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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context and Background

There are more than 100 million home based workers (HBWs) in the world,\(^1\) of which around 50 percent are in South Asia alone where they form a fast growing part of the workforce\(^2\). Of these workers, an estimated 80 percent are women. While this substantive section of the workforce contributes to the national and subsequently to the global economy, it lacks the ‘voice’ to make its presence felt. Actually, women home based workers are doubly discriminated against – firstly, because of their status as semi-skilled workers in an unregulated informal sector, and secondly, because of their gender. The precarious existence of the rapidly expanding and female dominated informal economy leave HBWs with little or no access to legal and/or social protective measures. In the absence of such protection, and lack of information about their basic rights, HBWs have weak bargaining power.\(^3\) Working for long hours on low wages and exposed to poor working conditions, HBWs are victims of economic exploitation and social rights violation. These workers reduce their country’s capital and infrastructure costs of export goods by working from their homes using their own space, water, electricity and family time. But they cannot claim any health, maternity, education, old age, or retirement benefits. Interestingly, till recently, national governments across countries did not even recognize HBWs as part of the workforce in the informal sector.

The United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) has been firmly committed to empowering HBWs by advocating for their rights. UNIFEM’s Regional Programme for Home Based Workers dates back to 1994 when the concerns faced by HBWs were not even being publicly acknowledged, much less debated as a problem. Today, the organization’s work spans five countries - Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. UNIFEM’s programme initiatives are focused on lending greater visibility to the needs and concerns of HBWs in the region as also greater recognition to the vital economic contribution they make in today’s global economy.

An important landmark in UNIFEM’s programmatic work came in 2000 at the South Asia Regional Policy Seminar. It was a joint initiative of UNIFEM, International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO).\(^4\) From this emerged the Kathmandu Declaration. This document charted the course for progressive policies and programmes that were needed to promote the rights of

---

\(^1\) UNIFEM’s Six-month report (2007) on the Regional Home Based Workers Programme.
\(^3\) Ibid.
\(^4\) UNIFEM together with SEWA, and the Harvard Institute of International Development (HIID) is also a founding member of WIEGO (Women in Informal Employment Globalizing and Organizing), an organization that works to strengthen the home-based workers campaign at the global level.
women in the informal sector. It led to the establishment of HomeNet South Asia (HNSA) in 2000, facilitated by UNIFEM and the Self Employed Women’s Association (SEWA). The programme was funded by Federation Dutch Labour Movement (FNV). The total amount received was $1,101,380 during 2004-07.\(^5\)

Under the umbrella of HNSA, national networks/HomeNets exist in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. The facilitation of the growth and strengthening of these networks has been a major focus of the UNIFEM’s Regional Home Based Workers Programme in both Phase I (2002-2004) and Phase II (2004-2007). It adopted the strategy of engaging organizations with experience in working with HBWs as focal organizations in the respective member countries, namely, Bangladesh Homeworkers Women Association (BHWA) in Bangladesh, SEWA in India, Aurat Foundation in Pakistan and SIYATH in Sri Lanka. The organizations played a crucial role in establishing HomeNets both at the regional level, i.e., HomeNet South Asia (HNSA) and at the national levels, i.e., HomeNet Bangladesh (HNB), HomeNet India (HNI), HomeNet Nepal (HNN), HomeNet Pakistan (HNP) and HomeNet Sri Lanka (HNSL). All these national HomeNets function under the umbrella of HNSA.

Other stakeholders include key ministries at the national and provincial levels, such as the ministries of Labour, Women Development, Planning and Statistics. The External Affairs ministries too had an important role to play because of the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC) which provides a common platform to countries of this region to discuss issues pertaining to improving the trade-related environment amongst the member countries.

Building on the achievement of the first phase of the Strengthening Home Based Networks in South (and Southeast Asia) project,\(^6\) and incorporating lessons emerging from the end-of-project evaluation report (2004),\(^7\) the second phase of the programme focused on achieving the overall goal that was articulated as: *Ensuring the full realization of human rights of women home based workers (HBWs) in Asia.*\(^8\)

The projected outcomes of the programme were envisaged as:

- Existence of sustainable organizations of HBWs and their networks at national and sub-regional levels in South Asia.
- Existence of enabling policy environment for women HBWs/ informal sector workers in South Asia.
- Improved response from government and private sector on social protection measures and schemes for HBWs

---

\(^{5}\) UNIFEM SARO

\(^{6}\) See Project Document for relevant strategies and outcomes.


\(^{8}\) Home Based Workers, Phase II Project Document 2004.

It should be noted that, in this case, South Asia (as opposed to Asia more broadly) is the subject of the evaluation.
Key strategies to meet the outcomes included: i) advocacy and policy dialogue to support stronger implementation of commitments made to address issues faced by HBWs in the informal sector; ii) building sustainable knowledge and action networks to bring women HBWs, their associated networks and groups, women’s organizations, governments, UN organizations and other actors together to influence policies and programmes affecting the lives of HBWs; iii) capacity building of women HBWs and other key actors to influence the priorities, policies and programmes that affect their lives; iv) disseminating knowledge on emerging issues and innovative solutions with regard to women HBWs through effective use of new and traditional information and communications technologies; and v) experimentation on the “how to” of improving the lives and livelihoods of women HBWs through strategic piloting so that concrete experience could inform mainstream strategies.

**Purpose of Evaluation**

The purpose of the evaluation was to analyze the programme’s approach, strategies and interventions to support HBWs, both at the regional and country level. The evaluation was conducted with the broad objective of generating comprehensive and specific evaluation feedback in terms of the programme’s efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, impact and sustainability. The focus of the present evaluation was to assess the programme’s progress and achievements during phase II of the programme. The achievements as well as shortcomings during phase I were taken as context and reference points for the present evaluation.

This report highlights the programme strengths, weaknesses and constraints and identifies gaps in programme design and implementation with specific recommendations for strategic and programmatic improvements towards expansion of the programme’s reach in future.

**Evaluation Approach**

*CMS social* evaluation team decided in consultation with UNIFEM SARO that a qualitative approach was appropriate. Initially, as stated in the ToR, a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches was contemplated. However, due to the time and cost constraints, it was not feasible to undertake a quantitative evaluation with a robust sample of HBWs. Furthermore, the very scope of the study envisaged that only two of the countries namely, India and Nepal would be evaluated onsite (i.e. *CMS social*’s evaluation team would visit selected locations) and the other two (Bangladesh and Pakistan) offsite (i.e. by sharing of information and views/opinions through e-mail or telephonic interviews). In the backdrop of these reasons, a qualitative evaluation was considered the appropriate approach.

The study period initially was four months, December 2008 to March 2009, but was subsequently extended by a month as the field work could not be completed due to non-availability of respondents.
Research Techniques and Tools

Information was gathered through secondary research as well as primary investigation, using suitable research techniques and tools. The different methods adopted included desk review of documents, in depth interviews, either face to face or through telephone or by sending interview guidelines through e-mail, and by conducting focus group discussions. Separate guidelines were developed for each respondent group. The respondent groups included government officials; officials of UNIFEM, focal organizations and national HomeNets; representatives of member organizations of HomeNets and home based workers.

Study Team

CMS social evaluation team comprised three senior researchers led by a team leader. All the team members had rich experience of qualitative research and previous research studies on labour-related issues as well as on gender-specific concerns related to employment, livelihood and social protection. Each team member was responsible for reviewing the secondary information as well as the information gathered through primary research for one of the four countries assessed. While constituting the team it was ensured that one member of the team understood and spoke at least one of the three languages (Bengali, Hindi or Urdu) being largely spoken in these countries, besides English. In Gujarat (India) as well in Nepal, a local person accompanied the evaluation team to interpret the discussions with respondents, wherever needed. Each team member contributed to the evaluation right from the designing of research tools to conducting interviews and discussions to analysis of findings and report writing.

Coverage

The evaluation was undertaken in Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan. Since there is no UNIFEM office in Sri Lanka, it could not be included in the present evaluation. The assessment in India and Nepal was carried out onsite and in Pakistan and Bangladesh, the evaluation was conducted offsite. In the onsite countries, members of evaluation team visited and interacted with the respondents either by conducting individual interviews or by organising group discussions. In the offsite countries (Bangladesh and Pakistan), a list of probable respondents representing different stakeholders was provided by respective UNIFEM and national HomeNets and interviews were conducted telephonically. The interview guidelines were sent through e-mail to the UNIFEM officials and HomeNets, which was duly filled in by them and sent back to the evaluation team. Among two onsite countries, in India, the evaluation team visited five districts and conducted 22 in-depth interviews (IDIs) and 4 group discussions, while in Nepal, the evaluation team covered three districts to conduct 12 IDIs and 4 group discussions. In the two offsite countries, 10 telephonic
interviews were conducted covering 5 districts in Bangladesh; while in Pakistan, 13 telephonic interviews were conducted with respondents spread over 4 districts.

The evaluation exercise had some limitations of its own. Not many reference materials were available on HBWs as a whole, other than those documented by HomeNets and UNIFEM. The national HomeNets provided limited information on the fund utilization during the programme period. Another limitation, which was faced during telephonic interviews, pertained to non-connectivity or non-availability of the respondents. Further there was no scope to verify from other sources the information and data, particularly on membership of HBWs, provided by respective HomeNets.

**Key Findings**

Against the stated strategies of the programme, the evaluation observed that in each of the four countries, the focus was on the first three, i.e. advocacy and policy dialogue, building sustainable knowledge and action networks, and capacity building of women HBWs, their networks and relevant key actors.

The first strategy was given utmost priority. Emphasis was placed on participation in developing policy framework and advocacy for HBWs. While in all the countries assessed, a national policy document is at a draft stage, the involvement and recognition of HomeNets was found to be greater in countries like India, Nepal and Pakistan. In Bangladesh, it was observed that the country’s HomeNet was working on the draft of a national policy for HBWs but with little involvement of line ministries. Pakistan seems to be somewhat ahead of other countries, as already three bills have been introduced in its National Assembly. At the regional level, inaugurating the Policy Conference on Home Based Workers of South Asia at New Delhi in January 2007, the Prime Minister of India, Dr Manmohan Singh highlighted the current invisibility of home based workers and undertook to take forward the national policy for home based workers in India and also to promote their issues at the SAARC level. The setting up of an Independent Group on HBWs by the Government of India to define HBWs is a clear outcome of this conference and an important achievement of the programme.

On the fund utilization aspect, the evaluation found that the programme donor, FNV, had entered a caveat that the funds were to be utilized only for networking and advocacy purposes. Consequently, all HomeNets utilized the funds primarily to identify and network with organizations or groups/unions working with HBWs. Funds were also utilized for organizing workshops, conferences and seminars to give visibility to the cause and create an atmosphere conducive for policy advocacy.

Better advocacy efforts resulted in the willingness of the donors such as ActionAid, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Ford Foundation, SAARC Development Fund (SDF) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) to fund projects and programmes for empowering HBWs at regional and national levels. This support was a positive response for the
programme. Partnership with international agencies, such as WIEGO and IDRC, helped the programme to move ahead despite the challenges encountered by it.

The involvement of focal organizations at the national level in the member countries was the key for fostering the respective networks and the programme implementation. The registration of national HomeNets and HNSA was critical to building sustainable knowledge and action networks.

As part of the networking and expansion process of HomeNets under the programme, the involvement of member based organizations (MBOs) played an important role in identifying HBWs. The numerical strength of HBWs that joined the network showed an upward trend in all the four countries.

Similarly, with regard to building the capacity of HBWs, initiatives at the regional level like the SAARC Business Association for Home Based Workers (SABAH) and some at the national level were taken from time to time. National HomeNets organised exposure visits and ensured participation of HBWs, though in limited numbers, at trade fairs and exhibitions organised within the country or in one of the member countries. Some skill development training workshops for HBWs were also organised by HomeNets in each member country.

With regard to the other two strategies i.e. disseminating knowledge on emerging issues and innovative solutions, and experimentation through strategic piloting, some more concrete measures may be needed in the future. Though the programme has used resources and communication materials like newsletters, posters and pamphlets to disseminate information about their rights amongst the HBWs yet, in the absence of a policy and schemes, much has not been achieved. The websites developed by HNSA and all HomeNets (except HNI) constitute another good initiative towards giving visibility to the cause of HBWs. However, with the majority of HBWs being illiterate and having almost no access to information technology, these communication materials remain targeted more towards the policy makers and other stakeholders.

In terms of progress in demonstrating pilot approaches to social protection or promoting fair trade practices more concrete measures are required in future in all the four countries. Though the evaluation team came across some examples of social protection measures taken in India and Nepal by a few member organizations, these were not really facilitated by the HomeNets. Another challenge is to not only educate HBWs about these social protection schemes and their rights, but also make the schemes more accessible.

The attention given to promoting fair trade practices was found to be limited. In the next phase, the programme designers would need to face the challenge of developing a code of conduct for fair trade practices and advocacy amongst the private employers and ensuring its acceptance and implementation.
Recommendations

Based on the analysis of the programme’s achievements, its strengths and weaknesses, challenges faced and good practices noticed, the following are the key recommendations to HNSA, national HomeNets and UNIFEM.

For HomeNet South Asia (HNSA):
- Facilitate resource generation for national HomeNets from international donor agencies. Ensure participation of its representatives in international seminars and workshops to give ‘visibility’ to HNSA and the cause of HBWs.
- Develop a uniform Management Information System (MIS) to be adopted by the national HomeNets for maintaining the records of all the activities undertaken during the programme as well as funds utilized for the purpose. Having a MIS will ensure proper tracking and monitoring of the programme’s progress.
- Validate HBWs membership figures shared by the respective HomeNets by developing an internal monitoring mechanism. This could also be done at regular intervals by engaging a reputed external agency.
- Develop proposals for other sectors on the lines of the SAARC Project for HBWs in the garment sector.
- Work towards developing a code of conduct for fair trade practices.
- Give momentum to the agenda for ensuring social protection for HBWs, and showcase existing social protection measures in the region.
- Expand its network by including other SAARC countries namely, Afghanistan, Bhutan and Maldives to be its member. They should identify focal organizations in this country and work towards formation of national HomeNets.

For HomeNet Bangladesh (HNB):
- Push forward the national policy with the Government partners and do advocacy for the passage of the policy. Further, make a concerted effort to have specific questions in the next round of survey to be conducted by Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics.
- Maintain regular interaction with UNIFEM Bangladesh.
- Organise regular meetings with MBOs and HBWs to assess their needs and provide assistance in addressing those needs.
- Help MBOs in identifying marketing avenues for the HBWs.

For HomeNet India (HNI):
- Focus on the passage of a national policy for HBWs by engaging in a dialogue with key stakeholders.
• Help MBOs in identifying marketing avenues for HBWs.

• Reach out to more states, particularly in the southern part of the country and explore the possibility of having regional offices for better coordination and regular interaction with HBWs and MBOs.

• Construct its website and give contact details of its member organizations, so that HBWs or any organization(s) presently not in the network could contact them in case they need any assistance.

For HomeNet Nepal (HNN):
• Work more vigorously to formulate of national policy and take advantage of the fact that present government is positively inclined towards reforms of labour laws.

• Follow up with the government for ensuring the collection of data on HBWs in Nepal. The National Labour Surveys should have specific questions for identifying HBWs.

• Engage in regular interaction with HBWs and MBOs.

• Help MBOs in identifying marketing avenues for HBWs.

For HomeNet Pakistan (HNP):
• Lobby with the champions of the cause for the passage of the three bills pending with the National Assembly.

• Ensure that statistics on HBWs is collated during labour and other related surveys conducted by Pakistan’s Federal Bureau of Statistics.

• Work more effectively towards bringing more women HBWs into its fold. It ensures that individual HBWs (who are not associated with any organization or group working with or for HBWs) are not left out.

• Set up its own office to give more visibility to the network. This will be in accordance with the exit policy suggested for focal organizations.

For UNIFEM:
• Develop targets for each input/activity identified to be undertaken in the logical framework for the next phase of the programme.

• Continue to play the role of facilitator. Its respective country offices should provide support to national HomeNets in their advocacy with policy makers at the national level.

• Ensure HNSA’s presence at international forums for two reasons; one, to share and learn from the experiences of the international community; and two, to identify and encourage donor agencies for supporting HNSA and national HomeNets’ activities in the region.

• Work towards bringing in other member countries of SAARC, which are currently not members of HNSA.
Chapter I: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

Home based workers form a fast-growing part of the workforce in South Asia. There are more than 100 million home based workers (HBWs) throughout the world, of which nearly 50 percent are in South Asia alone. Of these workers, an estimated 80 percent are women. While they constitute a large section of the workforce and contribute to the national and global economy, they lack the voice to make their presence felt. As a matter of fact, women home based workers are doubly discriminated against - firstly because of their status as semi-skilled workers in an unregulated informal sector, and secondly, because of their gender. The precarious nature of the rapidly expanding and female-dominated informal economy leaves HBWs with little or no access to legal and/or social protective measures. In the absence of such protection, and information about their basic rights, HBWs have weak bargaining power. Working for long hours, for low wages, and in poor conditions, HBWs are particularly susceptible to economic and social exploitation. Relegated to the bottom of the supply/value chain, they occupy a particularly vulnerable position in the global economy. The contribution of HBWs to a country’s national income and to its exports may be gauged from a few examples. Incense-stick industry contributes $240 million annually to national income in India and has an export value of $112 million. Similarly, the garment industry in Bangladesh contributes $454 million to its national income and is the country’s largest export earner and fourth largest employer. In Pakistan, the match grade football manufacturing industry accounts for Pakistani Rupees three billion. These are only some examples of home based work’s contribution to a nation’s economy in South Asia.

Yet, till recently, national governments across the five countries did not even recognize home based workers as a part of the workforce much less as a separate entity. Thus they underestimated the contribution of home based work in the informal sector. Consequently, HBWs have been denied various benefits which they would have otherwise availed of as their right.

While estimates of the informal sector’s contribution to exports, GDP (Gross Domestic Product) and income have been attempted, no such information on home based work is

---

2 UNIFEM’s Six month report (2007) on the Regional Home Based Workers Programme.
3 Ibid.
4 FNV Project document
available in official documents, and this is the case, despite findings which indicate that home based work is the backbone of many industries like garment, carpets, agarbatti (incense stick), football making, semi-precious stones and jewellery, and several other labour intensive handicraft exports in South Asia. The contribution of women and other unpaid family labour to the production of items meant for export is also substantial, and the growth rate of women’s employment in these enterprises is high. For women home workers, the line between productive work and domestic chores is very thin; their productive employment at home is regarded as a mere extension of housework. Hence, the statistical invisibility of women HBWs.

Home based workers are also totally out of the ambit of labour laws. There is a compelling argument for a domestic policy that safeguards the interests of these workers by recognizing their worker status, bringing their working conditions under the ambit of labour laws, and providing them social security. A vast majority of workers are poor; they make substantial contributions to exports, earning foreign exchange but their own entitlements are negligible. Although HBWs subsidize their country’s capital costs of exports by working from their homes using their own space, water, electricity and family time, they cannot claim any health, maternity, education, old age, or retirement benefits.

1.2 Background

The United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) from its inception has been firmly committed to advocating the rights of HBWs in South Asia. Its regional programme on home based workers dates back to 1994 when the concerns faced by HBWs were not even being publicly acknowledged as problems. Today, the organization’s work spans five countries - Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. UNIFEM’s programme and advocacy initiatives are oriented to giving greater visibility to the needs and concerns of HBWs in the region and enhance recognition of the vital economic contribution these workers make in an increasingly globalized world. In 1995, UNIFEM along with SEWA and 15 other governments in the Asia Pacific region played a critical role in lobbying for the adoption of ILO Convention No. 177 on Home Work, supplemented by a recommendation on Home Work at its 83rd conference. This was a significant landmark, as for the first time, it gave HBWs international recognition as workers, who as such, are entitled to basic rights under international law. A subsequent and important landmark came in 2000 at the South Asia Regional Policy Seminar - a joint initiative of UNIFEM, International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO) – from which emerged the “Kathmandu Declaration”. This document defined the nature of progressive policies and programmes that were needed to promote the rights of
women in the informal sector, and facilitated the establishment of HomeNet South Asia (HNSA) in 2000, jointly by UNIFEM and SEWA.

