San Jose, November 2008.

ILO/IPEC, "Diagnosis on the application of the protocols for repatriation of children and adolescents, victims of human trafficking", San Jose, November 2008.

ILO/IPEC, "Regional Report. Analysis of coverage of commercial sexual exploitation problem in the newspapers of Central America, Panama and Dominican Republic during the period: September 2007 to February 2008. Working Document, Katia Chacón and Alejandro Vargas, March 2009.

ILO/IPEC, "Sexual commerce with underage children in Central America, Panama and Dominican Republic, Second Study on Social Tolerance, Analysis of Results, Challenges and Recommendations," Ana Lucía Calderón and José Manuel Salas, San Jose, 2009.

ILO/IPEC, "Art and other creative tools for promoting a culture of Zero Tolerance toward commercial sexual exploitation, Virginia Elizondo, (draft)

ILO/IPEC, "Commercial Sexual Exploitation, Masculinity and Work with Men in Central America: Review of a Proposal for Prevention," José Manuel Salas and Álvaro Campos, (draft).

ILO/IPEC, NCFC, DHS, "Belize Protocol How to Care for Child and Adolescent Victims of Commercial Sexual Exploitation" Diana Shaw.

ILO/IPEC, Systematization of the experiences developed by the programmes of attention to underage children, victims of commercial sexual exploitation," Luis Felipe Barrantes, San Jose 2009 (rough draft).

ILO/IPEC, Technical Progress Report (TPR) CSEC Central America, March 2007.

ILO/IPEC, Technical Progress Report (TPR) CSEC Central America, September 2007.

ILO/IPEC, Technical Progress Report (TPR) CSEC Central America, March 2008.

ILO/IPEC, Technical Progress Report (TPR) CSEC Central America, September 2008.

Ordoñez Dwight and Ana Badilla, "Contribution to the prevention and elimination of commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents in Central America, Panama and Dominican Republic" (First Phase) Final Evaluation, March 2006.

Sagot Montserrat and Rosa Cheng Lo, “Mid-Project Evaluation: Contribution to the prevention and elimination of commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents in Central America, Panama and Dominican Republic”, Mid-term Evaluation, April 2004.

Annex IV - Agenda of the Workshop for Interested Parties and the List of Attendees

Final Evaluation Process of the Sub-regional Project:

"Contribution to the prevention and elimination of commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents in Central America, Panama and Dominican Republic"

San Jose, Costa Rica, 24 and 25 March 2009

Tuesday 24 March 2009

8:30 – 9:00 Welcome

Guillermo Dema, ILO Regional Specialist in Child Labor and Juvenile Employment

9:00 – 10:00 General overview of the Sub-regional CSEC Project: main contributions to the regional situation of commercial sexual exploitation

Victoria Cruz, ILO - IPEC Sub-regional CSEC Project Coordinator

10:00 – 10:15 Recess

10:15 – 11:15 Progress and challenges: horizontal cooperation and institutional strengthening

- Reforms and application of penal law penal for sanctioning CSEC, Nidia Zúñiga, Sub-regional ILO – IPEC Officer
- Panel: strengthening national commissions
  Elizabeth Ballestero, Technical Secretary CONACOES
  Rosa Corea, Coordinator IPEC Honduras

11:15 – 13:00 Progress and challenges: awareness building and social mobilization

- Presentation of results of the second study on social tolerance of CSEC in Central America and Dominican Republic
  Ana Lucía Calderón, José Manuel Salas and Thais Aguilar, consultants IPEC

- Panel: Prevention of CSEC from new sectors:
  - Work with men in the general population
  - José Manuel Salas, consultant IPEC
  - Art at the service of preventing CSEC
    Virginia Elizondo, Sub-regional IPEC Officer

  - The response from ILO constituents: employers and workers.
    Victoria Cruz, Sub-regional Project Coordinator

13:00 – 14:30 Lunch

14:30 – 16:30 Progress and challenges: Direct Care to underage children, victims of commercial sexual exploitation and their families

- Video "Know that you can"

- Good Practices and lessons learned from the programmes of direct care giving and strengthening of protection institutions
  Adriana Hidalgo, Sub-regional IPEC Officer
  Luis Felipe Barrantes, Consultant IPEC

16:30 – 17:00 Recess

17:00 – 18:00 "In the Net"

National Dance Company, Costa Rican Ministry of Culture

Wednesday 25 March 2009

8:00 – 8:30 Registration of participants

8:30 – 9:00 Inauguration

Jesús de la Peña, Sub-regional Coordinator of IPEC

9:00 – 9:30 Presentation of the evaluation methodology

Claudia Ibargüen y Mauricio Benito, Evaluation Team

9:30 - 10:00 Principal objectives attained by the project

10:00 – 10:15 Coffee break

10:15 - 12:30 Work in groups: Debate and systematization of the conclusions

(A series of questions was delivered to each group as subjects for debate. Each group had a coordinator and a rapporteur who systematized the discussion and prepared a 10 minute talk before the assembly, expressing the development of the group's work, giving the conclusions reached and the points of dissension).

