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This report describes the findings of the end line assessment of the Centre for Workers’ Management (CWM) in India, which is a partner of Hivos.

The evaluation was commissioned by NWO-WOTRO, the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research in the Netherlands and is part of the programmatic evaluation of the Co-Financing System - MFS II financed by the Dutch Government, whose overall aim is to strengthen civil society in the South as a building block for structural poverty reduction. Apart from assessing impact on MDGs, the evaluation also assesses the contribution of the Dutch Co-Funding Agencies to strengthen the capacities of their Southern Partners, as well as the contribution of these partners towards building a vibrant civil society arena.

This report assesses CWM’s contribution towards strengthening Civil Society in India whilst using the CIVICUS analytical framework. It is a follow-up of a baseline study conducted in 2012. Key questions that are being answered comprise changes in the five CIVICUS dimensions to which CWM contributed; the nature of its contribution; the relevance of the contribution made and an identification of factors that explain CWM’s role in civil society strengthening.
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1 Introduction

This report presents the civil society end line findings of Centre for Workers’ Management (CWM) in India which is a partner of Hivos under the People Unlimited 4.1 Alliance. It is a follow-up to the baseline assessment that was carried out in 2012. According to the information provided during the baseline study CWM is working on the theme Governance.

These findings are part of the overall evaluation of the joint MFS II evaluations to account for results of MFS II-funded or –co-funded development interventions implemented by Dutch CFAs and/or their Southern Partner Organisations (SPO) and to contribute to the improvement of future development interventions. The civil society evaluation uses the CIVICUS framework (see appendix 1) and seeks to answer the following questions:

- What are the changes in civil society in the 2012-2014 period, with particular focus on the relevant MDGs & themes in the selected country?
- To what degree are the changes identified attributable to the development interventions of the Southern partners of the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?
- What is the relevance of these changes?
- What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?

The CIVICUS framework that comprises five dimensions (civic engagement, level of organization, practice of values, perception of impact and contexts influencing agency by civil society in general) has been used to orient the evaluation methodology.

Changes in the civil society arena of the SPO

In the 2012 – 2014 period, the two most important changes that took place in the civil society arena of CWM are related to ‘level of organisation’ and ‘practice of values’.

With regards to level of organisation, CWM intensified its interactions with a limited number of trade unions (a maximum of five unions of the 41 unions they consider part of their constituents), in particular those of the garment and domestic workers sectors where by tradition most workers are female. Apart from the support given to these three unions, CWM started to position workers’ struggles in global supply chains systems, as a means to reorient lobby and advocacy strategies of trade unions and to engage them in international networks. The SPO further expanded its international network and its financial resource base.

With regards to ‘practice of values’ CWM became a little bit more transparent to the trade unions it supports, by means of creating a website that was recommended since 2008, but which is not kept up to date, and by reorganising its board that now also includes persons with a relevant background in training and research which is needed to improve CWM’s effectiveness in its support to the workers organisations.

These findings were obtained through an analysis of documents, a workshop and follow-up interviews with the SPO, and interviews with external resources persons working in civil society organisations that receive support from the SPO; other civil society organisations with whom the SPO is collaborating; public or private sector agents and; external resource persons capable of overlooking the MDG or theme on which the SPO is concentrating.

CWM’s contribution to changes

Based upon an analysis of the projects and programmes financed by the Dutch CFAs a selection was made of SPOs to be included in an in-depth process tracing trajectory and those to be included for a quick contribution assessment. CWM was amongst those SPOs selected for in-depth-process tracing.

In the first place the evaluation assessed CWM’s contribution to the increase in membership and the quality of women’s engagement in two trade unions, the Garments and Fashions Workers Union (GAFWU) and the domestic workers’ union Penn Thozhilalargal Sangam (PTS). Both unions are working in typically female sectors. The most plausible explanation of this outcome is a combination of the two trade unions already having shown to defend the interests of their constituents before MFS II;
CWM making its support approach more demand-oriented during MFS II; supporting the unions to use a template to calculate a need-based minimum wage indexed to inflation developed by CWM (in 2008) that helped to negotiate wage hikes with the government, and; other actors who helped to position garment workers’ concern in an international and supply chain context.

In the second place the evaluation team explained the capacity of the Garment and Textile Workers Union (GATWU) in Karnataka state to successfully negotiate a minimum wage hike and to finally ensure that industries started to pay dearness allowances to their workers according to the regulations in place. This outcome is most likely explained by the fact that GATWU is a mature organisation; support received by Workers’ Right Consortium and Clean Clothes Campaign in targeting the international brands that source their products from the garment factories in Karnataka before and during MFS II, and CWM’s technical support to calculate a needs-based inflation indexed minimum wage as an input for negotiations on these wages with the industry and the government.

CWM has been working with all three trade unions on a regular basis since 2008 – 2009 and these unions received more support than any other union that CWM considers as its constituents. During the MFS II period, CWM improved the quality of its services by means of making it more demand-driven and by means of including not only the union leaders, but also the second and the third rung. CWM itself became aware of the importance targeting international brands as a means to improve working conditions for women.

Relevance
Interviews with staff of CWM, with external resource person, with the former programme officer of Hivos, as well as contextual information helped to assess the relevance of CWM’s interventions in terms of; its Theory of Change (ToC) for Civil Society as designed during the baseline study; the context in which CWM is operating, and; the Civil Society policies of Hivos.

The changes to which CWM contributed along with many other actors are relevant in relation to its 2012 Theory of Change and the external context. However these changes only concern some five to six of the 41 trade unions that the organisation is supporting.

CWM is a very relevant organisation in relation to the Rights and Citizenship programme of the People Unlimited 4.1 alliance, but the partner organisation did hardly contribute to this programme.

Explaining factors
The information related to factors that explain the above findings was collected at the same time as the data were gathered for the previous questions. The evaluation team looked at internal factors within CWM, the external context in which it operates and the relations between CWM and Hivos.

The most important factor that explains the evaluation findings is within CWM. Some of the critical issues mentioned in an external evaluation report of 2008 have been addressed as of 2012, such as the creation of a new and more performant board that now comprises professionals in the field of research and advisory on the one side and representatives of unions on the other side. However, CWM’s current strategic and operational planning, monitoring and evaluation in place hamper the organisation to effectively and efficiently make a considerable difference for the trade unions that it supports. The past two years have seen some changes into more effective interventions and more strategic relations with other organisations to make this difference, which is promising and should be pursued.

Design of the intervention
The design of CWM’s interventions requires a further critical reflection in order to make it replicable at a wider scale by CWM in the first place.

The following chapter briefly describes the political context, the civil society context and the relevant background with regards to the governance theme CWM is working on. Chapter 3 provides background information on the partner organisation, the relation of its MFS II interventions with the CIVICUS framework and specific information on the contract with Hivos. An evaluation methodology has been developed for the evaluation of the Civil Society component which can be found in appendix 2; however, deviations from this methodology, the choices made with regards to the selection of the outcomes for contribution analysis, as well as difficulties encountered during data collection are to be found in chapter 4. The answers to each of the evaluation questions are being presented in chapter 5, followed by a discussion on the general project design in relation to CS development; an assessment of what elements of the project design may possibly work in other contexts or be implemented by other organisations in chapter 6. Conclusions are presented in chapter 7.
2 Context

This paragraph briefly describes the context CWM is working in.

2.1 Political context

With growing tensions between the industry workers and management, the newly elected right-wing Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) government at the centre, in October 2014, proposed changes in labour laws. This move has been lauded by corporates and industries, as it shows the government is making efforts to create an investment friendly environment in the country. The trade unions on the other hand see this as a move which will further “depress wage levels and give a free hand to the corporates to hire and fire workers”.\(^1\) Rajasthan with the BJP in power has already started a similar process that is being severely criticised by trade unions.\(^2\)

In terms of change in the political context, these have been the most significant changes in the past few years. It remains to be seen if these statements and proposals by the government will take any concrete shape, as the demand for reforming labour laws has been present for a long time, with only token promises made by the government. The issue has been gaining increasing prevalence in the current discourse following the industrial violence that took place in Maruti Suzuki’s Manesar Plant in Haryana.

To understand the political economy of industrial relations and trade union movement in independent India, one must be familiar with the course of collective bargaining around wages and facilities for workers which goes back to recommendations of the Fair Wage Committee, 1948, that mooted the concept of a minimum wage to be paid by all industries; this later became a law and organised sector unions achieved fair indexation and an extra month’s salary as bonus. Another landmark is the Trade Union Act (1926), which facilitates unionisation in organised and unorganised sectors. But both of these laws had their own limitations in practical life. For example, the right to form trade union and register it does not mean that the employer must recognise the union and absence of such a legal compulsion enables even the organised sector to bypass collective bargaining of wages and not recognise such unions which are more assertive in terms of demanding workers’ rights.

This was the case in 2009-10, when most of the well-known workers struggles were on the issue of formation or for recognition of the trade union for collective bargaining\(^3\). The same trend has continued over the past two years, and incidences like Maruti workers strike and violence in July 2012 emerged because of these reasons\(^4\). On the minimum wage front, an employer in the informal sector like construction work, domestic work, physical labour etc can fire an employee at will without advance notice or reason, and absence of measures for security of a fixed period of employment in this sector gives the employer a huge advantage over the employee, who most of the time agrees to work below minimum wages so as to save his employment.

---

3 e.g. Hyundai Workers Struggle for Recognition of the Union, Nokia Workers Struggle for Wage Hike and Against Victimization, MRF Workers Struggle for Recognition of Union, Pricol Workers Struggle for Recognition of Union, Graziano Workers struggle for Unionization, The Case of Trade Union Repression in Nestle, Vivva Global Workers Struggle for Minimum Wages and Unionization, Rico Auto Workers Struggle for Unionization and Sunbeam Workers Struggle for Democratisation of the union.
The period from 1991 till date is considered as the phase of full-fledged economic reforms, decline in public sector and formal employment, continued decline of bargaining power of centralised unions, increasing contractualisation and outsourcing, poorer implementation of labour laws in special economic zones. This has given rise to plethora of non-mainstream workers’ organisations which inform, enable, and advocate for localised, sector specific unions, and filing petitions in the court for implementation of rights has also become a very important recourse for trade unions and workers’ organisations in last two or three decades.

2.2  Civil Society context

This section describes the civil society context in India which is not SPO specific. The socioeconomic, socio-political, and sociocultural context can have marked consequences for civil society, perhaps more significantly at the lower levels of social development. The information used is in line with the information used by CIVICUS.5

2.2.1 Socioeconomic context (corruption, inequality and macro-economic health)

Social Watch assessed India’s progress being made against the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and concludes that the country fails to meet goals set with regards to; poverty and hunger (MDG 1); gender equality (MDG 3); infant mortality (MDG 4); maternal mortality (MDG 5) and; environmental sustainability MDG 7. Three fundamental factors explain these appalling shortfalls, which are:

- Although social sector expenditures (rural development, education, health, family welfare, women and child development and water and sanitation increased in absolute terms between 1999 – 2000 and 2012-2013, in percentages of total public expenditures there was a general decline.
- The administration costs of centrally sponsored schemes such as the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment (MANREGA) schemes have been increasing between 2006-2007 and 2011-2012 and only 66 % of the budget has been used for wage employment. Apart from this, misappropriation of funds explains the weak impact of such schemes.
- The government is promoting 'non-inclusive growth’ and has sought to provide basic social services through subsidized institutions that all have problems of inefficiency, corruption, and so on. The formal, organized sector, which is the main source of quality employment, employs only 12% to 13% of the country’s workforce and this is declining. The remaining 87% are relegated to the agriculture and informal sectors with low and uncertain earnings.

As a consequence, in the rural areas more than a quarter million farmers committed suicide in the last several years because they could not earn a living anymore in the agricultural sector6.

An additional indicator for the social and economic context in India is the Social and Economic Rights Fulfilment Index (SERF Index)7. The SERF Index provides a means of determining the extent to which countries are meeting their obligations to fulfil five of the substantive human rights enumerated in The International Covenant of Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR): the right to food, the right to adequate shelter, the right to healthcare, the right to education, and the right to decent work.

Table 1
Social and Economic Rights Fulfilment Index (SERF) for India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>India</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Country Right to Food Index Value</td>
<td>32.70</td>
<td>32.74</td>
<td>33.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Country Right to Health Index Value</td>
<td>74.74</td>
<td>74.16</td>
<td>74.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Country Right to Education Index Value</td>
<td>82.64</td>
<td>84.23</td>
<td>85.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Country Right to Housing Index Value</td>
<td>62.55</td>
<td>62.60</td>
<td>66.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Bhaskara Rao Gorantla, Research Director and Ajay Kumar Ranjan, Research Officer, National Social Watch, India
In 2011 and 2012 India was achieving a little over 56% of protecting its social and economic rights, feasible given its resources. Whereas relatively no changes occurred between 2011 and 2012, a slight improvement occurred in 2013, except for the right to food index (33.05) and the right to housing (27.57).

The Corruption Perception Index (CPI) ranks people’s perception of corruption within the public sector of their respective countries.\(^8\) A low score indicates that a country is perceived as highly corrupt. India’s score was 3.6 out of 10 in 2012, which is 0.1 point lower than the average for all countries (3.7) and it occupies the 76\(^{th}\) place on the CPI rank list with a total of 174 countries. In India, 24.8% of citizens surveyed believe that the government is effective in the fight against corruption. On the Bribery Perception Index India scores 7.5 out of 10, which is 2.6% lower than the average. Of the people who participated in the survey, 54% reported having paid a bribe in 2011. Since 2002, India’s perception index in slightly improving from just below a score of 3 (0 is very corrupt and 10 is not corrupt at all) in 2002 to 3.6 in 2012. Most corrupt institutions in 2012 are political parties, the police, legislature, public officials, public officials in the education sector, NGOs.

The Index of Economic Freedom measures economic freedom of 186 countries based on trade freedom, business freedom, investment freedom and property rights. The score is based on 10 freedoms in 4 pillars: rule of law, limited government, regulatory efficiency, and open markets. India’s economic freedom score in 2012 is 55.7, making its economy the 120\(^{th}\) freest in the 2014 index\(^9\). India is ranked 25\(^{th}\) out of 41 countries in the Asia-Pacific region, and its overall score is below the regional and world averages (see figure 3). In the past 20 years, India has advanced its economic freedom score by nearly 11 points out of 100 points. It has achieved very large improvements in half of the ten economic freedoms, most notably in trade freedom. This has improved by over 65 points. As seen in figure 3, India’s score continued to increase steadily over the past four years. However, it is still perceived as a ‘mostly unfree’ country. The main reason for this, as stated in the Index report, is the institutional shortcomings in the country. The state owned enterprises and wasteful subsidy programs result in chronically high budget deficits.

The Fragile States Index of FFP\(^10\) is an index which is derived from 12 different indicators. These are social indicators, economic indicators and political and military indicators. From these, we can see trends in the overall development of a country.

\(^8\) http://country-corruption.findthebest.com/l/98/India
\(^9\) http://www.heritage.org/index/pdf/2014/countries/india.pdf
\(^10\) http://ffp.statesindex.org/2014-india
Table 2 shows India’s five of the twelve most problematic indicators of the past five years, as well as the average score for the twelve indicators: Low scores indicate a good situation and high scores indicate a bad situation.

**Table 2**

**India’s Fragile States Index scores of the critical indicators on a scale of 1 (good situation) to 10 (bad situation)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Demographic Pressure</th>
<th>Group Grievance</th>
<th>Uneven Economic Development</th>
<th>Security Apparatus</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Average score 12 indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FFP Fragile States Index for 2010-2014

The FSI shows that India is improving its status over the past five years, but is doing so at a very slow pace. Demographic pressure, uneven economic development and the security apparatus have improved slightly since 2010, which can be seen by the decline of the scores. However, group grievance has not improved and public service has even declined (the index got higher). Out of the 178 countries in this index, India does not succeed to become more than mediocre. However, the figure 2below shows that the development of India did have a steep improvement since 2006, but has been declining since 2011.

2.2.2 Socio-political context

Freedom House evaluates the state of freedom in 195 countries on an annual basis. Each country is assigned two numerical ratings – from 1 to 7 – for political rights and civil liberties. In this rating 1 represents the most freedom and 7 the least freedom. The two ratings are based on 25 more detailed indicators.

**Table 3**

**India’s Freedom indexes over time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Freedom status</th>
<th>Political rights score</th>
<th>Civil liberties score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3 shows that scores have not changed over the past four years. India is considered a free country with an overall ‘Freedom Status’ of 2.5 (out of 7).

2.2.3 Socio – cultural context

The World Values Survey is a global network of social scientists who study changing values and their impact on social and political life. They survey different values which can give an indication of the social status of a country. People in India indicate that they are generally quite happy. In the wave of 2010-2014 a total of 38.2% of the people questioned stated that they were very happy. In comparison, in the period of 2005-2009 this number was significantly lower with 28.9%. When asked about general satisfaction with their lives respondents give different answers. The respondents were

---

11 Idem
12 https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2014/india-0#.VGCiRvwtcQ
13 Idem
14 http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSContents.jsp
asked to rate their satisfaction from 1 to 10, 1 being completely dissatisfied and 10 being completely satisfied. In 2010-2014 a total of 16.4% indicated that they were quite dissatisfied (rating 2) and 11.9% indicated they were completely dissatisfied (rating 1). Whereas 17.7% stated that they were satisfied (rating 8). This situation is very different from the 2005-2009 results where 41% indicted to be moderately satisfied and 15.8% was satisfied. This indicates that during the past five years people have shifted from being neutral about their life satisfaction, to being either dissatisfied or satisfied.

Another index to look at for social-cultural context is the Global Peace Index. This index attempts to measure the positions of nations’ peacefulness, and is developed by the Institute for Economics and Peace. The position of a country is based on 22 indicators which can be divided into three main factors. The main factors on which this index is based are 1) militarisation, 2) society and security, and 3) domestic and international conflict. The maximum score is 5, which indicates that this factor is a problem for the peacefulness of the country. The higher the score, the lower country ranks in the total Index. The current position of India is 143 out of 162 countries.15 The table below shows the development of India as of 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Militarisation</th>
<th>Society &amp; Security</th>
<th>Domestic &amp; International Conflict</th>
<th>Country Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>132 (of 148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>142 (of 153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>144 (of 158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>141 (of 162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>143 (of 162)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Vision of Humanity Global Peace Index from 2010-201416

2.2.4 The Foreign Contribution Regulation Act 201017

NGOs are perceived as very important in India, as they contribute a lot in the development of the country.18 NGOs often work with marginalized groups and try to raise their awareness on their rights vis-à-vis the state. Most local NGOs are funded by international organizations. In order to keep this funding under control, India’s government installed the ‘Foreign Contribution Regulation Act’ in 1976.

In March 2011 an amendment of the original Foreign Contribution Regulation Act passed both Houses of Parliament. Compared to the 1976 Act, major changes comprise a list of persons and organisations that cannot receive foreign contributions anymore. These are; election candidates; correspondents, columnists, journalists; judge, government servant or employee of an entity controlled or owned by the government; members of any legislature; political party or its office bearers; organizations of a political nature as may be specified; associations engaged in the production or broadcast of audio news.

In the first place this Act seems to have no consequences for the Dutch NGOs and their Southern Partners, however a leaked report of India’s International Bureau tells a different story, suggesting that protests against development projects had caused a loss of India’s GDP with 2-3%. These protests were allegedly fuelled by foreign-funded NGOs, mentioning Greenpeace, Cordaid, Hivos, Oxfam, Amnesty and ActionAid.19 The main allegation against these NGOs is that they are funding organizations which are working in politically sensitive sectors such as the mining sector and the agricultural sector with regards to Genetically Modified Food production. Foreign contributions to support SPOs that work on human rights issues, governance and sensitive sectors like mining, forestry and agriculture are increasingly being monitored.

