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Introduction

The Overall Effectiveness Evaluation included preparation of five case studies, one for each of the C&A Foundation signature programmes, as identified below. The five case studies informed the analysis and recommendations presented in Volume 1 of this study, and have been compiled separately in Volume 2.
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1. Introduction

In February 2019, Universalia was contracted to conduct an Overall Effectiveness Evaluation (OEE) of C&A Foundation (2014/15-2019/20). The purpose of the evaluation was “to assess the extent to which the foundation is making progress towards achieving its vision, mission and strategic objectives”. Given the importance of context in examining the fashion industry’s complex system, the evaluation team undertook five case studies, one for each programmatic area of the foundation’s work.

This case study examines the Sustainable Raw Materials programme. The initiatives in Table 1.1 (at end of section) were sampled for the case study.

The evaluation team collected data for the case study using interviews, document review (documents consulted are listed in Appendix A), the Staff Survey and a field visit. Thirty-six stakeholder interviews were done for the case study (of programme staff, staff of partner organisations and non-grantee partners listed in Appendix B). In addition, the evaluation considered data from the Partner Perception Report (PPR) 2016 and 2019, Delphi report, previous evaluations and research studies. A field mission, led by Dr Archi Ratogi, visited India from 27 May to 14 June 2019. This mission included a visit to the Newali region of Madhya Pradesh for meetings with farmers, including beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries covered by an initiative led by the Aga Khan Foundation (AKF). Thus, in addition to the in-depth interviews, a total of 30 beneficiary farmers were consulted through focus groups. For the latter, a convenience sampling approach was used, covering a variety of farmers in the region visited. Overall consideration was given to gender, social and economic diversity. For details of the case study methodology, consult Appendix A in Volume 1 of this report.

Overview of the programme

The Sustainable Raw Materials programme had a portfolio of EUR 25.7 million for 2014-18 for implementation and core support grants, EUR 25.0 million of which comprised grants of EUR 100 thousand or more. Year-over-year grant-making by the programme was stable. The portfolio focused heavily on Asia, specifically India, with a significant secondary focus in Brazil, where grants were of smaller value. The programme also made grants in several other countries, including Tanzania and China. The programme has a healthy pipeline in both the number and value of grants.

The average value of implementation and core support grants per year hovered around EUR 600 thousand, with the exception of 2015 (EUR 1.1 million) when large grants were allocated to the AKF (Figure 1.1A). The average duration of grants was slightly above average (25.7 months compared to 23.3; Figure 1.1B). Core support grants that cover administrative and organisational costs of partners (not including farmer institutions) were few and of relatively small value. Overall, the programme is ready to continue its activities, intensify them and expand its narrow focus on cotton to a broader range of materials.

An estimated 25 million metric tonnes of cotton lint is grown annually worldwide. About 85% is conventionally grown, without regulation on the use of genetically modified (GM) seeds and pesticide. Only about 15% of
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Global cotton is sustainably produced, with organic cotton accounting for less than 1% of the global production. This sector is also marked by gaps in investment and coordination.

Based on the premise that organic and sustainable cotton are superior alternatives in terms of carbon emissions, water footprint, ecotoxicity and human toxicity, the vision of the Sustainable Raw Materials programme is that “cotton is produced in a way that improves livelihoods of farmers and does not have an adverse impact on the environment and the health of communities”. The programme has focused on sustainable cotton, with a primary investment in organic cotton, to address a lack of investment and inadequate sector-wide coordination.

Figure 1.1. Implementation and core support grants provided by the Sustainable Raw Materials programme, 2014-18

The programme aims to realise its vision by mainstreaming sustainable cotton, which is built on three interlinked elements:

1. **Direct Capacity Building for Farmers.** These activities have sought to demonstrate the case for sustainable cotton, increase production through capacity support to farmers, and build the capacity and leadership of women farmers. Initiatives were implemented in five countries by nine partners: Action for Social Advancement (ASA), AKF, the German international aid agency (GIZ), Solidaridad, CottonConnect, Pratibha, World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Rare, and Esplar.

2. **Industry and Ecosystem Building.** The programme aimed to build both industry and a complex ecosystem by strengthening industry cooperation as well as strengthening institutions and technologies. Related initiatives were implemented by Cotton2040, Organic Cotton Accelerator (OCA), Better Cotton Initiative (BCI), and Textile Exchange.

3. **Policy Advocacy.** Fostering a supportive policy and regulatory environment was undertaken by development of a network of local stakeholders, for instance materialising through the Organic and Fair-Trade Cotton Secretariat (OFCS) in India. OFCS, founded after an Organic Cotton Roundtable organised jointly by C&A Foundation and CottonConnect, has been the primary focus of activity for engaging and lobbying state governments, and organising multi-stakeholder dialogues.

The programme has been a foundation leader in adopting a systemic approach. Most of its initiatives have strategically focused on organic cotton. Part of the industry and ecosystem building has included a focus on sustainable cotton (primarily with BCI) and other raw materials, including viscose (with CanopyStyle). Programme initiatives were implemented in five countries: Brazil, China, India, Pakistan and Tanzania. Of the initiatives sampled for this evaluation, Madhya Pradesh state in India has been the “hotspot”, identified based on its favourable policy environment for organic farming and its nearly 50% share of organic cotton.

