

REDUCING CHILD LABOR IN COTTONSEED FARMING: FOCUSING ON THE PRIVATE SECTOR

A Report for Seva Mandir by the Undergraduate
Business and Human Rights Advocacy Lab

May, 2015

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution - Noncommercial - No Derivative Works 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>. You may reproduce this work for non-commercial use if you use the entire document and attribute the source: The Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke University.

This report was written by undergraduate students in Duke University's "Business and Human Rights Advocacy Lab" class, taught by Professor Suzanne Katzenstein in Spring 2015.

About the Institute

We are an interdisciplinary "think and do" tank committed to promoting moral reflection and commitment, conducting interdisciplinary research, and shaping policy and practice. At Duke we serve as a central node for analysis, debate, and engagement on ethical issues at and beyond the university. We currently feature work in five core areas: Human Rights, Global Migration, Rethinking Regulation, Moral Attitudes & Decision-Making, and Religions & Public Life.

For more information, visit dukeethics.org.

The Duke Human Rights Center at the Kenan Institute for Ethics explores contemporary international human rights challenges by promoting interdisciplinary collaborations and innovative pedagogy for faculty, students, and practitioners. It encourages critical investigations from a broad range of disciplinary traditions that engage undergraduate and graduate students on the ethical issues at play and that bridge the often separate spheres of research, advocacy and policy.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 1: Using Corporate Accountability to Evaluate Potential Partners and Targets | 3 |
| <i>Shade Adeyemo</i> | |
| Three Dimensions of Corporate Accountability | 3 |
| Backgrounds on Monsanto and Bayer CropScience | 3 |
| Comparing Corporate Policies: Specificity and Coverage | 4 |
| Transparency: Sharing Information in the Process of Change | 6 |
| Pledges and MSI Membership: Added Accountability | 7 |
| Implications for Seva Mandir | 8 |
| Chapter 2: An Example of a Frayed NGO-MNC Collaboration | 10 |
| <i>Sayari Patel</i> | |
| NGO-Monsanto Partnerships in Andhra Pradesh | 10 |
| MVF-Monsanto Collaboration | 11 |
| MVF-Monsanto Confrontation | 13 |
| Implications for Seva Mandir | 17 |
| Chapter 3: An Example of a Successful NGO Partnerships with a Multi-stakeholder Initiative (MSI) | 19 |
| <i>Maria Alas</i> | |
| Defining Success | 19 |
| Background on NGO-MSI Partners | 19 |
| Strengthening Evidence on Child Labor in Cocoa Fields | 20 |
| Raising Awareness and Advocacy About Child Labor in Cocoa Fields | 21 |
| Implications for Seva Mandir | 21 |
| Chapter 4: An Example of a Successful NGO-MNC Collaboration | 23 |
| <i>Caroline Yarborough</i> | |
| Defining Success and the Landscape of Corporate-NGO Initiatives | 23 |
| Background on Mondelēz's Cocoa Life Initiative | 24 |
| Mondelēz -NGO Partnerships: Community Action Plans and the Bicycle Project | 25 |
| Implications for Seva Mandir: BP Emerging from CPM Needs | 27 |
| Chapter 5: Best Educational Practices to Combat Child Labor | 28 |
| <i>Michael Bleggi</i> | |
| Defining Success | 28 |
| Current Landscape of Anti-Child Labor Educational Initiatives | 28 |
| Best Practices: Community Scorecards and Rapid Learning | 30 |
| Implications for Seva Mandir | 32 |
| Chapter 6: Child-Centered Approaches to Addressing Child Labor | 34 |
| <i>Michelle Khalid</i> | |
| The Appeal of a Child-Centered Approach and the Peer Educational Model | 34 |
| Defining Success | 35 |
| Children's Forums | 35 |
| Child Friendly Villages | 37 |
| Implications for Seva Mandir | 40 |

TABLES

| | |
|---|-------|
| 1.1 Methods for Establishing Accountability | 4 |
| 1.2 Accountability Findings for Bayer and Monsanto | 8 |
| 2.1 NGO-Monsanto Collaborations | 10 |
| 2.2 Summary of Action Plan | 12 |
| 2.3 Topics Discussed by Panel | 13 |
| 2.4 MVF’s Confrontational Strategies | 14-15 |
| 2.5 Comparison of Action Plans with and without MVF Participation | 16-17 |
| 4.1 Landscape of Corporate-NGO Initiatives | 23-24 |
| 4.2 Comparing CAPs and the Bicycle Project | 27 |
| 5.1 Landscape of Educational Initiatives to Reduce Child Labor | 28-29 |
| 5.2 Rapid Learning Strategies | 31 |
| 5.3 Businesses that Fall under the CSR Regime | 32 |
| 6.1 Comparing Child Free Labor Zones | 39 |
| 6.2 Comparing Best Child-Centered Practices | 41 |

INTRODUCTION

This report discusses interventions used to address child labor in agricultural production. Its primary focus is on the private sector. The report was written by undergraduate students in Duke University's "Business and Human Rights Advocacy Lab" class (spring 2015).

In the last decade, Indian companies and multinational corporations have been increasing their direct control over cottonseed production areas. Between 2006 and 2010, for instance, the three most important multinational companies in cottonseed (Monsanto, Bayer and Advanta) increased their direct control of production areas by 194% (from 3,400 acres to 10,000 acres).¹ As one report documents, "large companies are slowly increasing their control over the seed industry by expanding their production area and also by acquiring smaller companies."² Our hope is that the report provides insights to Seva Mandir that are relevant for its existing programs addressing child labor originating in Southern Rajasthan in hybrid cottonseed production occurring in Gujarat.

The first four chapters of the report consider a range of possibilities in working with and/or targeting private companies, particularly multinational corporations, to change their child labor practices. Focusing on two of the largest western MNCs in India's cottonseed industry, Monsanto and Bayer, the first chapter suggests and demonstrates how examining accountability may be a useful strategy to evaluate an MNC as a potential partner or target. The second chapter relays a description of one NGO's collaboration and later withdrawal from working with Monsanto. Chapters three and four explore relatively successful NGO collaborations with a multi-stakeholder initiative and MNC respectively. The last two chapters shift the focus from the private sector to innovative educational and child-centered approaches for addressing child labor. These chapters are described in more detail below. When relevant, we open the chapters by defining the term "success" and close the chapters with a brief discussion of potential implications for Seva Mandir.

Chapter 1, *Using Corporate Accountability to Evaluate Potential Partners and Targets*, evaluates the potential of two leading MNCs in cottonseed production India, Monsanto and Bayer, to be either a partner or a target by examining three metrics of corporate accountability: policy coverage in their supply chains, transparency, and participation in multi-stakeholder initiatives. Although both companies have been rightly condemned for their child labor practices, the chapter finds significant differences between them along these three accountability metrics, with Monsanto performing more poorly. Due to Monsanto's weak accountability mechanisms, which potentially stems from its market dominance, the Chapter concludes that Bayer is likely the more useful partner or target for anti-child labor interventions.

Chapter 2, *An Example of a Frayed NGO-MNC Collaboration*, examines one NGO's (MV Foundation) iterative use of both collaborative and confrontational strategies in Andhra Pradesh to pressure Monsanto on its child labor practices in cottonseed production. It also reviews MVF's ultimate decision to withdraw from its collaboration with Monsanto. Its main finding is that NGOs may not need to choose between collaborative and confrontational strategies but instead can effectively deploy both. Yet, it also notes that confrontational strategies risk losing funding from the private sector. Still, the price may be worth it.

Chapter 3, *An Example of a Successful NGO Partnerships with a Multi-stakeholder Initiative (MSI)*, looks to child labor in the cocoa industry in Africa to examine a relatively successful collaboration between an NGO called World Association for Orphans (WAO) and a multi-stakeholder initiative, the International

1 Venkateswarlu, Davuluri. "Seeds of Child Labour: Signs of Hope," 2010: 4.

2 Ibid.

Cocoa Initiative. The analysis shows how the WAO, through documentation and raising community awareness, was able to work effectively with ICI, both by providing it with evidence of child labor practices and by drawing on ICI support for its own community awareness campaigns. It underscores the importance of not only documenting child labor but ensuring that such documentation is put in the hands of strategically important actors – such as those with leverage in the private sector. The Chapter also points to the possibility of turning to MSIs rather than the purely private sector for financial and logistical support.

Chapter 4, *An Example of a Successful NGO-MNC Collaboration*, continues the focus on child labor and the cocoa industry and explores two relatively successful NGO-MNC collaborations in Africa, the first between a farmer's cooperative, Kuapa Kookoo, and the multinational cocoa firm Mondelez International and the second between CARE and Mondelez International. Both partnerships used Community Action Plans and a bicycle program to address child labor and education challenges. The chapter concludes that one main reason these partnerships seem to be successful is that they are structured to encourage community leadership throughout their programs, from the identification of community needs to program implementation and oversight.

Chapter 5, *Best Educational Practices to Combat Child Labor*, moves away from the focus on business sectors to highlight two innovative educational practices aimed at reducing child labor, both of which have been effectively used by the MV Foundation in Andhra Pradesh: the community scorecard approach and the rapid learning technique. The chapter also addresses two challenges, funding these initiatives and sustaining enrollment in schools once programs have concluded. It points to the new CSR Provision of the 2013 Indian Companies Act and to inclusive monitoring and collaborative curriculum development as potential solutions.

Chapter 6, *Child-Centered Approaches to Addressing Child Labor*, explores two child-centered interventions aimed at addressing child labor, Children's Forums and Child Friendly Villages. The chapter highlights the two programs' shared peer-based approach, as well as some important differences. Children's forums are relatively low-cost and malleable models, but have a confined impact on child labor and are best implemented with other programs. Child friendly villages are more costly and time consuming to establish and more rigid in their principles and structure, but can have a significant effect.

Chapter 1: Using Corporate Accountability to Evaluate Potential Partners and Targets

Most, if not all, corporations sourcing cotton from Rajasthan and Gujarat address their corporate responsibility in some capacity, however there is often a gap between stated policies and actual practices. Corporate accountability is one way to bridge such gaps. This Chapter focuses on corporate accountability for two reasons. First, evaluations of corporate accountability can help determine whether and which corporations are likely to be promising partners (i.e. truly committed to addressing child labor) or problematic ones (disingenuous in their commitments to reducing child labor), or where they fall between these two extremes. Second, evaluations of corporate accountability can also help identify which corporations are likely to be receptive to external pressure to improve their child labor practices.

This Chapter analyzes Monsanto and Bayer CropScience -- both are MNCs with operations in Rajasthan and Gujarat -- across four metrics to assess their accountability. Although both MNCs have been shown to have deeply problematic human rights track records,³ the analysis finds that, for various reasons, Bayer CropScience is more likely both to be a productive partner on child labor issues, and also more likely to be receptive, perhaps vulnerable, to confrontational-type advocacy campaigns. For a more detailed preview of the findings, please see Table 1.2 at the end of this Chapter.

I. Three Dimensions of Corporate Accountability

Corporate accountability is shaped by both policy and practice. It can be established through the following three methods: providing specific and far-reaching policies, ensuring transparency, participating in multi-stakeholder initiatives (MSI), and collaborating with grassroots organization. Table 1.1 below offers more details on these four methods securing accountability.

II. Backgrounds on Monsanto and Bayer CropScience

Differing levels of accountability within the same industry can be seen clearly between Monsanto and Bayer CropScience, both of which source from Rajasthan and Gujarat and both of which have had serious issues with child labor in India. Although Bayer has not come under fire for child labor since 2004, it is often cited as having unsustainable agriculture practices. Monsanto is constantly under fire for its practices, including child labor practices, and was the target of large campaigns as recently as 2014. To better understand the practices of both companies, one must first establish their roles not only in their industry, but in the areas they source from.

3 The Global Exchange has put Bayer on its 2014 list of Corporate Criminals List, not for using child labor, but for “manufacturing and using bee-killing pesticides” while “pinning the crisis on other causes and exposing farmers to dangerous pesticides.” (<http://www.globalexchange.org/corporateHRviolators>). Although the group has not found Bayer to be actively using child labor since 2004 (<http://www.cbgnetwork.org/271.html>), it has criticized the corporation for “bluewashing” its image, using its membership of the UN Global Compact to deflect criticism without actually addressing it. (<http://www.cbgnetwork.org/271.html>). The Global Exchange lists Monsanto as a repeat offender on its Corporate Criminals list, stating that the corporation has “harmful toxic chemical use, involvement in government, refusal to label product, and bankrupting small farms.” (<http://www.globalexchange.org/corporateHRviolators>). The Greenwashing Index gives Monsanto a ranking of 3.9—or between “suspect” and “bogus”—for false advertising, stating that the corporation’s pledges to sustainable agriculture are attempts at greenwashing itself to hide the fact that it is creating a savage industry. (<http://www.greenwashingindex.com/monsanto-imagine-banner/>). The International Labor Rights Forum has stated the high selling price of Monsanto product seeds to Indian farmers forces the farmers to employ children, though Monsanto states that all its workers are above 15 years old. (<http://www.laborrights.org/in-the-news/child-labor>).