---

17 http://www.fcraforngos.org/
18 Status of grass root level NGOs in Rajasthan
3 Description of the SPO and its contribution to society/policy changes

3.1 Background of the SPO

Centre for Workers’ Management (CWM) is a resource centre for trade unions, created in 1991, to serve working people and their organisations. It was created because according to its understanding working people and even their collective movements lack the time, resources and sometimes even the skills to take forward medium and long term strategies. CWM works with grass root workers organisations in the rural, garment, domestic, auto, metal and plantation sector, and aims at organising contract workers, casual workers and the self-employed, mainly in the unorganised sector. It seeks to address the issues of rural workers and workers with non-standardised urban jobs. CWM works with 41 trade unions and has a total outreach of about 700,000 workers, of which 40 percent are women.

Since its registration as a society in 1991, the Centre for Workers’ Management (CWM) has been involved in various activities related to research, training, issue-based advice and campaign and information dissemination on areas of industrial democracy and workers’ rights. The organisation has a constituency of workers and workers’ organisations with which it interacts actively, and which benefits from its inputs.

CWM’s long-term goal is for trade unions to expand democracy in the enterprises, in industry and in the economy. Towards this end its immediate objectives are to:
- Furthering of industrial democracy;
- Aid trade unions in their understanding of the enterprise, industry and economy;
- Assist trade unions in using this understanding for more effective collective bargaining;
- Facilitate the expansion of a trade union network with a common set of objectives;
- Provide trade unions with research and campaign support on legislative and policy changes that affect work, wages, industry and the economy.
- Working with trade union organisations on issues of collective bargaining and organisational democracy;
- Research, documentation and education on new forms of worker organisations, including cooperatives;
- Research and campaign on legislation related to labour and capital regulation;
- Trade union education, towards building an effective cadre at the workplace/region/sector of work;
- Assisting building of networks among worker organisation.

Since 2012, when CWM counted 16 staff members of which 7 female, CWM has grown in staff numbers: at the end of 2013 it had 3 principal researchers (2 female); 1 campaign coordinator (female); 5 researchers & educators (1 female); 5 administrative and financial staff (2 female) and 13 campaign staff (2 female).

---
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3.2 MFS II interventions related to Civil Society

CWM is collaborating with Hivos since 2004. In November 2012 it ended a four-year programme, which was followed by a second programme that lasted until September 2014.

The following table relates CWM’s core interventions with the CIVICUS dimensions, based upon the contract agreements made for the 2008-2012 contract and that of 2012 – 2014.

Most of the interventions foreseen in both the 2008-2012 and the 2012 – 2014 contracts with Hivos, aim to influence public sector policies and practices: Related expected results in the 2008-2012 period comprised the “improvement of the legal framework to protect and promote unionisation” and of “the capacity of unions to uphold labour rights and bargain on behalf of their constituencies”. In the 2012 – 2014 period this was continued by means of the expected result “provide workers’ activists with robust information to advance their concerns”. Three other expected results in the same contract were meant to contribute to this;

1. Developing a curriculum and train workers on a regular basis which should culminate in the creation of full-fledged worker schools in 2016. This is a follow up of the 2008-2012 result to create trade union training school activities in Chennai, Surat and Patna;
2. Conduct sectoral and policy or legislative issue based research which is also a follow up of a result in the previous contract.
3. Use these findings to assist workers organisations and social movements in their lobby and campaign efforts, which is also to be seen as a continuation of the previous contract.

The 2012 – 2014 contract further explicitly mentions expected results under the ‘practice of values’ CIVICUS dimension, consisting of a reconstitution of CWM’s board as a means to ensure plurality and diversity.
3.3 Basic information

Table 5
SPO basic information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of SPO</td>
<td>Centre for Workers’ Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium and CFA</td>
<td>People Unlimited 4.1, Hivos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Advancing Industrial Democracy for Economic and Social Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG/theme on which the CS evaluation focusses</td>
<td>Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start date of cooperation between the CFA and the SPO</td>
<td>Since 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFS II project name 1</td>
<td>Advancing Industrial Democracy for Economic and Social Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract period</td>
<td>1 October 2008 and November 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget Hivos</td>
<td>€ 409.141 = 48 % of total funds available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other donors if applicable</td>
<td>ActionAid; Fund for Global Human Rights; Asia Pacific Forum on Women; Prakruthi; Contribution from Constituent Organisations; UmverteilenStiftung; Solidaridad;ILRF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimation of % of budget for Civil Society²¹</td>
<td>33 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MFS II project name 2</td>
<td>Advancing Industrial Democracy for Economic and Social Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract period</td>
<td>October 2012 – September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget Hivos</td>
<td>€ 108.000 = 29.4 % of total funds available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other donors if applicable</td>
<td>Rosa Luxemborg Stiftung; Global Fund for Human Rights; ActionAid; International Labour Rights Forum; The Workers’ Rights Consortium and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimation of % of budget for Civil Society</td>
<td>33 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: project documents

²¹ Costs that relate to civil society development or policy influence are those costs that possibly contribute to the development of the CIVICUS dimensions, excluding coordination and office costs; staff costs and financial reserves.
4 Data collection and analytical approach

4.1 Adjustments made in the methodology of the evaluation

Only minor adjustments were made in the methodology: due to the unclear and incomplete progress reports it was not possible to conduct an input – output- outcome analysis in line with the results/outcomes to be achieved according to the contract requirements. CWM simply does not report against these results but reports against education, research and advocacy or campaigns.

Only four CWM staff attended the evaluation workshop at the beginning of the end line study whereas according to the 2013 annual review CWM counts some 27 staff, amongst which 13 campaign staff and 5 researchers. The four workshop attendants were one research head; one programme staff; one administrative head, and one board member. These all participated together in follow up interviews the day after the workshop. One of the consequences is that the triangulation of information from different staff of CWM has been limited.

4.2 Difficulties encountered during data collection

As mentioned already, the progress reports produced by CWM are missing quality and do not provide oversight of progress being made since 2008 and no efforts were made to improve the quality of these reports, which all have been accepted by Hivos.

In the first place the reports do not follow the logical framework described in the project proposals and instead reporting is organised according to education, research and documentation, lobby and advocacy work and occasionally new forms of organisation.

Further we observe that several parts of progress reports have just been copied and pasted from previous reports, in particular when CWM is asked to report against its logical framework:

1. Reporting against result area 1 of the annual report 2010-2011 (page 29-39) is an exact copy of the text in the 2009-2010 report under the same heading. The same applies for result area 2 (page 31 in the 2010-2011 report) and 3 (page 31-32 in the 2010-2011 report). This is also valid for the report covering April 2011 – March 2012

2. Reporting against the 3 result areas in the progress reports covering 2012 and 2013 is a copy-paste exercise again, in addition to other pieces of texts which have been copied from different reports. The 3 result areas are part of “Part F. Questions related to the result indicators of Hivos’ overall programme”.

The in-country evaluation team faced the following problems during further data collection:

In the first place trade union representatives were reluctant to be interviewed, because the Indian government has become increasingly insistent on ensuring that there is no foreign funding in political protests and labour issues. Trade unions are therefore wary of responding to requests to be participants in evaluations regarding foreign funding.

In the second place the collection of documents that provide evidence was a hurdle: Labour departments associated with the government are known for their inefficiency regarding maintaining proper records, such as the minutes of proceedings of Karnataka’s Tripartite Wage Board on the issue of wage rise for garment sector workers, in which CWM’s partners participated. Similarly, documented membership figures of the trade unions were difficult to corroborate. As, other than the unions themselves, no other state body conducts a yearly or bi-annual check or headcount to ascertain the
actual membership (it is done for longer intervals, and the standards of such verification are not rigorous); hence trade unions generally succeed in inflating their membership figures because of faults in the verification processes\footnote{http://www.newindianexpress.com/nation/Trade-union-membership-CPI-eclipses-its-big-brother/2013/06/03/article1617463.ece; http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2013-04-06/news/38327411_1_india-trade-union-congress-membership-indian-railways; http://www.business-standard.com/article/economy-policy/uni...}

However, the evaluators sought to compensate for this lack of paperwork and written evidence by allowing the use of accounts of two or more external resource people or concerned parties as corroborating evidence, so as to substantiate a finding or attribute the changes to an actor.

4.3 Identification of two outcomes for in-depth process tracing

CWM was selected for in-depth process tracing of outcomes associated with the strategic orientation Civic Engagement and that of Strengthening Intermediate Organisations.

The first outcome to be explained and in relation with civic engagement is that of union membership increasing, as well as the quality of the engagement of women in these trade unions. The evaluation team looked at two Chennai-Based unions: Penn Thozhilalar Sangam (PTS) which organises domestic workers and Garments And Fashions Workers Union (GAFWU).

The second outcome to be explained is that of the rise in the minimum wages in the garment sector and the implementation of Dearness Allowance (DA) norms in Karnataka state, in which the Garment and Textile Workers Union (GATWU) is involved. This outcome relates to “the capacity of unions to uphold labour rights and bargain on behalf of their constituencies” and “provide workers’ activists with robust information to advance their concerns” which are results to be obtained when accomplishing the Hivos contracts and which are related to the CS orientation of Intermediate Organisations.

The reasons for selecting these outcomes is that CWM has been working with these unions since 2009 in a consistent way, whereas all other interventions are seemingly scattered around a wide range of issues; these observations are made based upon the progress reports made available.
5 Results

5.1 Results obtained in relation to intervention logic

The quality of CWM’s progress reports does not allow for a detailed overview of outputs and outcomes achieved versus targets set and hardly against their outputs which are education, documentation and research and campaigning. No monitoring takes place at the outcome level. CWM works in the following sectors or topics: the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA); minimum wages; contract labour; plantation labour; engineering and metal work; garment; domestic workers and; construction. Apart from these other themes that CWM worked on are Free Trade Agreements, Human Rights and New Industrial Areas.

Table 6 presents an overview of those sectors that have received support since 2008-2009.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs delivered</th>
<th>Sectors receiving most attention</th>
<th>Sectors receiving scattered attention</th>
<th>Concentration of activities in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Women activists in trade unions; NREGA and rural employment</td>
<td>Plantation labour Engineering and metal work Construction</td>
<td>Chennai and Bangalore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation and research</td>
<td>NREGA and rural employment; Women workers</td>
<td>Mapping of New Industrial Areas Contract labour</td>
<td>i) Gujarat (2 times), (ii) Tamil Nadu and (iii) Uttar Pradesh (2 times); (iv) Karnataka; (v) Madhya Pradesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>Universal Social Security Bill NREGA</td>
<td>Contract labour Free Trade Agreements</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: project progress reports 2008 – 2013

With regards to the results to be delivered under the Hivos contracts we observe the following:

- ‘Women activists’, which according to Hivos needed to be a cross sectoral theme, has only been addressed in the garment and the domestic workers’ sector, which are typical feminine sectors.
- CWM’s intention to establish worker activist schools has not materialised in the 2012-2014 contract period.
- The number of workers organisations with whom CWM works is not clear: figures are constantly changing in the reports (38 according to an excel sheet made available during the baseline study; 41 according to the 2012 – 2014 project proposal and 50 unions in other documents). The progress reports only mentions support to eight trade unions.

5.2 Changes in civil society in the 2012-2014 period

5.2.1 Civic engagement

Civic engagement describes the formal and informal activities and participation undertaken by individuals to advance shared interests at different levels. Participation within civil society is multi-faceted and encompasses socially-based and politically-based forms of engagement.

Civic engagement has slightly improved since the baseline, because CWM has a) systematised the process of beneficiary interaction through better targeted research and education b) structured workshops and meetings together with activist leaders of the unions c) increasingly used the workshop
mode or focus group discussions to check outcomes and test ideas, and d) engages also with the union second and sometimes third leadership’s level, whereas before it only worked with the executive leadership of the trade unions. This has been observed in particular in the garment and domestic workers sector.

CWM works with 41 trade unions and has a total outreach of about 700,000 workers, of which 40 percent are women according to the 2012 – 2014 project documents. However the document analysis of progress reports only identifies concrete activities with eight unions.

Table 7 presents an overview of persons reached through education, research and documentation and campaigns before MFS II (March 2011) and during MFS II (after March 2011). The evaluation team has not been able to verify these data, implying that these only represent tendencies. The percentage of women reached through CWM’s education and research and documentation together did only slightly increase from 59 percent before March 2011 to 61.3 percent during the MFS II period, with a significant decline of female participation (54.6%) in educational activities during the MFS II period.

Since the baseline assessment, CWM discontinued its activities to address rural workers’ issues in the new worksites created by the NREGA scheme because its ideas to support rural workers to understand their rights vis-à-vis the scheme rather than to enrol a maximum number of workers into the scheme was not what the government had asked for.

CWM intensified however its collaboration to unions in the primarily female workforce in the garment sector in Bangalore (Karnataka state) and Chennai (Tamil Nadu state), in particular GATWU and GAFWU and the Chennai-based domestic workers union PTS.

Score baseline 2013 on an absolute scale from 0-3
Score end line 2014, relative change on a scale of -2 → +2

---

23 Hivos Project document 2012 –2014
24 The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 is an Act to provide for the enhancement of livelihood security of the households in rural areas of the country by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto. See http://nrega.nic.in/rajaswa.pdf
25 GATWU: Garment and Textile Workers’ Union in Bangalore. See http://gatwu.org.in/
GATWU was formed in 2005 and was officially registered in 2006 in Bangalore. They are committed to building the power of the working class in the Karnataka garment industry and building a movement with like-minded organizations to advance the interests of workers and their families. GATWU is fighting for living wages, better working conditions, safe and harassment-free working environments, and freedom of association.
26 Garments and Fashion Workers’ Union (GAFWU) is a Chennai (Tamil Nadu) based workers’ union, more than 95% of whose members are women. The union works for the rights of garment-apparel sector workers, and is a partner organisation of the CWM.
27 Penn Thozhilalar Sangam is an organisation working in Chennai, with a neighbourhood based focus. Most of its members are women, and it also works for making government services accessible to women workers’ in a neighbourhood. It is also a partner organization of the CWM.
5.2.2 Level of organization

This dimension assesses the organisational development, complexity and sophistication of civil society, by looking at the relationships among actors within the civil society arena.

CWM managed to increase its interactions with other civil society actions since the baseline and some trade unions managed to become more performing in defending the interests of their members.

In the first place the organisation intensified its interactions with a activists of various grassroots workers organisations, such as with the two aforementioned unions in the garment sector and the domestic workers organised in Penn Thozhilallar Sangam (PTS); various plantation workers associations/unions; auto workers’ unions.

After the Rana Plaza incident in April 2013, when an eight-store garment factory collapsed in Bangladesh, CWM together with Transnational Information Exchange (TIE\textsuperscript{28}), supported the creation of a network of trade unions in the garment sector in South Asia, including GAFWU and GATWU. Those two unions collaborated intensively with CWM on issues as a fair minimum wage, developing a bargaining strategy based upon the understanding of the global supply chain, and struggles against workplace violence.

The two unions and PTS have improved their performance in the past period: their trade union membership has increased, some of them have developed grass roots leadership and in particular GATWU effectively participated in the tripartite committee on a wage hike in Karnataka’s garment sector.

Apart from the three mostly female trade unions with which CWM interacted intensively in the past years, only some unions of rural workers and tea plantation workers are said to have developed grass roots leaders. It is this performance of the trade unions that explains the extent to which the interest of workers can be defended.

Due to the absence of a solid M&E system, the extent to which other trade unions have increased their membership, their internal performance and their capacity to negotiate with employers and the government is unknown. According to CWM staff however, generally speaking, increasingly workshop costs are borne by trade unions themselves, which is to be interpreted as a principle important for the autonomy of the unions.

In the past two years, apart from its collaboration with TIE, the SPO further expanded its international network with organisations as the Workers’ Rights Consortium (WRC)\textsuperscript{29}, TIE, Rosa Luxembourg Stiftung (RLS)\textsuperscript{30} and the International Labour Rights Forum (ILRF)\textsuperscript{31}. Those organisations and ActionAID are partly intervening and partly financing CWM’s interventions. This expansion is to be interpreted as CWM’s strategy becoming more mature in defending its target groups.

\textsuperscript{28} Transnational Information Exchange (TIE) is a global grassroots network of workers active in workplaces and communities. It includes both union and non-union activists in the formal and informal sectors. TIE aims to encourage, organise, and facilitate international consciousness and cooperation among workers and their organisations in various parts of the world. See http://www.tie-germany.org/who_we_are/index.html

\textsuperscript{29} Workers’ Rights Consortium (WRC) is an independent labour rights monitoring organization, conducting investigations of working conditions in factories around the globe. Their purpose is to combat sweatshops and protect the rights of workers who make apparel and other products. See http://www.workersrights.org/

\textsuperscript{30} The Rosa Luxemburg Foundation is one of the largest political education institutions in Germany today and sees itself as part of the intellectual current of democratic socialism. The foundation evolved from a small political group, “Social Analysis and Political Education Association”, founded in 1990 in Berlin into a nationwide political education organisation, a discussion forum for critical thought and political alternatives as well a research facility for progressive social analysis. See http://www.rosalux.de/englis/h/foundation.html

\textsuperscript{31} International Labor Rights Forum is a human rights organization that advocates for workers globally. See http://www.laborrights.org/about
CWM’s own financial resource base improved since 2011 whereas Hivos’ contribution decreased from 48 to 29 percent of all funds available. Two important donors are the Rosa Luxembourg Stiftung and ActionAid, but most donors are more inclined to pay for project costs, rather than institutional costs that were mostly financed with Hivos funding. This new financial situation is seen as a concern.

**Score baseline 2013 on an absolute scale from 0-3**  
2

**Score end line 2014, relative change on a scale of -2 → +2**  
1

### 5.2.3 Practice of Values

Practice of Values refers to the internal practice of values within the civil society arena. Important values that CIVICUS looks at such as transparency, democratic decision making, taking into account diversity that are deemed crucial to gauge not only progressiveness but also the extent to which civil society’s practices are coherent with their ideals.

CWM’s situation with regards to ‘practice of values’ has slightly improved since the baseline. CWM aims to ensure accountability at three levels: accountability to the target group; accountability to the board and strong internal audits supported by robust external audits.

**Accountability to the target groups** has improved by means of a deeper and continuous engagement with trade unions that CWM works with. The absence of a CWM website at the baseline, which has been recommended since 2008, was conspicuous, especially since CWM is in the field of information generation and dissemination. The CWM website is now up, has a news ticker update, but the upcoming events listed and the publications uploaded on the site date from 2012 (observations made in April and October 2014).

At the time of the baseline, four out of the five CWM’s board members (all male) held posts in workers organisations that were federated in the New Trade Union Initiative (NTUI) as an umbrella organisation of independent trade unions in the organised and unorganised sector.

The new board still counts five persons (one woman), two of which represent trade unions and three other members include professionals committed to CWM’s objectives but having a wider experience in action research, education and in similar organisations as a means to improve the SPO’s performance.

Generally speaking the board has become more diverse in terms of gender and background, and in comparison to the baseline situation, it works more systematically and regularly, which is expected to improve CWM’s performance. Factors that have supported the performance of the board consist of more rigorous compliance standards of CWM’s funder Rosa Luxembourg Stiftung, the annual review mechanism introduced by Hivos, financing of board meetings and quarterly internal audits.

No changes occurred with regards to external financial auditing, which is mandatory for all NGOs in India.

**Score baseline 2013 on an absolute scale from 0-3**  
1

**Score end line 2014, relative change on a scale of -2 → +2**  
1

### 5.2.4 Perception of Impact

Perception of Impact assesses the perceived impact of civil society actors on politics and society as a whole as the consequences of collective action. In this, the perception of both civil society actors (internal) as actors outside civil society (outsiders) is taken into account. Specific sub dimensions for this evaluation are the extent to which the SPO has contributed to engage more people in social or political activities, has contributed to strengthening CSOs and their networks, has influenced public and private sector policies.