---

in India (a leading producer of organic cotton). As a result, the programme has had multiple initiatives in the state, across the three elements, undertaken by diverse partners. The neighbouring state of Maharashtra has been identified as the next hotspot and a large partnership with Solidaridad is already in place to learn from and replicate the success of Madhya Pradesh.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of sampling &amp; stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>Partner organisation</th>
<th># grants</th>
<th>Strategic objective(s)</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Type of grantee</th>
<th>Type of support</th>
<th>Size of initiative</th>
<th>Value of initiative</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Aga Khan Foundation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Private international non-profit</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€1,389,000</td>
<td>2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 3 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Government development agency</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€1,987,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Diaconia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 3 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€669,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Esplar Centro de Pesquisa e Assessoria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 3 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€317,000</td>
<td>2016, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Stichting Organic Cotton Accelerator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Global-general</td>
<td>Platform</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€2,406,000</td>
<td>2016, 2017, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SAMPLING</th>
<th>PARTNER ORGANISATION</th>
<th>EVALUATION REPORT</th>
<th>DATE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Forum for the Future</td>
<td>Cotton 2040</td>
<td>3.2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Rare Inc.</td>
<td>Accelerating Organic Cotton in China by Replicating Behavioural Change + Phase 1</td>
<td>10.2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research quality assessment</td>
<td>American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>(Follow-up study...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research quality assessment</td>
<td>American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>(Social and Economic Impact Assessment...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research quality assessment</td>
<td>Dalberg</td>
<td>Building a bottom-up network of organic cotton sector stakeholders for effective advocacy: Lessons from India</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research quality assessment</td>
<td>Gatsby Foundation</td>
<td>(Tanzanian Cotton Sector...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research quality assessment</td>
<td>KPMG</td>
<td>(Data Assurance and Process-Related Observations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research quality assessment</td>
<td>PriceWaterhouseCoopers Private Limited</td>
<td>(Bridging the credit gap...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research quality assessment</td>
<td>Thinkstep</td>
<td>(Life Cycle Assessment of Cotton Cultivation Systems)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research quality assessment</td>
<td>(s.a.) Organic Cotton</td>
<td>Mapping Study First version OT_JF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Relevance, niche, strategic focus and alignment of the programme

The programme has been well situated to advance C&A Foundation aim to transform the fashion industry into a force for good. However, the success of the programme has been constrained by the scale of the challenges, the programme’s niche in organic cotton and, later, sustainable cotton, and the limits of the programme’s intervention capacity.

To begin with, the programme has concentrated on investing in organic cotton. Interview respondents rightly perceive the foundation as the world’s leading philanthropy in this area. Although the impact on the supply chain has been modest, this focus was established in the foundation’s first strategic period. According to the 2018 edition of Pulse of the Fashion Industry, two-thirds of the sustainability impact happens at the raw materials stage, and the selection of materials is the single most important decision that determines a product’s environmental and social performance. The report further points out that 72% of the total environmental footprint – equivalent to EUR 618 million – occurs within raw materials. Thus, this focus has been of strategic relevance for the foundation and the industry. It is also narrow, as the foundation itself acknowledges.

In recent years, the foundation has expanded into sustainable cotton. On this, the foundation’s partnership with BCI has been key, since BCI is the most significant proponent of sustainable cotton worldwide. The foundation has also initiated work beyond cotton, which is relevant to the foundation, given that cotton accounts for only about 25% of the raw materials in the fashion industry. The transition from organic cotton to sustainable cotton, and secondarily to other raw materials, has reflected the foundation’s desire to have impact on the industry. However, the approach to materials other than cotton has been limited; for instance, it has not addressed synthetics in any way and cannot be expected, as things currently stand, to have a significant systemic impact.

The alignment of the programme with C&A business interests has been good. There is support for C&A Foundation’s focus on both organic cotton and sustainable cotton. The programme has addressed social as well as environmental dimensions of the fashion supply chain.

To illustrate, the business’s approach to sustainability has three dimensions: Sustainable Products, Sustainable Supply, and Sustainable Lives. Within products, the business has a target of sourcing 100% more sustainable cotton by 2020 and increasing the sustainability of raw materials used to 67% by 2020. According to C&A business leaders: “Cotton makes up 57% of the raw materials we buy, and in 2018 for the sixth time we were the world’s largest buyer of organic cotton, with 38% of our cotton sourced as certified organic.”

The Sustainable Raw Materials programme has covered all dimensions of C&A “products” by supporting initiatives on sustainable cotton, organic cotton and other raw materials. The programme has aimed at creating the conditions for achieving sustainability objectives and

been in alignment with the sustainability priorities of the business.\textsuperscript{1} All interviewed staff of C&A business agreed that the programme had high alignment with business priorities.

While the programme is in strategic alignment with environmental imperatives of the sector and the business, the perception of alignment has been heightened by multiple exchanges among programme staff and the business. Staff of the business and C&A Foundation have had informal and frequent meetings, especially to consult on initiatives supported by the programme. The sense of alignment is supported by strong interpersonal interactions among staff members of the business and the foundation’s programme.

The programme’s focus on organic cotton touches upon livelihoods, empowerment, conservation and agriculture, among other dimensions. This appeals to field-based partners for a variety of reasons. The programme has worked with a diversity of partners focusing on biodiversity (WWF), rural transformation (AKF and ASA), or agriculture and food security (AKF and ASA), all of which align with one or more dimensions of the programme. Partners covered by the sample and interviewed for this evaluation identified multiple strategic advantages of working with the programme, including expansion of geographical coverage (Solidaridad), extension to a new crop in a same geographical area (AKF), and continuation of a previously considered initiative idea (GIZ). During the field visit, AKF reported that organic cotton work aligned with its other initiatives on gender, irrigation, organic farming and infrastructure, among others.