GROUP A.- *Regional Cooperation, elaboration y diffusion of awareness of the issue of CSEC.*

GROUP B.- *Inter-institutional Coordination: Legislative Reforms, Plans y National Programmes*

GROUP C.- *Contribution of the Action Programmes to the building of a model for providing care to victims*

GROUP D.- *Social awareness building*

12:30 – 12:30 Lunch

13:30 – 14:10 Presentation of work groups in the Assembly

14:10 – 15:00 Debate in the Assembly

15:00 – 15:30 Conclusions of the workshop by the Evaluation Team

15:30 – 15:45 Closing

15:45 Coffee Break

List of participants

Workshop for Interested Parties

San Jose, 24 and 25 March 2009

	Name	País	Institution
1.	Karina Javier	Guatemala	Consultant IPEC
2.	Silvia Roxana Morales	Guatemala	Magistrate Appeals Court Chamber of Children and Adolescents, Supreme Court of Guatemala.
3.	Ma. Eugenia Villareal	Guatemala	Director ECPAT
4.	Rosa Corea	Honduras	National Coordinator IPEC
5.	Nora Urbina	Honduras	National Commission against CSEC
6.	José Manuel Capellín	Honduras	Casa Alianza
7.	Sonia Sevilla	Nicaragua	National IPEC Officer
8.	Santos Jiménez	Nicaragua	MIFAM / Amor Programme
9.	Ma. Consuelo Sánchez	Nicaragua	Quincho Barrilete Association (AQB)
10	Fátima Payán Molina	Nicaragua	INPRHU Estelí
11	Rafaela Burgos	Dominican Republic	National Commission against CSEC
12	Carmen Gerald	Panama	National IPEC Officer
13	Eiselys Vásquez	Panama	CONAPREDES
14	Gaspar Maldonado	Panama	MIDES
15	Carmen Taitt	Panama	CONATO
16	Guadalupe Portillo	El Salvador	Consultant IPEC
17	Ada Lazo	El Salvador	Labour Ministry
18	Starla Acosta	Belize	Consultant IPEC
19	Pearl Stuart	Belize	NCFC
20	Inda Wright Codrington	Belize	YES
21	Nidia Zúñiga	Costa Rica	National Officer

22	Elizabeth Ballestero	Costa Rica	CONACOES
23	Sheila Rosales	Costa Rica	Ministry of Culture
24	Mauricio Medrano	Costa Rica	PANI
25	Xinia Sossa	Costa Rica	Migration
26	Jhonatan Monge	Costa Rica	CMTC
27	Tyronne Esna	Costa Rica	CTRN
28	Norma Pereira	Costa Rica	CEFEMINA
29	José Manuel Salas	--	Regional Consultant
30	Paula Antezana	--	Regional Consultant
31	Rigoberto Astorga	--	UNICEF
32	Ronald Woodbridge	--	ILANUD
33	Guillermo Dema	--	Regional Specialist in Child Labor and Juvenile Employment, ILO
34	Bente Sorensen	--	ATP Project Verification, ILO
35	Hans van de Glind	--	TPN Specialist IPEC HQ
36	Lars Johansen	--	Officer of the Americas IPEC HQ
37	Jesús de la Peña	--	Coordinator Sub-regional IPEC
38	Victoria Cruz	--	ATP Sub-regional CSEC Project
39	Adriana Hidalgo	--	Sub-regional Officer
40	Virginia Elizondo	--	Sub-regional Officer
41	María del Mar González	--	National Officer
42	Claudia Ibargüen	--	Evaluator
43	Mauricio Benito	--	Evaluator

Annex V - Evaluation Instrument [31]

Final Independent Evaluation

Contribution to the Prevention and Elimination Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Adolescents in America, Panama and Dominican Republic

The final independent evaluation final of the project, Contribution to the Prevention and Elimination Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children and Adolescents in America, Panama and Dominican Republic will analyze the design, strategies and the models for direct action and will document the achievements of the project and the lessons learned. This is for the purpose of providing feedback for the interested parties and to suggest recommendations for future efforts to eradicate CSEC.