Monsanto—headquartered in St. Louis, Missouri, USA—has many competitors in agriculture, but when it comes to seed production, it is the largest in the world.⁴ Its brand-name products account for 23% of the entirety of seed supply,⁵ but through the licensing of biotech traits (namely Roundup Ready) to other seed firms for their subsidiaries to sell, Monsanto produces more than 90% of GM crops worldwide,⁶ with the four main commercial crops being soya beans, maize, cotton, and oilseed rape. Data from 2004 cite Monsanto’s world share of GM crops as 91% for soybeans, 97% for maize, 63.5% for cotton, and 59% for canola.⁷ In the United States, over 85-90% of all soybeans, corn, cotton, sugar beets, and canola grown contains Monsanto’s patented genes.⁸

Bayer CropScience—headquartered in Leverkusen Germany - generally makes, along with four other companies, seed products not made by Monsanto. Its peer companies are: Syngenta, DOW, DuPont-Pioneer, and BASF. Together, these six companies control three-quarters of the global pesticide market and dominate the global seed industry.⁹

Table 1.1: Methods for Establishing Accountability

| Method | Description of Best Practices |
|--|---|
| <i>Providing Policy Specificity and Broad Coverage (Section III)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate policies provide specific codes of conduct, that explicitly address human rights and child labor • Policies providing quantitative benchmarks for reducing and eliminating child labor • Policies extend to supply chain, with the inclusion of punitive measures for non-compliant suppliers |
| <i>Ensuring Transparency (Section IV)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies requires disclosure of members of supply chain • Policies entail third-party, random auditing systems for supply chain • Company discloses human rights abuses/ child labor violations found within the corporation/along the supply |
| <i>Pledging Commitment, MSI Participation (Section V)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Company participates in relevant multi-stakeholder Initiatives and/or child labor pledges, both with monitoring systems in place |

III. Comparing Corporate Policies: Specificity and Coverage

Corporate policies are most effective when they are specific and wide in their reach, demanding compliance by all partners in the production process. Specificity may minimize potential policy gaps in corporate practices, leaving little room for companies and their partners to strategically circumvent their own commitments. Wide reach ensures that corporations do not limit their responsibility to only the direct employ-

4 Gertsberg, Deniza. “More Organic Growers Join the Suit Against Monsanto.” *GMO Journal*. 2011.
 5 Ibid.
 6 Adam, David. “Q&A: GM Crops.” *The Guardian*. 2008.
 7 Philpott, Tom. “Monsanto’s latest court triumph cloaks massive market power.” *Grist*. 2008.
 8 Ibid.
 9 Bruno, Kenny. “Green Peace: Greenwash.” *Greenpeace*. 2012: 5-48.

ment of children, but instead address the exploitation of children through subcontractors and suppliers down their supply chain.¹⁰

The following framework will be used for evaluating corporate policies: specificity of the corporate social responsibility statement, a specific reference to child labor,¹¹ inclusion of human rights language,¹² punitive measures included for supply chain, and quantitative benchmarks in place for the elimination of child labor in the supply chain.

To preview the findings, while both companies have clear references to human rights and child labor in their policies, only Bayer incentivizes compliance in its supply chain with both carrots and sticks and provides some, if vague, benchmarks for the reduction of child labor. Monsanto only offers rewards to farmers that comply with child labor policies¹³ and does not set forth any benchmarks.

Bayer

Bayer states that it is among the founding members of the United Nations' Global Compact (the world's largest sustainability and corporate citizenship initiative), and as such "actively promote sustainability and social responsibility principles and support the United Nations' Declaration of Human Rights."¹⁴ In compliance with ILO's standards, it has a "zero tolerance to child labor policy" in its worldwide operations. Bayer extends these standards to its supply chain through its legally binding Bayer's Supplier Code of Conduct, "which is based on the principles of the U.N. Global Compact and our Human Rights Position."¹⁵ Included in this Human Rights Position is a strict ban on child labor. Bayer states that, "particularly when working with suppliers in developing countries or emerging markets, we take care that they do not engage in child labor—which is still widespread in these regions."¹⁶ Suppliers who show that they are strictly observing its ban on child labor receive, "a bonus from Bayer along with training in agricultural efficiency;"¹⁷ those who are sanctioned for non-compliance receive warnings before finally having their contract terminated.

Lastly, Bayer has benchmarks in place in the form of targets and performance indicators, including a 2020 deadline for the, "evaluation of all potentially high-risk suppliers with significant Bayer spend."¹⁸ These benchmarks seem part of a broader recognition of the need to address child labor. As discussed later in the chapter, through a detailed child labor section on Bayer's website and its own Child Care Program in India, Bayer addresses the need to support organizations, and as partnered with some local groups, that work to reduce child labor and reintegrate children into the Indian school education system.¹⁹

10 Azmi, Feza and Ifran, Abdeeba. "Child labour in the Unorganized Sector: Examining the Surrogate Role of MNCs." *Newman Publication*. 2014: 323-331.

11 United Nations. "Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights." *United Nations*. 2011: 3-28.

12 United Nations. "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights." *United Nations*. 1948.

13 There are reasonable grounds for not penalizing farmers that hire child labor, including that such penalties often exacerbate the lives of children they are meant to help. When penalties are imposed, children may be forced to work for lower wages, or go into other, even less regulated forms of work. It is not clear if these concerns have informed Monsanto's policies, or if a lack of commitment to fully addressing child labor is the main driver.

14 Brekau, Uwe. "Investing in the future of our children: The Bayer CropScience Child Care Program." *Bayer Crop Science AG*. 2011: 4-30.

15 Bayer Crop Science AG. "Annual Report 2014: Procurement and Production." *Bayer Crop Science AG*. 2014: 101-108.

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid.

18 Bayer Crop Science AG. "Target and Performance Indicators." *Bayer Crop Science AG*. 2014.

19 Bayer AG. "Fighting Child Labor." *Bayer AG*. 2014.

Monsanto

Monsanto, also a member of the United Nations' Global Compact since 2009, highlights corporate responsibility commitments in a somewhat annual sustainability report, the most recent being in 2012. It claims to be compliant with the ten principles of the Global Compact, including, "supporting and respecting the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights," and ensuring that, "they are not complicit in human rights abuses."²⁰ While the company does not seem to have clear punitive measures in place for its supply chain, it has created, "a reward system for the growers,"²¹ and safety checklists that must be completed.²² The sustainability reports states that Monsanto has developed, "an education and monitoring program," for its seed coordinators and contract farmers, as well as language reinforcing that child labor will not be used.²³ Monsanto claims to not only try to increase awareness of child labor among its business partners, but that it has tried to reach out to local villages and has "hired social workers to speak to the families of child workers" about the importance of keeping children in school.²⁴

Monsanto does not have clear benchmarks in place for the reduction of child labor, however it has chronicled the reduction of child labor in, "Monsanto Human Rights Business Partners," cottonseed production as 4.9% to 0.2% from 2006 to 2012.²⁵ Unfortunately, the context for these numbers and their validity is questionable. Citations are only from Monsanto data from audits.

IV. Transparency: Sharing Information in the Process of Change

Transparency is essential to ensure that corporate policies are actually being implemented. In particular, supply chain transparency removes the physical distance between a corporation and its downstream manufacturers, a distance that spans different legal jurisdictions, business practices, and cultural norms. As such a lack of transparency is an important reason why gaps between proclaimed policy and actual practice exist. While there are some outside mechanisms in place to urge the transparency of corporate operations (such as legislation requiring disclosure, or voluntary commitments to reporting information through MSI memberships), at the end of the day it is up to the corporation to – through transparency measures – reveal child labor practices that occur within its jurisdiction, take responsibility for such practices and address them - either directly or by engaging subcontractors down the supply chain.

This transparency can occur through various measures, however some of the most important are as follows: having a system of supply chain transparency, detailing year-to-year changes in supply chain compliance, ensuring fairness and legitimacy by using a third-party system to audit the supply chain randomly, and lastly, by disclosing the human rights abuses found through audits, if any.

To foreshadow the findings, Bayer has stronger transparency measures than Monsanto, but its measures are still need of improvement. Specifically, Bayer has some supply chain disclosure (Monsanto does not), and does publish findings from third-party audits (Monsanto does not). This said, Bayer's supply chain disclosures are quite vague, and the substantive findings about child labor practices from third-party audits seem potentially low. This may be because child labor is increasingly difficult to document as farm-workers and the whole global supply chain become increasingly resistant to and troubled by third party evaluations and critique.

Bayer

Relative to Monsanto, one of Bayer's stronger transparency practices comes from its disclosure about land usage and audit results from its farmland in Rajasthan and Gujarat. First, and most basically, in contrast

20 Monsanto. "Sustainability Report." *Monsanto*. 2012: 7-151.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid.

to Monsanto, Bayer is transparent about its specific land usage in Rajasthan in Gujarat. For the 2014/2015 growing season for kharif (from July-October; includes rice, maize, sorghum, pearl millet/ragi, arbar, soya bean, and cotton) and rabi (October-March; includes wheat, barley, oats, chickpea, linseed, and mustard)²⁶ crops, Bayer had 70,561 laborers across 24,053 acres of monitored land.²⁷

Bayer professes that its goal is to take systemic action to prevent child labor in seed supply by visiting the fields used in cotton, rice, and vegetable seed production. Once a year, the audit firm Ernst & Young (India) “conducts unannounced inspections of randomly selected farms.”²⁸ Though it does not specifically release information about each of the farms, which would then show transparency of its suppliers, Bayer does publicly disclose the results of the third-party audit. In kharif production in Rajasthan and Gujarat, the 2014/2015 audits revealed that of the 70,761 laborers monitored, there were 10 proven cases of child labor. These numbers may be questionably low, which suggests that the auditing system needs improvement. But, to its credit, Bayer does have a process in place for independent audits on child labor and does publicize the findings.

Monsanto

Despite Monsanto Pledge that, “will ensure that information is available, accessible, and understandable,” it is unclear much land in Rajasthan and Gujarat Monsanto uses for cottonseed production. Moreover, Monsanto’s yearly sustainability reports list its “total number of incidents on non-compliance” from its third party, random audits as undisclosed.²⁹ So other than the aforementioned reduction in child labor cases from its business partners, there is no other data, quantitative or otherwise, that has been released to the public.

V. Pledges and MSI Memberships: Added Accountability

Added accountability can occur when a corporation complies with rules and guidelines or entities outside its jurisdiction. Such rules and guidelines may involve the previously mentioned Universal Declaration of Human Rights and ILO’s Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. The efficacy of such principles is limited, however, since they lack extensive monitoring systems. Simply committing to these principles does not ensure accountability. Membership in external entities may offer more potential for changing practices. Some MSIs, for instance, have annual evaluations that require corporations to disclose human rights information, either publicly or through the membership organization.

Both Bayer and Monsanto fall short along this accountability metric: although both companies participate in MSIs, neither company, as far as public information suggests, are members in MSIs that are focused on addressing child labor.³⁰ There are at least two such MSIs that Bayer and Monsanto have refrained from joining.

Bayer

According to publicly available information, aside from signing onto commitments from the International Labor Organization and the UN Global Compact, Bayer largely partners with food and supply chain sustainability groups rather than those dedicated to combatting child labor. For example, in order to address challenges of a sustainable supply chain, Bayer voluntarily participates in two industry initiatives: the Pharmaceutical Supply Chain Initiative (PSCI) and Together for Sustainability (TFS), which Bayer

26 Srijia, A. “Cropping Seasons of India- Kharif & Rabi.” *Arthapedia*. 2015.

27 Bayer Crop Science AG. “Annual Report 2014: Procurement and Production”. *Bayer Crop Science AG*. 2014: 101-108.

28 Ibid.

29 Monsanto. “Sustainability Report.” *Monsanto*. 2012: 7-151.

30 These companies may occasionally participate in MSI meetings, however. See Chapter 2 for an example of Monsanto’s brief participation in meetings run by the Fair Labor Association.

also co-founded. Participation in these initiatives requires compliance with performance evaluations and provides support and training for suppliers.³¹ In striking contrast, Bayer does not seem to participate in partnerships or groups combatting child labor, such as the Responsible Sourcing Network’s Cotton Pledge and Company Pledge Against Child Labor, which has yearly evaluating systems in place.

Monsanto

Similar to Bayer, Monsanto does not participate in anti-child labor initiatives aside from stating compliance with guidelines set by ILO, UN Global Compact, and some individual corporate initiatives. But Monsanto does participate in other initiatives. For example, Monsanto has many partnerships largely devoted to protecting biodiversity and reversing the decline of honeybee populations,³² such as with Conservation International and the National Climate Assessment.³³ Thus Monsanto’s failure to participate in child labor MSIs cannot be attribute to a corporate policy or disposition against such collaborations.

