



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation
Office

Partnerships in Action to End Child Trafficking in Peru – Midterm evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries:	<i>Peru</i>
Mid-Term:	<i>12/2020</i>
Evaluation Mode:	<i>Independent</i>
Administrative Office:	<i>Regional Evaluation Officer for Latin America and the Caribbean</i>
Technical Office:	<i>ILO Office for the Andean Countries</i>
Evaluation Manager:	<i>Cybele Burga</i>
Evaluation Consultant(s):	<i>Macroconsult S.A.</i>
Project Code:	<i>PER/17/51/USA</i>
Donor(s) & Budget:	<i>United States Department of State (USDOS) (USD5.7 million)</i>
Keywords:	<i>Trafficking, Children and Adolescents, Capacity Building, Prosecution, Protection, Prevention</i>

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

This document corresponds to the midterm evaluation of the Project called “Partnerships in Action to End Child Trafficking in Peru”. This project has been implemented by ILO since 2017 within the framework of the Child Protection Compact Partnership between the US and Peru. Due to a budget increase, the Project budget is USD 5.7 million given by the US Department of State (USDOS) and it has a duration of 51 months, until December 31st, 2021.

The Project aims to enhance the capacity of the Peruvian Government to eradicate trafficking in children and adolescents in Lima, Cusco, and Loreto, with some specific activities in Madre de Dios and Puno. To achieve this aim, the Project carries out twelve activities of technical assistance –following a

victim-centered approach (VCA)– with the 3P paradigm: Prosecution of traffickers, Protection of victims, and Prevention of crime. The public institutions benefiting from the Project are the Permanent Multisectoral Commission against Trafficking in Persons and the Illicit Smuggling of Migrants, the Judiciary, the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights, the Ministry of the Interior, The Office of Public Prosecutions, the Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations, the Ministry of Health, the Metropolitan Municipality of Lima, the Regional Governments of Cusco and Loreto, and the Peruvian National Police. The Project is managed by a team of six people located in Lima who reports to the director of the ILO Office for the Andean Countries. The implementing partners are the Legal Defense Institute (IDL) and the Alternative Human and Social Capital (CHS Alternativo).

Present Situation of the Project

This evaluation covers till the second quarter of 2020. Currently, the project is in the first term of 2021.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The purpose of this document is to serve as an input to enhance the impacts of the Project towards the end of the intervention. The internal clients of the midterm evaluation are the ILO Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, the Project team, FUNDAMENTALS, GOVERNANCE, PARDEV, and the Evaluation Office. The external clients are the beneficiary public institutions and the implementing partners.

Methodology of evaluation

The midterm evaluation aim is to provide an independent evaluation of the intervention progress analyzing the relevance of the Project, the validity of

the design, the effectiveness of management and activities, as well as the use of resources and the sustainability of outcomes, according to the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-based Evaluation (2017). The evaluation covers the period from October 2017 to July 2020 and is guided by the evaluation questions laid down in the Terms of Reference. To conduct the evaluation, the Project design and management documents, given to the consulting team, were reviewed. That information already reviewed was complemented with the interviews carried out remotely with the donor's representatives, the ILO team, the implementing partners, the beneficiary public institutions, among other qualified informants (63 interviews). In addition, for the outcome indicators measure, joint work was done with the Project team to specify their syntax and collect the information needed for its calculation.

Main Findings & Conclusions

The main findings of the midterm evaluation are reported below:

Finding 1: The Project is relevant because it deals with a problem of national priority. Peru is a country of origin, transit, and destination for human trafficking, where half of the victims are underage. In this respect, The Peruvian Government has signed and confirmed the main international agreements committing themselves to eradicate human trafficking. Furthermore, it has formalized this commitment formulating and implementing national plans and policies and has even signed a partnership with the United States Government to strengthen its capacities to address this problem.

Finding 2: The Project is relevant because it addresses the causes of human trafficking in Peru. The diagnosis of the Project is based on the National Plan of Action against Trafficking in Persons 2017-2021. This concludes that trafficking happens not only due to the existence of structural risk factors such as poverty or vulnerability but also, due to the limited capacity of the Peruvian State to prosecute traffickers, protect victims and prevent crime. The Project provides technical assistance to strengthen the capacities of the Peruvian State taking actions in eleven of the fifteen critical factors identified in the diagnosis of the national plan. Additionally, to validate the strategy and identify the specific needs of the public institutions involved, the

Project performed a situational diagnosis at the beginning of the intervention, thus ensuring the relevance of the activities that are done.