1.- Climate of the evaluation

This evaluation will cover all of the interventions carried out by the project in the region, at the regional, national and local level. This includes a general analysis of the project, as well as the action programmes, mini-programmes, external consultations, workshops, studies and other activities that have been carried out by the project.

2.- Purpose of the evaluation

The evaluation seeks to respond to the following issues, in general terms:

- Evaluate the project's validity and the design of strategies, including its pertinence in the context of the country.
- Review all of the activities and results of the project to evaluate the pertinence, efficacy, degree of compliance, impact and sustainability of the efforts of IPEC, in the countries of Central America, Panama and Dominican Republic to eliminate commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents.
- Document the achievements, intervention models and lessons learned.
- Provide recommendations that will bolster the strategies and future activities of IPEC on these issues as well as to suggest possible directions for future work that might be incorporated into the strategies of the national commissions in the battle against commercial sexual exploitation (CSEC).
- Document the processes carried out by the project to identify and cooperate with other initiatives and organizations that work to eliminate the worst forms of child labour.

[31] This instrument is based on the guidelines of "ILO Evaluation Guide Planning and Managing Project Evaluations" Draft, April 2006. ILO; "Process of Managing Evaluations in IPEC" DED Note 5 version 2.0 (October 2002); "ILO/IPEC Principles and Processes for Project Evaluations" DED Note 8, Version October 2003; "ILO Guidelines for the Preparation of Independent Evaluations of ILO Programmes and Projects" ILO, November 1997; "Guidelines for the Integration of Gender Issues into the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of ILO Programmes and Projects. ILO, January 1995; "TOR Independent Final Evaluation for ILO/IPEC Project: Contribution to the Prevention and Elimination of the Commercial Sexual Exploitation of boys, girls and adolescents in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic" Draft TOR February 2009; and "Standards of Evaluation in the United Nations System". UNEG. April 2005.

- ❖ Provide feedback to the sectors involved on the process and the achievements;

- ❖ Make possible an analysis of the achievements of the project in terms of sustainability.

3.- Methodology

Based on the ToR and the documents mentioned in the footnote of page 1, the following procedural methodology will be used:

3.1.- Office work

Revision of documents, including:

- Project Documents
- Progress reports
- Final Evaluation of Phase One
- Technical and financial reports from the executing agencies
- Registers of beneficiaries
- Report on good practices and lessons learned
- Studies on CSEC
- Memoirs of technical meetings and workshops
- Diagnoses on the application of protocols
- Compendium of Legislation
- Reports from the APs and MP

During the period of document revision, the evaluation team will hold a telephone interview with the person in charge at the USDOL (the donor) and with IPEC Geneva.

3.2.- Field trips

The evaluation team shall meet with project personnel based in the IPEC office in San Jose. They will also interview the national coordinator of the project in each country. An interview agenda will be planned, in coordination with the CTA, with counterparts and interested parties such as:

- The Presidency of the National Commissions on CSEC and the most relevant government and non-government members
- State Children's Support Organisms
- Prosecutors and Police
- USAID and the U.S. Embassy
- Trade Union and Employer Organizations
- Executing agencies of the APs
- Ex-beneficiaries of the APs.
- Members of the communities where APs were carried out.
- NGOs and other partners, UNICEF, UCW, IOM
- International NGOs pro Defence and Promotion of Childhood

3.3.- Regional workshop for interested parties

The two-day workshop will be held in San Jose, Costa Rica and will have the participation of representatives from different national and international players involved in carrying out the Project.

The workshop's main objectives are: i) to present the preliminary findings of the evaluation and to discuss the sustainability of the actions and the following steps to be taken, from the perspective of the interested parties and to gather opinions for the final version of the evaluation document; ii) to hold a joint recounting of the achievements and lessons learned in carrying out the Project.

3.4.- Drafting the final report

The rough draft of the evaluation report will be complemented, based on the input provided by the regional workshop for stakeholders; the sub-regional offices of IPEC; IPEC-HQ and DED-HQ.

4.- Focus of the Evaluation

The Final Independent Evaluation, given the geographical extension and the great number and variety of activities carried out by the project, shall prioritize its general and central aspects and study the achievements of the project, based on the following criteria: a) relevancy and validity of the design; b) efficacy and degree of fulfilment and c) sustainability. Given the theme of the project, the gender and human rights perspective will be considered as motive for special care giving. Each section shall include findings, conclusions and recommendations.