VI. Implications for Seva Mandir

Both Bayer and Monsanto have been rightly criticized for egregious human rights practices.³⁴ But the two companies are not the same. As this analysis of accountability has shown, Bayer:

- Has a more extensive supply chain code, which includes punitive measures for those who persistently use child labor (Monsanto does not have punitive mechanisms)
- Has some, if limited, supply chain disclosure policies (Monsanto does not)
- Has some, if loose, benchmark goals in place for reducing child labor (Monsanto does not)
- Discloses the findings of third party audits (Monsanto does not)

In some areas, both Bayer and Monsanto’s practices seem to be equally insufficient. For instance, neither company seems to participate in existing MSIs on child labor. Where Bayer’s practices are stronger than Monsanto, it perhaps goes without saying that they could still use improvement. Table 1.2 below offers a comparative summary of the accountability findings.

Table 1.2: Accountability Findings for Bayer and Monsanto

| | Bayer | Monsanto |
|--|--|---|
| <i>Providing Policy Specificity and Broad Coverage</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear references to human rights and child labor in policies; • Supply chain code of conduct with punitive measures and rewards; • Loose benchmarks in place | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear references to human rights and child labor; • Supply chain code of conduct with only farmer rewards in place; • No clear benchmarks |
| <i>Transparency</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vague on supply chain disclosure; • Use of third-party, random audits; • Disclosure of human rights abuses from audit results on a year-to-year basis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No supply chain disclosure, • Use of third-party, random audits; • Undisclosed audit results; |
| <i>Pledging Commitment, MSI Participation</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participant in MSIs and Pledges, few relating to child labor | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participant in MSIs and Pledges, few relating to child labor |

31 Bayer AG. “Setting Standard for Good Relations.” *Bayer AG*. 2014.

32 Howler, Mike. “Monsanto Launches Coalition to Reverse Decline of Honey Bee Populations.” *Sustainable Life Media*. 2013.

33 Monsanto. “Monsanto and Conservation International Partner to Conserve Biodiversity.” *Monsanto*. 2014.

34 *Supra* note 3.

This analysis is meant to be useful to Seva Mandir in two ways. First, if Seva Mandir in the future looks to partner with MNCs on the issue of child labor, this analysis suggests that focusing on accountability is one way of distinguishing companies that are more likely to be promising partners from those that are likely to be problematic. Second, on the chance that Seva Mandir is considering either working with MNCs or, instead, pressuring them in a more confrontational way to improve their practices, this accountability analysis suggests that Bayer is more likely to be not only the better partner (for collaboration) but also the better target (for advocacy campaigns). Compared to Monsanto, Bayer has stronger policy commitments and accountability procedures in place – and thus it will be easier to suggest that Bayer is falling short of *its own* policies and promises.

The question arises, however, why does Bayer have accountability policies and procedures than Monsanto? One possible explanation lies in market dominance. Monsanto has a clear monopoly. As stated in the background section, 90% of GM crops contain Monsanto traits. With these patents in its control, Monsanto can shape the market how it chooses, evidence by its many successful lawsuits against small farmers.³⁵ With so much market power, there is minimal incentive for Monsanto to stop using child labor. By contrast, Bayer does have peers with whom it competes and collaborates. In terms of market incentives, then, Bayer is under more pressure than Monsanto to respond to external stakeholders.

35 Philpott, Tom. “Monsanto’s latest court triumph cloaks massive market power.” *Grist*. 2008.

Chapter 2: An Example of a Frayed NGO-MNC Collaboration

In the state of Andhra Pradesh, various NGOs seem to have collaborated with Monsanto to combat issues surrounding child labor in Bt Cotton. One example is the partnership between MV Foundation and Monsanto, which serves as a case study in understanding when and whether to collaborate with MNCs and when and whether to walk away from such collaborations. MVF appears to have adopted both a *collaborative* and *confrontational* approach to working with Monsanto, and has done so both *directly* and *indirectly*.

I. NGO-Monsanto Partnerships in Andhra Pradesh

Apart from MVF, most of the NGO-Monsanto partnerships appear to have surrounded community development initiatives such as the creation of learning centers and rehabilitations programs for children. Table 2.1 below summarizes additional examples of past or ongoing NGO-Monsanto collaborations in Andhra Pradesh.³⁶

Table 2.1 NGO-Monsanto Collaborations

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <i>MVF</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationship primarily concerned the creation of monitoring mechanisms Ended partnership with Monsanto in favor of indirect collaboration with seed “organisers”¹ |
| <i>Naandi Foundation</i> ² | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relationship primarily concerned the creation of learning care centers to redirect children into the education system³ Received funding from Monsanto Fund in 2006 totaling 79,256 USD Partnership with Monsanto ended after about 1 year but continued with the MNC Bayer |
| <i>VORDS</i> ⁴ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of a double partnership with Monsanto in addition to the international organization Australian Foundation for People of Asia Pacific (AFAP) Received funding from Monsanto Fund in 2010 and 2011 totaling around 85,000 USD Relationship primarily concerned creation of learning centers and unclear whether partnership extended beyond creation of learning centers |
| <i>CARE</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received funding from Monsanto Fund in 2012 and 2013 totaling 168,685 USD Relationship described by Monsanto fund as a partner “addressing child labor education in seed production locations” |
| <i>JKWS</i> ⁵ | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received funding from Monsanto fund in 2012 totaling 47,785 USD Relationship primarily consisted of creating supplementary education centers |

³⁶ A list of all the NGOs in India that Monsanto Fund has provided money to can be found in the additional sources provided in this report under the title “Monsanto Fund 990 Grant Information.”

MV Foundation was chosen as the case study for this report both out of practicality³⁷ and due to the organization's similarity to Seva Mandir. Although there are still important gaps in information, the nature of MV Foundation's partnership with Monsanto is well mapped, and enough information is available to begin to note how their partnership with Monsanto evolved and speculate as to reasons why. Furthermore, MVF is similar to Seva Mandir, in that the organization adopts a comprehensive approach to combatting child labor through a focus on education as well as community awareness techniques.

MVF appears to have adopted both a collaborative and confrontational approach to working with MNCs, including Monsanto.³⁸ I define an approach as both collaborative and confrontational since MVF has assisted Monsanto in developing and implementing monitoring mechanisms to reduce child labor³⁹ and has also worked towards heightening public awareness about MNC wrongdoings through local and international partners and directly criticized Monsanto's practices.⁴⁰

II. MVF-Monsanto Collaboration

In terms of its direct collaboration with Monsanto, MVF took a leading role in facilitating multi-stakeholder discussions between various MNCs and local NGOs. The product of this partnership was the creation and adoption of a joint action plan that included transparency provisions and monitoring steps to be taken by MNCs to reduce child labor. Table 2.2 below summarizes key points of the adopted action plan in 2005-2006 (done in partnership with MVF).

37 The NGO VORDS and Naandi Foundation may serve as examples of NGO's to analyze as well

38 I define an approach as collaborative *either* if it works to strengthen the capacity of a corporation and aid in changing industry practices *or* if it aids in the implementation of company CSR projects. Examples of such collaborative approaches could include an NGO assisting an MNC in conducting an assessment of child labor usage across their supply chain or an organization serving as the implementing partner of an MNC's community development or school-support programs. An approach is defined as confrontational if it primarily rests on strategies to pressure MNC's. Such approaches could include the monitoring of MNC activities through local activists, organization of protests, or naming and shaming corporations.

39 Venkateswarlu, Davuuluri. "Seeds of Change." *OECD Watch*. 2007: 4-24.

40 Lifer, Yumi. "Politics of Negotiation: MVF and Multinational Corporations on Child Labor in Cottonseed Fields." *eSocialSciences*. 2004: 1-23.

Table 2.2: Summary of Action Plan⁴¹

| | Action Plan 2005-2006 (with MVF participation) |
|--|---|
| <i>Transparency</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participating MNC's agreed to share details about their chain of production including list of farmers and sites involved in seed production |
| <i>Contract Changes</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addition of clause prohibiting use of children below 15 yrs. In production activities |
| <i>Monitoring</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint monitoring committees of NGO (including MVF representatives) and company representatives formed at state, district, and mandal level Mandal level committees responsible for field inspections and reporting violations to state and district committees |
| <i>System of Incentives</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5% bonus on procurement price to child labor free farms (<i>monetary</i>) Financial support towards educational infrastructural needs (ie: school building, education materials) towards villages of child labor free farmer villages (<i>monetary</i>) |
| <i>System of Disincentives</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notice by company on 1st violation 10% cut in procurement prices after 2nd violation Blacklisting of farmers after 3rd violation |
| <i>Awareness or Sensitization Techniques</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-applicable or not reported |
| <i>Programs Targeted towards/involving impacted children</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract w/ local NGO Naandi Foundation to build learning centers and child labor rehabilitation programs |
| <i>Described Gaps in Action Plan</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited effect due to lack of effective implementation on the ground and lack of a holistic approach Reforms didn't address low procurement prices Lack of coordination between education programs and other company interventions Lack of community mobilization at the village level |

MVF also began a partnership with, “organisers,” (local persons who act as representative on behalf of the companies), farmers in the local councils, and the government administration -- a form of indirect collaboration.⁴² For instance, it participated in multi-stakeholder meetings, in which Monsanto also participated,⁴³ through the Fair Labor Association's, “ENABLE: Enhancing Agricultural Labour and Environmental Standards,” initiative. The organization, along with other participants including Monsanto's Director of Human Rights and CSR, led a discussion on how companies can improve the accuracy of child labor indicators.⁴⁴

41 Venkateswarlu, Davuuluri. “Seeds of Change.” *OECD Watch*. 2007: 4-24.

42 See additional source included with this report titled “MVF Response to Questions.”

43 Although Monsanto participated in these meetings, it is not listed as a member of the FLA on the FLA's website. See also Chapter 1 for information on Monsanto's lack of participation in MSIs working on child labor issues.

44 Fair Labor Association. “ENABLE: Enhancing Agricultural Labour and Environmental Standards A Multi-

Table 2.3 summarizes some of the topics discussed by the panel that included MVF.⁴⁵

Table 2.3: Topics Discussed by Panel

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Topics Discussed</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring criteria to be concerned in order to adopt a zero tolerance child labor policy • Adoption of a more scientific method for monitoring |
| <i>MVF Panel Recommendations/ Ideas Suggested</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring process should be extended to include weekends as well as weekdays since most children (even those attending school) work on the farms during off days • Role of growers in upholding child labor principles key since identifying child laborers in “surprise visits” difficult <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Census records maintained by gram panchayats, birth certificates, ration cards should be cross-verified with documents such as “family cards” maintained by the growers to determine the age of workers on the farm • Companies could establish or work with local authorities to implement weekend vocational training programs • Parents could face a potential penalty for children working in the farms |

III. MVF-Monsanto Confrontation

MVF’s initial collaboration with MNCs ended on a sour note, with the organization describing MNC’s such as Monsanto as unable to internalize the idea of no child labour in their policies.⁴⁶ This section will provide details about the two stages of the MVF/Monsanto confrontation: (1) strategies to pressure MNC’s to negotiate in the first place (2) the actual negotiation and fall-out – adoption of action plan and alternatives.

Strategies to Pressure MNCs to Negotiate: Before 2005

During the pre-negotiation phase, MVF adopted a primarily confrontational three-prong approach to pressure organizations to eliminate child labor. As Table 2.4 below indicates, it involved mobilization of the local community and local government, adoption of more moderate techniques, and careful partnership with international organizations. Though these strategies, MVF was able to create mechanisms to monitor local MNC activity as well as pressure corporations such as Monsanto to come to the negotiation table.

Stakeholder Consultation Series Organized by the Fair Labor Association in association with Bayer CropScience”. *Fair Labor Association*. 2010: 1-20.

45 Ibid.

46 Email exchange with MVF employee, May 2015.

Table 2.4: MVF’s Confrontational Strategies⁴⁷

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Mobilization of Local Community and Local Government</i></p> | <p>Rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heightening awareness and sensitizing the community to issues of and alternatives to child labor in cottonseed production stems the supply of child labor and provides a monitoring mechanism on MNC actions and their supply chain. <p>Implementation Examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Government Involvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Created and distributed campaign posters sponsored by the local government and the child labor department including reminders that employers are punishable under Child Labor Prohibition & Regulation Act of 1986. ○ Met with district collectors to educate labor department about the gravity of child labor. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ District collectors agreed to send warning notices to employers (MNCs and farmers) if violations found. |
| <p><i>Adoption of Moderate Techniques</i></p> | <p>Rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensationalist techniques can lead to actions harmful to promoting dialogue with and enacting reforms through MNCs due to the lack of coordinated action, the “flight of capital” or villainization of MNCs. ⁶ <p>Implementation Examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MVF does not use boycotting or raiding as techniques to pressure MNCs. |
| <p><i>Carefully form Partnerships w/ International Allies</i></p> | <p>Rationale</p> <p>If partnerships with international organizations are formed after due diligence to ensure that partners have a consistent vision of resolution, they may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplement local efforts, which are limited in geography and capacity, by applying pressure on MNCs across multiple regions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MVF found that seed farmers would locate outside of areas of their operation to avoid pressure • Apply greater financial pressure on MNCs to bring them to the negotiating table <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ International Financiers can divest funding and thus possess greater financial leverage over MNCs • Add gravity to the nature of the problems of child labor and reduce MNCs’ ability to deny the problem |

47 Lifer, Yumi. “Politics of Negotiation: MVF and Multinational Corporations on Child Labor in Cottonseed Fields.” *eSocialSciences*. 2004: 1-23.