Under the umbrella of HomeNet South Asia (HNSA), five national networks/HomeNets exist in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. A major focus of UNIFEM’s Regional Home Based Workers Programme in both Phase I (2002-2004) and Phase II (2004-2007) has been facilitation of the growth and strengthening of these networks. These networks *inter alia* have aimed at: increasing the visibility and recognition of HBWs by governments and other key actors; contributing to a greater understanding of the size and scope of HBWs in South Asia; increasing the influence and capacities of sub-regional and national home based networks and finally, facilitating improved access to markets and social security for HBWs. More broadly, the regional initiative has worked towards generating data on HBWs and organizations working in conjunction with them; strengthening and supporting their organizations and networks at national and regional levels in South Asia; and supporting efforts made by HBWs themselves to address the multiple challenges and obstacles they face.

### 1.3 Programme Goal and Strategies

Building on the achievements of the first phase of the programme Strengthening Home Based Networks in South (and Southeast Asia), and incorporating lessons learned from the end of programme evaluation report (2004), the second phase of the programme focused on achieving the goal that was articulated as: *Ensuring the full realization of human rights of women home based workers (HBWs) in Asia.*

The following strategies were implemented to achieve the above stated goal:

- **Advocacy and policy dialogue** to support stronger implementation of commitments to issues faced by women HBWs in the informal sector;

- **Building sustainable knowledge and action networks** that bring women HBWs, their associated networks and groups, women’s organizations, governments, UN organizations and other actors together to impact policies and programmes affecting the lives of HBWs;

---

---

---

---
- **Capacity-building** of women HBWs, their networks and relevant key actors (such as governments, organizations, and departments) to influence the priorities, policies, and programmes that affect the lives of women HBWs;

- **Disseminating knowledge on emerging issues and innovative solutions** with regards to women HBWs through effective use of new and traditional information and communications technologies and materials;

- **Experimentation on the ‘how to’ of improving the lives and livelihoods** of women HBWs through strategic piloting so that concrete experience can inform mainstream strategies.

It was anticipated that these strategies to implement the activities outlined in the Phase II Logical framework would contribute to increased institutional and financial sustainability of HBW networks and initiatives in South and Southeast Asia, within the context of an enabling environment.

The logical framework developed for the programme is best understood in the context of outcome 6 and corresponding outputs 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 of the UNIFEM Global Strategic Plan (SP), 2008-2011, and the South Asia Sub-Regional Strategy (SRS), which stipulates that women workers who are subject to exclusion and/or discrimination should themselves be able to successfully advocate for the incorporation of their priorities into relevant national policies, programmes, budgets, and processes. Outputs 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 respectively, stipulate that women HBWs should be able to 1) participate in and influence all stages of planning, development and implementation of concerned policies, programmes, budgets, and processes; 2) benefit from increased resources to support their advocacy work; and 3) benefit from increased access to relevant forums for voicing their priorities. This is in line with a rights-based approach, and is also reflected in the projected outcomes of phase II of the programme, namely, the emergence of an enabling environment for HBWs and their networks so that they can press for legislative reform with regard to their economic and social rights. More specifically, the programme aimed at facilitating increase in the capacity

---

9 The UNIFEM strategic plan, 2008-2011 provides strategic policy and management direction for UNIFEM to increase its development effectiveness, strengthen strategic partnerships and mobilize resources for the next four years. It outlines how UNIFEM will work in partnership with United Nations system Member States and civil society organizations to contribute to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other internationally agreed goals. The strategic plan builds on achievements and lessons learned from the previous multiyear funding framework, 2004-2007 (MYFF), as well as relevant decisions 2004/10, 2005/22, and 2006/21 of the Executive Board of UNDP/UNFPA.

of HBWs for bottom-up advocacy, by ensuring that women HBWs gain ownership over HBW networks. Further it was aimed at ensuring that these networks become self-sustainable so that HBWs are capacitated to play a leading role in issues that concern their economic and social rights.

1.4 Planned Outcomes and Outputs

The projected outcomes and corresponding outputs\(^\text{10}\) from the second phase of the programme were as follows:

- **Existence of sustainable organizations of HBWs and their networks at the national and sub-regional levels in South Asia.**
  - Strong, representative, financially sustainable networks are legally established which are able to successfully achieve their mandates at the sub-regional and national levels in South Asia.
  - HBWs expand their regional and national membership bases towards institutional sustainability.
  - Regional and national HBW networks have skills in resource mobilization in order to achieve their own financial sustainability.
  - Knowledge sharing, networking and cross-national learning contribute to enhanced capacities of regional and national networks.

- **Existence of enabling policy environment for women HBWs/ informal sector workers in South Asia.**
  - Increased consensus among governments on the nature of policy and legislative measures needed for promoting the rights of women HBWs in the member countries.
  - HBWs and their networks are better able to advocate for legislative reform with regards to HBWs’ economic and social rights in member countries.
  - Increased public and government awareness of and commitment to HBWs’ rights to social protection and healthy working conditions.

- **Improved response from government and the private sector on social protection measures and schemes for HBWs.**
  - Women HBWs and their associated groups are better informed regarding the different types of social protection schemes.
  - Improved capacity of HBWs to advocate for and participate in different schemes in South Asia.
  - Improved understanding among governments and the private sector on the need for social protection for HBWs in South Asia.

---

\(^{10}\) See Home Based Workers, Phase II Project Document 2004
The present evaluation is an important and crucial exercise as it identifies lessons learnt after the completion of Phase II, highlights the programme’s strengths as well as weaknesses and constraints, and generates recommendations for strategic and programmatic improvements in future.

11 See Home Based Workers, Phase II Project Document 2004
1.5 Key Programme Stakeholders and Partners

Stakeholders identified for the programme, apart from UNIFEM, included SEWA, which has a long history of working with the informal sector and particularly women, and the Federation Dutch Labour Movement (FNV), the prime donor for the programme since 2002.

As the programme covers five countries, the nodal organizations in these countries were the key partners, namely, HomeNet Bangladesh (HNB) and Bangladesh Homeworkers Women Association (BHWA) in Bangladesh, HomeNet India (HNI) and SEWA in India, HomeNet Nepal (HNN) in Nepal, and HomeNet Pakistan (HNP) and Aurat Foundation in Pakistan.

Other stakeholders included key ministries and government departments at the national and provincial levels, such as the ministries of Labour, Women Development, Planning and Statistics. In the context of South Asian Region, the external affairs ministries too had an important role to play as the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC) provided a common platform to countries of this region to discuss issues related to developing a better trade-related environment amongst the member countries.

Another important stakeholder includes organizations working for HBWs, and of course, the home based workers themselves.

1.6 Organization of the Report

The evaluation report, including this chapter, consists of four chapters. Chapter Two discusses the Evaluation Approach, spelling out the objectives and scope of evaluation, criteria and evaluation questions, the evaluation methodology and its coverage. Chapter Three, based on findings of the evaluation, forms the crux of the report wherein details are given of the findings vis-à-vis the programme’s efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, impact and sustainability, particularly with regard to the role played by the HomeNets in the member countries. It also offers a comparative analysis of the situation, challenges, and achievements of each one of the member country. The last chapter (Chapter Four) sums up the report and points the way for better performance by showcasing good practices and by making recommendations for the future programming of UNIFEM’s regional programme for HBWs in South Asia.
Chapter II: EVALUATION APPROACH

This chapter discusses the evaluation approach adopted by CMS social for the evaluation of UNIFEM’s Regional Programme for Home Based Workers in South Asia Phase II (2004-07).

2.1 Evaluation Purpose and Scope

This is an external final evaluation conducted as an in-depth analysis of UNIFEM’s programmes (approaches, strategies and interventions) and advocacy initiatives to support HBWs, both at the regional level and with clear and specific country priorities in Bangladesh, India, Nepal and Pakistan. This (non-mandatory) evaluation was conducted, under the management of the UNIFEM SRO, with the broad objective of generating comprehensive and specific evaluation feedback on the regional HBW programme. The evaluation focused on assessing the effectiveness, sustainability (and capacity), relevance, efficiency and impact of the programme. It identifies lessons learned - highlighting programme strengths as well as weaknesses and constraints - and generate recommendations for strategic and programmatic improvements, and the expansion of the programme's reach in future.12

The evaluation will serve as a key document for UNIFEM’s organizational learning, at both the regional and country levels, and for its partners and concerned governments in South Asia.

The evaluation makes assessments at the regional, national and localised community level (i.e. amongst communities of home based workers). The evaluation was undertaken in accordance with the Evaluation guidelines of UNIFEM, HQ, and the United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation.13

The evaluation is qualitative in nature and is rooted in the core principles of gender equality and women’s human rights and empowerment. The human rights based approach, which is premised on developing the capacities of rights-holders to claim their rights, and of duty-bearers to fulfill their obligations, was applied as a critical benchmark in the design of this evaluation study.

---

12 Terms of Reference for the Evaluation
2.2 Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The discussion of findings in the evaluation report is done using the standard five OECD/DAC\textsuperscript{14} evaluation criteria for development assistance. These are:

- Efficiency
- Effectiveness
- Relevance
- Impact
- Sustainability of the programme

\textit{Efficiency}

The assessment includes evaluation of the overall programme performance, the outputs in relation to the inputs, the financial management to answer the following questions:

- How efficiently have the programme resources (financial and human) been used, and if activities and outputs could have been delivered with fewer resources without reducing their quality/quantity?
- How vital have HNSA, the five national HomeNets and partner organizations been in leveraging resources and expanding the scope of the programme and support for its overall objectives?

\textit{Effectiveness}

The evaluation assesses the extent to which the programme’s stated objectives have been achieved to answer the following questions:

- How successful has the programme been in facilitating the increased capacity of self-sustained national/regional networks of HBWs in South Asia?
- How effective has the programme been in facilitating positive changes in national and regional legal and policy frameworks?

\textit{Relevance}

The assessment also outlines the degree to which the programme remains justifiable and appropriate in relation to the national/regional/global context and priorities. It seeks an answer to the question:

\textsuperscript{14} The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
Do programme priorities and objectives adequately and accurately reflect the needs and priorities articulated by HBWs? If not, how can next phase of the programme be better designed to do this?

**Impact**

A significant part of the assessment is about what the programme has achieved and is likely to achieve in the future – measuring both the positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes and impacts it might have had on society. Some critical questions addressed are:

- What have been the intended and unintended, positive and negative, and long-term effects of the programme?
- How well placed is the programme to ensure increased upscaling by governments, multilateral/bilateral agencies and donors in the near and long-term future?
- Is the programme likely to have a catalytic effect? How and why?

**Sustainability**

Particular attention has been paid to assess the sustainability of HNSA and the five national HomeNets. The assessment also includes the extent to which the programme has adequately capacitated HBWs, and how much they are likely to be further empowered to advocate for their rights. Some questions raised under sustainability parameter are:

- To what extent has the establishment of National HomeNets led to the creation of sustainable processes and systems for bottom-up advocacy, networking and capacity development at the national and regional levels?
- Are the relevant stakeholders willing to ensure the continued strengthening of the networks created? Are HBWs themselves willing and able to push for policy change aimed at incorporating their needs and interests into national and regional policy directives?

### 2.3 Evaluation Methodology

*CMS social evaluation team* decided in consultation with UNIFEM SARO that a qualitative approach was appropriate to acquire the relevant information for the final evaluation. Initially, as stated in the ToR, a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches was contemplated. However, due to the time and cost constraints, it was not feasible to undertake a quantitative evaluation with a robust sample that would represent the target
population, namely, HBWs. Another constraint in carrying out a quantitative evaluation was that the very scope of the study envisaged that only two of the countries, namely, India and Nepal would be evaluated onsite (i.e. the evaluation team would visit selected locations) and the other two (Bangladesh and Pakistan) offsite (i.e. by sharing of information and views/opinions through telephonic interviews or e-mail). Furthermore, the design of the programme placed emphasis on approaches, strategies and interventions to make visible the issue of HBWs and, evidently, required the evaluation team to conduct in-depth interviews and discussions with stakeholders. In the backdrop of the above-mentioned reasons, a qualitative evaluation was considered the appropriate approach.

*CMS social* evaluation team comprised three senior researchers led by a team leader (See Annex 2). All the team members had rich experience of qualitative research and previous research studies on labour-related issues as well as on gender-specific concerns related to employment, livelihood and social protection.

Each team member was responsible for reviewing the secondary information as well as the information gathered through primary research for one of the four countries assessed. While constituting the team it was ensured that one member of the team understood and spoke at least one of the three languages (Bengali, Hindi or Urdu) being largely spoken in these countries, besides English. In Gujarat (India) as well in Nepal, a local person accompanied the evaluation team to interpret the discussion with respondents, wherever needed. Each team member contributed to the evaluation right from the designing of research tools to conducting interviews and discussions to analysis of findings and report writing.

*Research techniques and tools used:* Information was gathered through secondary research (See Annex 4) as well as primary investigation, using suitable research techniques and tools (See Annex 5).

The different methods adopted to collect and collate the necessary information included:

- **Desk Review of documents:** Prior to designing the research tools, a review of documents provided by UNIFEM and available on the Internet was carried out so as to understand the programme and issues of concern to the HBWs.

- **In-depth Interviews:** In India and Nepal, CMS social team conducted face-to-face interviews with the key stakeholders of the programme.
Focused Group Discussions: In India and Nepal, CMS social team also conducted group discussions with those HBWs in rural and urban locations who were associated with member organizations of HomeNet.

Telephonic and email-based interviews: In the offsite evaluation, carried out in Bangladesh and Pakistan, CMS social conducted interviews either through telephone or by e-mail. Being off site locations, FGDs were not possible in these two countries.

CMS social evaluation team developed separate In-depth Interview (IDI) and/or Focus Group Discussion (FGD) guidelines for each respondent group to elicit the relevant information. These guidelines were meant to serve as research tools that would trigger the discussion and ensure that the discussion captured the views of the respondent on the important parameters of the evaluation. The research tools were finalized in consultation with UNIFEM SARO, New Delhi.

Selection of Respondents: A list of probable respondents representative of different stakeholders like government officials, office bearers of member organizations and home based workers (in case of offsite countries only) was provided by HomeNets and UNIFEM.

In onsite countries i.e. India and Nepal, selection of HBWs was done in consultation with the representatives of HomeNets/member organizations in the places visited by the evaluation team. It was ensured by CMS social evaluation team that HBWs respondent group should have representation from both rural as well as urban locations.

In the offsite countries, most of the interviews were conducted only through telephone except with the officials of HomeNets and UNIFEM. In the latter cases, the IDI guidelines were sent to them in advance, which was duly filled in and sent back to the evaluation team. A brief interaction over telephone was also conducted in case any response (s) needed clarification or elaboration. For telephonic interviews, respective HomeNets informed the respondents in advance about the date on which they will receive a call from the CMS social evaluation team. This was done to ensure their availability and convenience. However, in many cases, repeated calls had to be made because of poor connectivity or non-availability of respondents due to some unforeseen engagement.

Coverage: The assessment was done at the national and localized community levels. The places visited in India were Ahmedabad, Mehsana (both in the state of Gujarat) Udaipur (in the state of Rajasthan), Patna (in the state of Bihar), and Delhi (national capital). The urban
locations were the localities within Ahmedabad and Udaipur city, while rural locations were village Kolivada in Mehsana district, village Shishvi in Udaipur and village Nasriganj in Patna, where the evaluation team visited to conduct interviews and for group discussion with HBWs. One interview in India was done through e-mail (Chennai, Tamil Nadu) while two interviews were conducted over telephone (Gurgaon, Haryana and Delhi). All officials of Government of India attached with different ministries were interviewed in Delhi. In Nepal, the team visited three districts namely, Kathmandu, Pokhara and Bhaktapur. HBWs residing with in urban limits were interviewed in all the three districts visited by the evaluation team. In Bhaktapur and Pokhara, HBWs from rural locations were interviewed at the centre of the member based organizations’ (MBO) with which they were associated. The senior officials of different ministries and a representative of ILO participated in a round table discussion held in Kathmandu along with representatives of HomeNet Nepal, trade unions and UNIFEM among others.

In Pakistan and Bangladesh, the evaluation was done offsite, i.e. through email and telephonic interviews. In Pakistan, calls were made to Islamabad, Lahore, Muzaffargarh and Quetta. In Pakistan, HBWs and representatives of MBOs from villages like Hamza Ali in Muzaffargarh and Meriyabad and Ibrahimzai in Quetta were interviewed. In Bangladesh, evaluation team spoke to respondents in Dhaka, Barisal, Gopalganj, Jhenaidah and Sirajganj. Besides talking to HBWs residing in the urban locations of these districts, the evaluation team spoke to a few HBWs in two villages, namely, Bakhergunj and Paschim Kunia of Barisal district. A senior official of Ministry of Labour in the Government of Bangladesh was interviewed on telephone.
Earlier reports have shown that as HBWs, women outnumber men.\textsuperscript{15} As the overall objective of UNIFEM’s programme was to strengthen home based workers’ networks as a means to combat women’s lack of rights and voice in the informal sector, the evaluation team interacted only with women HBWs.

The sample respondents in the four countries who participated in the evaluation are shown in Table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent group</th>
<th>Research Technique</th>
<th>Sample size (in number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials of concerned Ministries like Labour &amp; Employment, Statistics and Programme Implementation, External Affairs</td>
<td>In-depth Interview</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIFEM Programme Officers (current and ex-)</td>
<td>In-depth Interview</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Executive Council and Office bearers of HomeNet</td>
<td>In-depth Interview</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functionaries of member organizations/ individual members</td>
<td>In-depth Interview</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBWs who are members of HomeNet</td>
<td>In-depth Interview</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBWs who are members of HomeNet</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
<td>4 groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangladesh</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pakistan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\#Round table discussion

*Two during round table discussions where functionaries of different member organizations were present

**Analysis of Responses:** All interviews and group discussions were audio recorded and transcribed to capture the key responses. The responses were put in a matrix table developed to collate the responses against the research questions and identified parameters. The individual and group responses were cross-checked with the data and information provided through various documents by the respective country’s HomeNets and UNIFEM SARO.

**Study Timeline:** It may be mentioned that the timeline of the study was initially fixed at four months (December 2008 – March 2009), and was extended by a month later. The extension was mainly necessitated by non-availability of respondents.

\textsuperscript{15} ILO 2002 b and National Labour Force Survey of respective countries, cited in Overview and Journey of Home-Based Workers in South Asia. Jeemol Unni and Renana J.
2.4 Limitations of the Evaluation

One of the constraints of the evaluation faced was the paucity of relevant literature. In the past, most of the research studies had focused on HBWs engaged in a particular activity (like beedi-a type of cigarette-rolling, agarbatti-incense stick-making, etc.), and not on HBWs as a whole. Consequently, not much reference material was available other than those provided by UNIFEM and HomeNets. Another drawback was that in the case of offsite locations, namely Bangladesh and Pakistan, reliance on telephonic interviews meant that the selection of respondents, particularly HBWs, was dependent on the respective HomeNets. During telephonic interviews in particular, a problem faced was poor connectivity or non-availability of the identified person (respondent) for the interview. This led to delays in completing the interviews as per the schedule indicated in the work plan. Further, it is pertinent to mention here that the information and data, particularly on membership of HBWs, provided by respective HomeNets could not be cross-checked or verified with other sources. Another important limitation was that the break-up of the fund utilization in the activities undertaken during this programme period (2004-07) was not available to enable analysis of pattern of utilization of funds. Finally, due to logistical constraints, the programme was not assessed in Sri Lanka.
Chapter III: FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

The present chapter discusses the findings of the evaluation exercise undertaken by CMS social team. The backdrop to the discussion of the findings is the programme objectives and strategies laid down to meet the goal of the programme. The discussion in this chapter focuses on the progress of the programme from 2002 onwards in terms of five evaluation criteria, namely Efficiency, Effectiveness, Relevance, Impact and Sustainability, as mentioned in the previous chapter. The discussion on each one of the parameters includes identification of key gaps in programme implementation which could be construed as lessons learnt for future phase of the programme.