**Civil society arena - changes**

Generally speaking, CWM’s impact upon civil society, in particular upon the trade unions that it is working with did not change since the baseline: apart from the capacity of five to six trade unions of the 41 that CWM works with to influence the public and private sector becoming stronger, no other
changes occurred. The concerns of all trade unions consist of the right to associate and to collectively bargain; the right to a minimum and a living wage; universal social security and; livelihood and workers’ rights. In the garment sector in Karnataka and Tamil Nadu, minimum wages were increased due to interventions of GATWU and GAFWU, that also became active in organising workers in the Special Economic Zone (right to associate and to collectively bargain), and addressed sexual harassment at the work floor (livelihood and workers’ rights) in a Special Economic Zone, which was a rare thing as even by law, trade union activities are not allowed within the SEZ premises. Other impacts observed are an increase in membership of unions working in the garment sector; GAFWU started with 103 female members from one Bangalore factory in 2009 and actually counts 694 members from three districts of Karnataka state; increased interactions between GAFWU and PTS which helped to raise the awareness of women regarding their rights in their workspace, as well as grass root leadership. After the Rana Plaza incident both GATWU and GAFWU have joined a South Asian network of trade unions in the garment sector, which will further help to address value chain wide issues in the sector.

A research paper by CWM that relates the prevalent low wages of women workers in the tea plantations of Northern Bengal to a rise in child labour in 2013 brought the issue in the centre of discussion (the right to a minimum and a living wage and livelihoods and workers’ rights).

The facilitation of an international fact finding mission on violations of trade union rights at Maruti-Suzuki made the issue a matter of international concern amongst trade unions and democratic rights organisations (right to associate and to collectively bargain). Also efforts were made to link the trade unions in the auto sector to international networks that defend the rights of workers.

Although this impact is important for the five to six trade unions concerned, CWM did not identify other changes in the other 35 unions it works with.

Box 1: Living Wage

The issue of a living wage has gained urgency today, in the context of high inflation rates and increasing income disparities. Real poverty is a large concern of trade unions representing workers in the informal sector. Measurement of poverty and changing government definitions which push down wage norms make it difficult for unions to address the question of wage fixation. Norms like the 15th ILC have become a farce in the face of continuous pressure to push wages down. Trade union representation on wage fixing committees becomes ineffective in the face of absence of reliable and consistent data and analysis. At the same time, weakening of public social security measures available to the poor, further impacts real wages. A systematic region and sector specific series of studies on wages to workers linked to family employment and expenditure patterns, including aspects like incidence of forced employment of children in families of informal sector workers is a priority. The study information also needs to continuously feed into campaigns for fair wages, and is a just method of wage indexing.

Source: Advancing Industrial Democracy for Economic and Social Equality, Centre for Workers’ Management: 1 October 2008–30 September 2012

Collaboration with and influencing the public and private sector

CWM, by principle does not engage with the public sector, nor influence their policies. The same applies for the private sector. The organisation seeks to be an anonymous catalyst in the trade union

---

32 Project documents
33 CWM and ILRF, (April 2013), Brewing Misery: Condition of Working Families in Tea Plantations in West Bengal and Kerala, (April 2013), CWM (Delhi) and International Labour Rights Forum (Washington), together with two trade unions in the tea plantations – the Paschim Banga Cha Bagan Shramik Karmachari Union (PBCBSKU) (West Bengal) and the Plantation Working Class Union (PWCU) (Kerala), funded by International Labour Rights Forum.
movement. Therefore, the core belief behind all its interventions is that workers must represent themselves, should be self-managed and self-governed; and that CWM’s role should only be limited to playing facilitator and enabler. The organisation also states that this is the task of the trade unions that defend the interests of workers. Evidence has been found for the garment sector:

- With support of CWM, in the 2012 – 2014 period, GATWU became a member of the tripartite committee for minimum wages in the garment sector in Karnataka that comprised representatives of the public and the private sector and GATWU as a representative of a trade union.
- This same trade union and GAFWU were successful in raising the minimum wage of the garment sector in Karnataka and in Tamil Nadu.
- On two occasions workers affiliated to GAFWU resisted sexual harassment at the workplace, by filing complaints against it, something that was rare in earlier times.
- One of the two trade unions paved the way for the union’s entry into a SEZ for the first time.

No other examples of policy influencing by trade unions that received CWM’s support were mentioned by the SPO.

Score baseline 2013 on an absolute scale from 0-3 1
Score end line 2014, relative change on a scale of -2→+2 0

5.2.5 Civil Society Environment

The social, political and economic environment in which civil society operates affects its room for manoeuvre. The civil society context has been described in chapter 3. In this section we describe how NNET is coping with that context.

While the past two years have seen new challenges thrust upon workers and unions, the backdrop has been consistently bleak. As Hivos’ 2012-2014 contract with CWM sums up, the situation of labour in India is in a churn of an unprecedented order due to pro-market and liberal policies for some years. Even in the formal sector informal employment has increased from 39 to 46 per cent between 1990 and 2005 and is estimated at 51 per cent for 2010. This growing informality has put pressure on wages, and working conditions are far below those of standard employment, adversely impacting not just the formal but also the informal sector.

Other than this, the economic downturn, consequent retrenchment, increasing contractualisation of the workforce and spiralling inflation between 2012 and 2014 provided for a particularly difficult environment for workers. Controversies on mining contracts between government and the corporates multiplied; these were about violations of environmental norms and displacement issues impacting livelihoods of indigenous people and rural workers. Rural to urban migration continued unabated despite NREGA, which still suffers from widespread corruption and inappropriate implementation.

The right to dissent, meanwhile, has been under attack. Attempts at unionising and union struggles are met with increasing employer repression; often the government and police are complicit. The Maruti-Suzuki automobile workers brought to attention the attack on right to association and spread of contract employment in all forms of work. The struggles against displacement in Jagatsinghpur and Niyamgiri in Orissa, and around nuclear power generation sites in Kudakulam, all brought to fore the contradictions between unregulated industrialisation and democratic rights.

The Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act 2010 challenged CWM further, because it prohibits the use of foreign fund for unionisation. Those working with unions now have to be extra cautious that their foreign-funded activities are not linked with union formation.

---

Although CWM states that engaging with new national and international workers’ networks will bring to the fore issues and concerns of women workers and those working in the auto industries, generally speaking, CWM did not develop coping strategies to counter these tendencies; its strategies of working with trade unions remained the same, apart from minor changes in terms of intensifying the nature of the support.

**Score baseline 2013 on an absolute scale from 0-3**  
1

**Score end line 2014, relative change on a scale of -2 → +2**  
-1

### 5.3 To what degree are the changes identified attributable to the interventions of the Southern partners?

This paragraph assesses the extent to which some outcomes achieved can be “attributed” to CWM. Starting with an outcome, the evaluation team developed a model of change that identifies different pathways that possibly explain the outcome achieved. Data collection was done to obtain evidence that confirms or rejects each of these pathways. Based upon this assessment, the evaluation team concludes about the most plausible explanation of the outcome and the most plausible relation between (parts of) pathways and the outcome. The relations between the pathways and the outcomes can differ in nature as is being explained in table 8.

**Table 8**  
*Nature of the relation between parts in the Model of Change*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the relation between parts and other parts or outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The part is the only causal explanation for the outcome. No other interventions or factors explain it. (necessary and sufficient) | ✅  
| The part does not explain the outcome at all: other subcomponents explain the outcomes. | ✗  
| The part explains the outcome but other parts explain the outcome as well: there are multiple pathways (sufficient but not necessary) | ✅  
| The part is a condition for the outcome but won’t make it happen without other factors (necessary but not sufficient) | ✅  
| The part is a contributory cause it is part of a ‘package’ of causal actors and factors that together are sufficient to produce the intended effect. | ✅  

Sources: Mayne, 2012; Stern et al, 2012

The following paragraph assesses CWM’s contribution to two outcomes. Each paragraph first describes the outcome achieved and the evidence obtained to confirm that the outcome has been achieved. It then presents the pathways identified that possibly explain the outcomes, as well as present information that confirms or refutes these pathways. The last section concludes in the first place about the most plausible explanation of the outcome, followed by a conclusion regarding the role of the SPO in explaining the outcome.

#### 5.3.1 Strategic Orientation 1: Civic Engagement

**The outcome achieved**

Two Chennai-based unions, Garments and Fashions Workers Union (GAFWU) and Penn Thozhilalargal Sangam (PTS) have enhanced their membership, as well as the quality of women’s engagement in trade unions.

In the 2011 – 2014 period, membership and the quality of women’s engagement in two trade unions, that of the Chennai-based unions, GAFWU and PTS has improved. These unions are defending the interests of workers in the garment sector and the domestic-help sector, by nature female oriented sectors.

The membership of PTS grew from 297 persons in 2001 to 18300 in 2013 and PTS only has female members. The average annual growth (32 percent) was however more spectacular before 2011 than between 2011 and 2013 (10 percent). Whereas the union had 4 branches in 2007, in 2014 it had 145 branches, implying that the union is now present in many more places than earlier. Since 2008, the
The number of second level leaders in PTS has increased from 3 to 15 in 2014 and also the number of local leaders at branch level has increased.

The membership of GAFWU has increased from 112 persons in 2009 to 723 persons in 2013. Female membership has oscillated over these years between 85 percent (2012) and 96 percent (2013). Its most spectacular growth was in 2010 (55 percent), whereas the average growth as of 2011 is 29 percent. The number of factories where GAFWU is active has increased from one factory in 2009 to five factories in 2014. Despite not being an all women union, currently all GAFWU’s leadership - first, second and third rung – constitutes of female members.

Pathways that explain the outcome and information that confirms or rejects these pathways

1. The first pathway that possibly explains the outcome is the support given by CWM since at least 2008.

   Information that confirms this:
   CWM, together with Malarchi has worked with GAFWU and PTS since 2008 by means of capacity building, conducting research as an input to conduct evidence-based advocacy, and by coaching them to design their advocacy strategy.

   Also before MFS II, GAFWU managed to influence the Tamil Nadu Minimum Wage Committee to pass a wage revision and PTS was successful in including domestic workers as a category eligible for a minimum wage (2009). This campaign was supported by CWM that developed a template for computing a need-based minimum wage indexed to inflation which was tested and finalised by workers organisations at a workshop in 2008. This template was used by GAFWU to negotiate improved wages. Other support consisted of: capacity building efforts for both trade unions in collaboration with Malarchi, and; research on collective bargaining with PTS.

   During MFS II, CWM changed the way it works with both trade unions in Tamil Nadu and another Karnataka-based union in the garment sector (GATWU). Firstly, all three unions were clubbed together because they were working in female dominated sectors. Secondly, the content was redesigned with the target group and modified during courses and workshops when necessary; participants decided upon their follow-up strategies and plans of action, rather than CWM; more women (also from the second level rung) per union participated in the workshops and courses; more focus group discussions took place with target groups. Thirdly, CWM supported both GATWU and GAFWU to prepare workers’ testimonies to be submitted to a people’s tribunal in Bangalore, discussing working conditions in the garment sector. Fourthly, CWM conducted research on global supply chains in the garment sector and informed both GATWU and GAFWU about the results, which helped those unions and CWM realise the role of local factories in the global supply chains. As a consequence of which they also convinced them to change part of their campaign strategies to target the brands for better wages. This was followed up by a workshop in November 2013 during which they developed bargaining strategies within a tripartite framework. This framework also included international brands in the negotiations involved for better working conditions.

   Both PTS and GAFWU confirmed that CWM, as a resource centre, has played an important role in increasing their capacities to defend female workers in their work place. In consequence membership has increased, as women experienced improvements in their working place and in their salaries.

2. The second pathway that possibly explains the outcome consists of other unions and resource centres having engaged with the garment sector and domestic workers in Tamil Nadu.

   Information that confirms this pathway: PTS and Malarchi combined resources to conduct the study on Minimum Wages across sectors by the end of 2013, in line with the 2012 survey which was supported by CWM. The findings were circulated among workers of different unions and the
labour department of the government, followed by public meetings in worker-dominated areas. PTS also informed NTUI about the findings of the study and made recommendations to NTUI’s work and policies.

CWM, together with Transnational Information Exchange (TIE)\textsuperscript{35}, helped both GATWU and GAFWU to integrate a South Asian network of trade unions. The International Union League for Brand Responsibility attended the above mentioned November 2013 workshop during which bargaining strategies including international brands were developed

3. The \textit{third} pathway that possibly explains the increase in union membership consists of Tamil Nadu enjoying some of the best human development indicators in India. This, in turn, is assumed to have positively influenced the working conditions of women and their increased participation in Trade Unions.

Information that \textit{confirms} this pathway comes from CWM staffs who state that the government’s welfare schemes reach target groups effectively and efficiently, that the state is ensuring the provision of maternity benefits, pensions and better working conditions for women in particular. Indian Human Development reports also confirm the comparatively high human development indicators.

Information that \textit{rejects} this pathway comes from both PTS and GAFWU who state that despite higher gender indicators for Tamil Nadu in reports, practice and reality are really different because most of the state provisions do not reach their constituents, who are among the poorest of the poor. These statements are confirmed by reports and articles that highlight the difficult environment for activism, including labour rights in general.

4. The \textit{fourth pathway} explains increases in membership because GAFWU and PTS already successfully influenced the government in the past. As already mentioned above, GAFWU’s most spectacular growth was in 2010, one year after they had successfully influenced the minimum wage committee to pass a revision in 2009. The most spectacular growth of PTS occurred however in 2006, \textit{before} it successfully influenced the same committee to make domestic workers eligible for minimum wages. PTS’ average annual growth in membership and that of GAFWU were higher before MFS II than during MFS II, however membership figures of 2014 and 2015 are missing.

\textsuperscript{35} Transnational Information Exchange is a global grassroots network of workers active in workplaces and communities. It includes both union and non-union activists in the formal and informal sectors. TIE aims to encourage, organise, and facilitate international consciousness and cooperation among workers and their organisations in various parts of the world. See http://www.tie-germany.org/who_we_are/index.html
Based upon the analysis of the information available, we conclude that the most plausible explanation for the increased female membership of GAFWU and PTS are to be explained by a combination of the role played by the unions themselves in terms of conducting wage surveys, campaigning and negotiating minimum wage hikes (pathway 4), in collaboration with CWM (pathway 1), other actors (pathway 2). These three are part of a causal package that together is minimally sufficient and necessary to explain the outcome. An other factors that might have contributed to this increased membership is the collapse of the eight store garment factory in April 2013 in Bangladesh that received a lot of media attention and mobilised western countries in addressing working conditions in the garment sector by targeting the international brands.

CWM’s collaboration with both GAFWU and PTS had already began before the MFS II phase when it started to disseminate a template to calculate a need-based minimum wage indexed to inflation which was finalised in 2007. This template has been used in particular by GAFWU before and during MFS II to calculate minimum wages in the sector as an input to lobby for minimum wage hikes. Apart from this, regular courses and workshops organised since 2008 have helped the unions to improve their

---

**Figure 1** Pathways that possibly explain outcomes and conclusions about the nature of the relations between pathways and the outcome, GAFWU and PTS

**Conclusions**

Based upon the analysis of the information available, we conclude that the most plausible explanation for the increased female membership of GAFWU and PTS are to be explained by a combination of the role played by the unions themselves in terms of conducting wage surveys, campaigning and negotiating minimum wage hikes (pathway 4), in collaboration with CWM (pathway 1), other actors (pathway 2). These three are part of a causal package that together is minimally sufficient and necessary to explain the outcome. An other factors that might have contributed to this increased membership is the collapse of the eight store garment factory in April 2013 in Bangladesh that received a lot of media attention and mobilised western countries in addressing working conditions in the garment sector by targeting the international brands.

CWM’s collaboration with both GAFWU and PTS had already began before the MFS II phase when it started to disseminate a template to calculate a need-based minimum wage indexed to inflation which was finalised in 2007. This template has been used in particular by GAFWU before and during MFS II to calculate minimum wages in the sector as an input to lobby for minimum wage hikes. Apart from this, regular courses and workshops organised since 2008 have helped the unions to improve their
performance and become more effective in defending the rights of their constituents. CWM’s engagement with international actors, resulting in its 2013 research of the global supply chains to which both Karnataka and Tamil Nadu based factories are related, as well as their support to integrate GATWU and GAFWU in a South Asian network of unions, further helped to increase the performance of the trade unions.

5.3.2 Strategic Orientation 2: Strengthening IOs

Outcome
The capacity of Garment and Textile Workers Union (GATWU) in Karnataka state to influence policies and practices, and in particular in relation to a rise in the minimum wages in the garment sector and the implementation of Dearness Allowance (DA) norms in Karnataka.

GATWU was officially created in 2006, currently it has some 6500 members and it democratically elected its Executive Committee for the first time in 2011. It carries out awareness raising programmes at the gates of factories, has trained 15,000 workers, supports them to get access to government welfare schemes, and mobilises them for lobby and advocacy activities. Apart from this its intention is to conduct an annual wage survey as of 2012. GATWU is a member of NTUI and the International Union League for Brand Responsibility, has a number of local allies including Alternative Law Forum (ALF), and international allies, including Worker Rights Consortium (WRC), International Labour Rights Forum (ILRF) and Clean Clothes Campaign (CCC). Since its creation it has influenced policies and their implementation of both factories and the government of Karnataka. No other trade unions exist in Karnataka that organise the workers in the garment sector, 90 percent of which are female.

Evidence for the outcome
Following a direction of the High Court of Karnataka, the tripartite Minimum Wage Advisory Board of workers, managements and government representatives was again established and it decided upon a revision of minimum wages in the garment sector. GATWU was the only trade union which was an official member of the Advisory Board. The new notification of April 2014 provides for an increase in the daily wages by an average of Rs. 60 a day, inclusive of the Dearness Allowance which is applicable since April 2013. Some 400,000 workers are supposed to be benefitting from this wage hike which is the highest one-time increase in minimum wages since 1979. The wage hike is the result of a long itinerary that started in 2009, when the labour department of the government published a notification announcing a wage hike, which was refused by employers and not enforced by the government that in 2010 also published a new notification with a lower wage hike. In consequence GATWU went to the High Court which in a March 2013 ruling ordered that wages should be revised after tripartite talks.

Also the 2009 wage hike is to be explained by lobby efforts of GATWU, in collaboration with support from CWM, NTUI and WRC at the international level.

With regards to the Dearness Allowance, due to the pressure of GATWU all Bangalore major exporters except for one paid the DA for 2013. GATWU started with an awareness campaign through gate meetings and distributed pamphlets to help workers to learn their rights. In 2011-2012 it was supported by its international allies-Clean Clothes Campaign and Workers Rights Consortium and together they took up the issue with manufacturers and brands. The union estimates its intervention

36 Website GATWU
37 Source: The Hindu: Highest one-time hike in minimum wages, 1 May 2014.
38 Website GATWU
has helped over 100,000 workers to get an additional Rs.408 per month as DA. This is a significant amount, being nearly 10 percent of the wage of the workers.  

Pathways that explain the outcome and information that confirms or rejects these pathways.

1. The first pathway explains the outcomes achieved through collaboration with CWM.

Information that confirms this pathway

Minimum-wage surveys initiated by CWM

GATWU and WRC credit CWM for having developed in 2007 the template for computing a need-based minimum wage indexed to inflation. GATWU and CWM conducted a survey in 2012 to calculate the minimum wage. In 2013 GATWU was sufficiently capacitated to conduct a second survey more independently from CWM. The findings of these surveys are discussed with workers as a means to raise their awareness. GATWU aims to conduct these surveys annually but no evidence has been found that such a survey was conducted in 2014. The minimum wage calculations were used as an input by GATWU to negotiate the revision of the official minimum wages set by the government of Karnataka. According to CWM, GATWU was very effective in the tripartite minimum wage sub-committee where minimum wages were discussed. Workers’ Rights Consortium (WRC) observes that workers organisations supported by CWM have all been active in addressing issues of minimum wages and garment sector workers’ rights. Many activists in the sector can now explain the legal provisions for minimum wages in the state.