Finding 3: The Project continues to be relevant and pertinent in the context of Covid-19. One of the side-effects of the health crisis has been the increase in the crime of human trafficking and the difficulty in identifying and protecting the victims. In the current context, interventions aimed at strengthening the capacities of the Peruvian State to eradicate this crime are becoming more urgent and necessary, particularly those aimed at preventing the crime of trafficking.

Finding 4: The Project is consistent with the national policies and the strategy of the Peruvian State to eradicate human trafficking. The intervention of the Project is aligned with State policies 14, 16, and 18 set out in the National Accord and strategic axes 1 and 3 of the Bicentennial Plan. Likewise, it is framed in six of the eight of the general guidelines and thirteen of the two hundred and sixty-six specific guidelines written in the National Policy against Trafficking in Persons. Also, it contributes to achieving thirteen of the eighteen immediate aims established by the National Plan of Action against Trafficking in Persons 2017-2021.

Finding 5: The Project is also consistent with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the 2030 Agenda and ILO policies. From the seventeen SDGs, the intervention of the Project contributes directly to the achievement of SDGs 5, 8, and 16. It also contributes to compliance with ILO Convention No. 182 on the worst forms of child labor, and ILO Convention No. 29 on forms of forced or compulsory labor. In programmatic terms, the Project contributes to outcome 8 of the ILO Program and Budget 2018-2019; and with outcomes 6 and 7 of the Program and Budget 2020-2021.

Finding 6: The Project is not explicitly articulated with other interventions. However, potential coordination and learning with other projects that address the problem of human trafficking in Peru, from the public sector and non-governmental organizations have been identified, in particular, with CHS Alternativo that implements similar projects in Peru. In fact, the Project has already identified and explored the coordination spaces that exist with the project "Human Trafficking in the Peruvian Amazon" in charge of CHS Alternativo with the support of USAID. Moreover, potential coordination with the ILO Bridge project

(PER/15/50/USA) is identified. Even though this Project addresses an autonomous crime (forced labor) and works with a different target audience (youth), the possibility of joining efforts to collect reliable data could be explored to research both crimes.

Finding 7: The Project theory of change is adequate. The logic model of the Project was built based on the National Action Plan against Trafficking in Persons 2017-2021 and organizes the intervention into three components: persecution, protection, and prevention. It also includes activities related to improving institutional governance, even though these are not organized into a specific component. However, it has two limitations. The first one is the lack of explicit assumptions for each of the aim levels, which has consequences for the monitoring and evaluation system. The second one exhibits a certain disorder in the organization of some activities, outputs, and outcomes in the Project components, which –although it has no practical consequence in the implementation of the Project– conceptually breaks in the causal linkages of the logic for the intervention and it could make some outcomes invisible in the final evaluation.

Finding 8: The main weakness of the Project design is related to the indicators in the logical framework matrix (LFM). First, the Project only has indicators for two of the five aim levels (activities, outputs, outcomes, components, and purpose), these are outputs and outcomes. The outputs indicators measure the physical production of the Project and the outcomes indicators measure the immediate effects of the intervention, but not the behavior change, therefore, it is not possible to evaluate the impact of the Project with only these two indicators. Second, a third of the outputs and outcomes indicators do not meet to be good indicators (as assessed by SMART criteria). Third, the means of verifying the outcome indicators are not specific and even mention the midterm and final evaluations as a data source. Fourth, no technical evidence has been found to support the establishment of goal values.

Finding 9: Project management is effective, but it is oriented towards the production of outputs. It cannot be considered results-based management because decision-making is not guided by the degree of the progress of the outcomes or by components or purpose, which are not measured regularly; instead, it is guided by the physical production of the Project (outputs), so if they are measured regularly. Regardless of the above,

project team members, implementing partners, and external consultants all have specific roles that are not juxtaposed with each other, and the communication channels are clear and fluid. Besides, the Project shows considerable flexibility to adapt to the specific needs of the beneficiary public institutions, creating a favorable environment for implementation. On the other hand, public institutions are satisfied with the fluidity of communication and the level of coordination with the Project team, as well as with the technical assistance received.

Finding 10: According to the management model, the Project monitoring system monitors the output indicators, which are carried out quarterly and are guided by the donor's requirements. Financial monitoring is aligned with the Project operational monitoring as at the aim level (outputs) as in frequency (quarterly). However, the monitoring system has three weaknesses. First, it does not measure how the Project is contributing to the achievement of outcomes, components, or purpose. Also, the measurement of the outcome indicators is only left for the midterm and final evaluation, while the components and purpose are not done at any stage. Second, the LFM has a total of 86 indicators (48 outputs and 38 outcomes) without identifying which are the key indicators. Third, it does not monitor the assumptions of each aim level.