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MVF partnered with the following organizations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Landelijke India Group (LIG) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why: Organization possessed similar goals and philosophies as MVF ○ International Labor Rights Fund (ILRF) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why: Ability to apply greater pressure on Monsanto to take action through the organization of press conferences and publicity campaigns in the United States ○ National Labor Committee ○ Germanwatch ○ International Labor Organization (ILO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ILO's presence added gravity and international awareness ○ UNICEF <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UNICEF's presence added gravity and international awareness to child labor in Bt cotton as well ○ SNS Asset Management Bank <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why: MVF could aid in monitoring human rights related criteria the bank applied in selecting companies for investment. MVF maintained contact via e-mail regarding MNCs' progress in eliminating child labor |
|--|--|

Negotiation & Fallout: 2005 and After

MVF conducted over nine meetings with MNCs, including Monsanto, regarding the creation and adoption of the joint action plan. Tensions between the organizations rose as MNCs either stalled or refused to fully cooperate with MVF regarding issues related to monitoring mechanisms and transparency. MVF accused Monsanto and other MNCs involved in the negotiation of warning farmers about visits from the joint monitoring committee to assess whether or not farms used child labor, as well as being overly secretive and potentially submitting false reports about the scale of child labor in the fields.⁴⁸ MVF also fundamentally disagreed with the scale and extent to which MNCs like Monsanto were willing to collaborate. For example, MNCs sought to create, “model villages,” where working committees would operate and implement monitoring mechanisms, while MVF felt adamantly that joint committees should be formed in all areas of MNCs’ operations. Furthermore MVF opposed MNCs’ pro-business approach, which was in tension with and sometimes flat out contradicted the agreed principle that decisions should, “stand in favour of the child.”⁴⁹

The confluence of such factors led MVF to end its direct collaboration with MNCs in September of 2005. MNCs such as Monsanto continued discussions and joint monitoring with other local NGOs. MVF criticized Monsanto and other MNCs for “showing little concern and commitment to protect democratic values and human dignity” and publicizing their partnership with MVF “as a mask to continue to exploit children.”⁵⁰ Since then, MVF has worked more indirectly with “organisers” in its efforts to reduce child labor. As Table 2.5 below indicates, the absence of MVF’s partnership impacted the strength of the Action Plans.

48 Venkateswarlu, Davuuluri. “Seeds of Change”. *OECD Watch*. 2007: 4-24.

49 See additional sources through report titled “Consultative Meetings between MVF and Seed Companies.”

50 MVF India. “Evaluation Report: NGOs and Trade Unions Against Child Labour Project Implemented by MV Foundation and Supported by FNV.” *MVF India*. 2010: 1-24.

Table 2.5 Comparison of Action Plans with and without MVF participation

| | Action Plan 2005-2006 (with MVF participation) | Action Plan 2006-2007 (Without MVF participation) |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| <i>Transparency</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participating MNC's agreed to share details about their chain of production including list of farmers and sites involved in seed production | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-applicable, not reported, or no changes since last action plan |
| <i>Contract Changes</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addition of clause prohibiting use of children below 15 yrs. In production activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-applicable, not reported, or no changes since last action plan |
| <i>Monitoring</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint monitoring committees of NGO (including MVF representatives) and company representatives formed at state, district, and mandal level Mandal level committees responsible for field inspections and reporting violations to state and district committees | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-applicable, not reported, or no changes since last action plan |
| <i>System of Incentives</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5% bonus on procurement price to child labor free farms (<i>monetary</i>) Financial support towards educational infrastructural needs (ie: school building, education materials) towards villages of child labor free farmer villages (<i>monetary</i>) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boards with the message "Child Labor Free Cotton Farm" placed on plots of growers not using child labor (<i>non-monetary</i>) Nearly 100 boards places by Monsanto in various villages Extra Rs.15 paid per kg in addition to procurement price to farmers completely avoiding child labor |
| <i>System of Disincentives</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notice by company on 1st violation 10% cut in procurement prices after 2nd violation Blacklisting of farmers after 3rd violation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-applicable, not reported, or no changes since last action plan |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p><i>Awareness or Sensitization Techniques</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-applicable or not reported | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with growers/organizers, sub-organizers organized on issues related to child labor • Pamphlets and leaflets distributed in local language requesting farmers to not use child labor • Follow-up by Monsanto to farms using child labor to persuade them not to do so |
| <p><i>Programs Targeted towards/ involving impacted children</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract w/ local NGO Naandi Foundation to build learning centers and child labor rehabilitation programs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non applicable, not-reported, or no changes since last action plan |
| <p><i>Described Gaps in Action Plan</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited effect due to lack of effective implementation on the ground and lack of a holistic approach • Reforms didn't address low procurement prices • Lack of coordination between education programs and other company interventions • Lack of community mobilization at the village level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action plan didn't apply to cottonseed production indirectly controlled by MNC's such as joint venture companies, suppliers, sub-licensees, or other seed operations directly owned by the company |

IV. Implications for Seva Mandir

This analysis offers a number of insights that may be useful to Seva Mandir. First, the MVF case study illustrates that it is possible for an NGO to take both a collaborative and also a moderate confrontational approach. NGOs do not, necessarily, have to select one or the other. Indeed, in this case, MVF's more confrontational approach helped to get Monsanto and other companies to collaborate and create a Joint Action Plan. Moreover, if collaboration fails, as in the case here, an NGO can always turn to confrontation as the alternative strategy to effect change.

Second, choosing to be confrontational does, not surprisingly, come at a price. From the study of MVF as well as a preliminary look into other NGO approaches working with Monsanto, it appears as though adopting a mix of a confrontational and collaborative strategies or mainly working to improve monitoring mechanisms, seems to connect to losing financial support from MNCs. My limited research suggests that MVF was the only organization to have collaborated with Monsanto that did not receive funding from the Monsanto Fund. MVF was also the only organization found to have publicly criticized Monsanto and to not collaborate with Monsanto on community development initiatives. The relationship between these anomalies is unclear and requires further research.⁵¹

51 It's unclear whether Monsanto ever offered MVF money to support their community development work, and whether or not MVF would have found it ethically sound to accept this funding considering the nature of their work. It is known that MVF had previously declined funding offered by Syngenta, and instead suggested another NGO the company could work with for "social mobilization and bridge course camps," however all the reasons

The potential price of lost support may well be worth it. MVFs (and other NGOs) strategy of mobilizing the community and government and working with outside organizations (including banks) to pressure companies appears to have had an important impact: compared to other cottonseed producing states in India, the challenges of child labor “has received much wider attention due active campaigns...by local children’s rights groups.”⁵² The percent of child labor in cottonseed production has been significantly reduced, from 57.4% of total work force in to 29.8%).⁵³

for doing so are not known. Furthermore, it’s also unclear whether or not organizations identified as accepting a collaborative approach also publicly or privately applied pressure on Monsanto or what the conditions of accepting funding from the Monsanto Fund were.

52 Venkateswarlu, Davuluri. “*Seeds of Child Labour: Signs of Hope*,” 2010: 8.

53 Venkateswarlu, Davuluri. “*Seeds of Child Labour: Signs of Hope*,” 2010: 11.

Chapter 3: An Example of a Successful NGO Partnership with a Multi-stakeholder Initiative (MSI)

Although Chapter 2 suggests the benefits of a more confrontational approach with MNCs, certain forms of collaboration with firms and other actors can, under the right conditions, be fruitful. This Chapter discusses one such successful partnership in the context of a Multi-stakeholder Initiative (MSI). MSIs are defined as long-term partnerships in which at least two different types of stakeholders (NGOs, private companies, government representatives, academics, etc.) are involved in the governance process of the organization – constructing the rules, overseeing enforcement etc. One concern with MSIs is that NGOs that participate in them are usually outnumbered by the corporate participants and thus unable to effectively influence MSI policies. The analysis below instead suggests two ways in which one NGO based in West Africa, World Association for Orphan (WAO)-Afrique, has effectively worked with an MSI, the International Cocoa Initiative: through documenting child labor practices and raising community awareness.

I. Defining Success

Although a number of conditions enable success of NGO-MSI partnerships, such as MSI decision-making procedures, and transparency provisions—I define success in terms of factors that NGOs have some control over, including how NGOs use their program skills to help realize the MSI mission while drawing on MSI support in pursuit of their own needs and goals. A mutual collaboration can be considered successful when it is continued in a manner that establishes an enduring relationship between the NGO and MSI in order to work effectively towards a shared goal.

II. Background on NGO-MSI Partners

The practices of WAO-Afrique are focused on West Africa where 70% of the world's cocoa comes from (ICI). The missions of the WAO-Afrique and the International Cocoa Initiative are in agreement in their efforts to end a hazardous child practice in the West African region. The following segments in the missions of WAO-Afrique and ICI show the connection between WAO-Afrique as an NGO with the International Cocoa Initiative as the MSI.

WAO-Afrique Mission

The main thrusts of activities in the period 1990-1996 were social mobilization, awareness raising, lobbying, the removal of children from exploitative situations as well as their rehabilitation and reintegration. Since 1996, WAO-Afrique has played a co-coordinating role in the sub-region, particularly with regard to actions and initiatives pertaining to child domestic workers.⁵⁴

International Cocoa Initiative Mission

Established in 2002, the International Cocoa Initiative (ICI) is the leading organization promoting child protection in cocoa-growing communities. ICI works with the cocoa industry, civil society and national governments in cocoa-producing countries to ensure a better future for children and contribute to the elimination of child labor.⁵⁵

A successful partnership has been created by WAO-Afrique and the ICI through the following practices:

54 WAO Afrique. "[Child Trafficking & Domestic Labour](#)." WAO Afrique. 2006.

55 Pervan, Borjana. "ICI Annual Report." *International Cocoa Initiative*. 2013: 1-15.

1. Strengthening evidence on child labor in cocoa fields as a hazardous practice
2. Raising awareness and advocacy about child labor in cocoa-growing communities

III. Strengthening Evidence on Child Labor in Cocoa Fields

With, and independently of the ICI, WAO-Afrique has focused its efforts on documenting and providing evidence to help make the case against child labor and trafficking. Doing so seems to have elevated its legitimacy as an organization. More importantly, WAO-Afrique's documentation strategy has helped it to indirectly influence child labor strategies and policies: it provides information that the ICI can then use to encourage or pressure its corporate members to address the use of child labor in their supply chains.

Strong and consistent evidence of child labor is crucial for effecting change, and yet is still hard to come by. As the ICI wrote in a recent report, "date and specific numbers of child labourers in cocoa is elusive and inconsistent, owing to definitional and methodological differences" (ICI, Strategy 2015-2020). The need for comprehensive and consistent information is important for making sure companies recognize child labor as a real issue, one they cannot deny. Inconsistent or questionable information, by contrast, makes it difficult to persuade private companies and consumers of chocolate of the reality of child labor.

A successful way that WAO-Afrique has worked with the International Cocoa Initiative on this effort is through their renowned Documentation Center. "For over a decade, WAO-Afrique has made considerable effort in acquiring documentation related to children's rights in general, with a particular emphasis on child trafficking, child labour, sexual exploitation and abuse. This documentation was then made available to all interested parties and, over the years, "WAO-Afrique became increasingly known as a source of information on children's issues" (WAO-Afrique).

With the help of the Save the Children Sweden, WAO-Afrique opened a Regional Documentation and Information Center on the Rights of the Child in Togo. The documentation center has allowed WAO-Afrique to increase their efforts in collecting valuable evidence, and facilitating access to such documents. The documentation center located in Togo helps the ICI, WAO-Afrique and various other organizations in the collect evidence in order to strengthen their operations.

WAO-Afrique is able to effectively gather evidence through resource support by ICI. In turn, the ICI is aided in its own efforts to work with partner companies within ICI on child labor issues by utilizing WAO-Afrique information. These are specific efforts that have complimented each other in the goals of both organizations, and they facilitate the NGO and MSI in raising awareness and advocacy as well.