Of the nine initiative evaluation reports considered by this analysis,\textsuperscript{2} eight were deemed good (out of good, adequate, poor) on relevance (Appendix C summarises the OEE analysis of initiative evaluations). Two of the evaluations mentioned that the initiatives showed evidence of C&A Foundation’s system-wide thinking, being ahead of brands and retailers (Forum for the Future’s Cotton 2040 and CottonConnect’s Multi-Country Sustainable Cotton programme in China, India and Pakistan). Most evaluation reports found the initiatives filled a gap, as in the following examples:

- Organic Seed Development: Creating availability of organic seeds to cotton farmers in India and China
- Responsible Environment Enhanced Livelihoods (REEL) to BCI: Educating farmers about pesticide and fertiliser use
- Cotton 2040: Creating a neutral space to pursue alignment of sustainable cotton standards and codes.
- The majority also harnessed key elements to enable and promote conversion to organic or sustainable cotton, as in the following cases
- Drip pool: Establishing an interest free revolving loan fund
- Organic Cotton Farmer Training Programme: Developing training modules to promote organic cotton throughout India

\textsuperscript{1} There is not a sourcing relationship between the foundation and the business, i.e., the C&A business does not necessarily source from programme beneficiaries.
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- BCI: Providing funding to enhance uptake by brands and retailers.

Exceptionally, the evaluation of the initiative implemented in China by Rare was rated poor because the design of the initiative was not realistic (based on overly ambitious scope and targets stemming from underestimation of commercial, policy and regulatory barriers to development of organic cotton in China).

Finally, beneficiary farmers consulted for this evaluation found the alignment of the programme with their own priorities to stem from the impact it has on their lives. As evident from logical frameworks and documents, beneficiary farmers in the sample initiatives, and in much of the programme portfolio, have received support to cultivate and market organic cotton. The relevance and alignment of organic cotton to marginal tribal farmers interviewed for this case study was related to two factors:

1. **Monetary benefits of organic farming in general:** The area of India visited by the evaluation team has an arid climate with moderate rainfall and low productivity. However, absent alternatives, agriculture was the preferred livelihood. The area is largely tribal, and most farmers are small and marginal landholders, the average landholding being 0.7 hectares (ha). In this context, estimates by the Aga Khan Rural Support Programme (AKRSP) team suggest that the expenditure on chemical fertilisers and pesticides was INR 2,458 per acre, compared to an income of INR 6,255 per acre (roughly EUR 31.8 and EUR 80.1 respectively). The switch to organic farming is known to save smallholder farmers from relatively high expenditures at the beginning of the sowing period, when financial security is low for farmers. Large-scale challenges in conversion to organic cotton farming pertain to the procurement of seeds, provision of premium by sourcing companies to farmers, water shortages, and linkages with markets and brands. Nonetheless, the cost-saving and thus financial incentive of organic farming has been large, as reported by nearly all farmers interviewed for this evaluation.

2. **Fall-out and non-monetary benefits of organic farming:** Diverse benefits accrue from a switch to organic farming practices, including human health, soil health, quality and taste of food, increase in value of yield. Such benefits were reportedly experienced by farmers interviewed for this evaluation, representing another dimension of the alignment of organic cotton with farmer priorities.

3. Therefore, the programme emphasis on organic cotton has been in alignment with the broader interests of farmers.

"[We] used to use very high pesticide. It used to be a loss."

**Male beneficiary**

"[We] don’t have to buy other pesticide."

**Female beneficiary**

"There is no expense. Expense on pesticide was about INR 8-900 [roughly, EUR 100-115]. We don’t buy pesticide. We don’t use chemicals for anything now. We don’t buy. We have paid off loans. Others [other farmers] have loans of INR 2-3 lakhs [roughly, EUR 2,500-3,800]."

**Female beneficiary**

"Soil is moist, plant is green. With pesticides, plant used to dry up."

**Male beneficiary**

"Cotton used to be sick. There is less disease. There is more yield now."

**Male beneficiary**
3. Progress towards results

This evaluation, based on a Theory of Change, assessed the programme based on its outputs and outcomes relative to Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and strategic objectives. The effectiveness of the programme has been assessed based on demonstrated outcomes and evidence of the foundation’s contribution to those outcomes. Programme impact is discussed in Section 3.1.

The programme’s performance has been uneven. Three KPIs are on track, one vastly above target and three below target. The last KPI indicates varying success in increasing net farm income in different geographies. According to dashboard data from May 2019 (Appendix D), the following were noted:

1. **Number of certified audited farmers.** The programme is on track with this KPI (49.5 thousand farmers compared to a target of 49.5 thousand). Most certified audited farmers were in India, followed by Tanzania and Pakistan.

2. **Number of hectares under sustainable cotton cultivation and Number of metric tonnes of sustainable cotton produced.** These two KPIs are linked and both include organic cotton and sustainable cotton. The dashboard indicates that the programme is almost exactly on track for the cultivation KPI, having reached 54.4 thousand hectares compared to a target of 54.7 thousand. However, the production KPI is below target in 2018-19 (21.1 thousand metric tonnes compared to 27.6 thousand). For both KPIs, most progress was in India, followed by Pakistan.

3. **Number of women in farm leadership roles.** The programme overperformed on this KPI, achieving 2.6 thousand women in leadership roles compared to a target of 600 for the 2018-19 season. Most progress is in India and China.