It is necessary to state here that the use of the five criteria to evaluate the programme is based on information and data made available at the respective national HomeNets. Due to non-availability of the break-up of the fund utilization for different activities undertaken during the programme period, the analysis of pattern of utilization of the funds could not be done. Moreover, in the absence of any benchmarks being fixed against the activities listed in the logical framework developed for the programme, it was difficult to do a comparative assessment.

3.1 Efficiency

To assess the efficient utilization of fund, the evaluation examined (a) range of activities carried out during the programme period; (b) mobilization of resources from funding agencies other than FNV; and (c) growth of membership of HomeNets.

At the South Asia regional level, the information on the flow of funds from the FNV to HNSA and HomeNets (in USD) is given in Table 3.1. However, detailed information on activity-wise fund utilization was not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount (in USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>209,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>249,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>521,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>120,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,101,380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNIFEM SARO
At the regional level, the initial focus of fund utilization was on getting HNSA registered as a legal entity, which required several rounds of meetings and deliberations amongst partners. Ideally, for better operational coordination, it should have been registered in any one of the five member countries. Instead, it was registered in Mauritius in 2007. It took a little over five years to get it registered. Citing the reasons for doing so, Coordinator, HNSA explained: “Initially we tried to get it registered in one of the five member countries, but the country-specific laws and regulations caused various hurdles in smooth transition of activities.” For example, one of the major problems identified was that funds could not be transferred from India to other member countries. Also, to receive funds from outside required a Foreign Contribution (Regulation) Act (FCRA) certificate. Furthermore, the emerging political scenarios in these countries coupled with uncertain diplomatic relations with other countries led to further delay in the process of getting HNSA registered. Against this backdrop, the registration of HNSA could finally be achieved in 2007. HomeNet South Asia has established an operational office in Ahmedabad, India for coordinating the activities taken under the programme.

Funds were utilized for an equally important meeting in February 2006 by HomeNet South Asia, namely a three-day conference on Social Protection - A Policy Dialogue at New Delhi, which was attended by participants from all the five networks, as also Ministry of Labour officials and representatives of insurance companies. The workshop helped in identifying the niche areas on social security in the member countries and the outcomes of this dialogue are being translated into advocacy knowledge products. Further, to understand and address the concern with regard to social protection, in June 2006 HNSA published a report based on an action research study done by the Institute of Social Studies Trust (ISST) in the five countries of South Asia. Financially supported by the Ford Foundation, this study covered three critical categories of HBWs, namely: (i) Weaving and garments workers (in all five network countries); (ii) Poorest of poor - pottery and pearl workers in Bangladesh, incense stick rollers in India, handmade paper makers in Nepal, pottery workers in Pakistan; (iii) Social security measures for these workers in respective countries in terms of interventions made by their governments for the empowerment of the workers. The ISST study came out with crucial findings: Non-timely payments; more work load; absence of minimum wage; and lack of market information, credit facilities and skill training. These well researched findings were used for strengthening the advocacy efforts under the programme.

---

16 During face to face interview with CMS social evaluation team at Ahmedabad, India on February 3, 2009
Another noteworthy initiative of the programme was to bring more visibility to its network by creation of a website (www.HomeNetsouthasia.org). It is however essential to update the website at regular intervals to retain its relevance and impact.\(^{17}\) In order to give visibility to the issue of HBWs, the HomeNets have also come out with journals, publications and a compilation of technical papers presented by different authors during the Policy Conference on Home Based Workers of South Asia, organized at New Delhi in January 2007. The fact that this conference was inaugurated by the Prime Minister of India, Dr Manmohan Singh points to the significance attached to HBWs. Dr Singh, in his speech, highlighted the current invisibility of home based workers and made a commitment to take forward the National Policy for home based workers in India and also to promote their issues at the SAARC level. One clear outcome of this conference was the setting up of an Independent Group on HBWs by the Government of India. The concluding session of the conference was chaired by the Cabinet Secretary to the Government of India, Mr B.K. Chaturvedi. The conference was attended by senior officials from the line ministries of South Asian countries. This gave a positive indication of the political will at the highest level and greater visibility of HBWs and their issues at all levels.

During the initial phase of the programme, a great deal of HNSA’s time and energy went into establishing itself and helping HomeNets in the member countries to establish and form a link amongst themselves.

Through its advocacy efforts, HNSA has forged partnerships with international and regional agencies like WIEGO, the Global Labour Institute and the Ethical Trading Initiative on issues of concern to HBWs. On the partnership, the former Regional Programme Director, UNIFEM SARO, had this to say: \textit{“It was a strategic decision to involve institutions like the Harvard Institute of International Development (HIID) and WIEGO, to support the advocacy efforts with well-researched data and information. These initiatives, in turn, well supported the efforts made in the direction of bringing to fore the issues and concerns related to HBWs.”} \(^{18}\)

Funds were also used to facilitate the country-specific HomeNets to write proposals for funding and strengthening the network within the country. As a result, recent funding support has come from the Ford Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and from SAARC under the initiative SABAH-South Asian Business Association for Home Based Workers.

\(^{17}\) Evaluation team last visited the website on March 9, 2009

\(^{18}\) During face to face interview with CMS social evaluation team at Kathmandu, Nepal on February 10, 2009
To sum up at the regional level, resources were spent primarily on initiatives like establishing HNSA; organizing conferences and workshops at the regional level; advocacy efforts at regional and international levels; developing websites; and mobilizing funds from external sources.

The Bangladesh chapter of HNSA, HomeNet Bangladesh (HNB), was registered in 2004. It has received between 2003 and 2006, a little over 50,000 USD (Table 3.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Amount in Bangladeshi Taka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 (1st July-31st Dec.)</td>
<td>Leaflet Printing, Calendar Printing, Staged Spot Drama, Article Writing, Production &amp; Distribution of bulletin, Mapping on HBWs, Workshop</td>
<td>5,33,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 (1st April to 30th June)</td>
<td>Printing poster, Media Campaign, Training Programme, Network Formation Meeting (National Level), National Policy &amp; Social Protection Meeting</td>
<td>210,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 &amp; 2006 (1st October 2005-31st March 2006)</td>
<td>Skill upgradation Training, Training for candle making, Embroidery, Cutting &amp; Sewing, Daylong Workshop (National Level), Daylong Workshop (Fifty areas of different District), Organised Women’ Day Rally (22 Areas of different District), Discussion on HBWs &amp; informal Sector in electronic media (TV)- Interview with Labour Minister</td>
<td>18,84,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HNB

HNB primarily spent the fund on creating awareness among the population about the issue of HBWs. To support this activity, HNB used funds on printing of IEC materials like leaflets, calendars, posters etc. Ten spot dramas were staged to raise public awareness on the importance of ratifying ILO Convention 177.

An example of advocacy materials developed is the poster "Amar Bari, Amar Kormokhetro", which means "My Home, My Workplace" in Bangla. Developed and distributed by Bangladesh Homeworkers Women Association (BHWA), the poster portrays through pictures and visualization that a poor woman can come out of her misery and achieve success by converting her house into a workplace. She does not need to desert her family and children and leave her home in search of employment. In other words, she can engage in gainful home based work. Posters like this have the power of conveying a strong message that can motivate lots of underprivileged people to become home based workers and improve their economic condition. Other member countries too developed similar posters in their respective languages for giving visibility to the issue of home based work.

Another important activity on which funds were utilized was mapping of HBWs and organizations working for HBWs in as many as 64 districts of Bangladesh.
HNB has created its own website (www.homenetbangladesh.org) to give further visibility to the problems of HBWs. Another example of efficient fund utilization as per programme objectives was that HNB organized about 30 area meetings with HBWs between July 2006 and March 2007, as well as with other stakeholders including journalists, research institutes and ministry officials to sensitize them on the issue of the vulnerability and rights of HBWs. Four workshops were also organized on specific HBW related issues, including data collection on HBWs, minimum wage, development of identity cards, and occupational health and safety.

An instructive indicator of the efficient fund utilization by HNB is that the membership, reportedly, increased steadily over the programme period (Graph1).

Graph 1: Membership Trend of HomeNet Bangladesh (in numbers)

In India, HomeNet India (HNI), was established in 2001 after the Kathmandu Declaration, and was registered in 2003. Information on fund utilization pattern was provided by HNI for only one financial year 2003-04. For the remaining years of the programme period, HNI could not provide information on fund utilization due to logistical reasons.

It utilized the funds primarily for setting up HNI, organizing workshops towards formation of a registered network, carrying out advocacy meetings with policymakers, and bringing HBWs under the network through mapping exercise of organizations. These activities were taken up simultaneously. On the time and effort put in towards finalizing the constitution of HNI, a senior office-bearer of HNI stated: "The process of framing the constitution of the network took around four to five consultation meetings."\(^{19}\) Funds were also utilized to highlight the issues of HBWs in different sectors. For example, in 2003, HNI organized a People’s court for beedi (a type of cigarette) workers of Gujarat followed by a two-day workshop on employment opportunities for women in the food processing industry with the Ministry of Food Processing, Government of India. Similarly, a national-level workshop on

\(^{19}\) During face to face interview with CMS social evaluation team at Ahmedabad, India on February 2, 2009
agarbatti (incense stick) workers was organized by HNI and as a follow up of the workshop, HNI presented a memorandum of action (to Government of India) to ameliorate the working conditions in this industry.

Another important activity on which HNI used the available fund was on the mapping exercise to identify the organizations working for HBWs across the country and on research studies, like the one carried out by the Disaster Mitigation Institute, Ahmedabad on assessing the needs of HBWs after the floods in Gujarat (2003). HNI also developed a video on the status of HBWs for creating awareness and doing advocacy on the issue. Some indication on pattern of fund utilization by HNI may be had from Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Fund Utilization Pattern of HNI (during April 2003-June 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Amount in Indian Rupees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Workshop on Agarbatti workers</td>
<td>273,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead (Salary, Conveyance, Communication, Poster Design)</td>
<td>167,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Committee Meetings</td>
<td>156,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping Exercise</td>
<td>69,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Study on HBW</td>
<td>55,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Expenses</td>
<td>53,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>775,835</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HNI

As part of fund mobilization, in addition to mobilizing funds from other sources, HNI levied a smaller membership fee on HBWs. The fee structure suggests that membership based organizations contribute Indian Rupee (INR) 0.25 per member per year to a minimum fee of INR 100 ($2 approx.). Other category of organizations are supposed to contribute INR 500 ($10 approx.) annually and individual members INR 100 ($2 approx) annually. In addition to this, a one-time entrance fee of INR 51/- ($1 approx.) is paid by each person to become a member. However, information on the total contribution received through the membership fee was not available to the evaluation team due to logistical difficulties. Currently, HNI is operating from the premises of SEWA. It may be inferred that the amount saved on rent account is being utilized on other heads.

Graph 2: Membership Trend of HomeNet India (in numbers)

Among the notable outcomes of the activities examined above, which reflect the efficient utilization of resources was, expansion of the membership base i.e. increase in the number of HBWs brought within the network over the programme period (Graph 2). Further, HNI’s advocacy efforts led to drafting of a national policy for HBWs.
In Nepal, HomeNet Nepal (HNN), registered in 2001, (www.homenetnepal.org) utilized its funds chiefly for policy advocacy, mapping the individual HBWs and organizations working for HBWs in 20 out of the 75 districts of Nepal and skill upgradation. HNN organized a national-level workshop on HBWs, entitled the “Role of Home Based Workers in National Economy of Nepal” (2002) and held four policy-level meetings, using the fund received from UNIFEM. In addition to the fund received from FNV/UNIFEM and HNSA/IUP (in 2008-09), HNN also received funds from other donors like ActionAid Nepal, Ford Foundation, GTZ, Nepal Swiss Community Forestry Program, Poverty Alleviation Fund, and Nepal-Britain Forest Project.

HNN reportedly spent 11.04 lakh Nepali Rupees (14,000 USD approx.) on activities like policy advocacy and mapping exercise in the financial years 2002 and 2003. In the subsequent year (2004) too, funds were utilized to map and initiate policy discourses at the regional and central level in Nepal. In 2004, HNN also received around 1300 USD from ActionAid Nepal to initiate policy discourses. As a result of its advocacy efforts, HNN in 2005 and 2006 received from the Ford Foundation a sum of 19,000 USD to carry out an action research on the need assessment and possibilities of social protection of HBWs. Of late, in 2008-09, HNN mobilized around 16,000 USD from GTZ, Nepal Swiss Community Forestry Program, Poverty Alleviation Fund, Nepal Britain Forest Project for skill upgradation of 154 HBWs from rural areas. HNN also received around 34000 USD under urban poverty reduction programme from HNSA to upgrade the skills of urban HBWs in Nepal. As per the information shared on the capacity building of HBWs, HNN has organized 15 training programmes covering over 1100 HBWs.

It appears that there is a growing concern among donors to provide assistance for programmes meant for HBWs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Amount in Nepali Rupees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Policy Advocacy</td>
<td>3,51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>7,53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Mapping</td>
<td>6,80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Strengthening the networks</td>
<td>12,40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Strengthening the networks</td>
<td>13,35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Policy Advocacy</td>
<td>4,92,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>Policy Advocacy</td>
<td>3,80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the course of various activities under the programme, HNN has identified around 20,000 HBWs. As per HNN constitution, an HBW shall be a member of HNN by paying Nepali Rupees (NR) 100 as one time entry fee and NR 25 annually. On membership figure, the remark of
the Executive Director of HNN is relevant: "The membership strength does not imply that they are receiving membership fee from all." In other words, the effective strength of membership is less than the total HBWs identified by HNN.

The overall review of the funding process reveals that on an average, HNN received nearly 18 lakh NR (23000 USD) per annum. The amount was utilized primarily on skill upgradation and mapping followed by policy discourse and a workshop. Vis-à-vis the expenditure, the membership base expanded on an average of 4000 (approx.) per annum.

In Pakistan, prior to the formation of HomeNet Pakistan (HNP) in 2005, the focal organization Aurat Foundation carried out a mapping exercise of HBWs in 2001. The fund utilization information from HNP was not available for analysis. However, according to other information provided by HNP, around 56,000 HBWs are reportedly associated with HNP. The Programme Manager of HNP, clarified: "Till now, HNP didn’t charge any membership fee, but recently the idea has been circulated among members and member organizations to seek their views on the same." In 2004-05, information on organizations working for HBWs was collected for the first time. The figure of 2003 was based on the exercise conducted by Aurat Foundation.

Though HNP was established immediately after the Kathmandu Declaration in 2000, it could be registered only in 2005 (i.e. in the second phase of the programme) and currently reaches out to 86 districts.
For giving visibility to HNP, it has created its own website www.homenetpakistan.org.

Further, HNP as part of its advocacy activities went out and involved 538 member organizations, mainly at the district level across Pakistan. Along with Sungi Foundation, one of the key member organizations, the network of HNP has its presence in more than 60 districts of Pakistan. Like its counterparts in other countries, HNP focused its resources on raising awareness on HBWs. For example, it proactively facilitated exposure visits for around 100 HBWs and organized a number of awareness meetings for 585 HBWs in five provinces of Pakistan. HNP also organized 15 advocacy roundtables with 462 councillors, legislators, lawyers and media persons to deliberate on the rights of HBWs. During the programme period, HNP facilitated four two-day legal literacy workshops with 214 participants, including lawyers, media professionals, social activists and councillors. According to the Programme Manager of HNP, the major source of funding was HNSA. On efforts put to mobilise funds from other sources, she added, "There was no strategy in the initial programme phase to make efforts to pitch for external donors. However, since 2007, concerted efforts have been made to acquire more resources from the partner organizations. There has been a conscious endeavour to avoid duplication of work and use the expertise of one another."22

Initially, the funds from FNV, IUP, SAARC and UNIFEM were channelized through HNSA. Now, however, apart from HNSA and UNIFEM, HNP is directly getting funds from the International Labour Organization. HNP is also working closely with Sungi Foundation, and expects to receive some funds in future for short-term assignments. HNP also organized a regional workshop in late 2008 as part of experience sharing and learning. As regards staff, HomeNet Pakistan comprises a national coordinator, a programme officer at the national level, and three focal persons in Karachi, Quetta and Peshawar. Currently, HNP is operating from the premises of its focal organization, Aurat Foundation.

To sum up, it may be said that HNP, which received on an average 30000 USD per annum (Source: UNIFEM SARO), like other national HomeNets has spent on advocacy efforts and mapping of HBWs. However, it is notable that HNP expanded its network much more actively and successfully than the other countries.

22 During telephonic interview with CMS social evaluation team from Pakistan on March 30, 2009
One reason among others, for efficient utilization of funds by the four national HomeNets was the support they received from the focal organizations. In Nepal, it was HNSA and other HomeNets which lent the necessary support to HNN.

On efficiency aspect, as the HomeNets could not share the details of utilization of financial resources, the study could not reflect on the optimum utilization of funds in case of availability of fewer resources. In the present set up, the major gap noticed was absence of a Management Information System (MIS) at the national HomeNets level. This acted as a constraint in keeping records and monitoring of fund utilization.

3.2 Effectiveness

This section discusses the effectiveness of the programme in light of the expected outcomes and outputs.

The registration of HNSA and national HomeNets as legal entities could be seen as fulfilment of one of the key outputs of the programme - to have a legally registered network at the national and South Asia level. However, it is pertinent to mention that except HNN, the other three national HomeNets and HNSA could get themselves registered in the second phase of the programme. Highlighting the role of SEWA in setting up the networks, the President of HNSA said, "The role of SEWA as a focal organization in India was not restricted only to setting up HomeNet India, but also played a key role in establishing HomeNet South Asia (HNSA).\(^\text{23}\)"

The setting up of HNSA as a regional network of respective national HomeNets as a result of UNIFEM’s programme, brought HBWs together on a common platform, gave them the strength to unite for a common cause of the region, and also the opportunity to learn and enrich one another with their experiences and expertise. This was confirmed by the Coordinator of HNSA, who said, "The focal organization of each country shared its experience during focal-point meetings, which in turn helped their counterparts in the other countries to adapt it as per their need."\(^\text{24}\)

For example, among HomeNets, HNN was the first to get registered legally, and therefore looked upon as a leader by the other HomeNets who wanted to get registered. Similarly, Aurat Foundation (Pakistan), being a research organization, worked on the Questionnaire format for the mapping exercise. SEWA having worked on the national policy for HBWs in

\(^{23}\) During discussion with CMS social evaluation team at New Delhi, India on January 19, 2009

\(^{24}\) During face to face interview with CMS social evaluation team at Ahmedabad, India on February 3, 2009
India shared its experience with the focal organizations in other three countries to enable them to draft their respective national policies.

This sharing of experiences among member HomeNets and focal organizations, therefore, played a pivotal role in facilitating the process of increasing effectiveness of the programme content. The interactions were also crucial in giving visibility to the HomeNets in their respective countries, albeit in limited pockets or regions. According to the former Senior Programme Officer, UNIFEM SARO, “The participation of representatives of member based organizations in meetings expanded the visibility of the HomeNets among the organizations and their members (HBWs), and about the purpose of coming together.”

The programme was also effective in the sense that it inculcated a sense of identity among HBWs. A few HBWs who attended these meetings and conferences, spoke about how good they felt after the realization of having an identity of their own and the prospects of having a better future.

Initiatives such as holding exhibitions at South Asia regional level (March 2005, Lahore) for knowledge and experience sharing could be seen as an important step in effectively bringing the HBWs to the fore and giving a momentum to the programme.

The programme’s strategy to have the network registered at regional and national level proved effective in mobilizing funds from other donors to promote the cause of HBWs.

The programme was effective with regard to capacity building of the staff associated with respective HomeNets. The handholding by reputed focal organizations in respective countries lent credibility to the networks and helped in the capacity building. The confidence the office-bearers have gained from it is evident in HNSA’s working from its own office and having its own staff.