The ICI has a published report of their finances for 2013, in which "Strengthening the evidence base" is a section of their expenditures on their programs.⁵⁶ The ICI's website includes various facts sheets about the cocoa industry and the role child labor plays in the cocoa industry. Having strong evidence increases its legitimacy as an organization, and it convinces stakeholders—and most importantly market stakeholders—on the importance of their mission. Large buyers of cocoa such as Nestle, Mars, Hershey's and Ferrero must comply with the standards that the cocoa market expects. For example, Sandra Martinez, head of the Nestlé's global Chocolate and Confectionary business explicitly refers to the value of information regarding child labor in the following quote: "Identifying exactly what is happening, and where, represents an important first step to resolving the issue of child labor in cocoa farming."⁵⁷ The largest cocoa manufacturers in the world are members of the International Cocoa Initiative largely due to the impact that evidence on child labor in cocoa fields has on the market. As stated in the WAO-Afrique website:

The importance of research and accurate data to an organization like WAO-Afrique cannot be understated. Research is more than a collection of words and facts on a sheet of paper, it is used as an effective awareness-raising tool as well as for lobbying for change in the best interest of the child.⁵⁸

56 Image 1, Appendix

57 Martinez, Sandra. "Nestlé: Tackling child labour in cocoa farming." *Nestlé*. 2014.

58 WAO-Afrique, Research and Data Collection.

IV. Raising Awareness and Advocacy About Child Labor in Cocoa Fields

In addition to documentation, WAO-Afrique, with ICI's support, also engages in raising awareness and advocacy in cocoa-growing communities. Its key intervention methods are the following:

- Awareness
- Campaigns and Advocacy
- Child Protection Domestic
- Network Management and Coordination
- Direct Intervention
- Research and Data Collection

WAO-Afrique is involved in various projects that allow them to successfully work on the list above. For example, they work with national radio stations to raise awareness on the issues of child labor. "Pour Demain" a children's rights program is aired every Sunday on Radio Lome. WAO-Afrique has been at the forefront of translating Convention 182 "on the worst forms of child labor" into the local languages of Togo and Ghana to reach the rural population and inform them. They have produced documentaries through partnerships with PLAN Togo, Anti-Slavery International and Save the Children Sweden. The films are titled "The Price of a Bicycle," "A Life of a Maid," and "Fight Against Child Trafficking – Speak Out and Act" to raise awareness. WAO-Afrique has organized local seminars and even has its staff go door-to-door to raise awareness on these issues.⁵⁹ (Their efforts to create awareness within affected communities and internationally are extensive, and can be found in detail here: <https://waoenglish.wordpress.com/programs-projects/interventions/>)

Similar to its relying on and also financially supporting WAO-Afrique's documentation efforts, the International Cocoa Initiative has both financially supported and benefited from NGOs' advocacy work.⁶⁰ The International Cocoa Initiative, in collaboration with local NGOs, is able to engage in community level awareness and advocacy campaigns:

We carry out awareness-raising activities on child labour and child rights: we educate community members on the causes and consequences of child labour, the importance of schooling and vocational training to improve children's future prospects, and on the negative impacts of child labour on children's health and education.⁶¹

As previously stated, a successful partnership must involve genuine collaboration between an NGO and MSI. In this case, ICI is able to provide funding for many of the local-level advocacy programs that WAO-Afrique implements in its own communities. On their website, the ICI states that it has reached 451 communities through such partnerships, including those where the WAO-Afrique works.

V. Implications for Seva Mandir

Two key insights emerge from the WAO-Afrique-ICI collaboration that may be helpful to Seva Mandir. The first is the power of strong documentation to effect change, particularly when in the right hands. When NGOs make documentation available to strategic players – those with some form of market pressure, whether consumers, industry organizations or MSIs—the possibility of changes in policy or practice seem, under at least some circumstances, stronger than when NGOs try to leverage that information themselves, or pass it along to only government officials.

Second, for NGOs that may be reluctant to take corporate funding or work with firms directly, MSIs may be an alternative source of financial support or collaboration. MSIs of course vary in their commit-

59 WAO Afrique. "[Child Trafficking & Domestic Labour](#)." *WAO Afrique*. 2006.

60 Imagine I, Appendix

61 International Cocoa Initiative. "What We Do." *International Cocoa Initiative*. 2015.

ment to human rights. Like companies, some MSI commitments exist only on paper. In contrast to firms, however, MSIs by definition are comprised of NGOs or/and government officials -- some of which exert real influence on the MSI. Such MSIs may prove to be potentially fruitful partners – both for funding and for longer-term and mutually beneficial collaborations.

Chapter 4: An Example of a Successful NGO-MNC Collaboration

While Chapter 3 discussed one NGO’s successful collaboration with a multi-stakeholder initiative, this Chapter focus on a successful direct partnership of two NGOs, Kuapa Kokoo (which, more precisely, is a farmers’ cooperative) and CARE, with the multinational firm Mondelez International. The Chapter briefly describes two initiatives falling under Mondelez’s Cocoa Life Program, a Community Action Plan (CAPs) process and the Bicycle Program. One feature in particular that makes this NGO-MNC collaboration successful is that it structured to encourage community leadership – community members identify the community needs and participate in managing the project.

I. Defining “Success” and the Landscape of Corporate-NGO Initiatives

A successful NGO-MNC collaboration can be characterized by four features: number of beneficiaries; sustainability; ability to address the needs and preferences identified by members of the targeted community; and transparency. Like the cotton industry, the cocoa industry is plagued by child labor. In comparison to the cotton industry, however, it appears to be marked by more effective corporate-NGOs partnerships working on projects aimed at reducing child labor.

Three of the largest actors in the cocoa industry, including Cargill, Barry Callebaut, and Hershey, work directly with and are affiliated with local NGOs at a smaller, regional scale in the areas in which they produce.⁶² These social projects target a range of issues, promoting education partnerships in particular to combat child labor. The following corporations have their own, distinct project and frameworks for addressing child labor throughout their production operations:⁶³

Table 4.1: Landscape of Corporate-NGO Initiatives

| Corporation | Project Description | Implementing Partners |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| <i>Mondelez International</i> | Cocoa Life: focuses on helping farmers improve their yields and livelihoods, empowering the community through the promotion of gender equality, working to eliminate child labor, and protecting the environment in a more sustainable way | Care International, VSO, World Vision Ghana, International Cocoa Initiative, Ghana Cocoa Board, Kuapa Kokoo (cooper.) |
| <i>The Hershey Company</i> | Cocoa Link: Connecting Cocoa Communities: working to improving cocoa communities through community development and collaboration with government to meet cocoa farmers and their families needs while also achieving progress | World Cocoa Foundation, World Education, Ghana Cocoa Board |

62 Cargill. “Education Partners.” 2014.

63 Ibid.

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| <i>Nestlé S.A.</i> | Nestlé Cocoa Plan Schools Project: Improving Education in Cote d’Ivoire: aims to increasing accessibility of education to children, reducing incidence of worst forms of child labor (WCFL), and the physical improvement of schools | World Cocoa Foundation, Winrock International |
| <i>Barry Callebaut AG</i> | Quality Partner Program (QPP) Rural Schools & Community Learning Centers Project in Cocoa Growing Communities in Cote D’Ivoire: supplies two specific cocoa communities with primary schools, including the installation of a water well along with classrooms and the accessories needed for school. Activities focusing on raising awareness about child protection and the importance of education in combating child labor (run by ICI). Trainings of good agricultural practices and child labor sensitization will be offered to farmers as well. | Société Africaine de Cacao SACO SA, International Cocoa Initiative, AGEPE |
| <i>Ferrero Trading Lux S.A.</i> | Ferrero Cocoa Community Commitment in Ghana: to improve the well-being of cocoa communities by targeting communities with WFCL, offering best practices capacity trainings for farmers, creating village resource centers at schools to improve educational efficacy. | Sourcetrust Ghana |
| <i>Mars, Incorporated</i> | Vision for Change: empowering farmers to improve their yields in production, increase national coordination in cocoa sustainability, instilling a productivity pillar that aims to increase farmers’ income to address poverty as a cause of child labor, establishing a <i>community pillar</i> to educate communities about acceptable labor practices and living standards of agricultural workers | World Agroforestry Centre, Conseil du Café Cacao, Ivorian National Breeding Centre, Ivorian National Extension Service, International Cocoa Initiative |

II. Background on Mondelēz’s Cocoa Life Initiative

Mondelēz International’s partnership with various NGOs offers one example of an effective initiative. Formerly known as the Cadbury Cocoa Partnership, the initiative was renamed *Cocoa Life* in 2012.⁶⁴ Cocoa Life’s NGOs partners included: Care International, Voluntary Services Overseas, World Vision Ghana, International Cocoa Initiative (ICI), Ghana Cocoa Board, and Kuapa Kokoo. Two specific programs under the Cocoa Life project , one informal and the second formal, that appear to be successful practices are the Community Action Plan (CAP) and the bicycle program.

Before providing details, I provide some information on the broader Cocoa Life project. It involved four sub-projects:⁶⁵

1. Expansion of the **Core Program** to address the WFCL (worst forms of child labor) as part of a newly created strategy framework within the program

64 Buino, Richard. “Mondelēz International to Invest \$400 Million to Help One Million People in Cocoa Farming Communities.” *Mondelēz International*. 2014.

65 Engel, Eliot. “2012 Annual Report.” *U.S. DOL*. 2012.

2. The provision of **bicycles to schoolchildren** and teachers to improve access to education and academic performance;
3. The provision of equipment to provide **solar-powered energy to schools**, households and community centers to enhance the quality of education and living standards; and
4. The provision of community infrastructure such as schools, teachers' accommodation, health centers, community learning centers and water wells through **the Community Challenge Fund**.

The projects had the following timeframe:⁶⁶

| Project | Commencement | Timeframe | Notes |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-----------|--|
| <i>Core program</i> | October 2008 | 2008-2018 | Investment committed to 2018 as part of the overall program roll-out and specifically on relevant Child labor and community activity. Progressive scale up investment activity in 2010 and 2011 after start up in 2008 and 2009. |
| <i>Bicycles</i> | January 2010 | 2010-2012 | Impact assessment undertaken in 2011. Positive results recorded and therefore intervention being extended with next distribution targeted for February 2013. |
| <i>Solar Energy</i> | June 2011 | 2011 | May be extended beyond 2011. |
| <i>Community Challenge Fund</i> | 2010 | 2010-2012 | Ongoing construction of a Health Center; three 4-unit Teachers' living quarters; two community resource centers; three 3-unit classroom blocks; and a Kindergarten. |

Lastly, the financial allocation for each project was reported as the follows:⁶⁷

| Project | Funds (\$MM) specifically committed to child labor interventions | | | | Timeframe |
|---------------------------------|--|------|------|------|-----------|
| | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| <i>Core program</i> | 0.41 | 0.45 | 0.47 | 0.48 | 2008-2018 |
| <i>Bicycles</i> | - | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.65 | 2010-2013 |
| <i>Solar Energy</i> | - | - | 0.6 | - | 2011 |
| <i>Community Challenge Fund</i> | - | - | - | 1.19 | 2012-2018 |
| Total | 0.41 | 0.95 | 1.57 | 2.32 | |

III. Mondelēz-NGO Partnerships: Community Actions Plan and the Bicycle Project

Kuapa Kokoo is a farmer's cooperative that was formed in 1993 in Ghana as a response to the government's liberalization of the Cocoa Industry.⁶⁸ The cooperative expanded from 22 villages at the start to around

66 Ibid.

67 Engel, Eliot. "2012 Annual Report." *U.S. DOL*. 2012.

68 Kuapa Kokoo. "Update Report on Kuapa Kokoo Internal Systems and Policy Development and New

1,200 village societies in 2009, spread across the five regions in Ghana with the most cocoa cultivation: Western, Brong Ahafo, Ashanti, Eastern, and Central. The organization holds specific principles and values of which they hold their members accountable for through processes for membership and through Fairtrade certifications (although non-Fairtrade buyers also purchase the cooperative's cocoa).⁶⁹ Its mission reads as follows "To develop into a formidable farmer based organization, able to mobilize quality cocoa and cocoa products, improve the members' livelihood and satisfy our customers."⁷⁰

In terms of its child labor policies, the cooperative states that children working in agriculture can be a "good practice and discipline," but recognizes that frequent abuse of child labor that harms the children's development and livelihood. As a Fairtrade organization, the cooperative has implemented preventative and responsive measures concerning child labor, required for the farmers they support.

In 2009, Kuapa Kokoo published a report that outlined their new initiatives, which included empowering villages to conduct needs-assessment of their communities and to form "Community Action Plans" (CAPs) to address central issues such as "child labor, child protection, and child rights."⁷¹ The production of Community Action Plans (CAPs) by the village members that Kuapa Kokoo worked with led to a shared recognition of the "negative effects of walking long distance of more than 3 km between school and home for children resulting in low academic performance and attendance." Through the CAPs process it was suggested that the bicycle program be implemented in both Kuapa Kokoo and *Cocoa Life* communities.⁷² The program is monitored by "community-led management committees."⁷³ Important to note, Kuapa Kokoo villages in which the bicycle project was implemented already had strong NGO-farmer partnerships in place due to the presence of the cooperative.