4. **Percentage increase in net farm income by geography.** Performance on this KPI has increased more than planned in India and Tanzania, but it decreased in China (before the initiative closed) during the period considered by the evaluation. In Pakistan it increased slightly, though not as much as planned. This was primarily due to contextual factors and the selection of partners – two important factors of effectiveness and sustainability.

5. **Percentage increase in uptake of sustainable cotton by brands and Percentage increase in uptake of organic cotton by brands.** The programme had good success against the former indicator: while BCI performed well in 2016-17 and 2017-18 (achieving 84% and 91% increases against targets of 54% and 56% respectively), in 2018-19 the increase was 49% against a target of 50%. As of May 2019, the KPI on sustainable cotton is on target; however, that KPI has not been reported against since the beginning of the programme (the target has been a 5% increase per year).

6. **Number of policies and regulations supporting sustainable farming.** Performance against this KPI was stable, and in 2018-19 was below the expected value. According to dashboard data, the programme contributed to 7 policies and regulations every year, against a target of 6 in 2016-17, target of 8, in 2017-18, 11 in 2018-19 and 12 in 2019-20.

This discussion of progress is organised around elements of the strategy and on results. Each of the three strategy areas of the programme is presented and discussed below.

**Direct capacity building**

A key area of success was the number of farmers certified for organic cotton cultivation, primarily in India and to some extent in Brazil, Pakistan and Tanzania. The programme estimated that more than 50 thousand

---

1. KPI data result from the compilation by C&A Foundation staff of monitoring data collected by partners.
farmers have been certified and audited through programme activities. This covered a large proportion of the estimated 220 thousand farmers that produced organic cotton globally in 2017.¹

Other outputs at the local level promoted organic cotton farming by smallholder farmers. At sites visited by this evaluation in India, AKF, through AKRSP India helped establish Farmer Interest Groups.² According to documentation, the groups were federated into Farmer Producer Companies (FPC). The activities included training of staff and para-workers, training of farmers, and the establishment of Farmer Field Schools and demonstration and trial plots. A farmer and official of an FPC said:

“Today we have [members in] 22 villages. We now have 900 shareholders. We now have INR 625K [roughly, EUR 8 thousand] in shares. The size of our land holdings is usually 2.5 acres or less. We learnt a lot through AKRSP. We learnt a lot about the market.”

In the programme hotspot region, the initiative implemented by AKRSP alone resulted in seven thousand farmers certified and audited for organic cotton in Madhya Pradesh, India since 2016. The farmers visited by the evaluation team enthusiastically demonstrated the apparatus and methods for preparation of compost and other inputs; a small number of farmers also reported being able to sell these products locally. Interviewed farmers provided variable reports on yields during their participation in the initiative – some reported an increase while others reported a marginal decrease – yet income rose overall because of the reduction in costs of farm inputs.

The programme faced challenges in China related to the complexity of the organic cotton supply chain. The pilot initiative it supported was to develop a scalable model for organic cotton. According to documentation, this initiative intended to provide technical lessons from existing organic cotton practices, build readiness and demand for expansion among neighbouring communities, and refine the economic model. It was to do this while also providing a return on investment for the transition to organic cotton, including building links to markets and creating buying alliances with private sector partners. The objective was to synthesise and codify results of the initiative to inform future expansion. However, this initiative was not successful as most KPIs were not met and the initiative was not given further support. The external evaluation in 2019 recognised “considerable interconnected barriers that the initiative faced in terms of promoting organic cotton in China” but concluded that the initiative “did not provide adequate solutions or meet thresholds in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and results, and sustainability”. The failure of the initiative stemmed from its choice of partner, its design and the suitability of the approach to the context, all important lessons for the programme and the foundation.

² AKF and AKRSP are separate agencies under the Aga Khan Development Network.
Industry and ecosystem building

Programme performance has been either on track or surpassed expectations for uptake of sustainable cotton. In fact, the core and implementation support C&A Foundation provided to BCI has contributed to propelling this field significantly forward (Figure 3.1), and holds promise for greater success regarding the uptake of better cotton.

The KPI on organic cotton uptake by the industry has not been reported in the dashboard and reliable data are not available from external resources. However, qualitative evidence suggests that the programme has had success in this area. Through its initiatives, the programme has made connections among brands and farmers – through efforts of OCA and CottonConnect, but also directly through the partners focused on the field. Indeed, the evaluation visit occurred before the sowing season and at least two brands had procured cotton from the FPCs visited in the previous year, while interview respondents expected other brands to procure from additional areas. This success is also evident in initiative-level data, where OCA has progressed institutionally through the development of its strategy, recruitment of staff, workshop of partners on development of common practices for GM testing in cotton seed and textiles. In view of this evaluation, the single KPI does not sufficiently capture the progress or challenges faced by the programme. For instance, under this strategy area, the programme contributed heavily to the development of OCA, and separately contributed programme staff and resources (not necessarily directed through a particular initiative) to creating links among suppliers and brands.

The programme also faced challenges under this element, especially through OCA. OCA was designed as an accelerator to integrate action in the sector and to create a business case for organic cotton through “farm-level impact and improved integrity”. This works through interventions in sourcing, traceability, seed availability and collective action. C&A Foundation was instrumental in the establishment of OCA in 2016. Although the number of partners has increased (OCA website listed 19 partners in 2019), in terms of programme KPIs, the known percent increase in uptake of organic cotton by brands remained low in 2019. This can be attributed not only to low availability of data but also to OCA being a relatively new actor with limited convening power. In practical terms, this has meant that, so far, there remain only a handful of examples where brands had committed and sourced cotton from initiative areas.