Nature of the collaboration with CWM

As already mentioned in the previous paragraph concerning GAFWU and PTS, CWM has changed its approach of working with the three trade unions during MFS II. CWM intensified its support to the garment sector by clubbing the three unions together where possible. It changed its training and workshop approach, making these more demand driven and participatory, involving more than before the second and occasionally the third tier of the union to plan for future actions. GATWU states that their understanding on minimum wages and other issues like female workers’ conditions at the workplace has improved through their relations with network partners like CWM. They ask for CWM support when required. Other respondents like ALF and All India Trade Union Congress (AITUC) confirm that CWM provides an added value to GATWU, because of their trade union experience and that these have had a huge impact on garment sector workers in Bangalore. AITUC also states that no other trade union is capable of representing the garment sector workers and that AITUC failed to do so. The same respondent also states that AITUC asks CWM’s support from time to time.

International orientation of CWM increased

Since the baseline study, CWM has also increasingly tried to assess the position of workers and Indian factories into the global value chain and the global brands that these factories are working for. At the same time they have developed a new campaign strategy that targets these international brands that are sensible to consumer pressure as a means to introduce change at the shop-floor. Meanwhile they have engaged with other NGOs to engage their constituent unions in international union networks. Concrete examples given are the following:

• Together with Transnational Information Exchange (TIE), CWM set up a network of South Asian trade unions in the garment sector, including GATWU and GAFWU.

---

39 Issues of Garment Sector Labour and the Global Supply Chain: Some learnings from Bangalore (April 2013)
40 Wages and Employment Relations among Garment Workers in Bangalore (September 2013)
41 Workshop for PTS – GAFWU activists and members in Chennai (May 2013)
42 Wage Survey of Garments Sector in Bangalore (2012)
• CWM conducted global supply chain studies in the garment sector and concluded that informing brands about workers’ conditions could possibly increase pressure upon local factories to improve these conditions.\(^{43}\)\(^{44}\)

• November 2013, CWM, GATWU, GAFWU and Union League for Brand Responsibility, which is new globally working league, discussed minimum wage situation in the sector and developed an understanding wage campaign including bargaining strategies within a tripartite framework, and also using international brand in negotiations.

• Further, it engages in a constant dialogue with TIE and WRC, and is currently facilitating the interaction of garment workers from Bangladesh with different organisations in Germany around the cause of Rana Plaza collapse of Bangladesh.\(^{45}\)

**Information that rejects this pathway**

In the first place the evaluators observe that GATWU was already internationally oriented before CWM came to the conclusion that targeting consumer sensitive global brands helps to introduce changes at the work floor in Karnataka state. GATWU has campaigned with the Clean Clothes Campaign (CCC) since 2005 – 2006, targeting G-Star in the Netherlands and their supplier FFI in Karnataka. Although this campaign was a very tough one, gaining global media attention whilst GATWU and NTUI were brought to court by FFI, the campaign informed GATWU’s future campaigns to include international brands. With the newly established international Union League for Brand Responsibility (2012), GATWU is organising workers in three factories that produce for Adidas\(^{46}\).

In the second place, WRC already published the relations between the garment factories in Karnataka and international brands in March 2010, based upon which they started organising meetings of unions with representatives of international brands to reinstate the wage hike notification of 2009\(^{47}\).

In the third place, no evidence was found that CWM played a role with regards to the Dearness Allowance Campaign that in 2013 resulted in all but one factory paying the DA conform regulations. GATWU’s website states that CCC and WRC helped the union to increase the pressure through the brands, whilst GATWU spread the awareness of workers through gate meetings, pamphlet distributions, other meetings and training. Mohan Mani (2014) from CWM confirms this in his writings.\(^{48}\)

---

\(^{43}\) Issues of Garment Sector Labour and the Global Supply Chain: Some learnings from Bangalore (April 2013)

\(^{44}\) a study on the global supply chain prepared by CWM for garment sector in Bangalore in 2013

\(^{45}\) See Rana Plaza: A look into garment sector one year after the workplace tragedy, http://www.thedailystar.net/rana-plaza


\(^{47}\) http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2147&context=globaldocs

\(^{48}\) Mohan Mani, January 2014, “Ready Made”-Garments in India: Manufacturing cheap commodities in Global South, for the Global North, CWM and Rosa Luxembourg Stiftung South Asia
2. The second pathway consists of international pressure explaining the wage hike notification of 2014 and the payment of the Dearness Allowances in 2013, as a result of the collapse of the eight store Bangladeshi garment factory in April 2013; Rana Plaza.

The Rana Plaza accident raised the awareness of EU countries and the US that changes in the garment sector are necessary. Seven OECD countries called on companies to "donate generously to the [Rana Plaza Donor] Trust Fund, either for the first time or with a second contribution to come to an appropriate amount" in June 2014. But funds are still missing and some of the brands are refusing to compensate the victims of the collapse of the eight store high factory\(^49\). Apart from this wakeup call of OECD countries, the Dutch and the German Governments endorsed the principle of a living wage being paid to workers in the garment sector in 2013, but until so far these principles have not (yet) been operationalised by the sector itself\(^50\). These commitments were made during a conference convened by both governments in November 2013, regrouping business, international organisations, NGOs and trade unions, including GATWU, CCC and NTUI.

No evidence has been found so far that these initiatives have contributed to an improvement of the working situation in the factories of Karnataka state.

3. The 2014 wage hike in Karnataka state is explained by means of the 2014 national elections or because wages need to be revised every three to five years, which is mandatory according to the Minimum Wage Act.

\(^{49}\) http://www.tuac.org/en/public/e-docs/00/00/0E/D8/document_news.phtml

No evidence was found that the national elections and the mandatory review of minimum wages explain the wage hike of 2014, nor those wage hikes of 2001 and 2009, the last of which only became effective in 2014. According to GATWU many wage hikes notified by the government have been stayed because of industry opposition in 1979, 1986, 1993, 2001, 2007 and 2009. The three to five year mandatory revisions of the minimum wage did not occur in the garment sector in Karnataka either: the 2009 wage hike notification (not implemented) followed a previous notification of 2001. Between 2001 and 2014, no other notifications became effective.

**Conclusion:**
The most plausible explanation of GATWU’s capacity to successfully negotiate wage hikes and ensure that dearness allowances are being paid is a combination of causes:

- In the first place, GATWU’s has proven to be a mature grass root worker organisation before MFS II because it already successfully negotiated the 2009 wage hike, which unfortunately did not materialize and already worked with the CCC in the 2005-2006 period without interventions from CWM.
- In the second place, GATWU has received support from both WRC and CCC before and during MFS II, in particular in terms of becoming aware that exercising pressure through international brands helps to improve workers’ conditions as of 2006 and beyond, before CWM started to realise the importance of chain-wide thinking during MFS II period.
- In the third place, CWM’s technical support to calculate need-based minimum wages as a starting point for negotiations, as well as their support to GATWU’s negotiations with the industry and the government.

These three causes are part of the *causal package* that explains the outcomes obtained during MFS II. Together they are a *minimally sufficient and necessary explanation* of the outcome. The evaluators did not find a causal relation between CWM's efforts during MFS II to support GATWU at the international level, because GATWU already realised the importance of this as of 2006. Also the mandatory three to five year minimum wage revisions and the national elections do not explain the outcomes achieved.

The most important role of CWM in explaining the outcome starts with the template it made to compute a need-based minimum wage, indexed for inflation in 2007, which was used by GATWU in 2012 and 2013 to calculate minimum wages needed as a means to raise the awareness of garment sector workers and to continue negotiations with the government and the industry. Its second important contribution is the collaboration and guidance it offers upon request and which has become more demand driven since MFS II.

### 5.4 What is the relevance of these changes?

#### 5.4.1 Relevance of the changes in relation to the Theory of Change of 2012

According to the ToC of 2012, CWM’s ultimate goal is an 'Equitable and socially just society'. In order to achieve this, CWM works towards the creation of a ‘new generation of workers and activists’ that requires a new kind of leadership - the worker activist- that needs to reinsure the right to collective bargaining, also in Special Economic Zones and; that needs to create sound politically independent trade unions. Also the further democratisation among trade unions’ is needed in order promote this new generation of workers and worker –activists, which would lead to more dialogue, more sharing, and decision making based upon consensus. Both conditions would lead to ‘unity among workers’, as well as to the ‘right to association’ and the ‘right to collective bargaining’, which, would further ensure that trade unions working together for the larger cause of ‘universal security’ and ‘income based taxation’, impacting the conditions of all the workers across sectors. Further, ‘democratic industrialisation’ would enable an atmosphere where the needs of the workers will be voiced, heard and addressed. In this pathway, the role of CWM perceives for itself, focuses on the ‘emergence of new generation of workers activists’ and ‘trade union democratisation’. They intervene by means of
documentation and research to discover significant moments in trade union history as a way to chart out the best way forward from the past and present learnings.

The changes achieved by the five to six trade unions that CWM worked with still relevant in the light of its 2012 ToC but in comparison the total number of unions that it works with these are minimal changes.

5.4.2 Relevance of the changes in relation to the context in which the SPO is operating

The present day civil society context relating to labour and labour rights in India has been in the making for long, especially so since Liberalisation set off economic reforms in 1991. The public sector steadily declined since, privatisation brought in contractualisation of a kind that ignored labour rights and union activities saw a downfall.

The increase in use of contract labour—workers hired on temporary contracts through government-licensed intermediary or contractors—by industries, has led to increasing incidences of industrial violence.\(^5^1\) This is mainly because of the exploitative nature of this form of labour. By hiring contract labourers industries are able to cut down on costs and increase profits, this is on the cost of the workers experiencing, "anxiety over job security, lack of social security, exploitation at the hands of contractors, low wages, unequal treatment by trade unions and abusive behaviour from permanent workers and supervisors".\(^5^2\)

Most recently, the Manesar Plant (Haryana) of Maruti Suzuki India Ltd. witnessed industrial violence. The workers at the plant organised protests in August 2011 against the dismissal of 60 of their colleagues and the company’s refusal to accept the Maruti Suzuki Employees Union (MSEU). In July 2012, the skirmishes between the management and the workers culminated with the death of the HR manager and also, injured 100 people of the management by the rioting workers. The plant was subsequently shut for a month following this incidence, and 500 permanent and 1800 contract workers were dismissed. The Haryana police arrested 147 workers in connection to this, they are still in prison.\(^5^3\) There have been other instances of industrial violence, caused by friction between the workers and the management. In 2008, the CEO of Graziano Transmissioni India, an auto component maker, was beaten to death by 200 workers. In November 2010, an Assistant General Manager of Allied Nippon, again an auto parts maker, was stoned to death by angry workers. In March 2011, a Deputy General Manager of Powmex Steel, was killed when the workers set his car on fire.\(^5^4\)

It is under this contextual landscape that organisations like Centre for Workers’ Management (CWM) work. Their work is increasingly shaped by these growing challenges and issues faced by the labourers.

Apart from this local context, since the baseline and maybe triggered by the Rana Plaza incident, CWM has made efforts to position workers in global value chains, which helped to realise that not only the Indian industries and the Indian government need to be addressed, but also international brands that source from Indian factories. CWM’s work is highly relevant, but its effectiveness over the past two years shows that it is not capable to significantly contribute to changing the context.


5.4.3 Relevance of the changes in relation to the policies of the MFS II alliance and Hivos

CWM has been a partner of Hivos for more than 10 years. At the time of concluding the 2012-2014 contract Hivos stated that CWM’s work fitted into its ‘Rights and Citizenship programme in India which intensely focused on the informal sector. CWM was Hivos’ only partner that maintained relations with worker organisations in both the formal and informal labour sector, reaching out to 41 trade unions and 700,000 workers (40% women) of both the formal and informal sector. CWM has been a partner of Hivos for more than 10 years. At the time of concluding the 2012-2014 contract Hivos stated that CWM’s work fitted into its ‘Rights and Citizenship programme in India which intensely focused on the informal sector. CWM was Hivos’ only partner that maintained relations with worker organisations in both the formal and informal labour sector, reaching out to 41 trade unions and 700,000 workers (40% women) of both the formal and informal sector. The contribution of the workers’ organisations in the creation and strengthening of the New Trade Union Initiative (NTUI) in the beginning of the decennium has provided a fresh perspective on issues of labour and law that are non-political party aligned and representative of a wider mix of workers (everyone from sex workers to metal workers).

Apart from this, according to Hivos in 2012, CWM was at a critical juncture as far as its institutional history is concerned because they intended to create a Workers School in 2013. This school envisaged to be a process where second line leaders within trade unions would be equipped with sector-specific knowledge as well as pedagogical understandings of the economy to be able to do their job better. Further Hivos hoped to collaborate with CWM to support other Hivos partners to refine an advocacy agenda on the issue of Agricultural Labour/employment.

When looking back at CWM in 2014, with Hivos’ support CWM was to introduce changes in its institutional set-up in the 2012-2014 period as recommended already in 2008. However CWM did not make any progress on the workers’ school since the baseline and failed to clearly position itself as such an institute that is capable to do research and education.

5.5 Explaining factors

5.5.1 Internal factors

Hivos conducted a capability assessment in 2012 which is presented in the following table.

Its average score for the capability to act and commit is 5.3 on a scale of 1 (lowest score) to 9 (highest score). The major observation made by Hivos is that CWM had to reconstitute its board by December 2012, which has been done. The performance of the new board seems to have improved in comparison to the board that was in place in 2012. Barring Gautam Mody, CWM’s director until 2012, and who is now NTUI’s General Secretary, none of the other CWM board members are on NTUI’s board which indicates that the separation between CWM and any one other organisation, recommended since 2008, is slowly materialising.

Its average score for the capability to perform is a 4.8 explained by Hivos’ observation that its strategic and operational planning, monitoring and evaluation procedures needed to be revised in order to ensure monitoring not only at output, but also at outcome level, as well as the relevance of outputs delivered. These systems were meant to engage the organisation into a critical reflection on its position in the wider labour context and its added value. CWM has not improved these systems since 2012.

55 Contract Intake Form, Hivos, September 2012
Its capability to relate was assessed at 6 points and mentions in particular relations with trade unions. Since 2012, CWM has strengthened its relations with many other actors and seeks their collaboration to jointly work with worker organisations. However relations with trade unions only concentrate upon some intensively.

CWM’s capability to adapt and self-renew was appreciated with an average of 6 points, because the 2008 external evaluation had concluded that the organisation responds adequately to trends and changes in the context and uses up-to-date strategies and knowledge. Since 2012, CWM has made its collaboration with worker organisations more demand-driven and including a more global value chain perspective together with other actors. Whilst these confirm CWM’s capacity to adapt and self-renew, CWM’s added value in the labour sector would increase if it were able to become more effective in working with more trade unions. The evaluation team also questions CWM’s capability to adapt and self-renew in relation to the recommendations made by an external evaluation team, of which some have been implemented as of 2012 only and some are still pending, such as is the case of the website, which is not being maintained.

Its capability to maintain consistency scored 5 points in 2012: CWM at that moment in time was aware of the need for an organisational restructuring as well as the need to strike a balance between working with trade unions on a day to day basis and upon demand on the one side, and its own strategic priorities; that of creating a workers’ school and more engagement with larger policy issues. No changes were observed regarding this in this 2014.

Under the same capability Hivos observes that CWM is addressing gender sensitive issues at the workplace of female workers and has been recruiting female staff to further develop the issue.

Since 2012, when CWM counted 16 staff members of which 7 female, CWM has grown in staff numbers: at the end of 2013 it had 3 principal researchers; 1 campaign coordinator; 5 researchers & educators; 5 administrative and financial staff and 13 campaign staff. How many of these are female is unknown. The evaluation team did not find evidence that this increase in staff helped to serve more trade unions or to implement other activities that fit into CWM’s vision and mission.

| Table 9 |
| CWM capabilities’ assessment 2012 |
| 1 is lowest score - highly unsatisfactory | 5 is highest score - highly satisfactory |
| unknown score possible in first year |
| Capability | Scores |
| Capability to act and commit | 5 3 |
| 1.1 The organisation has a clear purpose and acts on decisions collectively. The leadership is accepted by staff, inspiring, action-oriented and reliable | 6 |
| 1.2 The organisation is capable to mobilise sufficient financial resources, and (where relevant) non material resources from members/ supporters. | 4 |
| 1.3 The organisation is internally transparent and accountable. (Relations between staff, direction and board; quality of decision-making process) | 6 |
| Capability to perform | 4 8 |
| 2.1 The number, composition and expertise of staff is adequate in view of the organisation’s objectives and programmes. (Indicate when there is high staff turnover) | 5 |
| 2.2 The organisation has a coherent and realistic strategic plan. (Context and problem analysis; Theory of Change; quality of formulation of objectives, intended results and indicators; explanation of strategic choices) | 4 |
| 2.3 The quality of financial and administrative management is adequate. (Budget, funding plan, financial management, financial report) | 6 |
| 2.4 The organisation has an appropriate monitoring and evaluation process (documentation & data | 4 |
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collection, involvement of stakeholders, quality of analysis and learning) and uses it for accountability and learning purposes.

3 Capability to relate 6

3.1 The organisation maintains relevant institutional relationships with external stakeholders and is seen as credible and legitimate. (Indicate main strategic relationships and collaboration with other actors) 7

3.2 The organisation is accountable to and communicates effectively with its primary constituents/beneficiaries. (Describe downward or horizontal accountability process; specify for women) 5

4 Capability to adapt and self-renew 6

4.1 The organisation (management) responds adequately to trends and changes in the context and uses up-to-date strategies and knowledge. 8

4.2 The organisation (management) encourages and supports internal learning and reflection processes. (Conditions, incentives) 4

5 C5.1: Capability to maintain consistency 5

5.1 The organisation is capable to maintain consistency between ambition, vision, strategy and operations. The management is able to deal strategically with external pressure and conflicting demands. 5

5.2 To what extent has the organisation formulated objectives with regard to the position of women and issues of gender equality? 6

5.3 To what extent does the organisation have internal gender expertise? 4

5.4 To what extent does the organisation maintain relations with key GW&D actors in its context, e.g. women’s movement, women’s organisations, gender experts? Scores

5.5 What is the percentage of women working in the organisation? 30% - 40%

5.6 To what extent is staff working in management or senior staff positions female? > 50%

Source: Hivos, September 2012, Partner Capacity Assessment Form

5.5.2 External factors

Apart from the worsening context for labourers in both the formal and informal sector, no other external factors explain the findings of this evaluation.

5.5.3 Relation CFA-SPO

Hivos closed its office in Bangalore in 2013 and a new office was opened in Mumbai in 2014. The last liaison officer that worked with CWM since 2010 quit her job in 2012. Since then the new Hivos office did not follow up on the contract with CWM. CWM has appreciated Hivos’ support that helped to support institutional costs. Other donors are more inclined to pay for programme activities.

Hivos, together with Rosa Luxembourg Stiftung also provided technical support to CWM, in particular to create a new board which brings a diverse experience set to evolve and monitor its programme.
6 Discussion

6.1 Design of the intervention and replicability

There is a gap between CWM’s vision, mission and the 2012 Theory of Change that reflect highly ideological ambitions which are relevant in India’s context on the one side and its intervention strategies on the other side that basically comprise training, research & documentation and support of trade unions in their campaigns. The relations between these three outputs and the concerns of all trade unions which are; the right to associate and to collectively bargain, the right to a minimum and a living wage, universal social security and, livelihood and workers’ rights are not clear and not reflected in the project documents. Perhaps they were only materialised in the garment sector and the domestic worker sector with three of the 41 trade unions that CWM works with.

The organisation continued to reply to demands coming from day-to-day base and failed to scale up its efforts by thinking more strategically as it wished to do, including the creation of a worker activist school.57

With the constitution of a new board that apart from trade union activists also counts academia and other experts, CWM is expected to set clearer strategic priorities in the coming years and implementing these.

The intervention is not suitable for replication, because it would not effectively and efficiently lead to sustainable development outcomes.

57 Baseline workshop information
7 Conclusion

Changes in the civil society arena of the SPO

In the 2012 – 2014 period, the two most important changes that took place in the civil society arena of CWM are related to ‘level of organisation’ and ‘practice of values’.