With regard to another outcome of the programme towards existence of enabling policy environment, the programme was effective in that it supported HomeNets to work towards building an enabling environment for drafting of national policy for HBWs. At the regional level, the SAARC conference organised in January 2007 at New Delhi (India) could be seen as a positive sign of the programme’s effectiveness.

---

25 During face to face interview with CMS social evaluation team at New Delhi, India on April 1, 2009
The third outcome of the programme was to have improved response from government and private sector on social protection measures and schemes for HBWs. Towards this, the respective national HomeNets along with the like-minded organizations and trade unions were able to put pressure on the national governments for passage of social protection bills for unorganised workers which include HBWs as well. However Pakistan, comparatively speaking, was found to be ahead of the other three countries, as the programme was effective in getting three bills introduced in the National Assembly of Pakistan towards protecting the rights of women HBWs. However, in the four countries, the programme could make a limited impact on the private sector.

In **Bangladesh**, besides facilitating HNB in establishing itself as a legal entity, the programme supported HNB to do advocacy at the level of policy makers as well as with civil society groups and media to focus also on difference between HBWs and domestic help. Through these efforts, HNB was able to create awareness amongst stakeholders to some extent about the need for the rights of HBWs.

In **India**, the programme played a key role convincing the Government on the need to bring HBWs into the purview of the Indian National Accounts System. As a result, an independent group on HBWs was set up to firm up the concepts and a definition of HBW. HNI also played a lead role in the drafting of national policy on HBWs, another indicator of the programme’s effectiveness. In 2007, HNI’s participation along with SEWA and other like-minded individuals and organizations, in a dharna (protest) in front of Parliament in New Delhi was another important outcome. This had the desired effect of accelerating the process of passing of Social Security Act in 2008. The Act, meant for unorganized sector workers, is expected to encompass and provide social protection to HBWs as well.

In **Nepal**, HNN’s inclusion as one of the members of the Task Force constituted by the Government of Nepal to draft national policy for HBWs reflects the programme’s effectiveness in the country. The programme’s presence also helped in HNN getting recognition by policy makers and NGOs as an agency working exclusively for the cause of HBWs in Nepal. The programme was effective in initiating the policy discourse at regional and central levels on the issue of HBWs. HNN has also been able to independently get funds from national and international donor agencies to implement different programmes for HBWs. Thus another aspect of the programme’s effectiveness was that HNN was able to attract the donor community to give financial support for the cause of HBWs.
In Pakistan, apart from registration of HNP and the mapping exercise to bring HBWs in the network, the programme was able to sensitize the politicians and policy makers on the economic and social rights of HBWs. In addition to drafting of a national policy on HBWs, Pakistan may be seen as a leader among the member countries as a bill was passed in one Provincial Assembly (Balochistan) and three bills (Working Women [Protection of Rights] Act, 2008; Home Based Workers Social Protection Act, 2008; In-House Working Women Protection Act, 2008) were tabled in the National Assembly of Pakistan to ensure social protection for women HBWs.

The discussion above brings out that the programme was effective in facilitating the increased capacity of regional and national HomeNets. However, some gaps were noticed which limited the programme effectiveness.

*HomeNets lacked visibility*: One drawback associated with bringing in a focal organization for handholding is that it overshadows the growth of the new organization - in this case, HomeNet. Focal organizations did help in nurturing the HomeNets and building their capacity, but inadvertently, their presence has not given the HomeNets the space to grow on their own. Another gap was that the programme strategy lacked impetus on marketing concern. While visibility for HBWs as workers is important, one of the prime concerns of the HBWs that needed more attention is marketing of their end products. The programme design did not allow HomeNets to directly work for the marketing of HBWs’ finished products which led to disenchantment among the HBWs.

Further, *lack of regular interactions* between HBWs and HomeNets was found wanting except in Pakistan. In India, representatives of a few member organizations felt that the activities of HomeNet are more centric to its headquarters (north-western region of India). Similarly, in Nepal, the discussion with a group of leaders of small organizations indicated that after initial rounds of meeting between HNN and MBO representatives/HBW, no follow-up meeting was organized to discuss the move-forward plan. In Bangladesh too, some representatives complained that meetings were held infrequently at HNB. The absence of coordination between UNIFEM Bangladesh office and HNB was also noticeable. The programme effectiveness was also affected due to exclusion of ‘un-associated’ HBWs. As part of the programme strategy of organizing and networking, HBWs not associated with any of the MBOs were left out for reasons more to do with logistics. This has led to majority of HBWs not being part of this network, as they were not associated with any organization or group.
3.3 Relevance

Regardless of its initial momentum, no programme or activity can succeed or sustain on its own unless the people for whom it is meant (in this case the HBWs) see its value and relevance.

In its endeavour to give visibility to HBWs at the policy makers’ level and to try and bring them onto one platform, UNIFEM took the benefit of an important landmark which emerged during the South Asia Regional Policy Seminar held in 2000 in Kathmandu (Nepal). This was the Kathmandu Declaration which clearly stated the need to promote the rights of women in the informal sector, and facilitated the establishment of HomeNet South Asia (HNSA) by UNIFEM and SEWA. Prior to the launch of the programme for HBWs in South Asia, UNIFEM had lobbied with fifteen countries in the Asia-Pacific region for the adoption of the ILO Home Work Convention No. 177, supplemented by a recommendation on Home Work at its 83rd conference. This helped to put forward for the first time the concept of treating HBWs as ‘workers.’

In spite of the presence of HBWs in large numbers within every country of the South Asian region, HBWs have remained the ‘invisible’ workforce contributing to the national economy. Thus, one of the biggest challenges of the programme was to give them visibility, not only in the eyes of policy makers, but in the eyes of the HBWs themselves. As admitted by policy makers, during the initial days, the awareness on distinction between a HBW and a domestic help was very low, even at the highest level. People engaged in earning their livelihood by working from home were themselves unaware that they were ‘workers’ contributing to their families’ and nation’s economic well-being. The relevance of the programme was therefore two fold – one, to give HBWs visibility as workers; and two, to empower them to fight for their rights related to getting the right wage/remuneration, having better work conditions and getting social security benefits as a worker.

UNIFEM’s programme thus addressed the felt need to facilitate advocacy for the cause of HBWs and particularly ensuring protection against exploitation. HBWs are paid lowly for their work, have weak bargaining power, no security for their future, and are exposed to health hazards associated with the activities they are engaged in. The programme was relevant because the network formed under it provided a platform to organizations working for and with HBWs to come together and work for policy changes to empower HBWs in the
member countries. The mapping exercise conducted in Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nepal or India was important as it helped to not only identify HBWs in different regions and provinces, but also to understand the issues that needed to be addressed. The programme was equally relevant in terms of sensitizing policy makers, civil society groups, trade unions and media towards the problems of HBWs.

In **Bangladesh**, the relevance of the programme could be gauged from the fact that the focal organization (BHWA) could get itself a trade union status in 2003, after sustained efforts for almost a decade. Prior to this, all efforts made to get the organization registered as a Women Workers group failed as permission was refused even by the Department of Women Affairs. The Department was of the view that home based workers were not workers. The programme and formation of HNB was therefore relevant for the purposes of sensitizing the policy makers, civil society groups, media and even the HBWs.

As reported by respondents, at the beginning of the programme in the country it was not only the general population, but even the government officials, who were unaware about HBWs. They would confuse HBWs with domestic help/workers. Still a lot needs to be done; as a senior government official from Ministry of Labour put it: “Though efforts of HNB and BHWA had to an extent brought the issue to the fore, but plenty still remained to be done (in bringing the issue of HBW to the fore).”

The programme was relevant since it assisted HNB to do advocacy for bringing in policy changes for HBWs at the national level. Low wages, long and irregular working hours, lack of social protection schemes, marketing facilities and skill training for HBWs were some of the issues of great concern for HBWs as well as organizations working for and with HBWs.

In **India**, the relevance of UNIFEM’s programme was easily discernible. Ignorance and invisibility of the plight of HBWs amongst policy makers was very much evident. Very few organizations were working for and with HBWs. This was found by HNI in the initial phase of identifying organizations working for HBWs. Trade unions were mainly formed for workers of organized sector with little or no effort being made to provide a platform for HBWs in the country. Despite the need to expand its base individual HBWs were not encouraged to become direct member of HNI. President of HNI told the evaluation team: “Member-based organizations were given preference, be it unions, SHGs or other organizations. The focus

---
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was on identifying genuine organizations and groups rather than on number. 27 The focus being on credibility, it was found that organizations working for HBWs were few, and restricted to some states and districts in India.

In Nepal, the absence of a national policy for HBWs and non-visibility of HBWs made the initiation of programme relevant. With the diverse and dispersed topography of the country, the mapping exercise under UNIFEM’s programme was helpful to identify the HBWs and their priorities. UNIFEM’s programme not only helped establish HNN but as a result of HNN’s continuous advocacy forced the government of Nepal to establish a Task Force for drafting of National Policy on HBWs and towards setting up of a Labour Commission to look into the labour rights of workers in Nepal.

In Pakistan, the concerns were also similar; HBWs were not covered under the labour laws of the country. These workers were deprived of the social protection schemes. Post Kathmandu Declaration (2000), the issue of HBWs gained some visibility and as such the initiation of the programme around the same time helped in giving momentum to the cause of economic and social empowerment of HBWs in Pakistan. The programme made a vital intervention, as like in other member countries, there was a long felt need for capacity building of HBWs and for providing marketing facilities to them.

To conclude, it clearly emerges from the discussion above that the programme was relevant for the four countries. HBWs not being considered part of the workforce and hence deprived of their rights as a worker, absence of any national policy for HBWs, and need of skill upgradation for HBWs were some of the core issues, which the programme aimed to address. The programme did make progress although in varying degrees on the above-mentioned issues in the four countries.

An important flaw noticed in the programme design was its insistence on using funds only for advocacy and networking purposes. As a result, not enough efforts were made by the national HomeNets to provide marketing avenues to the HBWs, although it was a matter of serious concern of HBWs.

Prior to initiation of the programme, a contextual analysis of the reports and documents available on the feminized poverty and informal sector in context of the South Asia region

27 During Face to face interview with CMS social evaluation team at Ahmedabad on February 2, 2009
was undertaken. At the beginning of the programme no systematic approach was adopted to gather data and information from HBWs, which would have provided baseline information on HBWs and the importance of the need to provide marketing avenues to the HBWs. However, in the programme period, one of the major activities undertaken by each national HomeNet was mapping of HBWs. Each national HomeNet during mapping gathered data and information, which helped the HomeNets to understand HBWs’ socio-economic status.

### 3.4 Impact

UNIFEM’s programme was initiated when there was rapid globalization and trade liberalization. More and more women had to seek various forms of employment at home or on the streets rather than in factories, fields and offices. In the formal sector, workers were being laid off and being compelled to take up self-employment at home, thus forcing them into the informal sector. Further, global marketing pressures compelled firms to cut costs through subcontracting, thus leading to an increase in the number of women employed as piece-rate workers.

The programme during its two phases (2002- present) succeeded in making an impact. The findings of the evaluation, to an extent, are consonant with the positive effects envisaged in the programme documents. The findings clearly suggest that the programme has been able

---

28 Strengthening the Network of Home Based Workers Proposal for Phase 2, UNIFEM SARO, SEWA and HomeNet South East Asia

29 Overview and Journey of Home-Based Workers in South Asia. Jeemol Unni and Renana J.
to give visibility to the issues surrounding HBWs and has convinced the South Asia region of the need and importance of addressing this issue.

At the **South Asia regional level**, one of the key achievements was that it drew the attention of the policy makers at the highest level. Eminent experts and representatives of line ministries from the member countries attended the conference in 2007.

Another key impact of UNIFEM’s programme in India, Nepal and Pakistan has been the government’s decision to draft a national policy on HBWs. However, in Bangladesh, it is HNB which has taken the initiative to draft the policy on its own.

At the national level, in **India**, the offshoot of the South Asian conference on HBWs (2007) was that an Independent Group on Home Based Workers was constituted by the Government of India with a comprehensive Terms of Reference to ensure visibility of HBW in the Indian Data System.\(^{30}\) The formation of this independent group had the desired result. A senior official of Central Statistical Organization, Government of India, told the evaluation team: “*The Independent Group after a lot of deliberations has been able to define the HBWs in the Indian context.*” Further, he added: “*The next round of National Sample Survey in India will have questions, which would help to identify and estimate HBWs in the country.*”\(^{31}\)

---

**Home based workers are—**

(a) own-account workers and contributing family workers helping the own account workers, involved in the production of goods and services, in their homes, for the market and

(b) workers carrying out work in their homes for remuneration, resulting in a product or service as specified by the employer(s), irrespective of who provides the equipment, materials or other inputs used; and those contributing family workers helping such workers. *(Source: Report of the Independent Group on Home Based Workers, India, March 2008)*

---

Once the data on HBWs is available in the country, the process of finalizing the national policy on HBWs will be expedited. A senior official in the Ministry of Labour, Government of India, said, “*Data on HBWs will give momentum to the efforts put towards formulation of a National Policy for HBWs in India.*”\(^{32}\)

The programme to some extent did help in infusing self-confidence amongst the HBWs. The participation of HBWs in the exposure visits and trade fairs organized under the programme and sharing of experience with their fellow HBWs back home has now generated a new kind of competition to improve one’s skills, and enthusiasm among many HBWs. These trips were

---


\(^{31}\) The National Sample Survey (NSS) is a nation-wide, large-scale, continuous survey operation conducted in the form of successive rounds to fill up data gaps for socio-economic planning and policy making through sample surveys. During face to face interview with CMS social evaluation team at New Delhi, India on January 21, 2009

\(^{32}\) During face to face interview with CMS social evaluation team at New Delhi, India on April 6, 2009
not just pleasure trips but helped the workers to develop their existing skills and learn new designs, e.g. as in the case of embroidery and garment stitching. As one HBW from the Bihar state of India said, “My trip to Ahmedabad (Gujarat, India), along with five fellow HBWs for a 15-day skill development training, gave me an opportunity to travel to such a distant place without being accompanied by any family member. The training has helped in upgrading my skills and has infused a new confidence in me.”

In Bangladesh too, the programme has made some impact in terms of bringing together policy makers and other key stakeholders, including HBWs, on a common platform to discuss the issues related to them. A senior official in Ministry of Labour in the Government of Bangladesh had this to say: “The Bangladesh Labour Welfare Foundation Act, 2006 encompasses HBWs as well. In other words, HBWs could avail of benefits, like group insurance and financial assistance at the time of an accident.” This is a significant achievement for this section of the workforce that was just three years back deprived of any benefit from the government.

---

33 During face to face interview with CMS social evaluation team at Patna, India on April 1, 2009
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The programme, to some extent has been able to make HBWs confident. Home based women workers now feel less hesitant to talk and deal with the buyers on business-related matters. In one of the telephonic interviews an HBW residing in Barisal district of Bangladesh had this to say regarding the change she had noticed in herself after becoming associated with the organization: “Being able to converse with a Delhi based researcher without any hesitation and shyness is itself an indicator of the positive change in my confidence.” And this was representative of the feeling in HBWs from other countries as well.

In Nepal, the programme has succeeded in convincing the government to form a Task Force for the preparation of a policy on home based workers. HNN, which has been identified as the nodal agency for the same, has shared the draft policy with the Ministry of Labour, Government of Nepal in late 2008. As aptly put by the Executive Director of HNN, “The programme has been able to gain four wings, namely: (i) Involvement of Trade Unions in HNN’s campaign; (ii) Government’s support; (iii) voices of HBWs; and (iv) Participation of donor communities with resources.” Though in varying degrees, the programme did help HNN in making some dent in these four areas. Despite the internal political unrest, the programme was able to bring organizations working for HBWs under the umbrella of HNN in around 30 districts of Nepal. Similarly, it has been able to generate funds from sources other than FNV/UNIFEM to do policy advocacy, conduct some action research and provide skill upgradation training to HBWs in specific districts.

The programme has been able to infuse confidence amongst HBWs. A HBW in Nepal, echoing the views of the majority of the HBWs said, "Now, I can work and earn even from home. This thought has replaced our earlier mindset- what can I do? ... I cannot go out of home to earn my livelihood.”

In the context of Pakistan, apart from active participation of HNP in policy advocacy, another key effect, which could be attributed to the programme, is the coming together of organizations at the provincial and district levels, giving recognition to the cause of HBWs and making people aware that there is a body called HNP, where they can take up the issue of women HBWs. The policy resolutions for HBWs passed during March 2009 in the Balochistan Assembly is another landmark for the programme in Pakistan. The advocacy efforts are showing desired results, as a senior office-bearer of HNP said, “The awareness campaign and advocacy under the programme has made government and donor agencies aware of the issue of home based workers.”

35 During telephonic interview with CMS social evaluation team from Dhaka on March 31, 2009
36 During face to face interview with CMS social evaluation team at Kathmandu, Nepal on February 13, 2009
37 During face to face interview with CMS social evaluation team at Kathmandu, Nepal on February 10, 2009
show concern for HBWs and take measures to address their problems. Women parliamentarians have shown a keenness to take up policy issues concerning HBWs in the parliament. On the political will, a social activist and ex-Parliamentarian in Pakistan said: “A Policy favouring HBWs was framed and put up in the previous Parliament, but could not be taken up.” She hopes that the current Parliament will do so. Significantly, three bills have been moved in the current National Assembly of Pakistan.

These bills are:

- In House Working Women Protection Act, 2008.

Once passed, these are expected to act as a stepping-stone towards framing of schemes and programmes for empowering HBWs, particularly women.

On changes noticed at HBW level in Pakistan, the activities like trade fairs and exhibitions have helped them to see the kind of products, made by other HBWs and exposed them to marketing skills. On benefits of participating in trade fairs and exhibitions, a representative of a MBO from Quetta said, “Participation in trade fairs and exhibitions has helped HBWs to improve their skills as well as an opportunity to interact and share our experiences with fellow HBWs.”

Across the four countries, the MBOs’ association with their respective national HomeNets has been beneficial to them. It has given them an opportunity to send their members (HBWs), though in limited number, for skill development training, to trade fairs and exhibitions. The exposure visits and interaction with fellow HBWs from different parts of the country and even from other countries, has infused the workers with a new confidence and zeal. Now, they are keen to be part of such trips, where they can share their experience and expertise in the work they do.

To conclude, the programme produced positive impact in all the four countries. It is pertinent to add that no negative impact of the programme on HBWs (such as reluctance on the part of employers to give work to HBWs) was reported. As far as catalytic effect of the programme is concerned, it triggered drafting of national policy for HBWs in respective

---
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countries. Additionally, in India, an independent group on HBWs was constituted by the national government, while in Pakistan, the programme also led to introduction of three bills in the National Assembly.

However, some factors hampered the programme and impacted the final results.

**Political Uncertainty**: Due to the unpredictable and sometimes volatile political scenario within a country, and uncertain diplomatic relations between the countries of the region, visits by members of HomeNets of one country or the other could not take place. For example, during a 10-day exposure visit to SEWA, organized by HNSA in 2002, delegates from Pakistan could not attend the same, as they did not get a visa. A similar situation was faced by participant-members from Bangladesh during the Women Home Based Workers’ Craft Fair organized in Lahore (Pakistan) in 2005.

**Lacked Recognition**: In Nepal, the campaign of HomeNet Nepal was initially seen as more of an NGO module rather than as a labour rights approach. This could be due to less participation of HBWs in advocating and fighting for their rights, which needs to be addressed in future.