Policy advocacy

Qualitative evidence is available on the nature of the policy work, as follows.

Primarily through the OFCS, the programme supported advocacy action in India at the level of the states. These activities have advanced in Madhya Pradesh and are more recent and nascent in Maharashtra. Notable among the outputs, a Cotton Trailblazers event was organised in Madhya Pradesh in 2018 that brought together industry actors. A partner in India recalled meeting with the state government in 2018:

“OFCS organised a meeting with agriculture minister in MP [Madhya Pradesh] who said they will support organic cotton. All the market players came for a one-day event in MP in Bhopal and government said they will give all out support. The foundation facilitated the process directly or
Activities of this and other initiatives are expected to yield future results. For instance, through OFCS activities, the government of Madhya Pradesh approved establishment of a Centre of Excellence for the development of non-GM seeds, according to the Dalberg Study on OFCS.1 Staff of the programme are also on the advisory group on traceability of the Agricultural and Processed Food Products Export Development Authority, a body of the Indian government. With the recruitment of a manager for advocacy, programme efforts were expected to scale up in India. At the international level, C&A Foundation was recently invited to serve on a working group for the International Cotton Advisory Committee, an association of cotton producing, consuming and trading countries. Further, BCI standards were in the process of being used to different extents by governments in China, Israel, Mozambique, Pakistan and South Africa for the development of standards or guidance. Policy work in Brazil has been preliminary.

Again, the single KPI does not adequately reflect the scale of efforts, or the challenges. A key challenge in the policy and advocacy work was the effort required.

Despite the challenges, policy advocacy has remained on the agenda of the Sustainable Raw Materials programme. This is a strategic lever with much potential for significant transformative change.

Looking to impact

Several evaluations highlighted the selection and articulation of KPIs as a challenge even outside of policy advocacy (for example, BCI and CottonConnect’s Organic Farmer Training Programme and REEL). Therefore, programme KPIs may not be appropriately representing actual achievements and not giving C&A Foundation sufficient guidance for strategic planning. Evaluation reports also suggest that initiatives have had mixed impacts (33% good, 33% adequate, 33% poor). Among the evaluations reviewed, poor performance on impact was related to unrealistic targets, which had to be scaled down (for example, unrealistic targets for Rare, overly ambitious agendas for Organic Roundtable, and insufficient preparation in Rare in China and the Organic Farmer Training Programme in Pakistan – all of which provide important lessons about planning).

While KPI performance has been an important assessment tool, a bigger question pertained to the contribution of C&A Foundation to the fashion industry’s transformation. In the PPR 2019, when asked whether the foundation advanced the state of knowledge in the field and when asked to rate the foundation’s impact on the local community and public policy, partners rated the Sustainable Raw Materials programme the highest of all C&A Foundation programmes (Appendix E). A few explanatory words distinguishing sustainable and organic cotton are shared below.

---

Sustainable cotton

The work of C&A Foundation and BCI on sustainable cotton has made meaningful progress and continues to be promising and well situated to contribute to a transformation of the industry. So far, their work has had the following results:

- A significantly expanded BCI membership base, from 37 retailers and brands in January 2016 to 138 in August 2019
- An accelerated brand conversion process, resulting in measurably shorter conversation times
- Annual uptake of better cotton that has exceeded expectations and was at 1,278 thousand metric tonnes by August 2019, up from 250 thousand in January 2016
- Development of training tools and processes to continue supporting membership and conversion processes.

A key challenge has persisted around national embeddedness, where much work remains to be done and has been underway.

Organic cotton

Partners interviewed for this evaluation from across the policy and non-profit sector were unanimous in the view that by contributing a policy “activism”, increase of production, certification of farmers, and creating connections in procurement, C&A Foundation has made a major contribution to putting organic cotton on India’s national agenda and, because of the importance of India, on the global agenda.

According to partners, the foundation has also emerged as the global leader in the discourse on organic cotton. Results have varied across areas of intervention, with the most advancement in India, which has the highest concentration of partners, investments and global production of organic cotton. A respondent interviewed for the evaluation recalled successes of the programme in eliciting support from across the supply chain:

“One measure of success is that among the brands there is a better understanding that premiums have to reach the farmers directly. That understanding was evident at the conference last year [Cotton Trailblazers event organised by the programme in Madhya Pradesh]. This is a powerful step that brands are listening to farmers. Where does that happen in an industry that they would listen to women farmers?”

Comments from farmers suggest that the outcomes of the programme included a range of environmental benefits, as well as benefits of collective action. A farmer in Chatali village told the evaluation team: “there used to be a lot of loans. Pesticide – it was poison we got from the city. Children used to be sick all the time with itching and sudden fever. Since the project, it is better.”

If not selling the produce through the FPC, there were various points of leakage, where farmers with low literacy and capacities lost money, including for transport, weighing of produce and to pay commissions to intermediaries and ultimate buyers. Explaining the benefits of bypassing several points of loss, one beneficiary farmer stated: “They [FPC] give a better price. Otherwise we would have to pay a price to get it weighed, we will pay the road toll, the ginner will keep some aside. It is much easier to sell it here.”
All of the farmers the evaluation team visited saw a clear case for organic farming: the costs for inputs is low; those lower costs come at an especially vulnerable time of the year when capital is especially tight; the prevalence of cattle husbandry provides a plentiful supply of manure; the land holdings are relatively small and require low amounts of inputs; the yields are similar to or better than conventional farming; the crop is in better health than conventional farming, and fetches a higher price; health benefits of organic crops, along with benefits to soil fertility; and finally, collective action undertaken through the FPC and Farmer Interest Groups allows for higher returns.