CARE International is a second NGO that partnered with Mondelez. In fact, CARE was a founding NGO in the *Cocoa Life* program that Mondelez International initially set up in Cote d'Ivoire. CARE's general focus is on fighting "poverty and injustice in 87 countries around the world" to assist the world's poorest populations to "find routes out of poverty."⁷⁴ In its own words, it partners with corporations in order to "improve the impact of their activities on poverty, ensure financial inclusion, and challenge market systems to be more inclusive so that real opportunities are created for poor people."⁷⁵ The organization places an emphasis on women's empowerment issues and how to address the exclusion of women economically in impoverished regions.

The Bicycle initiative has reportedly proved very successful: 15,000 bicycles distributed to 13,998 school children, 350 teachers and 278 community animators, 99 health workers and 285 other community workers in 1,455 communities. The school attendance rate and academic performance has improved and school retention is reportedly 100%.⁷⁶ Further, one report notes that at least one community is providing additional funding of its own to expand the program.⁷⁷

With CARE's involvement, the *Cocoa Life* program in Cote d'Ivoire principally worked in 11 villages in order to support 4,000 cocoa farmers to improve "the livelihoods of nearly 40,000 community members."⁷⁸ In these communities (where Community Action Plans were not in place), *Cocoa Life* and

Proposals First Initiated". *Kuapa Kokoo*. 2009.

69 Ibid.

70 Ibid.

71 Ibid.

72 Engel, Eliot. "2012 Annual Report." *U.S. DOL*. 2012: 59.

73 *ibid.*

74 Buino, Richard, ed. "Mondelez International Launches Cocoa Life Sustainability Program in Côte D'ivoire." *Mondelez International*. 2013.

75 Care International. "Working with Business." *Care International*. 2015.

76 Mondelez International. "CLCCG Stakeholder Briefing." *Mondelez International*. 2013.

77 Engel, Eliot. "2012 Annual Report." *U.S. DOL*. 2012: 59.

78 *Ibid.*

Care jointly facilitated CAPs in villages, helping cocoa farming families to more democratically express their priorities and needs. As with the Kuapa Kokoo example, these community-led management committees that direct the village meetings effectively completed a need-assessment and subsequently managed the bicycle project. Mondelez International has financed and commissioned a monitoring and evaluation system to measure the outputs of the program.

IV. Implications for Seva Mandir

The main take-away from this case study is that the importance of not simply community participation in NGO-Corporate projects, but community leadership. An important reason the Community Action Plans and bicycle program have been relatively successful is that they emerged from community members’ own initiative and their identification of local needs, and then involved community oversight (for the bicycle program, in the form of management teams). More broadly, the CAPs processes among farming families is proving to be sustainable and democratic. They promote more discussion of important local social issues while also offering a plan of action to improve the circumstances and address the communities’ needs. The Bicycle program, moreover, has been marked by transparent reporting of both the number of beneficiaries and the annual budget. Table 4.2 below summarizes each program along the four dimensions of success outlined at the outset of the Chapter.

Table 4.2: Comparing CAPs and the Bicycle Project⁷⁹

| Best Practice | Number of Beneficiaries Reached (2013) | Sustainability | Ability to solve location-specific problems | Transparency |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| <i>Bicycle Project</i> | Children: 18,000 Adults: 203 (Extension agents- 3, Teachers-160, Community animators-25, Health workers-15) | - Project was continued into 2013 after positive feedback and community assessment the previous year - 100% retention of students in regions where project implementation occurred the 1 st year | - Only implemented in those communities with a significant need of teachers or students more than 3 km away from school (research based project) | - Clear finances and budget outlined annually |
| <i>Community Action Plans (CAPs)</i> | N/A (depends on location of CAPs and what projects materialize from them) | - Capacity building-oriented through trainings of community leaders (who can then train others in the community) - Held more than once, “committee” meetings to check progress - Specific to <i>Cocoa Life</i> : strong monitoring and evaluation system in place to check compliance with action plan | - Community oriented: led by leaders in village who understand and are knowledgeable about the population - Allow for a more democratic process of calling plans to actions: encompasses women who are often sidelined | -Some corporations outline their training sessions and their community meetings (transparent). <i>Cocoa Life</i> did not (weakness) describe in detail the formation of their CAPs |

79 Engel, Eliot. “2012 Annual Report.” *U.S. DOL*. 2012: 59.

Chapter 5: Best Educational Practices to Combat Child Labor

This Chapter moves away from the business-focused approach of the previous chapters to briefly highlight two innovative, educational practices, used by the MV Foundation in Andhra Pradesh, that have relatively successful in addressing child labor. The Community Scorecard Approach has community members grading schools and then coming together to collectively address school weaknesses. The Rapid Learning Technique Approach focuses on building interpersonal connections between students and teachers and tailoring incentives or disincentives to individual student needs and contexts.

I. Defining Success

The Success of educational interventions to reduce child labor may be measured in the following five ways: (1) higher enrollment and attendance in school, (2) fewer children participating in child labor, (3) a positive long-term impact on quality of life and (4) whether or not the programs are sustainable, and (5) whether programs are tailored to their political and cultural context.⁸⁰ Because these measures vary in their availability, reliability and accuracy, programs are best evaluated across as many dimensions as possible.

II. Current Landscape of Anti-Child Labor Educational Initiatives

The organizations I reviewed mainly focused on increasing government involvement, targeting girls' education, raising awareness campaigns, and incorporating teachers into their initiatives. The Table below offers a few examples of some of the most relevant initiatives, including the *country* in which they are, the *entity* which is implementing them, and the actual *program(s)* themselves. All programs mentioned in Table 5.1 have met, to varying degrees, the above five criteria for success.

Table 5.1: Landscape of Educational Initiatives to Reduce Child Labor⁸¹

| Country (Continent) | Organization | Program(s) |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| <i>Columbia (South America)</i> | Asociación Cristiana de Jóvenes de Santander, Columbia | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persuaded government to implement the “Accelerated Learning Programme” to help girl domestic laborers be up to speed with their education • State involvement necessary • Community Volunteers involved • Professional benefits incentivized teacher participation • Textbook lending program • Worked directly with families |

80 International Labour Office. “Evaluation: Prevention and Eradication of Domestic Child Labour and Commercial Sexual Exploitation in Chile, Colombia, Paraguay and Peru.” *International Labour Office*.

81 Data from this table was compiled from organization websites and ILO Education as an Intervention Strategy to Eliminate and Prevent Child Labour.

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| <p><i>India (Asia)</i></p> | <p>Mamidipudi Verkatarangaiya Foundation (MVF), Andhra Pradesh, India</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims to create <i>awareness</i> and <i>demand</i> for <i>education</i> among <i>poor</i> • Focuses on <i>girls'</i> education • Addresses counterproductive social norms through <i>public rallies</i> and <i>theater</i> and using local leaders as insiders • “Bridge Camps” to help transition students from working to school life • Department of Social Welfare (of Andhra Pradesh) adopt “Bridge Camps,” while MVF provides technical support • Instill a feeling of competition between villages child labor free • Rapid Learning Technique: Uses children’s own experiences and stories as a format for teaching |
| <p><i>Peru (South America)</i></p> | <p>Acción Solidaria para el Desarrollo, Cooper Acción, Peru</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worked through “School insurance Policy,” providing supplementary course, organizing textbook lending schemes, etc. • State involvement necessary • Worked with local health providers for free health insurance for those attending schools • Provided a mechanized system to raise mined material to surface, eliminating need for child labor • Professional benefits incentivized teacher participation • Worked directly with families |
| <p><i>Thailand (Asia)</i></p> | <p>Special Project Division (SEMA), Office of the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education, Thailand</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determined girls wanted to “fulfill their filial responsibility” (earn money) • Improve teaching efforts by partnering with other program/ organizations • Empowered teachers to make education a route to self-esteem, creating a conscious social support and social recognition • Possibility for earning capacity → vocational training popular (appropriate for local labor market) • Offered scholarships, materials and equipment for vocational training • Common manipulation techniques by agents brought up in school • Exhibitions on child labor in schools • Group of 40 trainers on how to replicate programs against child labor and train teachers on issues |
| <p><i>Turkey (Asia/ Europe)</i></p> | <p>Ministry of Education (MONE), Turkey</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilize teachers to improve retention and performance rates of working children • Created group of 30 trainers to train teachers (training-of-teachers, aka TOT) • Training programs had evaluation and follow-up mechanisms • Redirected local governors’ Social Security Funds to provide funding to poor families |

MVF, located in Andhra Pradesh, seemed to fulfill these criteria the best of those mentioned and had the most comprehensive resources available to analyze. It therefore served as a primary source for the analysis below.

III. Best Practices: Community Scorecards and Rapid Learning

This section focuses on two examples of promising practices that seem to fit within Seva Mandir's learning camp model and nascent scholarship program: Community Scorecard Approach and Rapid Learning Technique.

Community Scorecard

In 2007, MVF in partnership with the Centre for Good Governance followed an evaluation strategy through a "community scorecard" method.⁸² This program attempted to bring together internal (school workers, etc.) and relevant but external parties (local leaders, prominent community members, etc.) at the village level to help evaluate the quality of education, on issues ranging from infrastructure to academics. Through this program, students, teachers and community members graded how well a school was functioning, including whether or not the education was satisfactory, the infrastructure was satisfactory, etc. Members from the community and school then came together in a town hall to discuss discrepancies in areas of consequence, creating a larger sense of community and facilitating conversation between both parties. The results were promising: there was a 10% drop in teacher absenteeism, school dropout rates fell and there was a significant amount in enrollment the first time the districts implemented the program.⁸³

Despite the initial cost of developing the scorecards and the operating cost of passing out then collecting the cards, the benefits seem to well outweigh the costs of the program. In eight of the 20 districts where MVF implemented this program, enrollment in school was 100%, and in other districts the enrollment was considerably higher than it was before.

Rapid Learning Technique

The Rapid Learning Technique promotes direct interaction with a student and teacher. Specifically, this technique focuses on building interpersonal connections between students and teachers, making learning feel relevant and easier to grasp. There is a significant amount of literature establishing that strong rapport between teachers and students can lead to positive effects, both academically and behaviorally.⁸⁴

From state government programs in Thailand to the programs of the local Montes Altos government in Brazil, direct interaction seems to vastly improve the outcome of education for students.⁸⁵ Indeed, MVF found success with this teaching method. Interaction can take place in the forms of positive incentive or discouragement, making sure to make critique of the student's actions and not the student him or herself.

Table 5.2 below offers a few examples of some of the most relevant practices in establishing rapport, including strategies to incentivize desired behavior and learning and strategies to discourage undesired behavior and learning.

82 Patel, Darshana. "Social Accountability Series, South Asia Sustainable Development Department." 2009. Post, Agarwal and Venugopal. "How-To Notes, Rapid Feedback: The Role of Community Scorecards in Improving Service Delivery".

83 Saith and Wazi. "M. V. Foundation, Achievements and Future Directions, A Review." 2010.

84 Fiore and Noam. "Relationships Across Multiple Settings: An Overview." 2004. Pianta and Stuhlman. "Teacher-Child Relationships and Children's Success in the First Years of School." 2004. Hamre and Pianta. "Student—Teacher Relationships." 2006.

85 Segi, Drew and Grieswood. "Child Labour, Book 2, The Role of Teachers and Their Organizations." 2004.

Table 5.2: Rapid Learning Strategies⁸⁶

| Group of Interest | Strategies to Incentivize Desired Behavior/Learning | Strategies to Discourage Undesired Behavior/Learning |
|-------------------|--|--|
| Students | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If student comes from negative home life, provide necessary time and items to complete homework • When a correct answer given, teachers smile, offer verbal praise (“good job,” etc.) and/or have other students applaud • Teacher responds with “immediate, consistent” and specific feedback • Randomly call on student to answer question (try to call on all students) → students start having a greater sense of responsibility over material • Teacher stands next to child during student presentation • Teacher offers personal stories (related to material) which models desired behavior • Use modern media (newspaper clippings, twitter feeds and other pop culture materials) to discuss and critically think about appropriate behavior → have children think about own behavior, particular subject, etc., with regard to stimulus • Place high-performing (academically, behaviorally) students with low-performing ones | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have student answer series of questions whether or not he/she would like if another student performed same behavior to him/her • Have student write report/essay about action and its effect on others → share report with class • Teacher does not call on student in class • Teacher makes stern eye contact with student in class • Teacher responds with “immediate, consistent” and specific feedback → Offers suggestion of a better behavior (“please speak when called on,” etc.) • Distract student through creative projects (coloring/drawing diagrams) related to material • Call student to blackboard to complete a question (embarrasses student for behavior without shaming) • Send students outdoors to release (very rarely, students might abuse a trend) • Place student in leadership role to decrease undesired behavior he/she committed |

The strategies in the preceding Table come from a case study of the MV Foundation’s own learning camps. Below, I offer some further suggestions, expanding on existing ideas.