**Non-Identification of genuine member based organizations**: To succeed in their ‘bottom-up advocacy’ strategy, HomeNets needed to identify HBWs or organizations working for or/and with HBWs, to bring them in the network. One of the major challenges was to identify HBWs or such organizations. The mapping exercise had both cost and time implications. Reaching out to different parts of a country was, therefore, a challenging task. Yet, it was equally important to identify genuine organizations and groups, and to avoid involving organizations having a vested interest and which were not concerned with the empowerment of the home based workers. Therefore, the spread of HNI was somewhat restricted. As in the case of India, only twelve provinces got represented in the HNI and even from these provinces, member organizations were only from 1-2 districts. Similarly, in Nepal, due to time and cost constraints as well as due to the conflict situation prevailing at that time in the country, the mapping exercise was restricted mainly to district headquarters and it did not cover remote areas. Further, financial constraints made regular interaction between the respective HomeNets and HBWs almost negligible. This adversely impacted efforts to create leaders from among the HBWs in most of the cases.
3.5 Sustainability

The sustainability aspect of a programme is always an issue amongst the stakeholders. A review of UNIFEM’s present programme revealed that the programme design, to some extent, has an inbuilt sustainability component by virtue of facilitating the process of legally forming and establishing a network at the country and South Asia regional level. The legal registration of all national HomeNets and HNSA is a key achievement in this regard. Another programmatic strategy was to have focal organizations in each country to foster the emergence of HomeNets. Further, as the evaluation study found, the networks on their own and with the support of focal organizations have been able to involve the donor community to contribute to the cause.

Handholding by focal organizations: A strategic decision that strengthened the programme was identification of focal organizations in each one of the member countries. Each of these focal organizations was working for the HBWs in their respective countries prior to the launch of this programme. Their familiarity with the sector, issues and community helped in bringing expertise and credibility to the programme. These organizations, besides working in their own countries, also came together under HNSA, which helped all the member countries in benefiting from each other’s experience.

Focal organizations have helped the national HomeNets and HNSA in their registration or in getting donors. In this direction, the SAARC Development Fund (SDF) for opening of Trade Facilitation Centres in the member countries is worth a mention. As a senior official of Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India informed that the fund was provided to SEWA. She further added that this was done for legal reasons, because HNSA, in spite of being registered in Mauritius as a charitable trust, does not hold much of an identity. Therefore, HNSA was taken up as a project by SEWA for channelling the fund received from SDF. Prior to getting permission for having a liaison office in India for practical reasons, the funds were coming through SEWA, but since late 2008, HNSA has been able to get funds directly from Mauritius.
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Regular flow of funds from various sources has helped in sustaining the programme. The South Asia Conference in India (2007), to some extent, also helped in routing the SAARC Development Fund (SDF) to SEWA/HNSA for facilitating the opening of Trade Facilitation Centres (TFC) in the member countries for HBWs engaged in the garment sector. Apart from this the national HomeNets are getting funds from donors other than FNV and UNIFEM.

Engaging Member based Organizations: The basic concept and design of HomeNets has definitely contributed to the programme’s success. Though the outreach of HomeNets is yet to encompass the length and breadth of each member country, it has succeeded in initiating the process and has found favourable response from the member organizations to a large extent. Further, the mapping exercise of HBWs and organizations working for and with HBWs, too, has created a positive attitude among the workers with regard to their future.

To ensure sustainability of the programme, UNIFEM’s partnership with International Agencies like the renowned Harvard Institute of International Development (HIID) and the Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WEIGO), as well as with private sector organizations like the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI), should continue so as to strengthen the efforts to sensitize policy makers and the public about the concerns and needs of HBWs.

Thus to conclude, on sustainability aspect of the programme, the study brings out that the programme has registered networks functioning at regional and national levels, focal organisations are continuing to support the HomeNets and its initiatives. Further, on financial sustainability, mobilization of funds and resources from donor community other than UNIFEM and FNV is an indication of the programme’s progress towards achieving sustainability.
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However, some of the concerns for sustainability of the programme were observed in the course of the evaluation and which should be looked into for the programme’s sustainability in future.

Across the four countries, as per the constitution of each network, representation of member-based organizations, and having HBWs in the committee, is mandatory. Further, the office-bearers should also be democratically elected, to avoid any favouritism and discrimination. However, in our discussion with HBWs and representatives of MBOs, it was observed that the degree of involvement of HBWs varied. The evaluation found that many HBWs are not aware of their association with HomeNets although they largely recognise the organizations with which they are associated. The reason cited by the HomeNets’ representatives was limited fund available under the programme. Since the programme in its initial phase required advocacy both at the policy makers’ and community (HBWs) levels, the frequency of interaction at the grassroots level was limited. Moreover, though the programme in each of the countries initiated the mapping of HBWs and organizations working for and with HBWs, the follow-up meetings and interaction were inadequate.

Opportunities and motivation for HBWs to come forward and push for policy changes aimed at incorporating their needs and interests into national and regional policy directives was found wanting due to fewer interaction between HBWs and HomeNets.

A cautious approach in future needs to be adopted by HomeNets while involving more MBOs within the network. Though it cannot be generalised, yet an issue of concern across the member countries was that some MBO representatives were found to be working more as a business-entrepreneur rather than an HBW heading the MBO. This in turn led to limited participation of HBWs in the management of MBOs.

3.6 Summing up

It is important to assess the overall progress of the programme in each member country vis-à-vis the key strategies drawn up to meet the goal under Phase II. The strategies included:

i) Advocacy and policy dialogue to support stronger implementation of commitments to issues faced by HBWs in the informal sector;

ii) Building sustainable knowledge and action networks to bring women HBWs, their associated networks and groups, women’s organizations, governments, UN organizations and other actors together to affect policies and programmes affecting the lives of HBWs;
iii) Capacity building of women HBWS and relevant key actors to influence the priorities, policies and programmes that affect the lives of women HBWs;

iv) Disseminating knowledge on emerging issues and innovative solutions with regard to women HBWs through effective use of new and traditional information and communications technologies and materials;

v) Experimentation on the “how to” of improving the lives and livelihoods of women HBWs through strategic piloting so that concrete experience can inform mainstream strategies.

Against the stated strategies, the evaluation observed that in each one of the four countries, the focus was on the first three, i.e. advocacy and policy dialogue; building sustainable knowledge and action networks, and capacity building of women HBWs, their networks and relevant key actors.

The first strategy was given more priority and perhaps rightly so. A lot of emphasis was placed on participation in developing a policy framework and advocacy for HBWs. While in all the four countries assessed, the national policy is at draft stage, involvement and recognition of HomeNets was found to be greater in India, Nepal and Pakistan. In Bangladesh, it was observed that country’s HomeNet was working on the draft of a national policy for HBWs but there was no involvement of line ministries. As stated by a senior official of Labour Department in Bangladesh, the nodal agency is yet to be identified for taking the initiative (national policy for HBWs) forward. Therefore, HNB might need to work a little harder to achieve this, compared to the other three countries. Pakistan on the other hand, seems to be a little ahead of other countries, as already three bills have been introduced in its National Assembly.

Nevertheless, in the given programme period, UNIFEM’s programme in all the four countries has been able to bring the cause of HBWs to the fore at the policy makers’ level.

With regard to building sustainable knowledge and action networks, the registration of national HomeNets and HNSA should be seen as a key indicator of success. However, further down, in all the countries, in terms of organizing HBWs from different parts of the country or engaging with like-minded member-based organizations, success was limited due to reasons like lack of follow up activities. Not only is regular interaction imperative, but more concerted efforts will be needed for identifying and engaging more MBOs.
Similarly, with regard to capacity building of HBWs, initiatives like SABAH and others at the national level were taken from time to time by respective national HomeNets. They organized exposure visits and ensured participation of HBWs, though in limited number at trade fairs and exhibitions organized within the country or in one of the member countries. A few skill development training workshops were organized for HBWs. However, these activities were not a regular feature due to resource constraints.

As regards the last two strategies – disseminating knowledge on emerging issues and innovative solutions; and experimentation through strategic piloting – more concrete measures may be needed in the future. Though the programme has used resources and communication materials like newsletters, posters and pamphlets to disseminate information about their rights amongst the HBWs yet, in absence of a policy and schemes, much has not been achieved. However, a good initiative has been creation of websites by all HomeNets except HNI as this has given visibility to the issue of HBWs.

As regards progress with respect to demonstrating pilot approaches to social protection or promoting fair trade practices, more concrete measures are required in future. Though the evaluation team came across some examples of social protection measures taken in India and Nepal by a few member organizations, the initiatives were found to be more of the MBO’s own rather than being facilitated by the HomeNets. For example, regular health check-ups, fixing minimum wages or deduction under Provident Fund scheme\textsuperscript{44} needs to be adopted across sectors. Another challenge is to make HBWs aware about these social protection schemes and their rights. Similarly, the efforts towards promoting fair-trade practices were found to be limited. It was observed that HomeNets put in greater efforts towards advocacy for the above two strategies rather than share concrete examples of success stories. For the next phase of the programme a major challenge would be to develop a code of conduct for fair trade practices and advocacy amongst the private employers and ensuring its acceptance and implementation.

\textsuperscript{44} Under Provident Fund scheme, both the employees and employer contribute to the fund at a rate (fixed by the government) of the wages payable to employees per month.
Mamta...a Transformed and Confident woman

“I am Mamta (name changed), residing on the outskirts of Udaipur city in Rajasthan, India. For the last 19 years, I am doing stitching work. Luckily, about four years back, I came to know about Sadhna through one of my neighbours. She encouraged me to visit it. Initially, I was hesitant because I was not sure whether they would like my work but when she insisted, I decided to take a chance and visited the office of Sadhna. I felt very happy when I was one of the ten women selected for training. Although I faced a lot of hardships during the last 19 years, but, never felt like quitting this work. Now I feel the situation is better. On an average, I can earn between Rs 1500-2000 ($32-42) per month. The quantity of work that I get in a year is not uniform; it varies depending upon the demand. After finishing one order, it takes another 10-15 days to get a new order. Fortunately, on the family front, I never faced resistance from any of my family members. Even when I, along with six other women went to Ahmedabad (a city in Gujarat state of India) for training in stitching, patchwork and cutwork, there was no resistance from my family. All this support and my association with the organization contributed a lot to my self-confidence. Moreover, whenever my work is praised, I feel very happy and confident. According to me, one of the benefits of the formation of HomeNet is that it not only carries out survey in the villages and meet women and their families, who are engaged in home based work but also inform these women that the stitch work they do, can help them earn money without going out of their home. They can work as per their convenience. This has helped a lot of women, as many of them, who were under debt, have come out of it; they have gained confidence and are more articulate. I feel we have got a community of our own, got a voice, and we are even going out to places like Delhi for a week and even for a fortnight!

“Another advantage I feel after being associated with Sadhna is that we are getting free health check ups every year; we have got a health card too. There is a facility for eye check up, because the kind of work we do puts a lot of stress on our eyes. Sadhna also deducts our Provident Fund.

“Now, I get more respect when I go to my relatives; they say- do not force her to stay back as she is a ‘working woman’! Earlier my mother-in-law used to say that I do a little bit of stitching but now she proudly shares with others that I do a very good job. I feel very happy.”(Source: Based on face to face interview at Udaipur, India on March 3, 2009).
Chapter IV: CONCLUSION, GOOD PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present chapter summarizes the programme’s progress and achievements at the end of the second phase. As a feed-forward, it discusses the good practices which could be replicated in other member countries. Based on the evaluation findings, recommendations are made for HNSA, national HomeNets and UNIFEM to make the programme more efficient, effective and sustainable in the future.

4.1 Conclusion

UNIFEM’s programme for Home Based Workers in South Asia which began in 2002 has completed two phases till 2007. The programme has primarily focused on and used its resources for achieving one primary objective, namely, ensuring the full realization of human rights of women home based workers (HBWs) in Asia.

HNSA and the HomeNets are now registered bodies, a key outcome of the programme. However, it is vital to further strengthen these bodies to help them sustain themselves. Till now, the HomeNets have been able to identify and involve organizations working for and with HBWs, as their members. In the coming years, there is a need for more concerted effort on the part of HomeNets to be a truly representative body of HBWs, as many regions and provinces are yet to be covered. The next phase will need a more focussed approach to improve HBWs’ working conditions in more sectors/activities.

The programme has been able to trigger discussion among policy makers at the highest level in all the member countries, though with varying success. The efforts and involvement towards the preparation of a draft national policy is an indication of this. Another important achievement is the recognition of the need to support efforts for the cause by SAARC. The Prime Minister of India inaugurating the South Asian Meet on HBWs; three bills related to the welfare and rights of HBWs being introduced in the National Assembly of Pakistan; and the decision to identify HBWs in the next round of the National Sample Survey in India, are some good examples of the programme’s impact.

Carrying forward these achievements of the first two phases, HNSA and HomeNets have been able to attract the donor community to give funds for the projects/programmes concerning HBWs, which itself is a positive outcome of the programme.
With increased globalization, liberalization and outsourcing, the involvement of HBWs as a workforce is expected to witness an upward growth in the coming years. On one hand, this kind of scenario will lead to a demand for better quality products and, on the other, will encourage competitive pricing of products. In this backdrop, HomeNets’ role will be important on two fronts: one, to help HBWs in upgrading their skills and two, to ensure that HBWs are not caught in the vicious cycle of exploitation. There is a vital need for developing code of conduct for fair trade practices which will benefit HBWs in terms of better wage and work conditions. Interestingly, the evaluation team felt that the need of skill upgradation and identifying marketing avenues are high on the agenda of HBWs, irrespective of whether they are living in rural or urban areas.

The programme/HomeNets in its next phase should prioritise its action plan in such a manner that HBWs are sensitized, empowered and get the opportunity to represent their community (HBWs) in the fight for their rights. Inclusion of HBWs from different sectors/activities and from different parts of the respective countries is expected to be another important focus of the national HomeNets.

HomeNets should ensure that the organizations, where the HBWs are members, do not exploit them in order to make profit. This will not only demoralize the HBWs, but will also have a very adverse effect on the programme.

To conclude, UNIFEM, with its global presence and credibility for working towards the development of women, should continue to facilitate and guide HNSA and HomeNets towards optimum utilization of available resources and to explore new avenues to generate resources for policy advocacy as well as empowering HBWs to fight for their rights.

### 4.2 Good Practices

The programme period also revealed some praiseworthy efforts that led to positive results, which could be replicated in other countries.

*Lobbying with People’s Representatives in Pakistan:* At the programme implementation level, one of the practices worth emulating is the active involvement of politicians for the passage of policy and Acts for the empowerment of HBWs. This was found commendable in the case of Pakistan. Lobbying with the people’s representatives has shown positive results, with the introduction of three bills in the National Assembly towards ensuring better work
conditions and providing social protection to the HBWs. The passing of a resolution in Balochistan Province Assembly of Pakistan is another noteworthy outcome.

**Identity card for unorganized workers including HBWs in India:** In this regard, the recent initiative by the office of Development Commissioner of Handicrafts, Ministry of Textiles, Government of India, to carry out a census of artisans engaged in handicrafts work and issue them an identity card is an example that could be followed for HBWs engaged in other sectors/activities. Though this initiative of the national government in India cannot be taken as the programme’s achievement, it is nevertheless a good practice which HomeNets should press for, to be followed in other sectors. Identification cards to HBWs will give them an opportunity to apply for and avail the benefits under various welfare schemes introduced by provincial and national governments.

**Health Check-up for HBWs in Nepal:** Among good initiatives is the one followed by Women’s Skill Development Project (WSDP), an NGO in Pokhara (Nepal). The Executive Director of the organization pointed out that besides providing training as well as work to the HBWs in weaving, sewing and dyeing, they had tied-up with a local hospital in Pokhara for providing medical facilities. Under this agreement, the hospital provides free eye-check facility to HBWs working with WSDP. Like sewing and weaving, other activities like beedi (a type of cigarette) rolling or agarbatti (incense sticks) making have a harmful effect on HBWs. Organizations should work towards establishing some tie-ups with local charitable hospitals for ensuring regular health-check-ups of HBWs engaged in different sectors and activities.

**Social Security for HBWs in India:** Another initiative worth mentioning is the one taken by SADHNA, a member organization of HomeNet India. As a social protection measure towards its member-HBWAs, the organization has arranged for health insurance and made an
arrangement for regular eye check-ups once in a year. For the first time, SADHNA bears the expenses and for subsequent check-ups, HBWs pay INR 50 (approx. $1) per consultation. SADHNA has also taken the initiative of Provident Fund deduction from the amount a HBW receives as remuneration (12.5% is deducted from her month’s remuneration and the same amount is contributed by SADHNA, as well) for the work she has done in a month.

**Regular income for HBWs in India:** SADHNA sells the produce with their brand name, but to ensure that their members get regular work, SADHNA has tie-ups with leading retail chain outlets to manufacture garment products for these companies, which are labelled with the brand name of the particular retail chain company and sold in their outlets. Undoubtedly, it ensures regular work for the workers, but there is no recognition for the organization (SADHNA) or the HBWs.

**Quality check measures in India:** SADHNA, in order to manage and monitor the work of its member HBWs, has made an arrangement wherein they have divided all its members in groups. Each group comprises 18-20 members from the locality. Each group has a leader responsible for managing and monitoring the work given to her group by SADHNA. The concerned person in SADHNA explains the details of the work required, for instance, the design, number of pieces and the deadline for delivering the finished products. The leader explains the details of the work to the group members. The group leader is also responsible for distributing the work as per the expertise of each member in finishing the number of pieces before the deadline. The group leader is responsible for checking the work before submitting the finished products; however, if any defect is found in the work, 5 per cent is deducted from the group leader’s payment. The group leader’s remuneration is 5 per cent of the income of the group and another 5 per cent from SADHNA.

Usually, the group leader is selected for a period of three years from among the group members, and ideally it is expected to be a process where each group member should have a say. At the time of the evaluation of the programme, a few groups already had a new leader as the previous leader had completed her tenure. During a group discussion with
member HBWs, it emerged that as the group leader is expected to maintain the accounts of the group, she should be somewhat literate and aware as well as willing to visit the organization’s office whenever required. Considering these requirements, currently the group leader is appointed by SADHNA rather than being elected by the respective groups. One of the advantages, as shared by group members, is that whenever they meet, they discuss issues concerning them or related to their locality and try to find a solution for the same. If required, they also help fellow group members in case of any financial need. The amount is returned by the member to the group from her income.

**Offices at Regional level in Pakistan**: A good programmatic approach was taken by HomeNet Pakistan, which could be emulated by other member countries. They have a HomeNet office/focal person at three places, namely, Karachi, Quetta and Peshawar. This ensures better coordination and regular interaction with HBWs.

**4.3 Recommendations**

Discussions in earlier chapters and sections suggest that the programme for home based workers in South Asia should modify its strategy and approach in the next phase. Recommendations by the evaluation team in this regard are given below. Some of these are general and some country specific.

**Advocacy with Policy makers**: The programme should continue with its advocacy at the highest level and not lose its momentum. All the HomeNets, except Bangladesh, have already shared the draft national policy for HBWs with the national governments. Now, HomeNets should continue to lobby with the policy makers, the people’s representative and the bureaucracy for its introduction in their respective national parliaments. The effort should be to ensure HBWs get benefited by any scheme of the government.

**Identification of HBWs**: Even as the debate on finalizing the national policy for HBWs continues, HomeNets should try to convince the national governments in their respective countries to identify and estimate the number of HBWs in different sectors. This would not only give credibility and legitimacy to the effort, but would also make HBWs ‘visible’ in the
eyes of different line ministries, which do not currently consider this an issue of priority. Once the data on HBW is available, HomeNets should focus on budgetary allocation for programmes and schemes aimed at the empowerment of HBWs. The identification by a government body like the Central Statistical Organization in India or the Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics, or for that matter the Central Bureau of Statistics in Nepal or the Federal Bureau of Statistics in Pakistan will help the respective HomeNets to use their limited resources for programme activities instead of mapping of HBWs.

One of the challenges for the government authorities collating figures on HBWs will be the parameter(s) on which to identify a person engaged in home based work. As per the definition by ILO Convention (C 177) or as defined by the Independent Task Group formed by the Government of India, the focus is on ‘place of work’. However, as revealed by various discussions, in home based work, the person is also assisted by her/his family members. While counting the number of persons engaged in home based work, it would be critical to assess whether to include all, who at one time or the other help the person primarily engaged in the home based work, or to include only those who spend a minimum person hours in a day or person-days in a month to be categorized as a ‘home based worker’.