Although specific challenges with organic cotton remain, all beneficiary farmers interviewed said they were inclined to continue organic farming. In this way, the programme has had results in various dimensions. However, this does not amount to a transformation of the fashion supply chain. While results can be seen at the level of initiatives, all the results faced sustainability and scalability issues. For instance, while many farmers were certified for organic cotton, the availability of non-GM and organic seeds remained a serious challenge and the goal of making the case for organic cotton. Along with irrigation, availability of seeds has been a major barrier to transformation of the value chain.

Adding to the complexity, local farmers make decisions about farming practices in a non-linear fashion. For instance, individual farmers choose their crop at the time of sowing, and those choices are impossible to predict or model. Therefore, accurate predictions about crops cannot be made in advance, limiting the estimates to be provided to brands. A handful of links between brands and farmers have been established, but these are not yet a prevalent practice; some brands have not been reliable in their procurement from FPCs.

The complexity of the challenges is summed up in “Thought Starter on 2020-2025 Strategic Planning” a programme document that identified the need to change the narrative “from demand driven power dynamics to one where the last tier suppliers (farmers) have a seat on the table”. It should also be noted that the achievements of the programme were discernible mainly in the primary hotspots of the programme, in India and more specifically in Madhya Pradesh. In other contexts (Brazil, Pakistan and Tanzania), while outputs have been on track, the initiatives did not achieve “critical mass”, and the results were not as advanced in ecosystem building and policy advocacy.

In the words of a Staff Survey respondent: “Transformation is a big word and a tall claim – we are not there yet.” On this point, a C&A Foundation staff member said: “To meaningfully contribute to the transformation, the sector will need ten foundations of the size of C&A Foundation.” A partner in India highlighted the complex nature of some of the barriers within the context:

“I will continue with organic even if others stop. We sell it to the company.”

Male beneficiary

Four partners in the PPR 2019 suggested that the programme has made a good start, with impacts likely coming soon. The initiatives outlined in the programme Theory of Change have been implemented and a portion of programme results have been achieved (for instance, increased number of certified farmers; production of organic/sustainable cotton; and others). However, some assumptions have been tested (for instance, those related to consumer demand, and government policies), and the emerging challenges have required the programme to consider additional assumptions (for instance, related to availability of seeds and farm inputs). Also, there has been little programmatic work on the citizen and consumer end, to change
the global narrative on organic and sustainable farming, aimed at seeing progress on this similar to what has been seen on organic and sustainable food.

To sum up, in the relatively short time of its operation, C&A Foundation has made a significant contribution to advancing the case for organic cotton and demonstrated that this may be feasible. Important progress has also been made on sustainable cotton, through the foundation’s partnership with BCI. In these areas, the foundation’s systemic approach has been laudatory, with commensurately appropriate results. The same cannot be said for its work on other raw materials, where investments made have been limited and narrow by comparison.
4. Partnership

The foundation strategy document “Thought Starters on 2020-2025 Strategic Planning of February 2019” identified three kinds of partners: non-profits and social enterprises, enablers and amplifiers, and doers. These partners included grantees and non-grantees and advanced various strategic goals (Table 4.1). Further, among the grantee partners consulted for this evaluation, the initiatives with ASA, OCA and BCI included components of organisational development. Of the signature programmes, however, Sustainable Raw Materials has provided the least core support, having dedicated 2.6% of its budget (implementation and core support grants) to grants identified as core support.

Table 4.1 Partners of the programme, and kinds of support provided, as analysed by the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNERS</th>
<th>NON-GRAANTEE PARTNERS</th>
<th>PRIMARY STRATEGIC GOAL</th>
<th>POLICY ADVOCACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-profits1 and social enterprises</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Yes, but not primarily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enablers &amp; amplifiers (government, multi-stakeholder initiatives)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doers (brands and retailers, input suppliers)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Yes, but not primarily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the grantee and non-grantee partners in the sample used for this evaluation have a wealth of experience and solid reputations in their fields:

- Esplar was established in 1974 and has nearly 50 years of experience working in the North-Eastern parts of Brazil.
- GIZ is one of the world’s largest service providers in international development, with a business volume of more than EUR 3 billion in 2017 as well as about 21 thousand employees spread over more than 120 countries.
- WWF has a formidable reputation as a global conservation organisation and was implementing initiatives in India and Pakistan.
- ASA, AKF, and Solidaridad were all considered by interview respondents, including staff and other partners, to have excellent reputations.

The Sustainable Raw Materials programme also scored among the highest with respect to partnership on the Staff Survey. A high proportion of staff members responding to the survey indicated that the programme established grantee-based partnerships i) with appropriate organisations (65% selected “outstanding” or “high”, higher than any other programme), ii) with

---

1 The evaluation team understands that this include implementing entities such as GIZ.
appropriate non-grantee-based partnership (42% selected “outstanding” or “high”, also higher than any other programme), and iii) in appropriate networks or platforms (46% selected “outstanding” or “high”, compared to 15% selecting “modest” and “not at all”) (see Appendix F). Qualitative data triangulates with this quantitative data, as shown in the text box (also see Appendix G).

In other words, the programme must be recognised for its high network intelligence in its grant-making, which is supported by strong partnership development and engagement unrelated to grants.