Strategy 1: Have Students Tell Stories through Various Media to Engage

As there has been great success with teachers offering their personal stories as a method for educating, perhaps students could offer their own personal stories to make education a personal investment. Teachers could employ this idea by having the students write plays, engaging grammatical, linguistic and creative fields, and then perform those plays to the class. This exchange of stories or favorite memories could foster

86 Mintz, Abby. “Corporal Punishment and Alternative Teaching Methods.” *MTV*. 2011.

a stronger interpersonal community, and could complement the activities at the closing ceremony Seva Mandir already conducts at the Learning Camp.⁸⁷

Strategy 2: Place Students in Leadership Positions to Motivate

Teachers could think about using incentives of placing a student in a leadership position as an additional strategy to improve schooling outcomes. MVF provides the example of how to discourage behavior – to put a misbehaving student in a leadership role that aims to stop other students from committing the same bad behavior. However, teachers can use leadership positions to incentivize desired behaviors. Teachers could, for instance, place students in leadership roles such as “study monitor” or “class scribe” when the class is brainstorming ideas. Leadership roles give the student some title, and, when appropriate to the demeanor of the child, a sense of pride and responsibility in a certain area. The incentive should ideally fit the personality of the student. Children who are extroverted could be given roles in which they engage the entire class at the same time. The more introverted students could be given positions that only require them to interact with one or a few classmates at a time.

IV. Implications for Seva Mandir

The Community Scorecard, School Adoption, and Rapid Learning Technique have been focused on partly because they seem potentially relevant for Seva Mandir’s current program, including its learning camps and scholarships. But their replication and implementation does face several challenges:

Funding Challenges and a Potential Solution: Private Sector Funding under the New CSR Law

These approaches require resources. One potential new source of funding for Seva Mandir to consider is the new corporate social responsibility law. Businesses with a net profit of 5 crore INR or more must donate at least 2% of their earnings to community development projects.⁸⁸ Below are a few businesses I gathered that Seva Mandir might consider contacting.⁸⁹ These businesses comprise only a small sample of those that fall under the new CSR regime.

5.3 Businesses that Fall under the CSR Regime

| Company | Profits in Dollars (Year 2014) | Minimum Amount Available to NGOs (2% of Profits) |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Reliance Industries</i> | \$3.8 Billion | \$76 Million |
| <i>State Bank of India</i> | \$3.3 Billion | \$66 Million |
| <i>Oil & Natural Gas</i> | \$4.5 Billion | \$90 Million |
| <i>ICICI Bank</i> | \$1.8 Billion | \$36 Million |
| <i>Tata Motors</i> | \$1.8 Billion | \$36 Million |
| <i>Indian Oil</i> | \$0.8 Billion | \$16 Million |
| <i>HDFC Bank</i> | \$1.3 Billion | \$26 Million |
| <i>NTPC</i> | \$2.3 Billion | \$46 Million |

87 Seva Mandir. “Closing Ceremony – Residential Learning Camps.” *Seva Mandir*. 2015.

88 PricewaterhouseCoopers. “Handbook on Corporate Social Responsibility in India.” *PricewaterhouseCoopers Private Limited*. 2013.

89 Forbes. “The World’s Biggest Public Companies.” *Forbes*. 2015.

These businesses are the largest publically traded companies based in India. While their size does mean they have access to an extraordinary amount of resources, there are perhaps more appropriate businesses available, based on factors like state-location, mission of the business, etc.

Sustaining Teacher Participation and Potential Solution: Incorporate Local Leaders, and involve Teachers in Curriculum Development

While Seva Mandir's programs demonstrate an extraordinary effect on children's enrollment in school, some enrollment levels may abate after a specific program has ended, which may often be correlated with a drop off in teacher participation. Continued enrollment and sustained teacher participation might be supported by following MVF's example of utilizing local leaders, including teachers, parents, and heads of village government to keep tabs on the children.

To encourage teachers to stay invested in their own teaching and schools, Seva Mandir could include the teachers in developing the curriculum. Having teachers personally shape the material (and making the material more personal) might foster more ownership over the material, and also build teacher-student connections. Moreover, creating a collaborative atmosphere where many teachers coordinate on creating a new or revamped curriculum allows for an opportunity to evaluate each teacher on how they are doing, with regard to both academics and social interaction with the students.

Chapter 6: Child-Centered Approaches to Addressing Child Labor

Child centered approaches to addressing child labor engage with the voices of children and recognize their agency by including them in the development of strategies to mitigate child labor. These strategies are sensitive to local contexts, which aids in their success. I focus on a particular type of child-centered approach that stems from the broader peer education. In the peer education model, people of similar ages and backgrounds educate and work with one another on issue. Here, children are the educators of other children and those involved in child labor practices. The two best practices that I will discuss in this report are Children's Forums and Child Friendly Villages. Children's forums are spaces that promote and ensure children's participation and help build their self-reliance. Child Friendly Village (and Child Labor Free Zones) seek to create a geographical area in which all children are removed from work and enrolled in full time, formal schools. Both practices, with some modification, seem potentially compatible with existing Seva Mandir program, but they also have important distinctions that are highlighted at the end of this Chapter.

I. The Appeal of a Child-Centered Approach and the Peer Education model

A child-centered approach (CCA) may prove a useful strategy for addressing child labor for the following reasons:

1. CCA dispels the stereotype of working children as helpless victims and recognizes and encourages the empowerment of children.
2. CCA recognizes that children are socially conscious and reasoning individuals who have legitimate reasons for working and thus fosters an environment for those children to discuss their experiences and teach others.
3. CCA creates a better understanding of community specific definitions of children and childhood, allowing for socially appropriate responses.⁹⁰
4. CCA focuses on the best interests of the child, ensuring that children remain the, "central concern of all action."⁹¹
5. CCA allows children to have a voice in the decisions that affect their lives, reflecting Seva Mandir's mission, "to make real the idea of society consisting of free and equal citizens who are able to come together and solve the problems that affect them in their particular contexts."
6. CCA recognizes, as well as facilitates, the agency that individual children possess by promoting children's, "individual and collective participation," in decisions and activities that involve them.⁹² Children involvement, "[helps] build capacities, attitudes, and support system[s] that increase their resistances," aiding in children's development and their ability to secure a safer and more fulfilling future.⁹³

Peer education is a specific kind of child-centered approach. It occurs when, "children, young people, or adults educate others of similar age, background, culture, or social status." It takes the form of providing academic support, enhancing communication, providing peer counseling, raising awareness, and encour-

90 Mbakogu, Ifeyinwa. "Child Trafficking in Africa: The Need for Child-Centred Approaches". *Institute for the Study of International Development*. 2012: 1-17.

91 Boyden, Jo, and William, Myers. "Child Labour: Promoting the Best Interests of Working Children". *Save the Children*. 1998: 2-30.

92 Ibid.

93 Ibid.

aging advocacy.⁹⁴ Peer education is created around the knowledge that children have the ability to empower themselves and educate their community about child labor and migration in socially relevant ways. They best understand the context in which they live, so peer educators can come up with appropriate ways of dissipating information that will make an impact on child labor and migration.

Through my research, I identified two best practices that utilize this idea of peer education: Child Friendly Villages and children's forums. These best practices have been successful in the different places in which they have been implemented. Before describing the practices, I elaborate on the meaning of success.

II. Defining Success

This Chapter defines success according to three criteria:

1. The practice must engage with the local community to increase awareness.
2. The practice must increase (at least part time) school attendance for children.
3. The practice must be sustainable for the long term.

First, in order to be successful, a best practice must engage with the local community. It must strive to raise awareness and educate community members about the risks associated with child labor and migration. Thus a best practice must include the community in its framework because the support of the community is necessary in order for the project to be accepted and sustainable. Second, a best practice must increase, at least part-time, school attendance for children. Education is a necessary component for reducing child labor and offering rehabilitation for previous child migrants. Lastly, a practice has to be sustainable in order to be a best practice. It must have the capability to run for an extended period of time and have a high impact level. The practice must also be sustainable in the sense that it discourages the renewal of child labor within the community after the practice has been successfully implemented.

III. Children's Forums

Children's forums, also called children's clubs, are a concept widely used by the Nepalese NGO Child Workers in Nepal (CWIN) that aim to stop child labor by creating spaces that promote and ensure children's participation and help build their self-reliance. The forums work by acknowledging the potential of children to be supporters and advocates of their own education and rights. Child Rights Forums, as CWIN calls them, came into being in 1998 after emphasis was placed on the importance of child participation. These forums were created in schools in rural and urban areas to raise awareness about child labor at a local level.⁹⁵ CWIN aims to make children, "strong change agents," in stopping child labor and promoting the importance of education. Currently, CWIN runs about 300 forums in 34 districts in Nepal and has provided a platform for about 38,000 children to address issues of children's rights.⁹⁶

Children's forums provide a space for children to get together and learn, as well as reflect on, their rights and educational development. They promote child-to-child advocacy and promote children as activists for raising awareness about local issues. Through the forum, children work together to find ways to increase awareness among peers, parents, teachers, and other community members about issues that affect children and young people. The forums organize meetings with ex-child laborers, create awareness campaigns for the local community, offer self-help group consultations, and brainstorm other creative ways to impact their community.⁹⁷

An important aspect of children's forums is that they are designed to link in with already existing structures in the community. CWIN stresses that in order for its interventions to have an impact on the

94 Winrock International. "Best Practices in Preventing and Eliminating Child Labor through Education". *Winrock International*. 2008: 144.

95 CWIN. "25 Glorious Years of CWIN-Nepal". *CWIN*. 2012: 47.

96 Gopali, Prabina, Pillai, Meera and Subedi, Govind. "A Critical Review of Child Workers in Nepal – Concerned Centre (CWIN) and its Programmes for Vulnerable Children". *Forut*. 2008: 31.

97 World Vision. "Work in progress: Effective approaches to end child labour". *World Vision UK*. 2015: 20.

community, it is necessary for them to engage with the institutions already present within that community. In this way, CWIN also emphasizes the importance of capacity building inside those institutions with its goal to, “actively [create] space for this where it had not existed previously.”⁹⁸ Therefore CWIN advocates creating Child’s Rights Forums inside schools and already established community structures. This also makes forums are especially sustainable because it allows them to easily recruit new members (younger children) as older children leave. Creating forums inside schools works in two ways.

1. It reaches children in poverty and allows them a safe place to learn from their peers.
2. It reaches middle class children who, according to CWIN, will be active practitioners and implementers of national policies.⁹⁹

The forums not only have short term effects in raising community awareness and changing community outlook on the realities of child labor and the importance of education, but also long term effects on the children that participate. According to a study on Children’s Clubs in Nepal, a significant effect of children’s clubs and forums is that they foster a way of thinking and working together that gets instilled in children and stays with them long after they leave the club.¹⁰⁰

Children in the children’s clubs and forums took their role of reaching out to community members, providing them with information, advocating for the rights of children, and reporting children at risk of child labor and migration to the proper authorities very seriously.¹⁰¹ Children’s forums are especially useful in coming up with creative ways in which to engage their community on the dangers of child labor and the benefit of childhood education. CWIN implemented a program within its Child’s Rights Forums where it developed a formal child-to-child advocacy program in which children were taught they were integral parts of society and not second hand citizens. The children received in-depth training on children’s rights and child labor exploitation. They also learned communication and interpersonal skills that aided them in persuading their peers to return to school and leave situations of child labor. About 600 children have participated in this program so far.

One of the most innovative practices implemented by these child advocates has been the use of street theater to convey their messages. The members of the theater group are former child laborers who share their difficult experiences through theater to relay a strong message for the audience. The dramas are preformed at schools, project sites, community centers, and other locations to raise awareness within the community, in adults, parents, and children. The dramas have reached at least 10,000 people and have been found to be an extremely effective method for reaching especially disadvantaged children.¹⁰²

Peer educators within clubs and forums are able to act as an early warning system in identifying at risk children, and are then able to reach out to teachers and other community members to help support the identified children. Forums help children and community members understand the consequences of child labor and they highlight the opportunities that education can provide.¹⁰³ Children’s forums ensure that children’s rights are respected, develop youth leadership, create child-friendly environments, can ensure children’s participation in issues that regard them, and lastly can help mainstream issues children are dealing with.¹⁰⁴

98 Gopali, Prabina, Pillai, Meera and Subedi, Govind. “A Critical Review of Child Workers in Nepal – Concerned Centre (CWIN) and its Programmes for Vulnerable Children”. *Forut*. 2008: 99.