Capacity building of HomeNet officials: The expansion of the programme has resulted in HNSA as well as HomeNets getting funds from different sources/donors. It is now important that they all maintain records in a prescribed format regarding resource utilization. A Management Information System (MIS) should be in place and used by HNSA and respective HomeNets.

Capacity building of HBWs: In a competitive market, HBWs will have to look for quality and variety in their products. The programme, in its next phase, should focus on providing skill development training, specifically on marketing skills, at regular intervals to HBWs of all sectors. Taking a lead from the Trade Facilitation Centre (TFC) programme under SAARC Development Fund (SDF), which is meant for HBWs of the garment sector, project proposals for other sectors/activities, should also be undertaken by respective HomeNets. User-friendly audio-visual communication materials should be used to disseminate information amongst the HBWs about their rights and social protection schemes available for them.

Uplink with Financial Institutions: HomeNets, in their respective countries could facilitate, either directly or through MBOs, loan facility for HBWs from banking institutions for purchase of equipment and raw materials, particularly in case of own-account (self-employed) HBWs.
Marketing Avenues for Products: One of the prime concerns of HBWs has been the uncertainty around the marketing of end products. Middlemen pay a low price for the product and many a time makes full payment only when the product is sold. HNSA and HomeNets should make a concerted effort towards ensuring regular market avenues for HBWs’ products.

Focus on Fair Trade Practices: Not much effort has been made to formulate a code of conduct for fair trade practices due to lack of pressure groups like HomeNets or trade unions. Though in a few cases, the multi-national companies showed interest in promoting fair trade practices, yet they did not include HBWs. With globalization and out-sourcing on the rise, the involvement of HBWs is bound to be more in future. To avoid exploitation because of stiff competition among market players, the HNSA along with national HomeNets should focus on formulating a code of conduct, including core labour standards. The experiences of the Trade Facilitation Centres of SEWA and one under SAARC Development Fund (SDF) meant for the garment sector in the member countries could be studied for developing code for conduct for other sectors as well.

A Bigger Role for SAARC: The funds provided under SDF, undoubtedly, have helped to make a right beginning towards capacity building of HBWs in the garment sector. In this phase, efforts should be made to infuse some more resources and use the existing resources (like TFC) for the capacity building of HBWs engaged in other sectors. Further, in the current scenario where the global economy is facing recession, SAARC/SAFTA can play an important role by guiding HomeNets in creating marketing avenues for HBWs and helping them in getting a regular income.

Inclusive progress: The programme or HNSA/HomeNets should focus on expanding its base both vertically and horizontally. National HomeNets should make attempts to reach as many regions and provinces, even villages; they should also take into its fold more sectors. This will give a broader base to HomeNets, which currently, as observed, are focused around garment-related work. In countries like India and Nepal, HomeNets should identify and involve MBOs from provinces and districts, who were not approached during the earlier two phases of the programme. At the same time, it is important that interaction with existing member organizations and even with small groups should take place with greater frequency to give them a feeling of ownership and belongingness to the HomeNets.
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**Exit policy for Focal Organizations:** Undoubtedly, focal organizations like BHWA, SEWA and Aurat Foundation have played a very important role in establishing the HomeNets in not only their countries, but in other member countries as well by sharing their experiences and expertise. However, their presence has also, to some extent, not provided the expected visibility to HomeNets in the eyes of the stakeholders. With the exception of Nepal where the HomeNet is functioning on its own, in the other three countries, HomeNets should focus on their visibility in the future. Focal organizations, in consultation with HomeNets, should plan their exit, so that HomeNets may stand on their own.

**Expand HomeNets:** At the programme implementation level, one of the initiatives of HomeNet Pakistan could be adapted and practised in other countries as well. This is the establishment of provincial offices. In a country like India, logistically having offices at provincial level might not be feasible, and therefore, HNI may have its sub-offices at least at the regional/zonal level. HomeNets should also explore the idea of promoting a toll-free helpline number, which HBWs can use to seek support from them on issues like capacity building, marketing of their products and entitlement to benefits under social protection programmes and schemes of the national and provincial governments.

**Engage Media:** Both print and electronic media can play an important role in giving visibility to HBW issues. The programme players should plan and introduce a ‘media fellowship programme’, wherein they could give scholarships to journalists and encourage them to write regular articles and features on issues concerning HBWs. HomeNets/HNSA, in consultation with regional and national media houses, should plan regular features covering all sectors/activities of home based work. This will further strengthen the HomeNets in their advocacy and lobbying with politicians and the bureaucracy for the cause of HBWs.

**Specific Recommendations for HNSA and national HomeNets**

**For HomeNet South Asia (HNSA):**

- Develop a uniform Management Information System (MIS) to be adopted by the national HomeNets for maintaining the records of all the activities undertaken during the programme as well as funds utilized for the purpose. Having a MIS will ensure proper tracking and monitoring of the programme’s progress.
- Facilitate resource generation for national HomeNets from international donor agencies.
• Update its website and provide contact detail of HomeNet India (HNI), as HNI does not have a website of its own. Bring out resource materials like audio cassettes, video compact discs for national HomeNets, which could be contextualised by them with minimal effort.

• Validate HBWs membership figures shared by the respective HomeNets by developing an internal monitoring mechanism. This could also be done at regular intervals by engaging a reputed external agency.

• Develop proposals for other sectors, similar to the SAARC Development Project for HBWs in the garment sector.

• Facilitate ‘exposure visits’ of HBWs from one country to another in a multi-sectoral manner, i.e., HBWs engaged in different activities should join the visiting team.

• Work towards developing a code of conduct for fair trade practices, which could be adapted by national HomeNets.

• Give momentum to the cause of social protection for HBWs, and showcase existing social protection measures in the region.

• Expand its network by including other SAARC countries namely, Afghanistan, Bhutan and Maldives to be its member. For this, they should identify focal organizations in this country and work towards formation of national HomeNets.

• Ensure participation of its representatives in international seminars and workshops to give ‘visibility’ to HNSA and the cause of HBWs.

For HomeNet Bangladesh (HNB):

• Build the capacity of HNB officials to ensure the use of the MIS system suggested to be developed by HNSA for maintaining the records on fund utilization and activities undertaken. With the expansion of HNB’s membership, it becomes even more important for better monitoring of activities.

• Maintain regular interaction with UNIFEM Bangladesh.

• Update its website and give contact details of its member organizations, as well, so that HBWs or any organization presently not in the network could contact them.

• Organise regular meetings with MBOs and HBWs to assess their needs and provide assistance in addressing those needs.
• Help MBOs in identifying marketing avenues for the HBWs. This will not only build confidence amongst the HBWs, but also help in building right atmosphere for promoting fair trade practices.

• Push forward the national policy with the Government partners and do advocacy for identifying the nodal government ministry to play a pro-active role for the passage of the policy.

• Make a concerted effort to have specific questions in the next round of survey to be conducted by Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics.

• Engage media to give further ‘visibility’ to the concerns and needs of HBWs.

For HomeNet India (HNI):

• Build the capacity of its staff, specifically with regard to the MIS system to be developed by HNSA for maintaining the records on fund utilization and activities undertaken. With the expansion of HNI’s membership, it becomes even more important for better monitoring of activities. It also becomes important in cases where the staff (only one full–time project coordinator) changes. HNI should recruit a couple of additional full-time staff for assisting in day to day work.

• Construct its website and give contact details of its member organizations, so that HBWs or any organization(s) presently not in the network could contact them in case they need any assistance.

• Make efforts to increase the visibility of its work, which, to some extent, is currently overshadowed by SEWA’s dominant role in this sector. In this regard, it should learn more from its association with SEWA, but at the same time, build its own identity in the community and amongst the policy makers.

• Reach out to more states, particularly in the southern part of the country and explore the possibility of having regional offices for better coordination and regular interaction with HBWs and MBOs. More MBOs should be identified in parts of the country currently ‘not-reached’.

• Use government data and findings on HBWs (expected in the next round of the National Sample Survey) for intensifying its efforts to pursue programmes and schemes for HBWs with Central and State governments.

• Focus on the formulation of a national policy for HBWs by engaging in a dialogue with key stakeholders.
• Help MBOs in identifying marketing avenues for the HBWs. This will not only build confidence amongst the HBWs, but also help in building the right atmosphere for promoting fair trade practices.

For HomeNet Nepal (HNN):
• Work more vigorously to formulate of national policy and take advantage of the fact that present government is positively inclined towards reforms of labour laws and constituting a labour commission.
• Follow up with the government for ensuring the collection of data on HBWs in Nepal. The National Labour Surveys should have specific questions for identifying HBWs in the country.
• Reorganize its efforts to ensure that the HBWs identified during mapping exercise, are ‘active members’ of the network. They should be regularly updated with the activities of HNN, either directly or through MBOs, to build a feeling of ownership amongst them.
• Update its website and give contact details of its member organizations, so that HBWs or any agency presently not in the network could contact them, in case they need any assistance.
• Engage in regular interaction with HBWs and MBOs and assist them in skill upgradation and marketing their finished products.
• Reach out to the HBWs in other districts as well as in remote areas, with the restoration of normalcy in the country.
• Expand its network by organizing and bringing in HBWs from other sectors and activities as well, to make it a truly representative body of HBWs.

For HomeNet Pakistan (HNP):
• Lobby with the champions of the cause for the passage of the three bills favouring HBWs by the National Assembly.
• Ensure that statistics on HBWs is collated during labour and other related surveys conducted by Pakistan’s Federal Bureau of Statistics.
• Build the capacity of HNP staff for maintaining the records on funds utilization and activities undertaken. With expansion of membership of HNP, it becomes even more important to monitor activities and keep track of the follow-up with the members and MBOs.
• Work more effectively towards bringing more women HBWs in its fold. It ensures that individual HBWs (who are not associated with any organization or group working with or for HBWs) are not left out.

• Set up its own office to give more visibility to the network. This will be in accordance with the exit policy suggested for focal organizations.

• Use its regional offices more effectively for advocacy both with policy makers and with media to highlight the issues concerning HBWs, particularly women.

• Update its website and give contact details of its programme offices in different provinces so that HBWs or any agency presently not in the network could contact them in case they need any assistance.

For UNIFEM:

• Develop milestones for each input/activity identified to be undertaken in the logical framework for the next phase of the programme.

• Continue to play the role of facilitator. Its respective country offices should provide support to national HomeNets in their advocacy with policy makers at the national level.

• Encourage HNSA to take a lead role in advocating for the drafting of the code of conduct for Fair Trade Practices related to home based work.

• Ensure HNSA’s presence at international forums for two reasons; one, to share and learn from the experiences of the international community; and two, to identify and encourage donor agencies for supporting HNSA and national HomeNets’ activities in the region.

• Work towards bringing in other member countries of SAARC, which are currently not members of HNSA.

*****
#### List of Persons Interacted with during Evaluation

*Between January-April.2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country: Bangladesh</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation /Organization/Address</th>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms Dilruba Anguri</td>
<td>Focal Head, Bangladesh Home Workers Women Association and President, HomeNet Bangladesh (HNB)</td>
<td>IDI-E-mail and Telephonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Naheed Ahmed</td>
<td>Program Manager, UNIFEM, Bangladesh</td>
<td>IDI- E-mail and Telephonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Kabir Ahmed</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Ministry of Labour</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nyarji Sultana</td>
<td>Vice President, HNB and Ankur Dustha Nari Unnayan Sanstha, District: Sirajgunj</td>
<td>IDI- Telephonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kauser Praveen</td>
<td>General Secretary, HNB and Mahila Kalyan, village: Bakhergunj, District: Barisal</td>
<td>IDI- Telephonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Swarnalata Devi</td>
<td>Moushumi Sansthan, a member organization of HNB, District: Gopalganj</td>
<td>IDI- Telephonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ferdouse Jannatun</td>
<td>Member, HNB, District: Jhenidhah</td>
<td>IDI- Telephonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Marima Rehman</td>
<td>Member, HNB, District: Dhaka</td>
<td>IDI- Telephonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Marjina Begum</td>
<td>HBW, village: Paschim Kaunia, District: Barisal</td>
<td>IDI- Telephonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nasreen Begum</td>
<td>HBW, village: Paschim Kaunia, District: Barisal</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Country: India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation /Organization/Address</th>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Renana Jhabvala</td>
<td>President, HomeNet South Asia</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sapna Joshi</td>
<td>Coordinator, HomeNet South Asia</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Manali Shah</td>
<td>President, HomeNet India</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Firoza Mehrotra</td>
<td>former Deputy Regional Programme Director, UNIFEM SARO</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Meenakshi Ahluwalia</td>
<td>former Senior Programme Officer, UNIFEM SARO</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr (Ms.) Kheya Bhattacharya</td>
<td>Joint Secretary (SAARC), Ministry of External Affairs. Government of India (GOI)</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. (Mr.) S.K. Das</td>
<td>Director General, Central Statistical Organization, Ministry of Planning and Implementation, GOI</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Anil Swarup</td>
<td>Director General (Labour Welfare), Ministry of Labour and Employment, GOI</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. K.S. Gill</td>
<td>Deputy labour Commissioner, Government of Gujarat</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Leela Vijayvergia</td>
<td>Chief Executive, SADHNA, Udaipur, Rajasthan</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shalini Trivedi</td>
<td>Policy Coordinator SEWA</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Reema Nanavaty</td>
<td>Director, Rural and Economic Development, SEWA.</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Mala Gupta</td>
<td>Treasurer, Angana, Patna, Bihar</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Parvinder Pal</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator, Foundation for MSME clusters, New Delhi</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Devika Sankar</td>
<td>Administrative &amp; Personnel Officer, The Community Services Guild, Chennai, Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>IDI-E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Devji Bhai Patel</td>
<td>M/S Surya Industries (Agarbatti) Ltd, Ahmedabad, Gujarat</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation /Organization/Address</th>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jetunben</td>
<td>HBW, Ahmedabad (urban), Gujarat</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Johraben Pathan</td>
<td>HBW, Ahmedabad (urban), Gujarat</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Leela Lohar</td>
<td>HBW, Udaipur (urban), Rajasthan</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Moti Yadav</td>
<td>HBW, Udaipur (urban), Rajasthan</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Manju</td>
<td>HBW, Udaipur (urban), Rajasthan</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kanta</td>
<td>HBW, Udaipur (urban), Rajasthan</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation /Organization/Address</th>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Menaben</td>
<td>HBW, village: Kolivada, District: Mehsana, Gujarat</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Savitaben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Meghaben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maniben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Baluben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Hansaben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Umiyaben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rasuben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Hansaben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Viajben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Madhuben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Dana</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jivtiben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Gaurben</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Krishna Lokar</td>
<td>HBW, village: Shishvi, District: Udaipur, Rajasthan</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Pushpa</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ramasai</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Pooja</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sunder</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Meera</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Gulab bai</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Prembhai</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Manju</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Geena</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sundar</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nirmala Jain</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sugna</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Yashoda</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Designation /Organization/Address</td>
<td>Type of Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Tara Yadav</td>
<td>HBW, Udaipur (urban), Rajasthan</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sharda Yadav</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Devli Yadav</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shamim</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nargis</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Khursheed</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Indira</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lalita</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Basanti Bai</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Chanda</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sheela</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Parveen</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Suman</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Salma</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Suraj</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Radha</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lalita</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maya</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Santosh</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nirmala</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Geeta</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Meena Devi</td>
<td>HBW, village: Nasriganj, District: Patna, Bihar</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Asha Devi</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ganga Devi</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Geeta Devi</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Puja</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Country: Nepal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation/Organization/Address</th>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Aruna Rana Thapa</td>
<td>National Programme Manager, UNIFEM</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ananta Rijal</td>
<td>Senior Programme Officer, UNIFEM</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Diwaker Chand</td>
<td>President, HomeNet Nepal</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mahendra Prasad Shrestha</td>
<td>Joint Secretary, Ministry of Industries</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Saloman Rajbanshi</td>
<td>Program Officer, ILO</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sanjay Khanal</td>
<td>Representative ,National Planning Commission</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sangeeta Thapa</td>
<td>Program Coordinator, UNIFEM</td>
<td>IDI-Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Om Thapaliya</td>
<td>Executive Director, HomeNet Nepal (HNN)</td>
<td>IDI- Face to Face and E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Chandni Joshi</td>
<td>former Regional Programme Director, UNIFEM SARO</td>
<td>IDI- Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Prajwol Sharma Aryal</td>
<td>Under Secretary, Ministry of Labour</td>
<td>IDI- Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ram Kali Khadka</td>
<td>Executive Director, Women's Skill Development Project (WSDP), Pokhara</td>
<td>IDI- Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Bagawati Kuwar</td>
<td>HBW, Pokhara (urban)</td>
<td>IDI- Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Yamuna Shrestha</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>IDI- Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Bagawati Dhaka</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>IDI- Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Diksha Pariyar</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>IDI- Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kumari Gurung</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>IDI- Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rita Tamang</td>
<td>HBW, Pokhara (rural)</td>
<td>IDI- Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Chu Maya Magar</td>
<td>HBW, Pokhara (rural)</td>
<td>IDI- Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Designation/Organization/Address</td>
<td>Type of Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Chandrika Bhattarai</td>
<td>Human Rights for Single Women</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Manjuri Singh</td>
<td>Member, HNN</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Mona Adhikari</td>
<td>Country Manager, SABA</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Pratima Pokhrel</td>
<td>Home Based Workers Concerned Society</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Bina Shrestha</td>
<td>Coordinator, Central Women Workers’ Department (CWWD), Kathmandu</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ambika Basnet Thapa</td>
<td>HBW, affiliation with Home Based Workers Concerned Society</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kamala Panta</td>
<td>HBW, affiliation with Home Based Workers Concerned Society</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sajana Thapa</td>
<td>Member, HNN</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Min Narayan Dangol</td>
<td>Member, HNN</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Bindu Shrestha</td>
<td>President of Home Based Workers' Union (affiliation with GEFONT)</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Roshni Tuladhar</td>
<td>HNN &amp; SABA</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Tara Karki</td>
<td>Member, HNN</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rahisha Dangol</td>
<td>Member, HNN</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sanu Thapa</td>
<td>HNN &amp; president of Women Skill development, Bhaktapur</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kalpana Thapa</td>
<td>HBW, district: Bhaktapur</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Subin Maharjan</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Hari Gopal Chyasi</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Subhadra Manandhar</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Dil Bahadur Gurung</td>
<td>Member, HNN</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Durga Gurung</td>
<td>Member, HNN</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ichchha Rai</td>
<td>Member, HNN</td>
<td>Round table Discussion-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Designation/Organization/Address</td>
<td>Type of Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Durga Bhattrai</td>
<td>HBW, Chabahil, Kathmandu</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kausila Rai</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nirmala Rai</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Gauri Pariyar</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Parmila Subba</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Maya Pariyar</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Posta Kumari Rai</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Bishnu Maya Tamang</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation/Organization/Address</th>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Champa Tamang</td>
<td>HBW, Bhaktapur(urban/rural)</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Archana Shrestha</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sunita Magar</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kalpana Thapa</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Prakriti Rajthala</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sabina Shrestha</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation/Organization/Address</th>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Radha Gitame</td>
<td>MBO representative, Pokhara</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Mina Sharma</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sabitri Nepali</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Manju Thapa</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sirjana Shrestha</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Phul Kumari Thapa</td>
<td>Regional Coordinator, HNN, Pokhara</td>
<td>FGD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Country: Pakistan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation/Organization/Address</th>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ume-Laila Azhar</td>
<td>Programme Manager, HNP</td>
<td>IDI- E-mail and Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Uzma Quresh</td>
<td>Programme Officer, UNIFEM</td>
<td>IDI-E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Younas Khalid</td>
<td>Director Finance &amp; Administration, Aurat Foundation</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Huma Nawab</td>
<td>Entrepreneur- HBW, village: Hamza Ali, Muzafargrah</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Mehnaz Rafi</td>
<td>Social Activist Ex Parliamentarian</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Zakara Noureen</td>
<td>Bilsam Taraqiyyat Tanzeem, Mastung, Quetta, Balochistan</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Fatima</td>
<td>HBW, village: Meriyabad, Quetta, Balochistan</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Sanam Raisani</td>
<td>PEACE, a member organization of HNP, Balochistan</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Seemien Marrayam</td>
<td>Entrepreneur- HBW, Quetta, Balochistan</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bakhtiar Khan</td>
<td>SMEDA, Balochistan</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Shahpari</td>
<td>HBW, village: Ibrahimzai, Quetta, Balochistan</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Raesa Naz</td>
<td>HBW, Quetta, Balochistan</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Nusat Imrani</td>
<td>Women Welfare Development, Quetta, Balochistan</td>
<td>IDI-Telephonic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Profile of Evaluation Team

About the Organization

**CMS social** is a specialized wing on social development research of **Centre for Media Studies** (CMS) [www.cmsindia.org](http://www.cmsindia.org). It is a body of eminent professionals, known for its research and evaluation studies. CMS, in the last two decades, has emerged as an inter-disciplinary research group with wide interest and capability in the areas of social research, communication research, public opinion surveys and operation research. The Centre’s emphasis has always been on research, monitoring, evaluation, policy advocacy and advisory services. CMS is empanelled with different Ministries of Government of India for providing research consultancy services. It has conducted a number of studies for the UN agencies as well other international bilateral and multilateral agencies. **CMS social** has to its credit research and evaluation studies on issues like livelihood and employment, child labour, vocational training, public health, among others.