With regards to level of organisation, CWM intensified its interactions with a limited number of trade unions (a maximum of five unions of the 41 unions they consider part of their constituents), in particular those of the garment and domestic workers sectors where by tradition most workers are female. Apart from the collaboration with these three unions, CWM started to position workers’ struggles in global supply chains systems, as a means to reorient lobby and advocacy strategies of trade unions and to engage them in international networks. The SPO further expanded its international network and its financial resource base.

With regards to ‘practice of values’ CWM became a little bit more transparent to the trade unions it works with by means of creating a website that was recommended since 2008, but which is not kept up to date, and by reorganising its board that now also includes persons with a relevant background in training and research which is needed to improve CWM’s effectiveness in its support to trade unions. The overlap of functions and roles between CWM and the New Trade Union Initiative (NTUI) considerably decreased.

Contribution/attribution analysis

In the first place the evaluation assessed CWM’s contribution to the increase in membership and the quality of women’s engagement in two trade unions, the Garments and Fashions Workers Union (GAFWU) and the domestic workers’ union Penn Thozhilalargal Sangam (PTS). Both unions are working in typically female sectors. The most plausible explanation of this outcome is a combination of the two trade unions already having shown to defend the interests of their constituents before MFS II; CWM making its support approach more demand-oriented during MFS II; supporting the unions to use a template to calculate a need-based minimum wage indexed to inflation developed by CWM (in 2008) that helped to negotiate wage hikes with the government, and; other actors who helped to position garment workers’ concern in an international and supply chain context.

In the second place the evaluation team explained the capacity of the Garment and Textile Workers Union (GATWU) in Karnataka state to successfully negotiate a minimum wage hike and to finally ensure that industries started to pay dearness allowances to their workers according to the regulations in place. This outcome is most likely explained by the fact that GATWU is a mature organisation; support received by Workers’ Right Consortium and Clean Clothes Campaign in targeting the international brands that source their products from the garment factories in Karnataka before and during MFS II, and CWM’s technical support to calculate a needs-based inflation indexed minimum wage as an input for negotiations on these wages with the industry and the government.

CWM has been working with all three trade unions on a regular basis since 2008 – 2009 and these unions received more support than any other union that CWM considers as its constituents. During the MFS II period, CWM improved the quality of its services by means of making it more demand-driven and by means of including not only the union leaders, but also the second and the third rung. CWM itself became aware of the importance targeting international brands as a means to improve working conditions for women.

Relevance

The changes to which CWM contributed along with many other actors are relevant in relation to its 2012 Theory of Change and the external context. However these changes only concern some five to six of the 41 trade union that the organisation is supporting.

CWM is a very relevant organisation in relation to the Rights and Citizenship programme of the People Unlimited 4.1 alliance, but the partner organisation did hardly contribute to this programme.
Explaining factors
The information related to factors that explain the above findings was collected at the same time as the data were gathered for the previous questions. The evaluation team looked at internal factors within CWM, the external context in which it operates and the relations between CWM and Hivos. The most important factor that explains the evaluation findings is within CWM. Some of the critical issues mentioned in an external evaluation report of 2008 have been addressed as of 2012, such as the creation of a new and more performant board and a further separation between CWM and NTUI. However, CWM’s current strategic and operational planning, monitoring and evaluation in place hamper the organisation to effectively and efficiently make a considerable difference for the trade unions that it supports. The past two years have seen some changes into more effective interventions and more strategic relations with other organisations to make this difference, which is promising and should be pursued.

Design of the intervention
There is a big gap between CWM’s highly ideological ambitions and the interventions that it does: training, research & documentation and support trade unions in their campaigns. The design requires a further critical reflection in order to make it replicable at a wider scale by CWM in the first place in relation to other trade unions.

Table 10
Summary of findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The CS interventions were well designed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CS interventions were implemented as designed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CS interventions reached their objectives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The observed outcomes are attributable to the CS interventions</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The observed CS outcomes are relevant to the beneficiaries of</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the SPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score between 1 to 10, with 1 being “not at all” and 10 being “completely”.
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### Resource persons consulted

For confidentiality reasons, the names and contact details have been removed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of key informant</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Function in organisation</th>
<th>Relation with SPO</th>
<th>Contact details including e-mail.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garment and Fashion Workers’ Union (Chennai)</td>
<td>GATWU</td>
<td>Receives support to work with target group/households</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATWU</td>
<td>Receives support to work with target group/households</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTS, Malarchi</td>
<td>Receives support to work with target group/households</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Rights Collective</td>
<td>Is collaborating with SPO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AITUC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALF (Alternative Law Forum)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIVOS</td>
<td>Former staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1  CIVICUS and Civil Society Index Framework

CIVICUS, the World Alliance for Citizen Participation is an international alliance of members and partners which constitutes an influential network of organisations at the local, national, regional and international levels, and spans the spectrum of civil society. It has worked for nearly two decades to strengthen citizen action and civil society throughout the world. CIVICUS has a vision of a global community of active, engaged citizens committed to the creation of a more just and equitable world. This is based on the belief that the health of societies exists in direct proportion to the degree of balance between the state, the private sector and civil society.

One of the areas that CIVICUS works in is the Civil Society Index (CSI). Since 2000, CIVICUS has measured the state of civil society in 76 countries. In 2008, it considerably changed its CSI.

1.1 Guiding principles for measuring civil society

Action orientation: the principal aim of the CSI is to generate information that is of practical use to civil society practitioners and other primary stakeholders. Therefore, its framework had to identify aspects of civil society that can be changed, as well as generate knowledge relevant to action-oriented goals.

CSI implementation must be participatory by design: The CSI does not stop at the generation of knowledge alone. Rather, it also actively seeks to link knowledge-generation on civil society, with reflection and action by civil society stakeholders. The CSI has therefore continued to involve its beneficiaries, as well as various other actors, in this particular case, civil society stakeholders, in all stages of the process, from the design and implementation, through to the deliberation and dissemination stages.

This participatory cycle is relevant in that such a mechanism can foster the self-awareness of civil society actors as being part of something larger, namely, civil society itself. As a purely educational gain, it broadens the horizon of CSO representatives through a process of reflecting upon, and engaging with, civil society issues which may go beyond the more narrow foci of their respective organisations. A strong collective self-awareness among civil society actors can also function as an important catalyst for joint advocacy activities to defend civic space when under threat or to advance the common interests of civil society vis-à-vis external forces. These basic civil society issues, on which there is often more commonality than difference among such actors, are at the core of the CSI assessment.

CSI is change oriented: The participatory nature that lies at the core of the CSI methodology is an important step in the attempt to link research with action, creating a diffused sense of awareness and ownerships. However, the theory of change that the CSI is based on goes one step further, coupling this participatory principle with the creation of evidence in the form of a comparable and contextually valid assessment of the state of civil society. It is this evidence, once shared and disseminated, that ultimately constitutes a resource for action.

CSI is putting local partners in the driver’s seat: CSI is to continue being a collaborative effort between a broad range of stakeholders, with most importance placed on the relationship between CIVICUS and its national partners.
1.2 Defining Civil Society

The 2008 CIVICUS redesign team modified the civil society definition as follows:

*The arena, outside of the family, the state, and the market – which is created by individual and collective actions, organisations and institutions to advance shared interests.*

**Arena:** In this definition the arena refers to the importance of civil society’s role in creating public spaces where diverse societal values and interests interact (Fowler 1996). CSI uses the term ‘arena’ to describe the particular realm or space in a society where people come together to debate, discuss, associate and seek to influence broader society. CIVICUS strongly believes that this arena is distinct from other arenas in society, such as the market, state or family.

Civil society is hence defined as a political term, rather than in economic terms that resemble more the ‘non-profit sector’.

Besides the spaces created by civil society, CIVICUS defines particular spaces for the family, the state and the market.

**Individual and collective action, organisations and institutions:** Implicit in a political understanding of civil society is the notion of agency; that civil society actors have the ability to influence decisions that affect the lives of ordinary people. The CSI embraces a broad range of actions taken by both individuals and groups. Many of these actions take place within the context of non-coercive organisations or institutions ranging from small informal groups to large professionally run associations.

**Advance shared interests:** The term ‘interests’ should be interpreted very broadly, encompassing the promotion of values, needs, identities, norms and other aspirations.

They encompass the personal and public, and can be pursued by small informal groups, large membership organisations or formal associations. The emphasis rests however on the element of ‘sharing’ that interest within the public sphere.

1.3 Civil Society Index- Analytical Framework

The 2008 Civil Society Index distinguishes 5 dimensions of which 4 (civic engagement, level of organisation, practice of values and perception of impact), can be represented in the form of a diamond and the fifth one (external environment) as a circle that influences upon the shape of the diamond.

**Civic Engagement,** or ‘active citizenship’, is a crucial defining factor of civil society. It is the hub of civil society and therefore is one of the core components of the CSI’s definition. Civic engagement describes the formal and informal activities and participation undertaken by individuals to advance shared interests at different levels. Participation within civil society is multi-faceted and encompasses socially-based and politically-based forms of engagement.

**Level of Organisation.** This dimension assesses the organisational development, complexity and sophistication of civil society, by looking at the relationships among the actors within the civil society arena. Key sub dimensions are:

- Internal governance of Civil Society Organisations;
- Support infrastructure, that is about the existence of supporting federations or umbrella bodies;
- Self-regulation, which is about for instance the existence of shared codes of conducts amongst Civil Society Organisations and other existing self-regulatory mechanisms;
- Peer-to-peer communication and cooperation: networking, information sharing and alliance building to assess the extent of linkages and productive relations among civil society actors;
- Human resources, that is about the sustainability and adequacy of human resources available for CSOs in order to achieve their objectives:
  - Financial and technological resources available at CSOs to achieve their objectives;
International linkages, such as CSO’s membership in international networks and participation in global events.

Practice of Values. This dimension assesses the internal practice of values within the civil society arena. CIVICUS identified some key values that are deemed crucial to gauge not only progressiveness but also the extent to which civil society’s practices are coherent with their ideals. These are:
- Democratic decision-making governance: how decisions are made within CSOs and by whom;
- Labour regulations: includes the existence of policies regarding equal opportunities, staff membership in labour unions, training in labour rights for new staff and a publicly available statement on labour standards;
- Code of conduct and transparency: measures whether a code of conduct exists and is available publicly. It also measures whether the CSO’s financial information is available to the public.
- Environmental standards: examines the extent to which CSOs adopt policies upholding environmental standards of operation;
- Perception of values within civil society: looks at how CSOs perceive the practice of values, such as non-violence. This includes the existence or absence of forces within civil society that use violence, aggression, hostility, brutality and/or fighting, tolerance, democracy, transparency, trustworthiness and tolerance in the civil society within which they operate.

Perception of Impact. This is about the perceived impact of civil society actors on politics and society as a whole as the consequences of collective action. In this, the perception of both civil society actors (internal) as actors outside civil society (outsiders) is taken into account. Specific sub dimensions are
- Responsiveness in terms of civil society’s impact on the most important social concerns within the country. “Responsive” types of civil society are effectively taking up and voicing societal concerns.
- Social impact measures civil society’s impact on society in general. An essential role of civil society is its contribution to meet pressing societal needs;
- Policy impact: covers civil society’s impact on policy in general. It also looks at the impact of CSO activism on selected policy issues;
- Impact on attitudes: includes trust, public spiritedness and tolerance. The sub dimensions reflect a set of universally accepted social and political norms. These are drawn, for example, from sources such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as CIVICUS’ own core values. This dimension measures the extent to which these values are practised within civil society, compared to the extent to which they are practised in society at large.

Context Dimension: External Environment. It is crucial to give consideration to the social, political and economic environments in which it exists, as the environment both directly and indirectly affects civil society. Some features of the environment may enable the growth of civil society. Conversely, other features of the environment hamper the development of civil society. Three elements of the external environment are captured by the CSI:
- Socio-economic context: The Social Watch’s basic capabilities index and measures of corruption, inequality and macro-economic health are used to portray the socioeconomic context that can have marked consequences for civil society, and perhaps most significantly at the lower levels of social development;
- Socio-political context: This is assessed using five indicators. Three of these are adapted from the Freedom House indices of political and civil rights and freedoms, including political rights and
freedoms, personal rights and freedoms within the law and associational and organisational rights and freedoms. Information about CSO experience with the country’s legal framework and state effectiveness round out the picture of the socio-political context;

- Socio-cultural context: utilises interpersonal trust, which examines the level of trust that ordinary people feel for other ordinary people, as a broad measure of the social psychological climate for association and cooperation. Even though everyone experiences relationships of varying trust and distrust with different people, this measure provides a simple indication of the prevalence of a world view that can support and strengthen civil society. Similarly, the extent of tolerance and public spiritedness also offers indication of the context in which civil society unfolds.
Appendix 2  Methodology Civil Society

This appendix describes the evaluation methodology that was developed to evaluate the efforts of Dutch NGOs and their Southern Partner Organisations (SPO) to strengthen Civil Society in India, Ethiopia and Indonesia. The first paragraph introduces the terms of reference for the evaluation and the second discusses design issues, including sampling procedures and changes in the terms of reference that occurred between the 2012 and 2014 assessment. The third paragraph presents the methodologies developed to answer each of the evaluation questions.

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 Terms of reference for the evaluation

The Netherlands has a long tradition of public support for civil bi-lateral development cooperation, going back to the 1960s. The Co-Financing System (‘MFS) is its most recent expression. MFS II is the 2011-2015 grant programme which meant to achieve sustainable reduction in poverty. A total of 20 consortia of Dutch Co Financing Agencies have been awarded €1.9 billion in MFS II grants by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA).

One component of the MFS II programme addresses the extent to which the Southern Partners of the Dutch Consortia are contributing towards strengthening civil society and this evaluation assesses this contribution for Southern Partner countries in Indonesia, India and Ethiopia. The evaluation comprised a baseline study, carried out in 2012, followed by an end line study in 2014.

The entire MFS II evaluation comprises assessments in eight countries where apart from a civil society component, also assessments towards achieving MDGs and strengthening the capacity of the southern partner organisations by the CFAs. A synthesis team is in place to aggregate findings of all eight countries. This team convened three synthesis team meetings, one in 2012, one in 2013 and one in 2014. All three meetings aimed at harmonising evaluation methodologies for each component across countries. CDI has been playing a leading role in harmonising its Civil Society and Organisational Capacity assessment with the other organisations in charge for those components in the other countries.

2.1.2 Civil Society assessment – purpose and scope

The overall purpose of the joint MFS II evaluations is to account for results of MFS II-funded or –co-funded development interventions implemented by Dutch CFAs and/or their Southern partners and to contribute to the improvement of future development interventions.

The civil society evaluation is organised around 5 key questions:

- What are the changes in civil society in the 2012-2014 period, with particular focus on the relevant MDGs & themes in the selected country?
- To what degree are the changes identified attributable to the development interventions of the Southern partners of the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?
- What is the relevance of these changes?
- Were the development interventions of the MFS II consortia efficient?
- What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?

Furthermore, the evaluation methodology for efforts to strengthen civil society should:

- Describe how a representative sample of Southern partner organisations of the Dutch CFAs in the country will be taken
• Focus on five priority result areas that correspond with dimensions of the Civil Society Index (CSI) developed by CIVICUS (see paragraph 6.4 - Call for proposal). For each of those dimensions the call for proposal formulated key evaluation questions.
• Should compare results with available reference data (i.e. a CSI report or other relevant data from the country in question).

The results of this evaluation are to be used by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Dutch Consortia and their partner organisations. The evaluation methodology has to be participatory in the sense that Dutch Consortia and their partner organisation would be asked to give their own perception on a range of indicators of the adjusted CIVICUS analytical framework in 2012 and in 2014.

2.2 Designing the methodology

2.2.1 Evaluation principles and standards

The overall approach selected is a participatory, theory-based evaluation through a before and after comparison. This paragraph briefly describes these principles and how these have been translated into data collection principles. It also describes how a ‘representative sample’ of Southern Partner Organisations was selected and how the initial terms of references were adjusted with the consent of the commissioner of the evaluation, given the nature of the evaluation component and the resources available for the evaluation.

Recognition of complexity
The issues at stake and the interventions in civil society and policy influence are complex in nature, meaning that cause and effect relations can sometimes only be understood in retrospect and cannot be repeated. The evaluation methods should therefore focus on recurring patterns of practice, using different perspectives to understand changes and to acknowledge that the evaluation means to draw conclusions about complex adaptive systems (Kurtz and Snowden, 2003)\(^{58}\).

Changes in the values of the Civil Society Indicators in the 2012-2014 period are then the result of conflict management processes, interactive learning events, new incentives (carrots and sticks) that mobilise or demobilise civil society, rather than the result of a change process that can be predicted from A to Z (a linear or logical framework approach)\(^{59}\).

A theory-based evaluation
Theory-based evaluation has the advantage of situating the evaluation findings in an analysis that includes both what happened over the life of the project as well as the how and why of what happened (Rogers 2004). It demonstrates its capacity to help understand why a program works or fails to work, going further than knowing only outcomes by trying to systematically enter the black box (Weiss 2004). Theory-based evaluations can provide a framework to judge effectiveness in context of high levels of complexity, uncertainty, and changeability when traditional (impact) evaluation methods are not suitable: the use of control groups for the civil society evaluation is problematic since comparable organizations with comparable networks and operating in a similar external environment would be quite difficult to identify and statistical techniques of matching cannot be used because of a small n.

Because SPO’s theories of change regarding their efforts to build civil society or to influence policies may alter during the 2012-2014 period, it requires us to develop a deep understanding of the change process and the dynamics that affect civil society and policies. It is important to understand what has led to


specific (non-) changes and (un)-expected changes. These external factors and actors, as well as the SPO’s agency need to be taken into account for the attribution question. Linear input-activities-outputs-outcomes-impact chains do not suffice for complex issues where change is both the result of SPOs’ interventions as those by other actors and/or factors.

Therefore, the most reasonable counterfactual that can be used for this evaluation is that of considering alternative causal explanations of change (White and Philips, 2012). Therefore the SPOs’ Theory of Change constructed in 2012 is also related to a Model of Change constructed in 2014 that tries to find the ultimate explanations of what happened in reality, including other actors and factors that might possibly explain the outcomes achieved.

**Triangulation of methods and sources of information**

For purposes of triangulation to improve the robustness, validity or credibility of the findings of the evaluation we used different types of data collection and analysis methods as well as different sources of information. The CIVICUS analytical framework was adjusted for this evaluation in terms of providing standard impact outcome indicators to be taken into account. Data collection methods used consisted of workshops with the SPO, interviews with key resource persons, focus group discussions, social network analysis (during the baseline), consultation of project documents; MFS II consortia documents and other documents relevant to assess general trends in civil society.

**Participatory evaluation**

The evaluation is participatory in that both baseline and end line started with a workshop with SPO staff, decision makers and where possible board members. The baseline workshop helped SPOs to construct their own theory of change with regards to civil society. Detailed guidelines and tools have been developed by CDI for both baseline and follow-up, and these have been piloted in each of the countries CDI is involved in. Country based evaluators have had a critical input in reviewing and adapting these detailed guidelines and tools. This enhanced a rigorous data collection process. Additionally, the process of data analysis has been participatory where both CDI and in-country teams took part in the process and cross-check each other’s inputs for improved quality. Rigorous analysis of the qualitative data was done with the assistance of the NVivo software program.

**Using the evaluation standards as a starting point**

As much as possible within the boundaries of this accountability driven evaluation, the evaluation teams tried to respect the following internationally agreed upon standards for program evaluation (Yarbrough et al, 2011). These are, in order of priority: Utility; Feasibility; Propriety; Accuracy; Accountability. However, given the entire set-up of the evaluation, the evaluation team cannot fully ensure the extent to which the evaluation is utile for the SPO and their CFAs; and cannot ensure that the evaluation findings are used in a proper way and not for political reasons.

### 2.2.2 Sample selection

The terms of reference for this evaluation stipulate that the evaluators draw a sample of southern partner organisations to include in the assessment. Given the fact that the first evaluation questions intends to draw conclusions for the MDGs or the themes (governance or fragile states) for each countries a sample was drawn for the two or three most frequent MDGs or themes that the SPOs are working in.