I Validity and Relevance

Validity investigates the logic and coherency of the project design process and in its objectives and assumptions.
The criterion of **relevance** examines the degree to which the objects of the project are/were consistent with the needs of the countries and beneficiaries and the policies and priorities of the interested parties.

Some possible questions and areas for consultation

1. What was the **justification** for the project? Did the requirements of the region's countries justify the project? (Fill an existing gap?)
2. Was the **theory of change** established at the beginning realistic? Does it have a logical and coherent progression of activities, products (outputs) direct effects (*outcomes*)? (*Internal logic*)?
3. Did it take the institutional capacities of the different countries into consideration?
4. Did it integrate a gender perspective into the project design?
5. Were the activities designed into the project appropriately adapted for each country?
6. How was the Project strategy adapted to the national policies of education and the war on poverty, etc.?
7. How was the strategy of the Project adapted to other interventions for elimination of CSEC by other organizations in the region? (Coordination with other initiatives)
8. What national **partners** were identified? Were they the most appropriate?
9. What **indicators** of progress and achievement of goals were established? Were they realistic and measurable?
10. What **assumptions** or risk hypotheses were defined? Were they adequate for the addendum?
11. Did they adequately analyze the needs of the beneficiaries that participated in the APs?
12. Were there sufficient human and financial resources?
13. Were the human and financial resources adequate?
14. Was the time of execution (including the APs) satisfactory?
15. What is the potential for replicating the Project in other regions?

II Efficacy and Degree of Fulfilment

Efficacy reviews the measure in which the objectives of the intervention were or are expected to be met. It analyzes whether the activities of the project were carried out and if the outputs and outcomes of those activities contributed to the objectives of each strategic component.

The analysis of efficacy is based on the *outputs and outcomes* stipulated in the logical framework of the addendum, Phase II)

Some possible questions and areas for consultation organized by strategic component:

1. Component of regional cooperation and coordination

1. What is the status of execution of this component in relation to the activities stipulated in the logical framework, chronogram and budget? (Status of implementation)
2. To what extent did the activities contribute to achieving the products (outputs) established in the logical framework (including new outputs of the addendum)?
3. To what extent did the products (outputs) contribute to achieving the immediate goal (outcome) of the component?: I/O 1: Creation of formal and informal mechanisms for horizontal cooperation and networks of institutions working on the elimination of CSEC
4. If in fact there is now greater regional coordination and cooperation on the issue of CSEC, what initiative(s) had the most impact on this progress?
5. What are some specific examples of the regional cooperation backed by the project (between players in the judicial system, the private sector, unions, childcare institutions, etc.)
6. To what extent is the greater coordination (if any) the product of the Project's efforts? (plausible attribution)
7. What would be the status of regional cooperation today (on the issue of CSEC) without the support of the project? (plausible attribution, with and without)
8. What obstacles or limitations have been confronted in developing regional cooperation on the issue of elimination of CSEC and human trafficking?
9. What have been the good practices and lessons learned from the approach of the project in promoting regional cooperation and coordination?
10. What are your recommendations for future efforts to improve regional coordination in the elimination of commercial sexual exploitation of children and adolescents?

<u>Battery of more specific questions depending on the interlocutor</u>

11. Which internships and visits had greater impact on promoting cooperation?
12. Were regional accords for collaboration between personnel from migration, the police, child protection institutions established? Were these regional accords actively implemented? What impact did they have on the fight against CSEC and human trafficking?
13. Was a follow-up system for international commitments established?
14. Was there coordination with UNICEF, IOM and other agencies on the definition of indicators for the DevInfo system?
15. Have the governments committed to continue supplying the follow-up and information system contained in DevInfo?

2. Component of support to policies, programmes and national legislation

1. What is the status of execution of this component in relation to activities stipulated in the logical framework, the chronogram and budget? (*Status of implementation*)
2. To what extent did the activities carried out contribute to achieving the products (outputs) established in the logical framework (including new addendum outputs)?
3. To what extent have the products (outputs) contributed to achieving the immediate objective (outcome) of the component? I/O 21: At the end of the project, national legislation, policies and programmes will have been formulated and measures taken to execute them.

4. To what extent is the review and legislative adoption in different countries a product of the project's efforts?
5. To what extent is the development of National Action Plans a product of the project's efforts?
6. What would the status of the legislation or the NAPs in the fight against CSEC be without project contributions? (with and without)
7. What have the obstacles or limitations been that have been confronted to modify legislation, NAP development, and establish national policies for the fight against CSEC?
8. What have been the good practices and lessons learned from the approach of the project in promoting national policy and programmes?
9. What are your recommendations in support of legislative revision and the promotion of national policies and programmes?