**Brief Profile of Core Team Members**

**Alok Srivastava** has around 15 years of experience in social development research. He has a post graduation in Rural Development and Management. He is a trained development programme evaluator from IPDET, organised by the World Bank and Carleton University. He is also a resource person on Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) for M&E of development programmes. Alok has been involved in developing research agenda, design, methodologies and conducting exhaustive research across the country. He holds vast experience and expertise in leading major nationwide primary research studies. He has led a number of evaluation studies of development programmes, on issues related to labour including child labour, employment and livelihood among others, both for national and international agencies.

**Subrato K. Mondal** is a Ph.D. in Population Studies and holds an experience of around thirteen years in programme/project implementation and evaluation. He specializes in programme evaluation, monitoring and planning. He has been engaged in developing logic model, research methodology and evaluation techniques for a number of programmes and projects. He has rich experience in quantitative data analysis, projection and reporting. Subrato is a member of the community of expert evaluators in South Asia.

**Paramita D. Mazumdar** holds Masters Degree in Regional Planning and Geography. She has been in the development sector for more than thirteen years and has rich experience in social and communication research. She has been involved in planning, coordinating and execution of research projects. She is a trained practitioner of Participatory Research and Action as well as on Participatory Monitoring & Evaluation. She has been associated and contributed to a number of studies undertaken on issues related to livelihood and employment. To her credit, she has evaluation studies on wide range of issues including public health, domestic violence, water and sanitation among others.

**Mumtaz Ahmed**, a post graduate in Sociology and a Bachelors in Law, has around 14 years of experience in conducting evaluation studies on a range of issues like child labour, vocational training, formal and non-formal education system, public health among others. He has rich experience in qualitative research with varied target population including females and adolescents. Mumtaz Ahmed's involvement in research studies has been right from writing the proposal to being in the field for interaction with the stakeholders to analysis and writing of reports.
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Terms of Reference

Title: Evaluation of the Regional Home Based Workers Programme in South Asia
UNIFEM South Asia Regional Office, New Delhi

1. Background and Purpose

UNIFEM South Asia has been firmly committed to advocating for the rights of home based workers (HBWs) for over a decade. There are more than 100 million HBWs throughout the world, of which, at least half are in South Asia alone. Of these workers, an estimated 80% of HBWs are women, who are doubly discriminated against both because of their status as semi-skilled workers in an unregulated informal sector, and also because of their gender. The precarious nature of the rapidly expanding and female-dominated informal economy, leaves HBWs with little or no access to legal and/or social protective measures. In the absence of such protections, and information about their basic rights, HBWs have little agency and bargaining power.55 Working for long hours, for low/poverty wages, and under poor working conditions, HBWs are particularly susceptible to exploitation and economic and social rights violations. Relegated to work at the bottom of the supply/value chain, they occupy particularly vulnerable positions in the global economy.

Yet, in today’s increasingly globalized world, employment in the informal economy remains a critical source of income for many women (and their families) in South Asia. It is in this context, and as part of its global and regional effort to address women’s economic and social empowerment and gender equality, that UNIFEM first embarked upon its journey to address the concerns and needs of HBWs, and to provide a platform that would provide these workers, the majority of whom are women, with greater visibility and recognition.

UNIFEM’s regional work on Home Based Workers in South Asia dates back to as early as 1994 when the concerns faced by HBWs were not yet even being publicly acknowledged as problems. Today, the organization’s work spans five countries - Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka - and UNIFEM’s programme and advocacy initiatives in this area have been instrumental in giving greater visibility to the needs and concerns of HBWs in the region, and greater recognition to the vital economic contributions they make in today’s increasingly globalized world. In 1995, UNIFEM played a critical role in lobbying, along with 15 other governments in the Asia Pacific region and The Self Employed Women’s Association (SEWA), for the adoption of ILO Convention No. 177 on Home Work (1996), supplemented by a recommendation on Home Work at its 83rd conference. This was a significant landmark, as for the first time, it gave HBWs international recognition as workers, who as such, are

54 2007 UNIFEM Six monthly report on the Regional Home Based Workers Programme.
55 Ibid.
entitled to basic rights under international law. A subsequent and important landmark in the journey came in 2000 at the South Asia Regional Policy Seminar - a joint initiative of UNIFEM, IDRC and WIEGO – from which emerged the Kathmandu Declaration. This document defined the kinds of progressive policies and programmes that were needed to promote the rights of women in the informal sector, and facilitated the joint establishment, by SEWA and UNIFEM, of HomeNet South Asia (HNSA) in 2000.

HNSA is a vibrant and registered network, comprised of 600 organizations representing over 3,00,000 home based workers from five countries. Its establishment arguably formed the basis for the subsequent launching, in 2002, of the UNIFEM regional home based workers Program in South Asia in partnership with SEWA and Federation Dutch Labour Movement (FNV). The programme focused strategically on the strengthening and formalization of HNSA; advocacy on key issues affecting home based workers; providing support to pilot approaches for the provision of social protection for home based workers; and promoting fair trade practices at the national level. UNIFEM has also made significant contributions towards mutual learning and capacity development at both national and regional levels.

Under the umbrella of HNSA, five national networks/HomeNets exist in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. The facilitation of the growth and strengthening of these networks has been a major focus of the regional home based workers programme. Amongst other things, these networks have been strategic and instrumental in: increasing the visibility and recognition of home based workers by governments and other key actors; contributing to a greater understanding of the size and scope of HBWs in South Asia; increasing influence and enhanced capacities of sub-regional and national home based networks and facilitating improved access to markets and social security for HBWs. More broadly, the regional initiative has been directed towards generating data on HBWs and organizations working in conjunction with them; strengthening and supporting their organizations and networks at national and regional levels in South Asia, as well as supporting efforts made by HBWs themselves, to address the multiple challenges and obstacles they face.

UNIFEM’s journey to date has culminated in the formal launch of HomeNet South Asia, by India’s Cabinet Secretary, at the Women Work & Poverty: Policy Conference on Home Based Workers of South Asia, in January 2007. The conference, inaugurated by the Honourable Prime Minister of India, focused on issues related to the formation of policies to protect HBWs; fair trade; social security; and building voice and organization. The conference also saw the adoption of a South Asian Regional Plan of Action for HBWs by participating countries, networks of HBWs, trade unions, NGOs& researchers from Bangladesh, India,

---

56 UNIFEM together with SEWA, and the Harvard Institute of International Development (HIID) is also a founding member of WIEGO (Women in Informal Employment Globalizing and Organizing), an organization that works to strengthen the home-based workers campaign at the global level.
Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Subsequent follow-up to the conference has led to the drafting of a National Policy on HBWs in India and other relevant national consultations in countries throughout the region. The concerns and interests of HBWs were also recently raised at the 2008 SAARC Summit where HNSA was recommended as the nodal agency of home based workers for future collaborations with SAARC.

2. Evaluation Purpose and Objectives

A. Evaluation Purpose

This is an external final evaluation to be conducted as an in-depth analysis of UNIFEM’s programs (approaches, strategies and interventions) and advocacy initiatives to support HBWs, both at the regional level and with clear and specific country priorities in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. This (non-mandatory) evaluation is to be conducted, under the management of UNIFEM SRO, with the broad objective of generating comprehensive and specific evaluation feedback on the regional HBW programme. The evaluation will focus on assessing the effectiveness, sustainability (and capacity), relevance, efficiency and impact of the programme (see section B for details). It will also identify lessons learned - highlighting programme strengths as well as weaknesses and constraints - and generate recommendations for strategic and programmatic improvements, and the expansion of the Programmes’ reach in next phase.

More specifically, the evaluation will generate information that will be instrumental for:
1) refining strategies for next phase of the programme and providing the SAARC Secretariat with input on how to take forth their strategies on HBWs in the next phase; 2) generating information for evidence-based advocacy to ensure that the interests of HBWs are reflected in national and local level policy prescriptions; and 3) the provision of input to national and regional government bodies, in the five specified countries, for the purpose of policy development and implementation.

The evaluation will be a key document for UNIFEM’s organizational learning, at both the regional and country levels, and for its partners and concerned governments in South Asia. It will also serve to inform UNIFEM’s broader global work objectives, reflecting the organization’s primary goal of ensuring that national commitments to advance gender equality and women’s empowerment are implemented in stable and fragile states. Under this broad goal, thematic indicators related to enhancing women’s economic security and rights, as per the UNIFEM Strategic Plan (SP), 2008-2011, and the Sub-Regional Strategy (SRS) will be drawn upon. The evaluation will also inform outcome 1 in the Global SP and SRS and outcome 6 (and corresponding outputs 6.1., 6.2 and 6.3) in the Global SP. 57

57 Note: Output 1.1 is focused on ensuring that national development strategies address the needs of HBWs amongst many other vulnerable groups. Outcome 6 is focused on promoting enhanced capacities of women, including HBWs, who are subject to exclusion and discrimination.
B. Evaluation Objectives and Criteria

The evaluation report must fully and comprehensively include an assessment of the programmes’:

B1. Effectiveness
The extent to which the programmes’ stated objective(s) is/are achieved or the likelihood that it/they will be achieved should be assessed. The effectiveness of the programme should be assessed in accordance with the activities, outputs and outcomes detailed in the programme document. Factors contributing to and detracting from results should also be included in the analysis.

B2. Sustainability
In this case, specific attention should be paid to assessing the sustainability of HNSA and the five national HomeNets. The extent to which HBWs have been adequately capacitated, as a result of the Programme, and the extent to which they are likely to be further empowered to advocate for their rights should be assessed and considered in the next phase.

B 3. Relevance
The degree to which the programme’s remains justifiable and appropriate in relation to the national/regional/global context and priorities should be outlined.

B 4. Efficiency
An analysis and evaluation of the overall programme performance, the outputs in relation to the inputs, the financial management, the implementing timetable should be included.

B 5. Impact
An assessment of what the programme has achieved and is likely to achieve in the future - measuring both the positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects on society, caused by the programme as well as the programme catalytic effects - should be made. The evaluation report should also clearly highlight good practices, success stories, and anecdotes.

3. Context of the Programme
UNIFEM’s Regional Home Based Workers Programme in South Asia was established in the context of intensified levels of economic globalization and trade liberalization, which defined much of the 1990s. In the context of growing economic competition, this period coincided with a rise in the decentralisation of production, which has led to the employment of various cost cutting strategies by retailers and suppliers and a “boom” in subcontracting. Against this backdrop, the mounting informalization and feminization of labour has enabled
employers to take advantage of low wages, low overheads and an increasingly flexible workforce characterised by systematic economic and social rights violations. As already highlighted, having emerged as the final link in a global chain of subcontractors, HBWs live in “on-the-margin” survival conditions. Engaged in low skilled/semi-skilled production ranging from sewing garments and weaving, to assembling electronic components, to simpler jobs of sorting, packaging and labelling goods, these workers perform work under conditions that can be detrimental to their health, for low wages, and with little or no legal and social protection or security. They are dispersed, isolated, and often lack access to information, which can lead to the further weakening of their already limited bargaining power. Moreover, women, who comprise the majority of HBWs, are particularly susceptible to exploitation when compared to their male counterparts.

In spite of the above, the importance of home based work as a critical source of employment for poor women cannot be underestimated. It is in this context, that UNIFEM, together with its partner agencies, has undertaken initiatives aimed at guaranteeing the realization of economic and social rights and protections for HBWs, with the ultimate goal of ensuring that the cycle of poverty is broken. UNIFEM’s Regional Home Based Workers Programme, remains a major component of the organizations’ broader effort to address poverty and achieve key and related priorities. The programme directly contributes to supporting UNIFEM’s thematic regional and sub-regional strategies aimed at guaranteeing economic security and rights, and access to livelihoods, for female informal sector/HBWs. To achieve the regional and global objectives and priorities, as per outcome 1 and outcome 6 outlined in the SP and SRS, UNIFEM’s strategic focus has been on facilitating a process, by which HBWs have been both organized into a network over which they themselves have ownership, and mobilized and capacitated so that they may articulate their own needs, concerns, and priorities, independently in the face of policymakers and concerned stakeholders.

The programme has also been linked, more broadly, to poverty reduction and development strategies at the regional and national levels. It has served as a catalyst for the adoption of a South Asian Regional Plan of action of HBWs and the drafting of a national policy on home based workers in India. Moreover, at a recent 2007 conference and at the SAARC Summit, the Honourable Prime Minister of India himself spoke publicly about the need for protective measures to be put in place for HBWs, which lead, subsequently, to an agreement by the Government of India, to host a SAARC meeting on HBWs. UNIFEM will be lobbying for a SAARC Convention on HBWs at the meeting. Beyond India, at the national level throughout South Asia, similar steps have been taken. Bangladesh and Nepal are currently in the process of passing a National Policy on home based workers. In Pakistan, at the Ministry level, commitments have been made to take forward issues related to HBWs and in Sri Lanka, serious efforts have been made to support the rehabilitation and recovery of HBWs affected by the Tsunami.
Moreover, even prior to the launching of the Regional Home Based Workers Programme in South Asia, UNIFEM played a critical role in contributing to the setting of international legal precedents on informal economy workers, by lobbying, together with 15 governments of the region, for the adoption of ILO Convention No. 177 on Home Work. The Convention acknowledged for the first time, HBWs as workers, and provided the basis for continued campaigning for the ratification of the convention; the adoption and implementation of relevant policies and programmes; and for the expansion of grassroots organizations of home based workers. Today, the regional programme also contributes to the achievement of both MDG 1 on Poverty and Hunger and MDG 3 on Gender Equality.

The strategic success of the Regional Home Based Workers Programme is largely attributable to the strategic partnerships forged between UNIFEM and a range of actors. These have been critical to the facilitation of advocacy and policy dialogues at the national, regional and international levels. This dialogue, in turn, has been instrumental in strengthening and consolidating HomeNet South Asia and the five national networks that fall under it. Partnerships have been particularly strong with SEWA, FNV, PATHAMBA, Harvard Institute of International Development (HIID) and now Women in Informal Employment Organizing (WEIGO), of which SEWA, UNIFEM and HIID are founding members. Broader partnerships with a range of home based women workers and organizations working with them, as well as gender advocates and research organizations, including HomeNet South Asia (and the five national HomeNets) have been key. Government bodies, such as the Ministries of Women’s Affairs and Labour and Statistics, have also been actively involved in lobbying at the national level. Similarly, partnerships with the private sector, and organizations such as the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI), have also become increasingly important for lobbying and sensitization about the concerns and needs of HBWs.

4. Subject of the Evaluation/Programme Description

The Regional Home - Based Workers Programme in South Asia was established with the underlying programmatic goal of ensuring safe and secure livelihoods for home based workers in Asia and setting in place the processes and direction for transforming HomeNet in the Asia region from a loose network into a flexible but representative organization that can support activities at the grassroots as well as represent home based workers at national, regional and international forums. The effective realization of this goal was to engender the following outcomes:

- Enhanced visibility and voice of organizations working with home based workers, at the regional and international levels.
- The putting in place of policies and programmers, at the national level, for recognition and protection of home based workers.
The establishment of linkages and facilities for home based workers to access the expanded opportunities of sustainable growth.

Guaranteeing that home based workers have higher incomes, steadier employment and better access to social security.

Under this broader programmatic goal, the primary programme objective during the early stages of the programme was to strengthen the capacities of the organizations and networks of home based workers in Asia/South Asia and South East Asia and promote affirmative policies for improving the working and living conditions of home based workers in Asia. The projected developmental outcomes from the programme were as follows:

- Regional networks in South Asia and South East Asia are to have a strong institutional base and be self sustaining.
- Regional networks for South and South East Asia are to be actively raising issues at various policy and advocacy forums/ campaigning for recognition and protection of home based workers.
- The Asia level network is active in co-ordinating activities in the region.
- Home based workers are included in the policies and programmes of governments, international agencies and civil society organizations.
- The company’s code of conduct includes more equitable working conditions for Home based workers.
- Progress towards ratification is made

The strategies adopted by HomeNet South Asia focused on supporting home based workers by:

I. Strengthening home based workers organizations and networks in South Asia
II. Supporting development of policy frameworks and advocacy on key issues affecting home based workers.
III. Supporting and demonstrating pilot approaches for the provision of social protection for home based workers.
IV. Promoting fair trade practices at the national level to ensure more favourable working conditions for home based women workers.

The underlying rationale driving the programme is best understood in the context of Outcome 6 and outputs 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3. Outcome 6 stipulates that women workers who are subject to exclusion and/or discrimination should themselves be able to successfully advocate for having their priorities incorporated in relevant national policies, programmes, budgets, and processes. Outcome 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 respectively, stipulate that women HBWs should be able to 1) participate in and influence all stages of planning, the development and
implementation of relevant policies, programmes, budgets and processes; 2) benefit from increased resources to support their advocacy work; 3) benefit from increased access to relevant foras for voicing their priorities. The overarching objective driving all of the above is to facilitate increased capacity for bottom-up advocacy, by ensuring that women HBWs gain ownership over networks. These networks must be self-sustaining, as only then can HBWs be capacitated and take leadership on issues that concern their economic and social rights as workers.

The Geographic Coverage of the programme spans Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. Each of these countries have established national HomeNets, which, together, form HomeNet South Asia. Since its inception in 2000, HNSA, and its national networks have progressed towards the establishment and strengthening of the networks at both the regional and country levels. All of the national HomeNets and HNSA at the regional level have been registered as legal entities, and are functioning democratically. Following the launching of the Regional Programme, 2002-present, these networks have arguably been further strengthened and capacitated.

The Management structure of the programme consists of the Economic Security and Rights Programme Officer, supervised by the DRPD and RPD and experienced implementing agencies and key partners, such as SEWA and FNV. For further details on partners please see section 3. The total programme Budget was USD 417,055, for the period 2005-2007. An additional USD45,000 was allocated for the evaluation during the period 2008-2009.

5. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will make assessments at the regional, national and localised community level (i.e. amongst communities of home based workers). The evaluation will be undertaken in accordance with the Evaluation guidelines of UNIFEM, HQ, and the United Nations Norms and Standards for Evaluation.58

Geographic Coverage: India, Nepal and Pakistan

Time Frame: December 2008-March 2009
- Desk review at UNIFEM SRO
- Visits to National HomeNets, member and partner organizations and other stakeholders.
- Field Visits
- Workshops/Roundtables and FGDs

Thematic Focus:
- Regional/national partnerships and networks of HBWs
- Capacity Building and sustainability of networks
- Bottom-up advocacy
- Women’s economic and social rights
- Livelihood security/poverty reduction

6. Evaluation Questions and Criteria

6.1 Efficiency
- How efficiently have programme resources (financial and human) been used, and could activities and outputs have been delivered with fewer resources without reducing their quality/quantity?
- How vital has HNSA, the five National HomeNets and partner organizations been in leveraging resources and expanding the scope of the programme and support for its overall objectives?