The Dutch MFS II consortia were asked to provide information for each SPO regarding the MDG/theme it is working on, if it has an explicit agenda in the area of civil society strengthening and/or policy influence. The database then give an insight into the most important MDG/themes covered by the partner organisations, how many of these have an explicit agenda regarding civil society strengthening and/or policy influence. For Indonesia, 5 partner organisations were randomly selected for respectively MDG 7 (natural resources) and 5 for the governance theme. For India 5 SPOs were selected for MDG 1(economic or agricultural development) and 5 others for the theme governance. The sample in Ethiopia consists of 3 SPOs working on MDG 4,5 and 6 (Health); 3 SPOs for MDG 2 (education) and 3 SPOs for MDG 1 (economic or agricultural development).
2.2.3 Changes in the original terms of reference

Two major changes have been introduced during this evaluation and accepted by the commissioner of the MFS II evaluation. These changes were agreed upon during the 2013 and the 2014 synthesis team meetings.

The efficiency evaluation question:

During the June 2013 synthesis meeting the following decision was made with regards to measuring how efficient MFS II interventions for organisational capacity and civil society are:

[…] it was stressed that it is difficult to disentangle budgets for capacity development and civil society strengthening. SPOs usually don’t keep track of these activities separately; they are included in general project budgets. Therefore, teams agreed to assess efficiency of CD [capacity development] and CS activities in terms of the outcomes and/or outputs of the MDG projects. This implies no efficiency assessment will be held for those SPOs without a sampled MDG project. Moreover, the efficiency assessment of MDG projects needs to take into account CD and CS budgets (in case these are specified separately). Teams will evaluate efficiency in terms of outcomes if possible. If project outcomes are unlikely to be observed already in 2014, efficiency will be judged in terms of outputs or intermediate results (e-mail quotation from Gerton Rongen at February 6, 2014).

Attribution/contribution evaluation question

During the June 2013 NWO-WOTRO workshop strategies were discussed to fit the amount of evaluation work to be done with the available resources. Therefore,

1. The number of SPOs that will undergo a full-fledged analysis to answer the attribution question, were to be reduced to 50 percent of all SPOs. Therefore the evaluation team used the following selection criteria:
   - An estimation of the annual amount of MFS II funding allocated to interventions that have a more or less direct relation with the civil society component. This implies the following steps to be followed for the inventory:
     - Covering all MDGs/themes in the original sample
     - Covering a variety of Dutch alliances and CFAs
   2. The focus of the attribution question will be on two impact outcome areas, those most commonly present in the SPO sample for each country. The evaluation team distinguishes four different impact outcome areas:
      - The extent to which the SPO, with MFS II funding, engages more and diverse categories of society in the 2011-2014 period (Civicus dimensions “Civic engagement” and “perception of impact”)
      - The extent to which the SPOs supports its intermediate organisations to make a valuable contribution to civil society in the 2011-2014 period (Civicus dimension ”Level of organisation” and “perception of impact”)
      - The extent to which the SPO itself engages with other civil society organisations to make a valuable contribution to civil society in the 2011-2014 period (Civicus dimension ”level of organisation”)
      - The extent to which the SPO contributes to changing public and private sector policies and practices in the 2011-2014 period (Civicus dimension ”perception of impact”)
   3. The CS dimension ‘Practice of Values’ has been excluded, because this dimension is similar to issues dealt with for the organisational capacity assessment.

The aforementioned analysis drew the following conclusions:
Table 11
SPOs to be included for full-fledged process tracing analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>SPO in the in-depth analysis</th>
<th>Strategic CS orientation to include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Indonesia | Esam, WARSI, CRI, NTFP-EP, LPPSLH | 1. Strengthening intermediate organisations AND influencing policies and practices  
2. If only one of the two above mentioned is applicable, then select another appropriate impact outcome area to look at. |
| India | NNET, CWM, CECOEDECON, Reds Tumkur, CSA | 1. Enhancing civic engagement AND strengthening intermediate organisations  
2. If only one of the two above mentioned is applicable then select another appropriate impact outcome area to look at. |
| Ethiopia | OSSA, EKHC, CCGG&SO, JeCCDO and ADAA | 1. Strengthening the capacities of intermediate organisations AND SPO’s engagement in the wider CS arena  
2. If only one of the two above mentioned is applicable then select another appropriate impact outcome area to look at. |

Source: Consultation of project documents

2.3 Answering the evaluation questions

2.3.1 Evaluation question 1 - Changes in civil society for the relevant MDGs/topics

Evaluation question 1: **What are the changes in civil society in the 2012-2014 period, with particular focus on the relevant MDGs & themes in the selected country?**

*Indicators and tools used*

In line with the CIVICUS Civil Society Index, a scoring tool was developed in 2012 which comprises 17 indicators. The selection was inspired by those suggested in the terms of reference of the commissioner. Each indicator was, also in line with the CIVICUS index accompanied by an open evaluation question to be used for data collection in 2012 and 2014. In 2012 the scoring tool contained four statements describing the level of achievements of the indicator and scores ranged from 0 to 3 (low score - high score).

A comparison of the scores obtained in 2012 informed the evaluation team that there was a positive bias towards high scores, mostly between 2 and 3. Therefore during the 2014 assessment, it was decided to measure relative changes for each indicator in the 2012 – 2014 period, as well as the reasons for changes or no changes and assigning a score reflecting the change between -2 (considerable deterioration of the indicator value since 2012) and +2 (considerable improvement).

In 2012 and based upon the Theory of Change constructed with the SPO, a set of standard indicators were identified that would ensure a relation between the standard CIVICUS indicators and the interventions of the SPO. However, these indicators were not anymore included in the 2014 assessment because of the resources available and because the methodology fine-tuned for the attribution question in 2013, made measurement of these indicators redundant.

Also in 2012, as a means to measure the ‘level of organisation’ dimension a social network analysis tool was introduced. However this tool received very little response and was discontinued during the end line study.

*Key questions to be answered for this evaluation question*

In 2012, SPO staff and leaders, as well as outside resource persons were asked to provide answers to 17 questions, one per standard indicator of the scoring tool developed by CDI.

In 2012, the SPO staff and leaders were given the description of each indicator as it was in 2012 and had to answer the following questions:

1. How has the situation of this indicator changed compared to its description of the 2012 situation? Did it deteriorate considerably or did it improve considerably (-2 → +2)
2. What exactly has changed since 2012 for the civil society indicator that you are looking at? Be as specific as possible in your description.

3. What interventions, actors and other factors explain this change compared to the situation in 2012? Please tick and describe what happened and to what change this led. It is possible to tick and describe more than one choice.
   - Intervention by SPO, NOT financed by any of your Dutch partners ……………
   - Intervention SPO, financed by your Dutch partner organisation …………….(In case you receive funding from two Dutch partners, please specify which partner is meant here)
   - Other actor NOT the SPO, please specify……
   - Other factor, NOT actor related, please specify……
   - A combination of actors and factors, INCLUDING the SPO, but NOT with Dutch funding, please specify…
   - A combination of actors and factors, INCLUDING the SPO, but WITH Dutch funding, please specify…
   - Don’t know

4. Generally speaking, which two of the five CIVICUS dimensions (civic engagement, level of organisation, practice of values, perception of impact, environment) changed considerably between 2012 – 2014? For each of these changes, please describe:
   - Nature of the change
   - Key interventions, actors and factors (MFS II or non-MFS II related) that explain each change (entirely or partially).

Sources for data collection
During the baseline and the end line and for purposes of triangulation, several methods were used to collect data on each (standard) indicator:
   - Self-assessment per category of staff within the SPO: where possible, three subgroups were made to assess the scores: field staff/programme staff, executive leadership and representatives of the board,, general assembly, and internal auditing groups if applicable completed with separate interviews;
   - Interviews with external resource persons. These consisted of three categories: key actors that are knowledgeable about the MDG/theme the SPO is working on and who know the civil society arena around these topics; civil society organisations that are being affected by the programme through support or CSOs with which the SPO is collaborating on equal footing, and; representatives of public or private sector organisations with which the SPO is interacting
   - Consultation and analysis of reports that relate to each of the five CIVICUS dimensions.
   - Project documents, financial and narrative progress reports, as well as correspondence between the SPO and the CFA.
   - Social network analysis (SNA), which was discontinued in the end line study.

During the follow-up, emphasis was put on interviewing the same staff and external persons who were involved during the baseline for purpose of continuity.

2.3.2 Evaluation question 2 – “Attribution” of changes in civil society to interventions of SPOs.

Evaluation question 2: To what degree are the changes identified attributable to the development interventions of the Southern partners of the MFS II consortia (i.e. measuring effectiveness)?

Adapting the evaluation question and introduction to the methodology chosen
In line with the observation of Stern et al. (2012) that the evaluation question, the programme attributes, and the evaluation approaches all provide important elements to conclude on the evaluation design to select, the teams in charge of evaluating the civil society component concluded that given the attributes of the programmes it was impossible to answer the attribution question as formulated in the Terms of References of the evaluation and mentioned above. Therefore, the evaluation teams worked towards answering the extent to which the programme contributed towards realising the outcomes.
For this endeavour explaining outcome process-tracing\(^{60}\) was used. The objective of the process tracing methodology for MFS II, in particular for the civil society component is to:

- Identify what interventions, actors and factors explain selected impact outcomes for process tracing.
- Assess how the SPO with MFS II funding contributed to the changes in the selected impact outcomes and how important this contribution is given other actors and factors that possibly influence the attainment of the outcome. Ruling out rival explanations, which are other interventions, actors or factors that are not related to MFS II funding.

**Methodology – getting prepared**

As described before a limited number of SPOs were selected for process tracing and for each country strategic orientations were identified as a means to prevent a bias occurring towards only positive impact outcomes and as a means to support the in-country evaluation teams with the selection of outcomes to focus on a much as was possible, based upon the project documents available at CDI. These documents were used to track realised outputs and outcomes against planned outputs and outcomes. During the workshop (see evaluation question on changes in civil society) and follow-up interviews with the SPO, two impact outcomes were selected for process tracing.

**Steps in process tracing**

1. **Construct the theoretical model of change – by in-country evaluation team**

After the two impact outcomes have been selected and information has been obtained about what has actually been achieved, the in-country evaluation team constructs a visual that shows all pathways that might possibly explain the outcomes. The inventory of those possible pathways is done with the SPO, but also with external resource persons and documents consulted. This culminated in a Model of Change. A MoC of good quality includes: The causal pathways that relate interventions/parts by any actor, including the SPO to the realised impact outcome; assumptions that clarify relations between different parts in the pathway, and; case specific and/or context specific factors or risks that might influence the causal pathway, such as for instance specific attributes of the actor or socio-cultural-economic context. The Models of Change were discussed with the SPO and validated.

2. **Identify information needs to confirm or reject causal pathways as well as information sources needed.**

This step aims to critically reflect upon what information is needed that helps to confirm one of causal pathways and at that at same time helps to reject the other possible explanations. Reality warns that this type of evidence will hardly be available for complex development efforts. The evaluators were asked to behave as detectives of Crime Scene Investigation, ensuring that the focus of the evaluation was not only on checking if parts/interventions had taken place accordingly, but more specifically on identifying information needs that confirm or reject the relations between the parts/interventions. The key question to be answered was: "What information do we need in order to confirm or reject that one part leads to another part or, that X causes Y?". Four types of evidence were used, where appropriate:\(^{61}\)

- **Pattern evidence** relates to predictions of statistical patterns in the evidence. This may consist of trends analysis and correlations.
- **Sequence evidence** deals with the temporal and spatial chronology of events predicted by a hypothesised causal mechanism. For example, a test of the hypothesis could involve expectations of the timing of events where we might predict that if the hypothesis is valid, we should see that the event B took place after event A. However, if we found that event B took place before event A, the test

---

\(^{60}\) Explaining outcome process tracing attempts to craft a minimally sufficient explanation of a puzzling outcome in a specific historical case. Here the aim is not to build or test more general theories but to craft a (minimally) sufficient explanation of the outcome of the case where the ambitions are more case centric than theory oriented. The aim of process tracing is not to verify if an intended process of interventions took place as planned in a particular situation, but that it aims at increasing our understanding about what works under what conditions and why (Beach & Pedersen, 2013).

\(^{61}\) Beach and Pederson, 2013
would suggest that our confidence in the validity of this part of the mechanism should be reduced (disconfirmation/falsification).

- **Trace evidence** is evidence whose mere existence provides proof that a part of a hypothesised mechanism exists. For example, the existence of meeting minutes, if authentic, provides strong proof that the meeting took place.

- **Account evidence** deals with the content of empirical material, such as meeting minutes that detail what was discussed or an oral account of what took place in the meeting.

3. Collect information necessary to confirm or reject causal pathways

Based upon the inventory of information needs the evaluation teams make their data collection plan after which data collection takes place.

4. Analyse the data collected and assessment of their quality.

This step consists of compiling all information collected in favour or against a causal pathway in a table or in a list per pathway. For all information used, the sources of information are mentioned and an assessment of the strength of the evidence takes place, making a distinction between strong, weak and moderate evidence. For this we use the traffic light system: **green letters mean strong evidence, red letters mean weak evidence** and **orange letters mean moderate evidence**. The following table provides the format used to assess these issues.

### Table 12
**Organisation of information collected per causal pathway and assessing their quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal pathway</th>
<th>Information that confirms (parts of) this pathway</th>
<th>Information that rejects (parts of) this pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1.1</td>
<td><strong>Information 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1.2</td>
<td><strong>Information 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc</td>
<td><strong>Information 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc</td>
<td><strong>etc</strong></td>
<td><strong>etc</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2.1</td>
<td><strong>Information 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2.2</td>
<td><strong>Information 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc</td>
<td><strong>Information 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etc</td>
<td><strong>etc</strong></td>
<td><strong>etc</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Dieuwke Klaver

5. Assessing the nature of the relations between parts in the model of change

The classification of all information collected is being followed by the identification of the pathways that most likely explain the impact outcome achieved. For this the evaluators assess the nature of the relations between different parts in the MoC. Based upon Mayne (2012) and Stern et al (2012) the following relations between parts in the MoC are mapped and the symbols inserted into the original MoC.

### Table 13
**Nature of the relation between parts in the Model of Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the relation between parts and other parts or outcome</th>
<th>[ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The part is the only causal explanation for the outcome. No other interventions or factors explain it. (necessary and sufficient)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The part does not explain the outcome at all: other subcomponents explain the outcomes.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The part explains the outcome but other parts explain the outcome as well: there are multiple pathways (sufficient but not necessary)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The part is a condition for the outcome but won’t make it happen without other factors (necessary but not sufficient)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The part explains the outcome, but requires the help of other parts to explain the outcome in a sufficient and necessary way (not a sufficient cause, but necessary) → it is part of a causal package</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Mayne, 2012; Stern et al, 2012
6. Write down the contribution and assess the role of the SPO and MFS II funding

This final step consists of answering the following questions, as a final assessment of the contribution question:

- The first question to be answered is: What explains the impact outcome?
- The second question is: What is the role of the SPO in this explanation?
- The third question, if applicable is: what is the role of MFS II finding in this explanation?

Sources for data collection

Information necessary to answer this evaluation question is to be collected from:

- Interviews with resource persons inside and outside the SPO
- Project documents and documentation made available by other informants
- Websites that possibly confirm that an outcome is achieved and that the SPO is associated with this outcome
- Meeting minutes of meetings between officials
- Time lines to trace the historical relations between events
- Policy documents
- etc

2.3.3 Evaluation question 3 – Relevance of the changes

Evaluation question 3: *What is the relevance of these changes?*

The following questions are to be answered in order to assess the relevance of the changes in Civil Society.

- How do the MFS II interventions and civil society outcomes align with the Theory of Change developed during the baseline in 2012? What were reasons for changing or not changing interventions and strategies?
- What is the civil society policy of the Dutch alliance that collaborates with the SPO? And how do the MFS II interventions and civil society outcomes align with the civil society policy of the Dutch alliance that collaborates with the SPO?
- How relevant are the changes achieved in relation to the context in which the SPO is operating?
- What is the further significance of these changes for building a vibrant civil society for the particular MDG/ theme in the particular context?

Sources for data collection

For this question the following sources are to be consulted:

- Review of the information collected during interviews with the SPO and outside resource persons
- The 2012 Theory of Change
- Interview with the CFA liaison officer of the SPO;
- Review of reports, i.e: the civil society policy document of the Dutch Alliance that was submitted for MFS II funding, relevant documents describing civil society for the MDG/ theme the SPO is working on in a given context.

2.3.4 Evaluation question 4, previously 5 - Factors explaining the findings

Evaluation question 4: *What factors explain the findings drawn from the questions above?*

To answer this question we look into information available that:

- Highlight changes in the organisational capacity of the SPO
- Highlight changes in the relations between the SPO and the CFA
- Highlight changes in the context in which the SPO is operating and how this might affect positively or negatively its organisational capacity.

Sources for data collection

Sources of information to be consulted are:

- Project documents
• Communications between the CFA and the SPO
• Information already collected during the previous evaluation questions.

2.4 Analysis of findings

A qualitative software programme NVivo 10 (2010) was used to assist in organizing and making sense of all data collected. Although the software cannot take over the task of qualitative data analysis, it does 1) improve transparency by creating a record of all steps taken, 2) organize the data and allow the evaluator to conduct a systematic analysis, 3) assist in identifying important themes that might otherwise be missed, and 4) reduce the danger of bias due to human cognitive limitations, compared to “intuitive data processing” (Sadler 1981). The qualitative data in the evaluation consisted of transcripts from semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions workshops, field notes from observation, and a range of documents available at the SPO or secondary information used to collect reference data and to obtain a better understanding of the context in which the CS component evolves.

To analyse this diverse collection of data, several analytical strategies are envisioned, specifically content analysis, discourse analysis, and thematic analysis. Although each of these strategies can be understood as a different lens through which to view the data, all will require a carefully developed and executed coding plan.

Data have been coded according to: standard civil society indicator; outcome included for in-depth contribution analysis; relevance, and; explaining factors.

This qualitative analysis will be supported by a limited amount of quantitative data largely arising from the score assigned by the evaluation team to each performance indicator described in the civil society scoring tool. Other quantitative data in this study are drawn information provided in background literature and organisational documents as well as the Social Network Analysis method.

2.5 Limitations to the methodology

2.5.1 General limitations with regards to the MFS II evaluation

The MFS II programme and CIVICUS

Although the MFS II programme stated that all proposals need to contribute to civil society strengthening in the South62, mention was made of the use of the CIVICUS framework for monitoring purposes. The fact that civil society was to be integrated as one of the priority result areas next to that of organisational capacity and MDGs became only clear when the MoFA communicated its mandatory monitoring protocol.

In consequence, civil society strengthening in the MFS II programmes submitted to the ministry is mainstreamed into different sub programmes, but not addressed as a separate entity.

This late introduction of the Civil Society component also implies that project documents and progress reports to not make a distinction in MDG or theme components vs those of civil society strengthening, leaving the interpretation of what is a civil society intervention our outcome and what not to the interpretation of the evaluation team.

At the same time the evaluation team observes that SPOs and CFAs have started to incorporate the organisational capacity tool that is being used in the monitoring protocol in their own organisational assessment procedures. None of the SPOs is familiar with the CIVICUS framework and how it fits into their interventions.

Differences between CIVICUS and MFS II evaluation

CIVICUS developed a Civil Society Index that distinguishes 5 dimensions and for each of these a set of indicators has been developed. Based upon a variety of data collection methods, a validation team composed of civil society leaders provides the scores for the civil society index.

Major differences between the way the Civil Society Index is been used by CIVICUS and for this MFS II evaluation is the following:

1. CIVICUS defines its unit of analysis is terms of the civil society arena at national and/or subnational level and does not start from individual NGOs. The MFS II evaluation put the SPO in the middle of the civil society arena and then looked at organisations that receive support; organisations with which the SPO is collaborating. The civil society arena boundaries for the MFS II evaluation are the public or private sector organisations that the SPO relates to or whose policies and practices it aims to influence.