While partners have had strong reputations and records in common, their strategic focal areas and profiles differed from one another. Even within the sample considered for this evaluation, the profiles are diverse, including: a grassroots organisation, an international service provider, a faith-based non-profit, a non-government organisation, and an industry accelerator (Table 4.2). Within the hotspot of Madhya Pradesh, this diversity was somewhat reduced, where partners such as ASA and WWF may have competed for similar initiatives as AKF. Although competition occurred among the partners working in congruent regions, partners did not report this to be a serious issue. On the contrary, mutual familiarity allowed partners to collectively engage in policy advocacy efforts. For instance, all partners active in Madhya Pradesh were part of the OFCS and joined to organise meetings with government representatives.

**Table 4.2 Profiles of partners considered in the sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ESTABLISHMENT</th>
<th>MISSION/PROFILE</th>
<th>SECTORS OF WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AKF</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Brings together human, financial and technical resources to address challenges faced by the poorest and most marginalised communities in the world</td>
<td>Agriculture and food security; economic inclusion; education; early childhood development; health and nutrition; and civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>2011, though comprising over 50 years of experience</td>
<td>Service provider in international cooperation for sustainable development and international education work, dedicated to shaping a future worth living around the world</td>
<td>Economic development and employment promotion, energy and the environment, and peace and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaconia</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Non-profit, Christian-inspired social organisation committed to promoting justice and social development</td>
<td>Service of transforming lives, through the empowerment of men, women, and youth from agricultural families; and through the mobilisation of social groups, churches and communities for the accomplishment of human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esplar Centro De Pesquisa E As</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>To jointly build a sustainable, ecologically sustainable and rights-based development project with a focus on family farming, based on agroecology, gender equality, strengthening autonomy of social movements, food and nutritional sovereignty and security, and against discrimination of race, ethnicity and generation</td>
<td>Agroecology and family agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Focuses on creating a prosperous organic cotton sector that benefits everyone – from farmer to consumer</td>
<td>Investments tackle the challenges in the sector and realise the benefits that organic cotton can bring for people, planet and long-term prosperity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most sampled partners were identified and selected by C&A Foundation based on prior experience of programme staff, with one (GIZ) recruited through a tender process. C&A Foundation has also participated on the board of some organisations, including BCI, where it is on the Investment Committee as part of BCI’s participatory governance system. As previously stated, the multidimensional nature of this agriculture-based programme created alignment with a variety of partners and their strategic priorities. All partners reported being able to use C&A Foundation support to different ends that were strategically aligned in various ways.

C&A Foundation support has included a financial component, often accompanied by an important non-monetary component. This additional enabling support outside of the grants has included, for instance, technical assistance, attendance at meetings, enabling connections with brands and support to procure seeds. Partners interviewed for this evaluation were highly appreciative of C&A Foundation as a grant-making body and as a strategic partner. A field-based partner commented:

“I see how active they are at the level of brands etc. this is another level, outside of the implementation of contracts. They are extremely well linked with the whole scene. [Programme staff] put me in touch with all brand retailers by email. The large retailers are talking to the foundation of a competition brand [C&A business]. I think that is very remarkable. Achieving contacts in a large organisation is not easy. So, it is extremely useful that the foundation is involved.”

The value of C&A Foundation as a strategic partner has derived from experience and reputation in the organic cotton sector. Partners generally said or implied that the foundation was able to create links across the supply chain. In particular, partners regarded as strategically valuable the ability and support of the foundation in linking partners with brands. They regarded the capacity to link with brands as rare among their donors. A partner with a different profile and geographical focus than the one above commented:

“If you find a friend like C&A Foundation who knows the technicalities and markets, and helps you find genuine buyers – that is huge. That is an immense contribution by the foundation. For us to do that without C&A Foundation would have taken years and we would have got entangled with fraudulent practices. We could have got sucked into that.”

To a small extent, in the review period, the programme provided core support to only a handful of partners. Among sampled partners, only OCA received core support (ASA was interviewed, although not part of the evaluation sample; BCI was examined through a separate external evaluation). According the documentation for the initiative, the foundation supported development of the Secretariat, including staff costs and capacity development during the first phase of support, while the second phase included the development of strategy, governance framework, marketing and communications, and the pursuit of additional affiliate organisations. Although such support has not been commonplace, partners have regarded it as crucial. It should be noted that for OCA, C&A Foundation was the biggest philanthropic partner (70% of philanthropic revenue), larger than the overall revenue from brand and retail partners.¹ Such support of C&A Foundation has been crucial for the continued work of partner organisations.

To a smaller extent, programme initiatives with a capacity development focus included the provision of support for the development of farmer institutions. For instance, Diaconia supported the development of Organismos Participativos de Avaliação da Conformidade (OPACs), roughly translated as Participatory Organisations for the Evaluation of Organic Quality, while AKF, ASA and WWF supported the organisation of FPCs. However, the approach for this varied and depended on context and partner. Of note, these farmer-level institutions were not regarded as direct partners of the foundation, and these partnerships were not directly assessed for this evaluation.

BCI and C&A Foundation have had a multifaceted relationship that rests on grants, membership in BCI, participation in BCI’s governance and a history of professional interactions in cotton-related networks. The partnership has been solid and long-lasting, representing a commitment over time. C&A Foundation grant-making has undoubtedly contributed to the continued growth and institutionalisation of BCI, helping build its reputation and membership base, among other things.