Finding 11: The Project presents adequate and homogeneous progress in the production of outputs among its components. Analyzing the progress of the indicators of the logical framework matrix, at the midterm Project, three of the eighteen Project outputs have already been delivered (17%); eight outputs are in the process of being delivered (50%); five outputs are in the process of being delivered but with a risk of delay or non-compliance towards the end of the intervention, mainly due to the crisis caused by Covid-19 (22%); and two outputs still had no progress (11%). To assess the outcomes, the work of defining and measuring indicators was done in an ad-hoc way since no information was found at the beginning of the evaluation, autonomously generated by the Project. With this information partially reconstructed, it is inferred that the progress of the outcomes is still slow: ten of the twenty Project outcomes would present progress (50%) and seven, would not (30%). Furthermore, sufficient information was not available to assess the progress of the other three outcomes.

Finding 12: The main Project contribution to strengthening the capacities of the State has been the development and institutionalization of guides, procedures, and tools for the fight against trafficking in children and adolescents in Peru. Another important contribution has been the incorporation of the victim-centered approach (VCA) for tackling the problem and the gender perspective for the care of LGTBI victims. Likewise, the care services of five Residential Care Centers (RCC) have been specialized; and the importance of mental health care for victims has been put on the agenda. However, it is still too early to identify concrete outcomes in terms of capacity building the Project seeks to generate. On the other hand, the outputs with a certain risk of delay are the mental health protocol, the pilot reintegration programs, the institutional guides and training for the identification of trafficking victims, and the implementation of regional action plans.

Finding 13: The budget implementation corresponds to the progress of the output indicators and the accomplishment of goals. In the second quarter of 2020, the Project had executed 53% of its global budget. Component 1 registered an execution of 57%; Component 2, a 50% execution; and component 3, 58%. As a result of the efficiency gains and the non-implemented budget in previous years, the Project has a fund equivalent to 14% of the global budget that could be used for contingency actions or for extending the execution period of the Project. The budget for the rest of the Project from July 2020 to December 2021 equals 20% of the global budget.

Finding 14: The Project adjustments in the Covid-19 crisis can be organized on two aspects. On the one hand, the Project adapted to immobilization and mandatory social distancing measures ordered by the Peruvian government. In this regard, the Project had to migrate to remote work and redesign its training strategies to the virtual modality. On the other hand, there is the response of the project as a UN agency, assisting beneficiary public institutions within the framework of ILO policies for the protection of workers in the workplace. To carry out this, the Project delivered personal protection equipment to police and prosecutors; equipped the Residential Care Centers so that staff can access virtual training, and conducted mental health workshops for service providers and justice officers.

Finding 15: The main impact of the health crisis on the implementation of the Project was the delay and postponement of some activities. There was a natural slowdown in the response of the beneficiary public institutions, particularly those involved in the front-line health care, such as the Ministry of Health, the Peruvian National Police, and regional governments. Besides, the Project had to adapt its intervention strategy to the virtual modality, which also generated certain delays.

Finding 16: Three minimum conditions must occur for the Project outcomes to be sustained after its intervention has concluded: (1) the political commitment of the Peruvian State to eradicate human trafficking must be renewed; (2) there must be specific financial resources (multi-sectoral budget program); and (3) there must be an installed capacity in the public sector to keep strengthen the capacities of the rest of the state apparatus. Actions have been taken to ensure that these conditions are met even though the Project does not have a concrete exit strategy. The main Project progress is found in the establishment of the capacity installed in the public sector, due to the institutionalization of instruments, the training of officers in the use of these instruments, and the establishment of a network of operators in the public sector and the already trained civil society.

Based on the above findings, the following is concluded:

Conclusion 1: At the level of relevance and pertinence, the Project meets both criteria in the Peruvian context. It is a Project consistent with national priorities and the Peruvian State's strategy to eradicate human trafficking. Furthermore, it is adequately aligned with the SDGs of the 2030 Agenda and the ILO corporate policies. There is potential coordination with other active projects in Peru executed by non-governmental organizations (particularly those in charge of CHS Alternativo since those projects share common aims and even common intervention scope) and by the public sector. Likewise, there is potential coordination with the ILO Bridge project, particularly, to increase efforts to coordinate the collection of reliable data and generate a data system on both autonomous crimes.

Conclusion 2: At the design level, the theory of change underlying the intervention is adequate and was built according to the National Plan of Action against Trafficking in Persons 2017-2021, addressing the

dimensions of prosecution, protection, prevention, and, although not explicitly recognized, institutional governance. However, it presents improvement at the level of causal linkages, mainly due to the management of components and outputs. In practice, these inconsistencies do not have any concrete implications at the operational level, but they make these outcomes invisible and the understanding of how they are achieved for monitoring and evaluation exercises. On the other hand, the logic model of the Project does not identify specific assumptions associated with each of the aim levels. However, the main weaknesses of the Project design are the indicators that do not allow to measure the concrete contribution of the Project to the strengthening of the State's capacities.