2. The CIVICUS assessments are conducted by civil society members itself whereas the MFS II evaluation is by nature an external evaluation conducted by external researchers. CIVICUS assumes that its assessments, by organising them as a joint learning exercise, will introduce change that is however not planned. With the MFS II evaluation the focus was on the extent to which the interventions of the SPO impacted upon the civil society indicators.

3. CIVICUS has never used its civil society index as a tool to measure change over a number of years. Each assessment is a stand-alone exercise and no efforts are being made to compare indicators over time or to attribute changes in indicators to a number of organisations or external trends.

Dimensions and indicator choice

The CIVICUS dimensions in themselves are partially overlapping; the dimension ‘perception of impact’ for instance contains elements that relate to ‘civic engagement’ and to ‘level of organisation’. Similar overlap is occurring in the civil society scoring tool developed for this evaluation and which was highly oriented by a list of evaluation questions set by the commissioner of the evaluation.

Apart from the overlap, we observe that some of the standard indicators used for the civil society evaluation were not meaningful for the SPOs under evaluation. This applies for instance for the political engagement indicator “How intense is your (individual staff or organisational) participation in locally-nationally elected bodies and/or sectoral user groups?”

Measuring change over a two-year period

The MFS II programme started its implementation in 2011 and it will finish in 2015, whereas its evaluation started mid-2012 and will end in the beginning of 2014. The period between the baseline and the end line measurement hardly covers 2 years in some cases. Civil society building and policy influence are considered the type of interventions that requires up to 10 years to reap significant results, especially when taking into account attitudes and behaviour. Apart from the fact that the baseline was done when MFS II was already operational in the field for some 1,5 years, some SPO interventions were a continuation of programmes designed under the MFS I programme, hence illustrating that the MFS II period is not a clear boundary. Contracts with other SPOs ended already in 2012, and practically coincided with the baseline assessment being conducted at the moment the relationship with the CFA had practically ended.

Aggregation of findings

Although working with standard indicators and assigning them scores creates expectations of findings being compared and aggregated at national and international level, this may lend itself to a quick but inaccurate assessment of change. Crude comparison between programs on the basis of findings is problematic, and risks being politically abused. The evaluation team has to guard against these abuses by ensuring the necessary modesty in extrapolating findings and drawing conclusions.

Linking the civil society component to the other components of the MFS II evaluation

The Theory of Change in the terms of reference assumes that CFAs are strengthening the organisational capacity of their partners, which is evaluated in the organisational capacity components, which then leads to impact upon MDGs or upon civil society. Because the evaluation methodology designed for both the organisational capacity and the civil society evaluation require considerable time investments of the
SPOs, a deliberate choice was made not to include SPOs under the organisational capacity component in that of Civil Society. This may possibly hamper conclusions regarding the assumption of capacitated SPOs being able to impact upon civil society. However, where information is available and where it is relevant, the civil society component will address organisational capacity issues.

No such limitations were made with regards to SPOs in the MDG sample, however, apart from Indonesia; none of the SPOs in the civil society sample is also in that of MDG.

2.5.2 Limitations during baseline with regards to the methodology

A very important principle upon which this evaluation methodology is based is that of triangulation, which implies that different stakeholders and documents are consulted to obtain information about the same indicator from different perspectives. Based upon these multiple perspectives, a final score can be given on the same indicator which is more valid and credible.

For India this has not always been possible:

- For each SPO a Survey Monkey questionnaire was developed to assess the intensity of the interaction between stakeholders in the network. Out of 233 actors that were invited to fill in this 5 minute questionnaire, only 79 actors effectively filled in the questionnaire = 34 %. The online Social Network Analysis aims at having both the opinion of the SPO on the intensity of the interaction with another actor, as well as the opinion of the other for triangulation. Important reasons for not filling in this form are that actors in the network are not technology savvy, or that they have difficulties in accessing internet.

- With regards to filling in offline interview forms or answering questions during interviews a number of civil society actors did not want to score themselves because they do not benefit from the interventions of the MFS II projects. Having the scores of their own organisations will help to assess the wider environment in which the SPO operates and possibly an impact of the SPO on other civil society organisations in 2014.

- With regards to public officials the evaluation team faced difficulties to have their opinions on a certain number of indicators such as perception of impact on policy influencing and relations between public organisations and civil society. Public officials fear that they will be quoted in the assessment, which may have repercussions for their position.

India has many different ethnic groups which speak many different languages. Although the evaluation team speaks the most important languages, sometimes it was really difficult to have a deep insight into all the processes in civil society and in policy influencing. Due to these language barriers it has been difficult to map the processes – the ripple effects of efforts to build civil society and to influence policies.

2.5.3 Limitations during end line with regards to the methodology

Project documentation

The methodology assumed that project documents and progress reports would be helpful in linking project interventions to the CIVICUS framework and obtaining an overview of outputs-outcomes achieved versus planned. These overviews would then be used to orient the in-country evaluation teams for the quick or in-depth contribution analysis.

In practice the most recent progress reports were hardly available with the CFAs or were made available later in the process. These reports often were not helpful in accumulating outputs towards to the planned outputs and even outcomes. Hardly any information is available at outcome or impact level and no monitoring systems are available to do so. Key information missing and relevant for civil society impact (but also to track progress being made on effects of project interventions) is for instance a comprehensive overview of the organisational performance of organisations supported by the SPO. For a number of SPOs the reality was different than the progress reports reflected which meant that constant fine-tuning with the in-country evaluation team was necessary and that CDI could not always provide them with the guidance needed for the selection of impact outcomes for contribution analysis.
Country specific limitations – India

The India team observes that triangulation of data was not always possible, given the resources available for the evaluation team. This was in particular valid for the first evaluation question regarding changes. Like during the baseline, government officials were not willing to take part in the evaluation because of the strict protocol they have to follow.

With regards to the first evaluation question on changes:

- During the end line scores (-2 until +2) were assigned to indicate relative changes. The in-country evaluation team observes that SPOs were inclined to interpret a score 0 as the organization not being performant on the issue, whereas in terms of the evaluation methodology it only states that no change took place which can be positive or negative in itself. This could lead to a bias towards having more positive changes.
- As already mentioned, there is overlap in answers being given for different indicators. They are not discriminatory enough, which is partly due to the CIVICUS framework and the indications given in the call for proposals.

With regards to the second evaluation question regarding attribution:

- A critical step was the selection of the impact outcomes to look at for contribution analysis. Although strategic orientations for selection were given for each country as a measure to prevent bias taking place at SPO level, the ultimate selection of outcomes after the workshop and with the SPO focussed in most cases on impact outcomes to which the SPO claims to have positively contributed.
- The design of the model of change that visualizes all pathways that possibly explain the outcome achieved has also proven to be a difficult step. In this phase it is critical that the evaluation team works together to brainstorm on alternative pathways. A major challenge is that in-country teams at that moment of the evaluation have obtained a lot of information from the SPO, and not from other NGOs or resource persons, which possibly might strengthen their bias in favour of attributing change to the SPO.
- The focus of the assessment has been on the contribution of the SPO, rather than that of MFS II funding. Not in all cases MFS II contribution has been clearly earmarked for specific interventions or results and some CFAs have preferred to give institutional support to their partners, making it even more difficult to assess contribution/Attribution.
- The process tracing methodology was not a simple step to step straight forward methodology and has needed a lot of back and forth between CDI and IDF and even within the CDI team. Points that were challenging: defining the ultimate outcome (SMART enough) to be explained through process tracing, identifying relevant pathways and describing them properly, defining indicators to assess whether the impact outcome has been achieved or not (look for the adequate information when it exists), dare to conclude that some pathways are less relevant than others, not wanting to include all the SPO’s interventions to one outcome.
- Defining the strength of evidence came out to be quite subjective, especially when it came to assessing interviewee’s inputs. How to carefully assess interview findings of the SPO with those of other actors.
- Process -Tracing requires sufficient documentation/ pieces of evidence and these were often not available at the level of the SPOs and when they were available they were often contradicting each other (different reports including different figures on the same results).
- More time was needed to get the methodology about process tracing well under control. Because of time and budget constraints, learning was made on the job. Moreover because of delayed feedback from CDI side, errors were repeated since time did not allow for a spreading of SPO workshops.
- Because of resource constraints, coding of data collected was done once and for most but in practice it was not relevant: you first need to have an idea about the changes before you can do a good process tracing and before you can answer evaluation questions regarding relevance and explaining factors.

With regards to the general evaluation procedure
• The workshop methodology was structured for literate English speaking people, which was not always the case. As a consequence, delays and possible misunderstanding happened due to translation and more time was needed to process the data.

• Many forms were filled in after the workshop/interviews and not between the workshop and the interviews as a means to inform the interview questions and the process tracing. The methodology and overall evaluation process would have benefited from allowing more time between the different parts, for example having more time between workshop and implementing process tracing to get properly prepared.

• The report format provided by the synthesis team includes lots of repetitions (for example, elements of the context are found back into standard indicators 5.1) and would have gained in being better structured.

• The ToC developed during the baseline took SPO’s staff time and dedication. The participants who had been involved during that process regretted that the end line workshop did not utilize the ToC more. In fact the ToC was used as a starting point to assess relevance issues, which was discussed during interviews rather than during the workshop.

With regards to collaboration between CDI and IDF

• The CDI team would have gained in being more consolidated (for example sending one type of feedback to IDF) and having more dedicated time for the evaluation (feed-back did not arrive on time)
## Civil Society Scoring tool - baseline

### Civil Society Assessment tool – Standard Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Outcome domains</th>
<th>What are factors (strengths, weaknesses) that explain the current situation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of marginalised groups</td>
<td>How does your organisation take the needs of your beneficiaries/target groups, in particular marginalised groups into account in your planning, actions, activities, and/or strategies?</td>
<td>Are NOT taken into account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of target groups</td>
<td>What is the level of participation of your beneficiaries/target groups, in particular marginalised groups in the analysis, planning and evaluation of your activities?</td>
<td>They are INFORMED about on-going and/or new activities that you will implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political engagement</td>
<td>How intense is your (individual staff or organisational) participation in locally-nationally elected bodies and/or sectoral user groups?</td>
<td>No participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of</td>
<td>Relations with other organisations</td>
<td>In the past 12 months what has been the most intensive interaction you had with other CSOs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Frequency of dialogue with closest CSO</td>
<td>In the past 12 months how many meetings did you have with the CSO that you have most intensive interaction with?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Defending the interests of marginalised groups:</td>
<td>Which CSO are most effective in defending the interests of your target groups? In the past 12 months, how did you relate to those CSOs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Composition current financial resource base</td>
<td>How does your organisation finance institutional costs such as workshops of the General Assembly (if applicable); attendants to workshops of other CSOs; costs for organisational growth and/or networking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Practice of Values</td>
<td>Downward accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Composition of social organs</td>
<td>What % of members of your mandatory social organs belong to the marginalised target groups you are working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with/for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>External financial auditing</td>
<td>How regularly is your organisation audited externally?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Client satisfaction</td>
<td>What are the most important concerns of your target groups? How do your services take into account those important concerns?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Civil society impact.</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, what impact did you have on building a strong civil society?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Relation with public sector organisations.</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, what interaction did you have with public sector organisations to realise your programme and organisations' objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Relation with private sector organisations</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, what interaction did you have with private sector organisations to realise your programme and organisations' perspective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Influence upon public policies, rules, regulations</td>
<td>How successful have you been in influencing public policies and practices in the past 2 years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence upon private sector agencies’ policies, rules, regulations.</td>
<td>How successful have you been in influencing private sector policies and practices in the past 2 years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>No activities developed in this area</td>
<td>Some activities developed but without discernible impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Environmental context</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No analysis of the space and role of civil society has been done.</td>
<td>You are collecting information of the space and role of civil society but not regularly analysing it.</td>
<td>You are monitoring the space and role of civil society and analysing the consequences of changes in the context for your own activities. Examples are available.</td>
<td>You are involved in joint action to make context more favourable. Examples are available.</td>
<td>Question not relevant, because .....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the past 2 years, how did your organisation cope with these changes in the context that may have been positive or negative consequences for civil society.
This table presents the appreciation of the evaluation team regarding changes occurred for each indicator between 2012 and 2014 on a scale of -2 to +2
- 2 = Considerable deterioration
- 1 = A slight deterioration
0 = no change occurred, the situation is the same as in 2012
+1 = slight improvement
+2 = considerable improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civic engagement</td>
<td>Needs of marginalised groups</td>
<td>How does your organisation take the needs of your beneficiaries/target groups, in particular marginalised groups into account in your planning, actions, activities, and/or strategies?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement of target groups</td>
<td>What is the level of participation of your beneficiaries/target groups, in particular marginalised groups in the analysis, planning and evaluation of your activities?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political engagement</td>
<td>How intense is your (individual staff or organisational) participation in locally-nationally elected bodies and/or sectoral user groups?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of organisation</td>
<td>Relations with other organisations</td>
<td>In the past 12 months what has been the most intensive interaction you had with other CSOs?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency of dialogue with closest CSO</td>
<td>In the past 12 months how many meetings did you have with the CSO that you have most intensive interaction with?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defending the interests of marginalised groups</td>
<td>Which CSO are most effective in defending the interests of your target groups? In the past 12 months, how did you relate to those CSOs?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composition current financial resource base</td>
<td>How does your organisation finance institutional costs such as workshops of the General Assembly (if applicable); attendance to workshops of other CSOs; costs for organisational growth and/or networking?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of Values</td>
<td>Downward accountability</td>
<td>To what extent can mandatory social organs (steering committee, general assembly, internal auditing group) ask your executive leaders to be accountable to them?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composition of social organs</td>
<td>What % of members of your mandatory social organs belong to the marginalised target groups you are working with/for?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External financial auditing</td>
<td>How regularly is your organisation audited externally?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of impact</td>
<td>Client satisfaction</td>
<td>What are the most important concerns of your target groups? How do your services take into account those important concerns?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil society impact.</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, what impact did you have on building a strong civil society?</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relation with public sector organisations</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, what interaction did you have with public sector organisations to realise your programme and organisations’ objectives?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relation with private sector organisations</td>
<td>In the past 12 months, what interaction did you have with private sector organisations to realise your programme and organisations’ perspective?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence upon public policies, rules, regulations</td>
<td>How successful have you been in influencing public policies and practices in the past 2 years?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence upon private sector agencies’ policies, rules, regulations</td>
<td>How successful have you been in influencing private sector policies and practices in the past 2 years?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS context</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Coping strategies</td>
<td>In the past 2 years, how did your organisation cope with these changes in the context that may have been positive or negative consequences for civil society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 4  Changes in civil society indicators between 2012 and 2014

1.1  Civic Engagement

1.1.1  Needs of the marginalised groups

HIVOS’ 2012-2014 contract with CWM states that the latter (in 2012) worked with 41 trade unions and has a total direct outreach of about 7 lakh workers—of whom 40 per cent are women—and that its annual indirect outreach is over a million workers per year. The evaluators had no independent way of verifying this quantitative claim, both as to whether the numbers were indeed as had been stated in 2012 or if they have increased or decreased since.

CWM works as a resource centre for trade unions comprising rural, garment, domestic, plantation, auto, metal and mining workers, and aims at organising contract workers, casual workers and the self-employed, mainly in the unorganised sector. It seeks to address the issues of the rural workers and workers with non-standardised urban jobs.

Its commitment to the larger needs of workers having remained constant, the past two years have seen CWM increasing focus on concerns and issues of women workers. CWM’s Work Plan 2012-2013, in fact, records its intent to engage with new forms of organisation of primarily women workers, and address issues of women leadership and patriarchy in traditional unions.

True to this, between 2012 and 2014 CWM closely engaged with unions in the primarily women workforce dominated garment sector in Bangalore and Chennai—GATWU63 and GAFWU64—as also interact intensively with the Chennai-based all-women union PTS65. Also, with the help of an ActionAid supported programme, CWM along with PTS, works with urban women workers from socially and economically disadvantaged sections. The underlying aim of all these activities is to highlight issues of fair minimum wage, increasing the role of women as primary wage earners and seek to build conditions for collective learning and action for women’s rights.

HIVOS’ partner capacity assessment form (October 2012-September 2014) corroborates this. It states that CWM works with organisations of women workers, industries where women are predominant and on issues of marginalisation related to caste and work-related stigma (unorganised workers in general, municipal workers, sex workers). HIVOS, however, scores CWM at a four out of nine on internal gender expertise.

63 GATWU: Garment and Textile Workers’ Union in Bangalore. See http://gatwu.org.in/
GATWU was formed in 2005 and was officially registered in 2006 in Bangalore. They are committed to building the power of the working class in the Karnataka garment industry and building a movement with like-minded organizations to advance the interests of workers and their families. GATWU is fighting for living wages, better working conditions, safe and harassment-free working environments, and freedom of association.

64 Garments and Fashion Workers’ Union (GAFWU) is a Chennai (Tamil Nadu) based workers’ union, more than 95% of whose members are women. The union works for the rights of garment-apparel sector workers, and is a partner organisation of the CWM.

65 Penn Thozhilalar Sangam is an organisation working in Chennai, with a neighbourhood based focus. Most of its members are women, and it also works for making government services accessible to women workers’ in a neighbourhood. It is also a partner organization of the CWM.
CWM’s only shift from its pre-baseline documented goals is its failure to address rural workers’ issues in the new worksites created by NREGA\(^6\). CWM had expressed intent to help rural workers understand their rights vis-à-vis the scheme. This has not happened. CWM attributes this to the government’s pressure that more and more rural labour opt to work under NREGA, and that NGOs be contracted to facilitate this. CWM thought it best to keep out of this scenario where NGOs were seen as adding to the quantitative, not qualitative, enhancement of NREGA.

Score: 0

### 1.1.2 Involvement of target groups

During the baseline evaluation, CWM’s executive leadership made it clear that the organisation seeks to be an anonymous catalyst in the trade union movement. Therefore, the core belief behind all its interventions is that workers must represent themselves, should be self-managed and self-governed; and that CWM’s role should only be limited to playing facilitator and enabler. This was reiterated during the end line workshop. CWM maintains a high level of interaction with the beneficiary groups, said the leadership; qualifying that while there is no formal mechanism for involvement of beneficiaries in CWM’s planning processes, needs of beneficiary groups are closely factored in, through an iterative process of research and documentation, education and problem solving intervention.

Having said which, the CWM staff, across hierarchies, felt that the target groups’ level of participation in the analysis, planning and evaluation of the organisation’s activities had improved in the past two years. This was variously seen as being a consequence of: a) CWM having systematised the process of beneficiary interaction through better targeted research and education b) workshops and meetings now being structured along with activist leaders of the unions c) using the workshop mode or focus group discussions to check outcomes and test ideas which, in turn, informed the next steps d) involving the union leadership’s second, and sometimes even the third tier, in deliberating on the next steps.

End line score: +1

### 1.1.3 Intensity of political engagement

CWM does not interact with political parties and elected bodies. The staffers said that such interaction is exclusively the remit of the target group. But that CWM staff is kept informed by the unions of such interactions, if any, so as to ensure exposure and improve their effectiveness.

Score: Not applicable

### 1.2 Level of Organisation

#### 1.2.1 Relations with other organisations

HIVOS’ partner capacity assessment in their 2012-2014 contract with CWM scored the latter at a seven out of nine on Capability to Relate. It noted that CWM maintains relevant institutional relationships with external stakeholders and is seen as credible and legitimate.

---

\(^6\) The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 is an Act to provide for the enhancement of livelihood security of the households in rural areas of the country by providing at least one hundred days of guaranteed wage employment in every financial year to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto. See [http://nrega.nic.in/rajaswa.pdf](http://nrega.nic.in/rajaswa.pdf)
During the end line evaluation workshop, the CWM staff was unanimous that there had been considerable improvement in their relations with other civil society organisations in the period between the baseline and the end line evaluations.