99 Ibid.

100 Rajbhandary et al. “The Children’s Clubs of Nepal: A Democratic Experiment”. *Save the Children*. 1999: 28.

101 Silan, Edelweiss et al. “Challenges to the Right of Children to Participate: Child Labor and Situations of Armed Conflict”. *HURIGHTS OSAKA*. 2011.

102 Winrock International. “Best Practices in Preventing and Eliminating Child Labor through Education”. *Winrock International*. 2008: 153.

103 Ibid, 145.

104 World Vision. “Work in progress: Effective approaches to end child labour”. *World Vision UK*. 2015: 21.

The use and success of children's forums are not only limited to Nepal; they are used across the world to address a multitude of issues that children face daily. In Ethiopia, they have been very effective in advocating for women and girl's rights. They have effectively curtailed the rate of child marriage and female genital cutting. It is estimated that peer educators and forums reached over 49,323 students.¹⁰⁵

Though children's forums have a multitude of strengths, they still face a few limitations. Children may be prevented from going to forums, which often take place after school, because of other obligations such as family chores. It is also important to make sure that adults and parents who help implement the children's forums do not end up dictating the terms on which the forums are run. There must be supervision to ensure that the voices of children are the ones that prevail. Thus, though children's forums can be a best practice in tackling child labor and migration, it is also important to take into account these weaknesses.

IV. Child Friendly Villages: Inclusive and Labor-Free Communities

Child Friendly Villages or Bal Mitra Grams (BMG) is a concept created by the NGO Bachpan Bachao Andolan in India that aims to create communities in which every child is removed from exploitation, receives education and health facilities, has their voices heard, and is guaranteed an environment of, "friendliness, rights and dignity."¹⁰⁶ BMGs were a result of over twenty years of experience and countless consultations with grassroots organizations that dealt with child labor. BMGs address the issue of child labor at the village level. The motivating idea behind BMGs was to, "make children aware of the exploitative nature of child labour, to emancipate them and make them self-reliant so as to eliminate the curse of child labour."¹⁰⁷ Although BMGs are initiated by the NGO, they rely on the support of the community and the participation of children in order to achieve their goal of creating an environment that is inclusive for children and deters child labor. As of 2014, there are 317 BMGs across 11 states in India consisting of over 800,000 people.¹⁰⁸ BMGs have been able to successfully withdraw 28, 812 children from work and enroll them in school.¹⁰⁹ The objectives of BMGs are outlined below:

1. Identification and removal of all child laborers in the village.
2. The enrollment of all children in mandatory, good quality schools.
3. Recognizing and responding to the voices and opinions of children—the Bal (children's) Panchayat is recognized by the Gram (adult's) Panchayat.¹¹⁰

These objectives' main purpose is to create and sustain a child friendly atmosphere within the village that puts an end to child labor and guarantees education. In order to achieve this, BMGs require the active participation and cooperation of the society, the local administration, the village Panchayat, and the family. BMGs pursue a tactic of prevention as a way to deal with child labor—which they emphasize can only be done through embracing a holistic community based approach.

A defining aspect of the BMG is the idea of the Bal Panchayat. The Bal Panchayat is a children's assembly that is formed to deal with issues that are related to children in regards to their welfare and development. This system ensures that children are given the platform to voice their opinions regarding issues that pertain to them. The community must then ensure that the Bal Panchayat is given official recognition by the Gram Panchayat, the democratically elected adult assembly within the village. The Bal Panchayat

105 Kereta, Worknish. "Women's and Girls' Empowerment Program in Ethiopia". *Pathfinder International*. 2010.

106 Bachpan Bachao Andolan. "Child Friendly Village". *Bachpan Bachao Andolan*. 2015.

107 Ribhu, Bhuwan. "Building Child Friendly Villages: Using village strengths to combat child labour and other exploitative practices". *The Center for Victims of Torture*. 2008: 9.

108 Dasgupta, KumKum. "Kailash Satyarthi's child-friendly villages are changing rural India". *The Guardian*. 2014.

109 Bachpan Bachao Andolan. "Bal Mitra Gram: Building a Child Friendly Society". *Bachpan Bachao Andolan*. 2012.

110 *Ibid*, 20.

must become an integral part of the decision making process of the Gram Panchayat to ensure that the voices of children are heard and accepted.¹¹¹

BMGs empower children by allowing them a more participatory role in society and encouraging them to become active members of the community. It is very motivating for children to have their roles and responsibilities within the community acknowledged. Many of the child volunteers were familiarized with the issues of child labor and were able to affectively relay the information on to younger peers and the general community. They were also better able to stress the importance of education for a better future.¹¹²

BMGs are not unique in their approach. Though BMGs are contained to the South Asian region, the same idea has been implemented in Africa, Asia, and South America through the creation of Child Labour Free Zones (CLFZ). CLFZ are certain geographical areas in which all children are withdrawn from labor and placed into formal, full time schools. These areas may be villages, school communities or parishes.¹¹³ CLFZ are designed on the following non-negotiable principles:

1. All children must attend formal day schools full-time.
2. A child laborer is defined as any child not in school.
3. All forms of child labor are hazardous and harm the development of the child.
4. All forms of child labor must be abolished.
5. Any law regulating child labor is unacceptable.
6. The community must condemn any justification that perpetuates the existence of child labor.¹¹⁴

CLFZ stress the importance of collaboration between grassroots, national, and international organizations and local communities to ensure that all child labor ends and that children enjoy a right to quality education. However most times the initiative to start a CLFZ is undertaken by NGOs (outlined in Table 3 below).

CLFZ involve all stakeholders within a community: teachers, parents, children, unions, community groups, local authorities and employers. Community mobilization and community ownership and involvement are key to making CLFZ possible and sustainable.¹¹⁵ The communities must set the norm that that no child should work and that all children should be in school. This community-based norm setting is especially important because it leads to a sustainable practice. Without this community-based norm setting, removing one group of children from labor would just mean that another group of children could soon replace them. However, within CLFZ child labor comes to be seen as unacceptable and thus the participation of any children in child labor is eliminated now *and* in the future. Instead a long-term safe environment is created in which all children are encouraged to attend school instead of work.¹¹⁶

CLFZ also increase sustainability by revitalizing already present local institutions and community groups that work towards protecting children's rights. One of the goals of CLFZ, and an aspect that aids in their sustainability, is to make parents understand how they can, "make a living without the work of the child and introduce [them to] income generating activities and initiatives such as village savings and loan associations."¹¹⁷ Just like BMGs, CLFZ emphasize that, "meaningful child participation should be promoted as a key strategy for creation of CLFZ since it empowers children as social agents and stakeholders in

111 Ribhu, Bhuwan. "Building Child Friendly Villages: Using village strengths to combat child labour and other exploitative practices". *The Center for Victims of Torture*. 2008: 21.

112 Winrock International. "Best Practices in Preventing and Eliminating Child Labor through Education". *Winrock International*. 2008: 148.

113 UNATU. "Working Towards Child Labour Free Zones in Uganda". *UNATU*. 2013: 1.

114 Nhenga-Chakarisa. "Out of Work and Into School: Working Towards Child Labour Free Zones". *Hivos*. 2013: 3.

115 Educational International. "International Conference on Child Labour: 'School is the best place to work: Education unions against child labour' ". *Educational International*. 2012: 15

116 Stop Child Labour. "What We Do". *Stop Child Labour*. 2015.

117 Stop Child Labour. "What We Do". *Stop Child Labour*. 2015.

framing their future opportunities.”¹¹⁸ All these aspects of CLFZ define them as a best practice in tackling child labor. Additionally, as outlined in the table below, CLFZ can be implemented in a community specific context, aiding in their effectiveness.

Table 6.1: Comparing Child Labor Free Zones

| Country | Implementing NGOs | Year Created | Most Successful Context Specific Actions for Enabling CLFZ |
|-----------------|---|--------------|--|
| <i>Zimbabwe</i> | Coalition Against Child Labour in Zimbabwe (CACLAZ) | 2007 | Creation of Incubation Centres: where long-term child laborers spend 6- 18 month becoming prepared for reintegration into schools. |
| <i>Uganda</i> | Kids in Need (KIN) | 2008 | Income Generating Activities (IGAs) and Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLAs) groups: which assist adults to generating income to meet household livelihood needs and support micro-loan funding. |
| <i>Ethiopia</i> | Forum on Sustainable Child empowerment (FSCE) | 2008 | Multi Stakeholder Child Protection System (MSCPS): Promotes maximum partnership and participation of all relevant stakeholders (NGOs, communities, government) in improving situations of children. |
| <i>Ghana</i> | General Agricultural Workers' Union (GAWU) | NA | Strategic partnership with media; public opinion surveys and mass action: use of medium to raise awareness the dangers of child labor and about the CLFZ program in general. |

Though BMGs and CLFZ are a best practice, they still face some limitations. One of the most pressing is that at times it may be difficult for community members to listen to the voices of children as they may oppose the participation of children in decision-making processes.¹¹⁹ It may also be inappropriate for children to address adults in some cultures—making it challenging for children to speak up. However, BMGs and CLFZ have an enormous capacity to challenge these views within the community and implement change. BMGs and CLFZ also have a hard time dealing with child labor migrants because they are geographically concentrated. However, if implemented properly, they can adequately discourage children from migrating because of the change in community norm.

BMGs and CFLZ are best practices that both center around the idea of taking a child- centered approach that uses peer education to tackle child labor. These two examples show how community support can lead to sustainable initiatives that combat child labor and promote education because they help change the local standards. In these examples, both BMGs and CFLZ sought to change community opinion and create an environment in which fulltime formal schooling was the social norm. The success of this approach in the various geographical settings outlined above holds promise that it could be beneficial for

118 Nhenga-Chakarisa. “Out of Work and Into School: Working Towards Child Labour Free Zones”. *Hivos*. 2013: 20.

119 Mbakogu, Ifeyinwa. “Child Trafficking in Africa: The Need for Child-Centred Approaches”. *Institute for the Study of International Development*. 2012: 1-17.

Seva Mandir to look into BMGs or CFLZ as a way to tackle child labor and migration in the context of Rajasthan.

V. Implications for Seva Mandir

Children's forums and child friendly villages both rely heavily on previous NGO presence in the communities they are seeking to help. They require a level of trust to be present between the NGO and community in order to be well received and make a positive impact in mitigating child labor and increasing at least part time school attendance and in this sense both these program seem potentially suitable for Seva Mandir to consider incorporating in some form. But, as the summary Table below illustrates, the two programs are distinct in important way.

Children's forums are relatively low cost projects that are easier to implement in a variety of situations and places. Because they rely on existing community institutions, children's forums provide maximum return on investments. They have low initial implementation costs and can reach a large number of children and community members, thus facilitating greater awareness about child labor the merits of education. Children's forums, moreover, allow for children to have an active voice in addressing the concerns that affect their daily lives. They also help children develop leadership skills and organization skills that are beneficial for their future.

The main challenge of children's forums relates to their breadth. These forums cannot eliminate child labor alone. Although they play a valuable role in raising awareness and influencing school attendance rates, they cannot fully address all of the reasons that children may work.

Child Friendly Villages (BMGs and CLFZ) appear better suited for environments where there is extensive child labor and where other forms of prevention have not been effective. It might be beneficial to use this best practice in areas where the social norm is for children to work and education is not considered a priority.

While a valuable tool, implementation of child friendly villages is quite labor intensive and time consuming. It requires a lot of NGO and community support. Also, at least traditionally, the child friendly villages model has adopted a non-negotiable view that all children must be enrolled in formal, full time schools and it adheres to a strict definition of child labor. These villages require a complete condemnation of all forms of child labor.

But this model may be amenable to modification. There may be room for part time schooling instead of full time, and for, for example, the establishment of vocational skills programs that could serve as a substitute for full-time schooling. These programs could remove children from working, but also provide them with valuable skills to support themselves and their families in the future. Were Seva Mandir to consider expanding upon its learning camp programs, the children's forums and a modified version of children friendly villages/child labor free zone seem to be both potentially compatible and promising programs.

Table 6.2: Comparing Best Child-Centered Practices

| Practice | Leading NGO | Year | Strengths | Weaknesses |
|---|--|------|---|--|
| <i>Child Friendly Villages</i> 323-331.blicationI. sesChild Friendly Villages | Bachpan Bachao Andolan (BBA) & Various NGOs (CLFZ) | 2001 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a child friendly environment within a given area. Effectively eliminate all child labor and enroll all children in fulltime school. • Involve the entire community in framework. Change societal norms in regards to child labor— leading to increased sustainability. • Bring attention to issues impacting children through Bal Panchayat. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costly to implement. • Very rigid in their requirements. • Geographical focus is problematic for child labor due to migration. |
| <i>Children’s Forums</i> | CWIN | 1998 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a safe space for children to discuss issues affecting their lives. • Ensure child participation. • Promote leadership and children’s agency. • Extremely effective in raising awareness and educating the community. • Has positive long-term effects on the children. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adults may overtake the voices of children if forums are not properly monitored. • Time at forums may be limited for children due to other obligations. |