Battery of more specific questions depending on the interlocutor

10. What was the role of the project in legislative changes on the issue of CSEC in the country?
11. What was the role of the project in promoting the creation of inter-institutional Commissions for the fight against CSEC?
12. Did the project promote a sensitive view of gender in developing the legislation, policies and programmes?
13. How successful has the project been in providing incentives for the incorporation of the issue of human trafficking and CSEC in national policies? (mainstreaming)
14. What was the role of the project in formulating the National Action Plans?
15. In the countries that have seen legislative modifications, have these National Action Plans been disseminated? Do the relevant players (judges, the police, Ministries) have knowledge of the legislative changes?
16. Were institutional guidelines (protocols) and materials produced for the relevant players? How have these guidelines influenced their daily routine?
17. Were *care protocols* drafted? Are they institutionalized in the pertinent government entities?
18. How are the community organizations linking up with the assistance entities of the government to implement the care provision model?
19. Have community players (teachers, local police) become involved in the creation and implementation of the model?
20. Were systems created for monitoring and remitting to give attended victims follow-up? How are they functioning?

Action Programmes

21. How effective have the Action Programmes been? How effective were they in rescuing children from CSEC and ensuring that they did not return?
22. What were the criteria to choose executing agencies?
23. Did the APs meet their objectives? Was the number of children established in the project documents rescued?
24. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the executing agencies (including the Government as executor of the direct action programmes)
25. Have the skills of the executing agencies (including community organizations) improved in designing, putting into operation and executing projects? How?
26. What aspects of the APs are effective models for replication?
27. If there have been differences in the approach to the different APs, What have their most effective models been and why?
28. What were the systems for follow-up on the beneficiaries? Were the monitoring systems of the different APs appropriate? What were the relative skills of the executing agencies for following-up on the beneficiaries of the APs?

3. Component of individual and community action to eliminate CSEC

1. What is the execution status of this component in relation to the activities stipulated in the logical framework, chronograph and budget? (*Status of implementation*)
2. To what extent have the activities carried out contributed to achieving the products (outputs) established in the logical framework (including new addendum outputs)?
3. To what extent have the products (outputs) contributed to achieving the immediate objective (outcome) of the component?: *I/O 3: At the end of the project will there be greater individual and community action to prevent CSEC and assist the children and adolescents of the region?*
4. Have there been changes in the awareness and perception of CSEC among journalists, police, childcare institutions, various authorities, employer and union organizations and the general public?
5. To what extent have the project actions been influential in changes of awareness and attitude? How has it been measured?
6. What would be the status of awareness about CSEC without the support of the project?
7. What have the obstacles or limitations been that have been confronted to influence the attitudes and perceptions on CSEC?
8. What have been the good practices and lessons learned from the approach of the project for this component?
9. What are your recommendations for influencing attitudes and perceptions about CSEC?

<u>Battery of more specific questions depending on the interlocutor</u>

10. Which of the workshops were most successful?
11. Did key sectors become incorporated (tourist sector, trade unions, etc.)? How have they contributed to achieving the project's objectives?

4. General Considerations on Project Efficacy

1. Was there continuity between Phase I and Phase II?
2. Were the recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation (Final Evaluation of Phase I) incorporated? What were the effects of including these recommendations?
3. What was the impact of the execution of factors and situations beyond the control of the project? Were they handled satisfactorily?

III. Sustainability

This criterion analyzes the probability of the project's benefits and achievements continuing over the long run.

1. Was the sustainability and exit strategy clearly defined from the beginning?
2. What were the specific actions for transferring responsibilities to national players?
3. What is the sustainability perspective of the achievements in regional cooperation without the contribution of the project?
4. How, (and how effectively) was the project in promoting a feeling of pertinence among community and local organisms?
5. How, (and how effectively) was the project in promoting a feeling of pertinence among government entities?
6. What is the perspective of sustainability of the achievements in matters of national policies without the contribution of the project?
7. What is the perspective of sustainability of the direct care provision programmes for CSE victims without project contributions?
8. What is the degree of involvement of governments in the processes being promoted? (Care Providing Model, protocols)? Differences between countries?

9. What are the principal risks to sustainability of the project's achievements? Differences between countries?
10. What do you consider to be the most important impacts of the project in the long term
11. Did the project contribute to strengthening the skills of local and national players, committed to the elimination of CSEC?
12. To what extent have the APs been assumed by local and national players?