6.2. Effectiveness
- How successful has the programme been in facilitating the increased capacity of self-sustained national/regional networks of home based workers in South Asia?
- How effective has the programme been in facilitating positive changes in national and regional legal and policy frameworks?

6.3. Relevance
- Do programme priorities and objectives adequately and accurately reflect the needs and priorities articulated by HBWs? If not, how can next phase of the programme be better designed to do this?

6.4. Impact
- What have been the intended and unintended, positive and negative, long term effects of the programme?
- How well placed is the programme to ensure increased upscaling by governments, multilateral/bilateral agencies and donors in the near and long term future?
- Is the programme likely to have a catalytic\(^{59}\) effect? How and why?

\(^{59}\) The following is a working definition of UNIFEM as a “catalyst”: UNIFEM will seek to 1) enable changes and change processes that would otherwise not take place; or (b) Influence the speed or quality of change processes, for example by facilitating the process through support to involved players and assistance in structuring the process.
6.5. Sustainability

- To what extent has the establishment of National HomeNets led to the creation of sustainable processes and systems for bottom-up advocacy, networking and capacity development at the national and regional levels?
- Are the relevant stakeholders, including SEWA, willing and able to ensure the continued strengthening of the networks created? Are HBWs themselves willing and able to push for policy change aimed at incorporating their needs and interests into national and regional policy directives?

7. Elements of an Approach

The evaluation will be conducted from early December 2008 to mid March 2009. Phase I (Inception) will take place from 10 December to December 15 2008. Phase 2 from 16 December 2008 to 30 January 2009. During Phase I, UNIFEM South Asia Office will act as task and contract manager and as secretariat to the Steering Committee. Phase II will consist of field visits and interviews, and Phase III (February 1st- March 15 31st 2009) will consist of Evaluation Consultations and Report Writing (See work plan for details).

Method and Approach

The Evaluation will be undertaken using a human rights-based approach and a gender lens. The methods employed will consist of a range of qualitative and quantitative approaches including the following:

- Phone and email based Interviews with relevant UNIFEM POs and staff in SRO and Country Offices
- Visits/individual discussions with National HomeNet Representatives; HBWs; partner organizations/stakeholders (incl. relevant Ministries and donors) in selected countries.
- Focused Group Discussions with HBWs in selected countries
- Web-based surveys
- Questionnaires
- Other relevant Field Visits

8. Expected Products

1. Evaluation Methodology and Work Plan
2. Inception Report
3. Synthesis of information obtained through FGDs
4. Draft and Final Evaluation Report Consisting of:
a. Recommendations for Refining strategies for next phase of the programme and upscaling by the SAARC fund
b. Evidence-based advocacy material
c. Inputs to be offered to national/regional government machinery for policy improvement and development

The evaluation report will include also include a discussion of findings using the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria for development assistance - Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability.

The evaluation report will not exceed 50 pages, including an Executive Summary. In addition, Annexes will include: the TOR, description of methodology, list of background materials used, interview reports, list of people interviewed, power point presentations and workshop materials, and short resumes of the consultants. The Annexes will include an analysis of strengths and challenges of the evaluation process, and the extent to which each evaluation question was covered. Evaluation Products will be prepared in English and submitted to UNIFEM electronically via e-mail and on CD-Rom in MS Word.
Annex 4

**Documents Reviewed/Referred To During study**

2. FNV ProDoc. – Focal Points
3. FNV Proposal
4. ILO Convention 177 on Home Based work
5. HomeNet South Asia Progress Matrix Report: July to March 2007
6. UNIFEM six month report (2007): Feminized Poverty Unit
7. Newsletter of Network of Women Homebased Workers in South Asia *(3 editions)*
8. Logical Framework Analysis: Phase II – Strengthening organizations of Home Based workers in South & South East Asia
9. Policy Conference on Home Based workers of South Asia (18-20 Jan’ 07)- Press release
10. HomeNet South Asia progress report – July 05 to December 05
11. HomeNet India/Nepal Brochure
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Research Tools

Evaluation of UNIFEM Regional Home Based Workers programme In South Asia Phase II (2004-07)

IDI Guideline - HomeNet-Office Bearer/ Executive

Name: ________________________________  Place: ________________________________
Designation in HomeNet: _______________________ Years of Association with HomeNet: _____
Parent Organization/Association: ________________________________
Occupation: ________________________________

Relevance & Reach

1. Was a Need assessment activity and prioritization of the needs of HBWs conducted prior to starting the programme?

2. To what extent UNIFEM’s programme for HBW reflected the priorities & objectives as identified by HBWs? Please elaborate on year wise activities carried out under the programme.

3. How can the programme be better designed to match the priorities in future? List issues that are needed to be brought to the fore?

4. How has the programme strengthened the HomeNet?

5. Were HBWs an issue at the policy level in your country when the programme started in 2000 and what changes were noticed over the period of time?

6. How participatory was HomeNet in terms of participation of the members, their subsequent contribution to the activities, and the overall programme?

7. Please elaborate the membership process in HomeNet (elaborate on criteria of selection, membership fee etc.)

8. What was the coverage of the programme in terms of reach and benefits to the target population (HBWs)? If still a significant proportion was not covered by the programme, what were the reasons behind it (barriers in getting associated with the HomeNet)? Do you think there is still a scope for improvement in terms of service delivery and reach? What steps can be taken to ensure their inclusion into the programme?

9. Has there been recognition of HomeNet by respective national governments?

10. Have the risk factors reduced over time?
Efficiency

11. What were the sources of financial support to the programme & HomeNet? Was there a strategy in place for resource mobilization? Please elaborate.

12. What measures do you suggest for optimum utilization of resources in future?

13. In case of scarcity of resources, particularly financial, how did HomeNet meet the requirement?

14. Were the activities undertaken in spite of fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the activity? If yes, please cite some examples.

15. How vital were HomeNet South Asia, national HomeNets and partner organizations contributions in pooling resources? What efforts were made to mobilize funds from sources other than UNIFEM?

16. What efforts were made as part of knowledge and experience sharing among members (HBWs) of different HomeNets and representation of HBWs at national/international levels?

Effectiveness

17. How successful was the programme in enhancing the capacity of HBWs at regional/national level?

18. What measures were taken to make it sustainable?

19. To what extent was the programme successful in bringing about positive changes in the policy framework in ******* (name of the country)?

20. What were the prioritized national policies that HomeNet wanted to influence within respective national context?

21. What steps could have been taken to ensure the desired change in policy in your country?

22. How effective was HomeNet, particularly in addressing the issue of poverty among HBWs?

23. In next phase, do you think the programme’s focus needs to be expanded? What changes need to be brought in the programme to make it more effective?

Impact

24. How did the programme facilitate the process of bringing positive change(s) in the situation of HBWs?

25. What were the immediate impacts, both positive & negative, of the programme?

26. What were the long-term effects, both positive & negative, of the programme/HomeNet?

27. Any impact positive/negative that was not foreseen, but took place?
28. To what extent the programme/HomeNet was able to bring the issue of HBWs in the priorities of the governments/multilateral & bilateral agencies and donors?

29. What have the HomeNets achieved in the past eight years in terms of structure and substance?

REMARKS, if any

Date:
Evaluation of UNIFEM’s Regional Home Based Workers programme in South Asia Phase II (2004-07)

IDI Guideline _UNIFEM Programme Manager

Name: ________________________________  Place:______________________________  
Designation: _________________ Years of Association with UNIFEM: _____

Relevance & Reach
1. To what extent UNIFEM’s programme for HBW reflected the priorities & objectives? Please elaborate on year wise activities carried out under the programme.

2. How can the programme be better designed to match the priorities in future? List issues that are needed to be brought to the fore?

3. How has the programme strengthened the HomeNet?

4. Were HBWs an issue at the policy level in your country when the programme started in 2000 and what changes were noticed over the period of time?

5. How participatory was HomeNet in terms of participation of the members, their subsequent contribution to the activities, and the overall programme?

6. Please elaborate the membership process in HomeNet (elaborate on criteria of selection, membership fee etc.)

7. What was the coverage of the programme in terms of reach and benefits to the target population (HBWs)? If still a significant proportion was not covered by the programme, what were the reasons behind it (barriers in getting associated with the HomeNet)? Do you think there is still a scope for improvement in terms of service delivery and reach? What steps can be taken to ensure their inclusion into the programme?

8. Has there been recognition of HomeNet by the national government?

9. Have the risk factors reduced over time?

Efficiency

10. What were the sources of financial support to the programme & HomeNet? Was there a strategy in place for resource mobilization? Please elaborate.

11. What measures do you suggest for optimum utilization of resources in future?

12. In case of scarcity of resources, particularly financial, how did HomeNet meet the requirement?
13. Were the activities undertaken in spite of fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the activity? If yes, please cite some examples.

14. How vital were HomeNet South Asia, national HomeNets and partner organizations contributions in pooling resources? What efforts were made to mobilize funds from sources other than UNIFEM?

15. What efforts were made as part of knowledge and experience sharing among members (HBWs) of different HomeNets and representation of HBWs at national/international levels?

**Effectiveness**

16. How successful was the programme in enhancing the capacity of HBWs at regional/national level?

17. What measures were taken to make it sustainable?

18. To what extent was the programme successful in bringing about positive changes in the policy framework in Pakistan?

19. What were the prioritized national policies that HomeNet wanted to influence within respective national context?

20. What steps could have been taken to ensure the desired change in policy in your country?

21. How effective was HomeNet, particularly in addressing the issue of poverty among HBWs?

22. In next phase, do you think the programme’s focus needs to be expanded? What changes need to be brought in the programme to make it more effective?

**Impact**

23. How did the programme facilitate the process of bringing positive change(s) in the situation of HBWs?

24. What were the immediate impacts, both positive & negative, of the programme?

25. What were the long-term effects, both positive & negative, of the programme/HomeNet?

26. Any impact positive/negative that was not foreseen, but took place?

27. To what extent the programme/HomeNet was able to bring the issue of HBWs in the priorities of the governments/multilateral & bilateral agencies and donors?

28. What have the HomeNets achieved in the past eight years in terms of structure and substance?

**REMARKS, if any**

Date:
Evaluation of the UNIFEM’s Regional Home Based Workers Programme In South Asia Phase II (2004-07)

IDI with members of HomeNet (HBWs)

Good Morning/Afternoon!! We__________ are from CMS, New Delhi (India) and would like to interact with you to have your valuable views and opinion about HomeNet and UNIFEM’s programme for Home based Workers in South Asia. Your views and opinion will not be identified as any individual’s response but that of the group. We therefore, request you to freely share your views, as your comments and feedback will help us in improving the programme and make it more effective and far-reaching at community as well as national level. Your valuable inputs will help in working towards bringing the desired changes at the policy level in national as well as global context.

Your participation will be voluntary and will have no bearing on your association with HomeNet in anyway. You are free not to respond to any of the issues raised during interview. You can go out of the discussion whenever you feel so. Please give your consent for participation in the interview by giving your details.

Thank you for your consent to participate in the interview.

Name:                       Age:                   Occupation:
Country:                    City:

Number of Years since working as HBW:

Years of Association with HomeNet:

Associated with any other organization/union/association (name, if any):

Date:                        Starting Time:         End Time:

Guidelines

1. How did you come to know about the HomeNet? What was the process to become member of a HomeNet? Please elaborate on the election of executive council members (Probe: representation or organized/individual members, voting rights, tenure etc.)

2. What motivated you to become a member of the HomeNet? Please identify the push and pull factors (motivating and de-motivating factors), which worked for/against HBWs being associated with HomeNet.

3. What kinds of activities (meetings, workshops, counselling session, any other recreational activity) were carried out under HomeNet? How often did you attend those activities? What motivated/discouraged you to attend regularly?

4. How often did you get an opportunity to put forth your views/opinion in the meetings of HomeNet?
5. What advantages did you see of the formation of HomeNet? (Probe: in terms of collective membership, coming together, networking, lobbying for a cause/issue)

6. Have national HomeNets/HNSA served as enabling platform for HBWs?

7. To what extent have these networks helped in facilitating the organization of HBWs (who are otherwise isolated)?

8. What benefits/new opportunities were you getting after being associated with HomeNet? (e.g. skill enhancement training, marketing training, advocacy training, health insurance, maternity benefit, adult education, education of child, old age benefit, child care centre etc.)

9. What positive changes did you notice in relation to your work, after becoming a member of the HomeNet? (e.g. better wage, wage in time, reduce gender differentials on wage, better work environment, social security such as benefit of PF etc.)

10. What would you have missed out on, had you not been a member of HomeNet?

11. What kind of other support/assistance (financial or any other) were you getting from HomeNet? (help in terms of providing raw materials, marketing of finished products etc.)

12. What other kind of support/assistance would you like HomeNet to provide, besides the ones that are being presently provided?

13. To what extent have these networks enabled HBWs to attain increased bargaining power/visibility and to converge on common agendas to push for at the national level?

14. What kind of difficulties/resistance did you face while/after joining the HomeNet from community/family/employers/dealers etc? How did you overcome them?

15. What changes did you observe in yourself after being associated with HomeNet, in comparison to the period when you were not a member of the same? (Probe on: informed about their rights, self-confidence, gender discrimination, health/family life, economic condition etc.)

16. On family front, what changes have you noticed? (Probe: consulted on important family matter and, financial issues, no more physical abuse etc.)

17. After your association with HomeNet, what kind of changes did you observe/notice in the community/employers/suppliers/dealers’ attitude while interacting with you?

18. What other measures can be taken by HomeNet to ensure the sustainability of the network/to make it more effective? What measures you suggest for making it self-sustainable?

19. Are there any other issues/initiatives that you feel HomeNet/UNIFEM should take up? Please elaborate. What are your expectations with HomeNet/UNIFEM/local administration/government?

20. Please share your views on the overall impact of the UNIFEM’s HBW programme on you and the community, however small, it may be? (Probe for both positive as well as negative impacts, if any)
Evaluation of UNIFEM’s Regional Programme for HBWs in South Asia

FGD with members of HomeNet (HBWs)

Good Morning/Afternoon!! We_________are from CMS, New Delhi (India) and would like to interact with you/ you all to have your valuable views and opinion about HomeNet and UNIFEM’s programme for Home based Workers in South Asia. Your views and opinion will not be identified as any individual’s response but that of the group. We therefore, request you to freely share your views, as your comments and feedback will help us in improving the programme and make it more effective and far-reaching at community as well as national level. Your valuable inputs will help in working towards bringing the desired changes at the policy level in national as well as global context.

Your participation will be voluntary and will have no bearing on your association with HomeNet in anyway. You are free not to respond to any of the issues raised during discussion/interview. You can go out of the discussion whenever you feel so. Please give your consent for participation in the discussion/interview by putting/giving your details in the matrix below.

Thank you for your consent to participate in the discussion/interview.

Country:   Venue (City):

Date:

Participants’ Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age (In yrs.)</th>
<th>Occupation/Activity engaged in as HBW</th>
<th>Years of association with HomeNet</th>
<th>Remarks, if any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines

1. How did you come to know about the HomeNet? What was the process to become member of a HomeNet? Please elaborate on the election of executive council members (Probe: representation or organized/individual members, voting rights, tenure etc.)

2. What motivated you to become a member of the HomeNet? Please identify the push and pull factors (motivating and de-motivating factors), which worked for/against HBWs being associated with HomeNet.

3. What kinds of activities (meetings, workshops, counselling session, any other recreational activity) were carried out under HomeNet? How often did you attend those activities? What motivated/discouraged you to attend regularly?

4. How often did you get an opportunity to put forth your views/opinion in the meetings of HomeNet?

5. What advantages did you see of the formation of HomeNet? (Probe: in terms of collective membership, coming together, networking, lobbying for a cause/issue)

6. Have national networks/HNSA served as enabling platform for HBWs?

7. To what extent have these networks helped in facilitating the organization of HBWs (who are otherwise isolated)?

8. What benefits/new opportunities were you getting after being associated with HomeNet? (e.g. skill enhancement training, marketing training, advocacy training, health insurance, maternity benefit, adult education, education of child, old age benefit, child care centre etc.)

9. What positive changes were noticed by you in relation to your work, after becoming a member of the HomeNet? (e.g. better wage, wage in time, reduce gender differentials on wage, better work environment, social security such as benefit of PF etc.)

10. What would you have missed out on, had you not been a member of HomeNet?

11. What kind of other support/assistance (financial or any other) were you getting from HomeNet? (help in terms of providing raw materials, marketing of finished products etc.)

12. What other kind of support/assistance would you like HomeNet to provide, besides the ones that are being presently provided?

13. To what extent have these networks enabled HBWs to attain increased bargaining power/visibility /and to converge on common agendas to push for at the national level?
14. What kind of difficulties/resistance did you face while/after joining the HomeNet from community/family/employers/dealers etc? How did you overcome them?

15. What changes did you observe in yourself after being associated with HomeNet, in comparison to the period when you were not a member of the same? (Probe on: informed about their rights, self-confidence, gender discrimination, health/family life, economic condition etc.)

16. On family front, what changes have you noticed? (Probe: consulted on important family matter and, financial issues, no more physical abuse etc.)

17. After your association with HomeNet, what kind of changes did you observe/notice in the community/employers/suppliers/dealers’ attitude while interacting with you?

18. What other measures can be taken by HomeNet to ensure the sustainability of the network/ to make it more effective? What measures you suggest for making it self-sustainable?

19. Are there any other issues/initiatives that you feel HomeNet/UNIFEM should take up? Please elaborate. What are your expectations with HomeNet/UNIFEM/local administration/government?

20. Please share your views on the overall impact of the UNIFEM’s HBW programme on you and the community, however small, it may be? (Probe for both positive as well as negative impacts, if any)
Evaluation of the UNIFEM’s Regional Home Based Workers programme in South Asia Phase II (2004-07)

IDI Guideline – Representative of MBOs

Name: ________________________________  Place:______________________________
Designation in HomeNet: _________________ Years of Association with HomeNet: _____
Parent Organization/Association:_______________________________________________
Occupation: __________________________________________________________________

1. How adequately were the issues with regard to the HBWs in the country addressed by UNIFEM’s programme?

2. Were HBWs an issue at the policy level in your country when the programme started in 2000 and what changes were noticed over the period of time?

3. How can the programme be better designed to match the priorities in future and to make improvement in terms of service delivery and reach?

4. How has the programme helped in strengthening your organization?

5. How vital were national HomeNets and partner organizations contributions in pooling resources? What efforts were made to mobilize funds from sources other than UNIFEM?

6. How successful was the programme in enhancing the capacity of HBWs at regional/national level? How did the programme facilitate the process of bringing positive change(s) in the situation of HBWs?

7. To what extent was the programme successful in bringing about positive changes in the policy framework in your country?

8. In next phase, do you think the programme’s focus needs to be expanded? What changes need to be brought in the programme to make it more effective?

9. Have the risk factors for the HBWs reduced over time?

10. What were the immediate impacts, both positive & negative, of the programme?

11. What were the long-term effects, both positive & negative, of the programme/HomeNet?

12. Any impact positive/negative that was not foreseen, but took place?

REMARKS, if any

Interviewed by:

Date:
IDI Guideline – Officials in the Ministry

1. How critical was the issue of HBWs for your Ministry? In other words, in terms of prioritization, where did you place the issue of HBWs? What measures were taken by the Ministry to support the cause of HBWs (e.g. in terms of identification, budget allocation, framing of policies, legislations, giving them representation at different forums). What changes were made in the Legislative reforms with regard to the rights of the HBWs?

2. What kind of convergence was there between key line departments/Ministry on the issue of HBWs in the country?

3. How adequately were the issues with regard to the HBWs in the country addressed by UNIFEM’s programme? What issues you feel are still needed to be brought to the fore?

4. To what extent was the programme successful in bringing about positive changes in the policy guidelines for HBWs in  (name of the country)? Has the programme brought change in the willingness at the government level to discuss issues pertaining to women, particularly women HBWs, in addressing need for their social protection?

5. What changes need to be brought in the programme to make it more effective in the next phase?