Conclusion 3: At the management level, the Project is organized for the execution of activities and the achievement of outputs, but it does not measure outcomes. The operational and financial monitoring and evaluation system are done on the outputs and not on the outcomes. This is due to the Donor's requirements (technical and financial progress reports at the output level) and, also due to the difficulty faced by the Project in measuring the usual outcomes indicators. Therefore, it is difficult to argue that the decisions made in the Project are based on the progress of the outcomes (immediate and higher-order). However, intervention strategies are very favorable for the achievement of the aims. For example, the team shows adaptability to the environment and the type of beneficiary (public sector) by matching the demand with the Project aims, facilitating the implementation of critical actions.

Conclusion 4: Based on the outcomes measured ad-hoc for this evaluation exercise, adequate and almost homogeneous progress is identified among its components. In turn, the budget has evolved in hand with the actions undertaken. Only four outputs could present some delay to the end of the Project, mainly due to the crisis generated by Covid-19: the mental health protocol (output 2.3.1); the pilot reintegration programs (output 2.4.1); and institutional guides and training to identify victims of trafficking (output 2.5.1). The main outcomes of the Project to strengthening the capacities of the State to prosecute, protect and prevent the crime of trafficking come from the institutionalization of instruments. However, it is still too early to identify important outcomes of capacity building that these instruments, together with the training, should generate.

Conclusion 5: At the level of sustainability, even though the Project does not have an explicit exit strategy, three conditions are identified that must be met to ensure the sustainability of the outcomes after the Project intervention has concluded: renewal of the government's political will, availability of financial resources, and establishment of an installed capacity base in the public sector. The Project has made important progress in the three of them, mainly through the institutionalization of guides, procedures, and tools for the prosecution, protection, and prevention of trafficking in children and adolescents, training officers in the use of these instruments, the institutionalization and transfer of their training programs, and the establishment of a network of operators in the public sector and the civil society that remains vigilant. It is expected that the next administration renews the political commitment to eradicate human trafficking in Peru, and also to create a budgetary program that allows allocating resources to achieve outcomes and coordinate the efforts of the three government levels.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1. To review the vertical logic of the logical framework matrix so that the Project can make visible its contribution to the achievement of outcomes at the component and purpose levels for an external evaluation of the Project. Although the problems identified do not affect the operation or performance of activities, the disorder and omissions in the LFM would make it difficult to exactly visualize how these activities are connected to the capacity building that the Project pursues. Moreover, problems arise from the Project's need to organize activities according to the Donor's requirements; however, it is possible to build the Project's LFM, which intention is limited to internal monitoring and evaluation purposes.

Recommendation 2. To implement an outcome tracking system (intermediate, component, and purpose) along with properly defined indicators according to SMART criteria to provide information on the progress of Project achievements in a timely manner. This tracking system may not meet the Donor's information needs and may need to be implemented as an alternative tracking system. Therefore, an initial system that is functional to the donor's needs will be oriented to meet the donor's data demands and a second system will be functional to

meet the data demands of the Project management. The first system will allow monitoring to fulfill its role as a transparency instrument and the second will allow it to fulfill its role as a management instrument, facilitating the optimization of decision-making related to the outcomes-based management that the Project needs to implement. Our recommendation focuses on this second role since, to the extent that the project does not have defined order indicators (components and purpose) that present formulation problems in lower-order indicators (intermediate) and that are not measured regularly, it prevents the effective implementation of an outcome-based management model with the resulting consequences in terms of the average impact of the intervention. The frequency of measurement of these indicators could be biannual or annual. The absence of properly formulated indicators will have an impact on the Project's evaluation possibilities for a final evaluation. As it has been reported, this study has attempted to correct certain deficiencies related to the indicators to be able to conclude the mid-term evaluation.

Recommendation 3. To take advantage of coordination spaces with projects with similar aims to avoid overlapping and evaluate synergies to optimize the outcomes in the territory. To this end, it is necessary to strengthen communication channels or promote participation in joint work meetings with defined agendas and leadership.

Recommendation 4. To prioritize an explicit exit from the Project. In this regard, considering that the project will conclude at the end of 2021, it is appropriate to outline a strategy that considers the prioritization of activities on two fronts. First, one that reinforces the activities that have been most delayed within each component. Second, one that defines complementary activities that explicitly address the threats to the sustainability of the outcomes achieved and reinforce the strengths achieved on that front. The exit strategy should rescue all the efforts that the Project has been making to institutionalize training instruments and programs.