CWM said that its most intensive interactions in the past 12 months have been with: a) Garment and Textile Workers’ Union (GATWU), Bangalore, Karnataka b) Garment and Fashion Workers’ Union (GAFWU), Chennai, Tamil Nadu c) Penn Thozhilalar Sangam (PTS), Chennai, Tamil Nadu d) Various plantation workers associations/unions in North Bengal e) Auto Workers’ unions (unnamed) f) New Trade Union Initiative (NTUI)67 Malarchi68, Chennai g) Action Aid69, India h) Workers’ Rights Consortium70, Washington DC (WRC), USA i) Transnational Information Exchange (TIE)71, Germany j) Rosa Luxembourg Stiftung72, Germany k) International Labour Rights Forum73, Washington DC, USA

CWM said that its engagement with the all-women’s union PTS, and unions in the garment sector which have a predominant women workforce, such as GATWU and GAFWU, is more focused since 2012. These interactions are around the issues of statutory minimum wage for garment workers and for domestic workers, leadership development for women trade union leaders, and issues that directly affect women at work such as violence at the workplace, low wages, absence of regulation, safe public transport; provisioning of public facilities like crèche etc. The engagement in the garment sector has in particularly become stronger with CWM being engaged in helping set up a network of trade unions (involving TIE) in the garment sector in South Asia, including GATWU and GAFWU from India and trade unions from Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. CWM has brought together its engagement with multiple actors, in India and abroad, to take forward experience sharing as part of collective learning.

CWM’s international networking also seems to have improved over the past two years. The organisation has both strengthened and derived strength from international bodies like WRC and TIE. The CWM staffers said that the aim behind this was not to address specific issues but a result of maturing of their strategy. CWM’s work with WRC, for instance, involves raising workers’ complaints with them, which is then presented by WRC at international platforms. CWM’s work with TIE, on the other hand, is driven towards the need to throw up a self-sustaining union network in the garment and the auto industry that is able to take up its indigenous issues and address them through collective action/collective bargaining.

Score: +2

1.2.2 Frequency of dialogue with closest civil society organisation

The CWM staff agreed, in differing degrees, that the frequency of their interactions with their partner CSOs had increased in number and quality terms in the past two years. In 2012 the leadership had said that CWM did not interact intensively with any trade union in particular. In 2014, however, the leadership shared that now CWM typically interacts many times in a month with some of its partner

67 New Trade Union Initiative is a national trade union federation in India founded in 2002. Refer http://ntui.org.in/ntui/
68 Malarchi is a Chennai-based women’s resource centre founded in 2001. Sujata Mody, President, PTS is a founding member of Malarchi.
69 ActionAid India is an anti-poverty agency, working in India since 1972 with the poor people to end poverty and injustice together. See http://www.actionaid.org/india/who-we-are-1
70 Workers’ Rights Consortium (WRC) is an independent labour rights monitoring organization, conducting investigations of working conditions in factories around the globe. Their purpose is to combat sweatshops and protect the rights of workers who make apparel and other products. See http://www.workersrights.org/
71 Transnational Information Exchange (TIE), is a global grassroots network of workers active in workplaces and communities. It includes both union and non-union activists in the formal and informal sectors. TIE aims to encourage, organise, and facilitate international consciousness and cooperation among workers and their organisations in various parts of the world. See http://www.tie-germany.org/who_we_are/index.html
72 The Rosa Luxembourg Foundation is one of the largest political education institutions in Germany today and sees itself as part of the intellectual current of democratic socialism. The foundation evolved from a small political group, “Social Analysis and Political Education Association”, founded in 1990 in Berlin into a nationwide political education organisation, a discussion forum for critical thought and political alternatives as well a research facility for progressive social analysis. See http://www.rosalux.de/english/foundation.html
73 International Labor Rights Forum is a human rights organization that advocates for workers globally. See http://www.labourrights.org/about
unions. Other staff pointed out that the change has also been about using different modes for dialogue not just limited to meetings, regular flow of information through emails and telephones have been a communication feature since 2012.

To illustrate the growing intensity of its engagements with its partners, CWM cited its interactions with GATWU and GAFWU, all sharing a common agenda of campaign for a fair minimum wage, bargaining strategy based on understanding of the global supply chain, and struggle against workplace violence. This has resulted in a more intensive interaction between CWM, GATWU and GAFWU. The TIE network has also facilitated a closer interaction.

Score: +1

1.2.3 Defending the interests of marginalised groups

Both in 2012 and 2014, the CWM staff has been categorical that trade unions, and trade union networks, are the best defendants of the interests of workers; they are elected organisations of workers, and help deepen democracy, empowerment, and in build sustainable interventions.

The CWM staff felt that the situation, on this count, has improved between 2012 and 2014. Within the various key sectors that CWM has been engaged with: a) there has been strengthening of some trade unions b) trade union membership has increased in unions such as GAFWU and PTS c) some unions, like GAFWU and PTS, have also developed grass roots leadership, including women as leaders of unions representing women workers in garments, domestic work, rural workers and tea plantation work d) there has been an improvement in the effectiveness of many such unions vis a vis their ability to use available skills, resources and experience that is a result of capacity building; such as GATWU’s effective participation in negotiations in the tripartite committee on wage hike in Karnataka’s garment sector.

Score: +1

1.2.4 Composition financial resource base

The baseline evaluation had found CWM in a precarious financial position. In a May 2011 letter, Hivos, whose contract with CWM had ended in September 2012, had informed CWM of a funding crisis and that it would be withdrawing its support from the organisation upon ten years of completion of funding. CWM’s Work Plan 2012-2013, however, mentioned that the organisation expected to enter into a new contract for an equitant amount from October 2012. A letter from Hivos to CWM, dated September 2011, emphasised that CWM needs to place ‘urgent priority on addressing the issue of financial sustainability, including looking at the option of charging associate trade unions for the provision of support.’; the message was repeated in a letter to CWM in December 2011. Even so, CWM in its Work Plan 2011-2012 estimated the total budget of CWM in the 2009-2012 period—and that only included confirmed grants—and showed an increasing dependency on HIVOS starting with 76 per cent in 2009-2010 to 88 per cent in 2011 to 2012. Eventually though, Hivos did get into a contract with CWM for October 2012 to September 2014.

This being the background, during the end line evaluations, the staff felt that CWM’s financial situation improved between 2012 and 2014. But the board member thought it had deteriorated.

A three year contract with Rosa Luxembourg Stiftung (RLS) beginning January 1, 2013 seems to have contributed largely to CWM’s newfound sense of financial stability. And there is now also assured funding from Action Aid for the Child Support Project up to 31 December 2015.

The CWM staff sees this new fund inflow as having averted an imminent financial crisis at around the time of the baseline evaluations. They credit CWM for having successfully managed to raise funds from donors other than Hivos—and ending their dependence solely on Hivos. The staff pointed out that certain costs, like say pertaining to workshops held with unions, are now increasingly borne by the host trade unions themselves; this is seen as a crucial issue of principle important for the autonomy of the unions. CWM however does finance its own costs (office costs, salaries, travel) for all the work that contributes to their activities.

The CWM board member’s less enthusiastic, and perhaps more pragmatic, perception of the organisation’s current funding situation is based on the fact that Hivos has been a key, and almost
sole, source of support for institutional costs; though some part of the review exercise is now financed
by the RLS. The reduction and uncertainty with regard to support from Hivos has led to some
curtailment of CWM’s work. It has also resulted in a decline in available resources as staff has been
required to raise additional resources, manage with less and put in time for compliance. Also, finally,
CWM is still dependent on donor support for all its fixed costs.

Score: +1

1.3 Practice of Values

1.3.1 Downward accountability

CWM aims to ensure accountability at three levels: a) accountability to the target group; b) through
strong internal audit supported by robust external audit; c) through its board. Having said which, CWM
has been assessed in the past as having too many overlaps with workers’ organisations. This has
challenged different evaluators—at separate points in time—in being able to measure CWM’s
accountability to its target groups, funders and board.

HIVOS’ Organisational Assessment 2004 states that CWM worked with various independent workers
organisations whose efforts contributed to the establishment of NTUI in 2001. Since then, CWM
continued association with these organisations that were affiliated to the NTUI. At the time of the
baseline, four out of five of CWM’s board members held posts in NTUI.

CWM has made some changes to address the above mentioned concerns in the past two years. And all
CWM’s staff said that these changes have improved the organisation’s accountability systems and
structures.

The CWM board has now been reconstituted; barring Gautam Mody who is now NTUI’s General
Secretary, none of the other CWM board members are on NTUI’s board. The CWM board has been
widened to include professionals committed to CWM’s objectives but with a wider experience of similar
organisations and issues. This has assisted in addressing accountability as also offering diversity in
mentoring.

The leadership said that there has been greater systematising and regularity of board meetings and
staff meetings over the past two years, and these have helped get inputs on CWM’s work. Also, there
are now more detailed and regular interactions with the target group, which has improved
accountability.

The board member said that compliance standards of Rosa Luxembourg Stiftung have led to improved
accountability. And the annual review mechanism introduced by HIVOS has helped integrate planning
with the annual compliance requirements—financing of board meetings, quality internal audit and
capable external audit firm are supported by HIVOS. In its 2012-2014 contract with CWM, HIVOS’
partner capacity assessment scores CWM at a five out of nine on its Capability to Relate, and
comments that CWM is accountable to and communicates effectively with its primary constituents/beneficiaries.

The absence of a CWM website, at the time of the baseline, was conspicuous, especially since CWM is
in the field of information generation and dissemination. The CWM website is now up
(http://www.cwm.org.in), has a news ticker update, but the upcoming events listed and the
publications uploaded on the site are not beyond late 2012.

Score: +1

1.3.2 Composition of social organs

CWM is a registered society with a board of governors, representatives of trade unions and activists.
The organisation’s governing council comprises five members.

Upon HIVOS’s request for a stronger representation of women in CWM’s Board, it was indeed
reconstituted in 2012 and now includes one female and four male persons.
The board now has two—40 percent—trade unionists as members. The inclusion of three members from academia and action research has been deliberate considering the need to maintain a high standard of research and education.

CWM’s former female co-executive head has become its executive head after the baseline assessment. However, there seems to be a significant divergence of views on the board reconstitution within CWM. The executive leadership felt that the representation of the marginalised has deteriorated in the new board given that the inclusion of action researchers and academics has been at the cost of losing trade union activists. Other staff and the board member, on the other hand, saw it as considerable improvement due to a woman being inducted into the board. These changes are being attributed to have been driven by CWM’s internal processes, but not without feeling the pressure to be seen to be ‘inclusive’. HIVOS’s assessments and support is said to have been an essential driver towards the board’s reconstitution.

Score: +1

1.3.2 External financial auditing

There is a quarterly internal audit of CWM as an organisation. External audits are held annually, within 90 days of the year end, with a report presented to the board. CWM prepares accounts with the use of Tally ERP.9 software. The audits are paid for by the HIVOS grant.

Score: 0

1.4 Perception of Impact

1.4.1 Client satisfaction

In 2012 the CWM staff—and documents authored by them—listed the following as the major concerns of its target groups: a) right to associate and collective bargaining b) right to a minimum as well as living wage

74 c) livelihood and workers’ rights d) lack of universal social security. These concerns were seen as aggravated by growing rural to urban migration, consequent unemployment, falling wages and abandonment of labour regulation. The declining rural economy further strengthened traditional hierarchies and created new forms of labour oppression—hitting hardest the most marginalised: women and dalits.

Over the past two years, CWM has continued to service the concerns of its target groups by being a resource centre for workers’ unions; such that these unions can look to CWM for information and guidance to best understand the issues at play, both nationally and internationally. And use this understanding while strategising for and negotiating with industry and government to further workers’ causes.

---

74 The issue of a living wage has gained urgency today, in the context of high inflation rates and increasing income disparities. Real poverty is a large concern of trade unions representing workers in the informal sector. Measurement of poverty and changing government definitions which push down wage norms make it difficult for unions to address the question of wage fixation. Norms like the 15th ILC have become a farce in the face of continuous pressure to push wages down. Trade union representation on wage fixing committees becomes ineffective in the face of absence of reliable and consistent data and analysis. At the same time, weakening of public social security measures available to the poor, further impacts real wages. A systematic region and sector specific series of studies on wages to workers linked to family employment and expenditure patterns, including aspects like incidence of forced employment of children in families of informal sector workers is a priority. The study information also needs to continuously feed into campaign for fair wages, and a just method of wage indexing, *Advancing Industrial Democracy for Economic and Social Equality, Centre for Workers’ Management: 1 October 2008–30 September 2012*
CWM increased its focus on issues pertaining to women workers in the past two years. Its interactions with unions in the women workforce dominated garment and domestic-help sector has seen a surge in the membership of such unions, as also an emerging women leadership.

For instance, garment sector union GAFWU in 2009 had a few women and about three women leaders from one garment factory. Now, it has women members and leaders from five factories in three Tamil Nadu districts. Despite not being an all-women union, currently its entire leadership—first, second and third rung—constitutes women. Because of this quantitative and qualitative growth of its women members, women workers affiliated to GAFWU chose to fight against sexual harassment at the workplace, and filed two cases of sexual harassment (between 2012 and 2013). One of them paved the way for the union’s entry into a Special Economic Zone for the first time. This was a rare thing as even by law, trade union activities are not allowed within the SEZ premises.

Further, these intensive interactions have also contributed significantly to an increase in the daily wages in Karnataka’s garment sector and a draft notification for the same in Tamil Nadu in 2014.

The CWM hierarchies were at variance as to why their target groups remained burdened with the same chronic concerns despite intensive interventions by their organisation in the past two years. They said that the organisation’s service to its targets group could not affect a remarkably large impact because of the worsening of policy and political environment, as also employer attitudes, towards workers; adding that there is now a strong attack by employers, with government’s complicity, on the workers’ right to freedom of association.

Score: 0

1.4.2 Civil society impact

CWM’s focus on concerns and issues of women workers’ has resulted in the growth—both in terms of membership numbers of women and the geographical expanse—of some of the unions associated with it. There has been a constant and steady increase in women’s engagement with GAFWU, which has more than 95 per cent women membership—it had 103 women as members from one Bangalore factory in 2009 and in 2013 it had 694 members from three districts of Karnataka. The membership in the all women PTS, associated with the domestic work and construction sector, has also grown from 297 to 18300 between 2001 and 2013. CWM has been organising workshops, training sessions etc to make workers, especially women workers, aware of their rights and develop leadership. Many of these workshops were conducted under the MFS II interventions. As a result of their interactions with GAFWU and PTS, women members of these unions now have enhanced levels of awareness of their rights in their workspace; on two occasions workers affiliated to GAFWU resisted sexual harassment at the workplace, by filing complaints against it, something that was rare in earlier times. CWM’s engagement with unions in the garment sector that employs mostly women, has also contributed largely to the raising of daily wages in Karnataka and a draft notification towards the same in Tamil Nadu.

CWM’s associate unions have benefited from its efforts to universalise the understanding of workers’ rights. They have been connected, sometimes through CWM, to national and international workers’ networks. With a much less segmented and targeted approach, the unions know now that even a specific struggle for minimum wages in Karnataka’s garment sector is linked to other national and international actors and factors.

All levels in CWM’ hierarchy felt that its impact over civil society has improved. Apart from the above mentioned, they see CWM as having contributed to: a) linking the prevalent low wage of women workers in the tea plantations of Northern Bengal to a rise in child labour and bringing this to the centre of discussions b) facilitating international fact finding on violations of trade union rights at Maruti-Suzuki and making the issue a matter of international concern amongst trade unions and democratic rights organisations.

Score: +1
1.4.3 Relation with public sector organisations

CWM staff and board said, as they had in 2012, that CWM does not deal with the public sector. The executive leadership, however, saw a change for the better; because a CWM partner union GATWU became member of the tripartite committee for minimum wages in the garment sector in Karnataka; and negotiated effectively in the committee comprising government and industry.

Score: Not Applicable for CWM; 0 or +1 for trade unions

1.4.4 Relation with private sector agencies

CWM does not interact directly with the private sector. This is done by the unions.

Score: Not applicable for CWM; no information available for trade-unions

1.4.5 Influence upon public policies, rules, regulations

CWM has no direct involvement in influencing public policies. However the staffers argued that some of their partner unions in the garment sector had addressed the minimum wage issue effectively in the past two years. Static for long, the minimum wage in Karnataka’s garment industry has now been raised, and Tamil Nadu has issued a draft notification for a rise.

CWM’s Annual Report 2010-2011 noted that the erstwhile UPA government’s attempt to unlink the NREGA wage to inflation led to a campaign by various CSOs for an inflation indexed wage. CWM was asked for its inputs by its constituent unions. The campaign saw the government backtracking and bringing in a formula compensating for inflation. Indexation of the NREGA wage has now come into place three years but NREGA’s implementation has been slack.

Though the CWM staffers do not claim sole credit for any of the above mentioned achievements, they see it as an improvement in their partner unions’ capacities influence public policies.

Score: Not Applicable for CWM; +1 for trade-unions.

1.4.6 Influence upon private sector agencies’ policies, rules, regulations

CWM has no direct interactions with the private sector. These matters are left to trade unions.

Score: Not Applicable for CWM; no information available for trade-unions

1.5 Civil society environment

1.5.1 Coping strategies

While the past two years have seen new challenges thrust upon workers and unions, the backdrop has been consistently bleak. As Hivos’ 2012-2014 contract with CWM sums up, the situation of labour in India is in a churn of an unprecedented order due to pro-market and liberal policies for some years. Even in the formal sector informal employment has increased from 39 to 46 per cent between 1990 and 2005 and is estimated at 51 per cent for 2010. This growing informality has put pressure on wages, and working conditions are far below those of standard employment, adversely impacting not just the formal but also the informal sector.

Other than this, the economic downturn, consequent retrenchment, increasing contractualisation of the workforce and spiralling inflation between 2012 and 2014 provided for a particularly difficult environment for workers. Controversies on mining contracts between government and the corporates multiplied; these were about violations of environmental norms and displacement issues impacting livelihoods of indigenous people and rural workers. Rural to urban migration continued unabated despite NREGA, which still suffers from widespread corruption and inappropriate implementation.
The right to dissent, meanwhile, has been under attack. Attempts at unionising and union struggles are met with increasing employer repression; often the government and police are complicit. The Maruti-Suzuki automobile workers brought to attention the attack on right to association and spread of contract employment in all forms of work. The struggles against displacement in Jagatsinghpur and Niyamgiri in Orissa, and around nuclear power generation sites in Kudamkulam, all brought to fore the contradictions between unregulated industrialisation and democratic rights.

The Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act 2010 challenged CWM further, because it prohibits the use of foreign fund for unionisation. Those working with unions now have to be extra cautious that their foreign-funded activities are not linked with union formation.

Although CWM states that engaging with new national and international workers’ networks will bring to the fore issues and concerns of women workers and those working in the auto industries, generally speaking, CWM did not develop coping strategies to counter these tendencies; its strategies of supporting trade unions remained the same, apart from minor changes in terms of intensifying the nature of the support.

---

The Centre for Development Innovation works on processes of innovation and change in the areas of food and nutrition security, adaptive agriculture, sustainable markets, ecosystem governance, and conflict, disaster and reconstruction. It is an interdisciplinary and internationally focused unit of Wageningen UR within the Social Sciences Group. Our work fosters collaboration between citizens, governments, businesses, NGOs, and the scientific community. Our worldwide network of partners and clients links with us to help facilitate innovation, create capacities for change and broker knowledge.

The mission of Wageningen UR (University & Research centre) is ‘To explore the potential of nature to improve the quality of life’. Within Wageningen UR, nine specialised research institutes of the DLO Foundation have joined forces with Wageningen University to help answer the most important questions in the domain of healthy food and living environment. With approximately 30 locations, 6,000 members of staff and 9,000 students, Wageningen UR is one of the leading organisations in its domain worldwide. The integral approach to problems and the cooperation between the various disciplines are at the heart of the unique Wageningen Approach.