The majority of partners interviewed perceived the Sustainable Raw Materials programme as a constructive, well-meaning and involved partner. The words used by partners to describe the programme team included: “kind and considerate”, “they are with you. They won’t just leave you”. Three interviewed partners said that, in their experience, the programme team was the best partner they had encountered. This was based on the flexibility, non-hierarchical relationship, understanding of the challenges of implementation, and support that went beyond simply provision of funds.

However, in the PPR 2019, the programme received scores that were either in the median or below average compared to other programmes. The programme scored relatively low on responsiveness, transparency, fairness, openness to ideas, approval process, and overall satisfaction (Appendix F). This relatively low placement of the programme must be understood in comparison to other programmes, which performed even better on providing support that was seen as constructive. Foundation staff themselves perceived that the foundation has been a difficult partner. This was noted in interviews and seen in results of the Staff Survey.

Therefore, while the partnership has been valuable to partners, foundation staff expressed concern that their partnership practices could be perceived as overbearing in some instances. Staff members explained this concern given the KPI-driven nature of the foundation, and its emphasis on results and “success.”
5. Sustainability

The results of the programme are on track to be sustainable. First, the average value of programme grants is high and their duration is appropriate. Second, the programme’s grant-making practices have favoured the sustainability of results for both organic cotton and sustainable cotton. Finally, the programme has high levels of co-funding, another sustainability factor.

With sustainable cotton in particular the data suggests that C&A Foundation support, through a large grant to BCI, has contributed significantly to the increasing membership and uptake. The training materials produced with grant funds have helped shape the discourse around sustainable cotton and to spread notions of ecological ethics and gender equality. Finally, the effort dedicated to transferring ownership of the Better Cotton Standard System to governments and industry organisations has contributed to progress.

For organic cotton, however, other factors have affected the sustainability of results.

1. **Direct capacity building for farmers.** All 30 interviewed farmers reported benefits for finance, health, environment and well-being. The farmers were convinced about the switch to organic farming, and they expressed no intention to switch back to using pesticides for the foreseeable future. These results are clearly sustainable.

2. The sustainability of results is more limited in other areas. For instance, farmers in the areas visited work through FPCs, which act on their behalf to procure seeds, negotiate with brands for procurement of cotton, and other matters. Two FPCs interviewed did not consider themselves capable of carrying out these functions without continuing support of the AKRSP.

3. Other challenges to the sustainability of the shift to organic cotton included the availability of organic seeds, which has remained a large challenge. For certified organic cotton, the use of non-GM seeds is mandatory. Yet every partner interviewed for this evaluation acknowledged the limited availability of organic seeds (except in Tanzania), a major barrier to the sustainability of organic cotton farming. Rajinder Chaudhary, former professor in the Department of Economics at Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, said: “BT [GM] cotton entered Indian fields illegally and then was accorded post-facto approval. Today non-BT cotton seeds are practically out of the market and can only be procured with great difficulty.”

4. Considering the severity of the challenge, seeds have been identified as a priority for future programme initiatives.

5. Bio-inputs can also create a limitation for sustained production of organic cotton in certain areas of India and elsewhere. In the areas of India visited, bio-inputs were not a serious concern, because land holdings were generally small and households tended to rear cattle, which provide biomaterials. In areas where landholdings were larger or there are fewer domestic cattle, the availability of bio-inputs was a bigger challenge.

6. Water shortages were a challenge for some programme areas. Further, the certification for organic cotton has been arduous and required intense documentation, and neither farmers nor FPCs had the capacity to meet certification requirements. In the area visited by the evaluation team, the farmer documentation needed to be maintained, audited and continuously updated, requiring extensive technical capacity. Farmer documentation was stored at the office of the FPC because it was not possible for farmers to retain and maintain logbooks. These challenges, and the limited evidence available otherwise, hindered sustainability of organic cotton farming beyond the initiative period.

---

While the conversion to organic agriculture practice may be sustained, the production of non-GM organic cotton has low sustainability without continued intervention.

7. Industry and ecosystem building. Some programme initiatives provided organisational support to partners. Partners considered these immensely valuable to the sustainability of their organisations. BCI stands out as a significant beneficiary of such support.

8. The efforts of the programme have built some connections among farmers and brands, leading to a handful of examples where brands were able to procure organic cotton from farmers. However, this required continued involvement of foundation staff and partners. The sustainability of the results of these processes is tenuous beyond the grant periods or without sustained effort by programme staff.

9. Policy advocacy. While results were limited, the maintenance of progress is contingent upon the continued involvement of C&A Foundation with its partners. For instance, many partners noted that the government in MP [Madhya Pradesh] had changed recently, and some of the prior policy efforts would have to be repeated. Given the nature of policy cycles, where efforts need to be maintained until a threshold is crossed, current results were not sustainable without continued work.

Among the evaluation reports reviewed by the evaluation team, the performance on sustainability was mixed (44% deemed poor, 33% adequate, 22% good). The two initiatives that scored well had designs tailored to the beneficiary situation and assured financial sustainability following initiative closure. Conversely, those performing poorly had not secured sufficient funding to assure financial sustainability beyond the end of C&A Foundation funding, and had not adequately strengthened their institutional structures.
6. Factors of effectiveness and sustainability

The evaluation identified three key factors of effectiveness and sustainability: complexity, context, and partners and staff. Each is discussed briefly in this chapter.

**Complexity**

A fundamental factor to consider for a programme like this is the scope of its ambitions and its engagement with extremely complex phenomena. Changing agricultural practices is neither simple nor linear. The ambitions of C&A Foundation and the programme have been wider than simply changing agriculture practices or fibre production and use and are therefore subject to a complex political economy. Whether it is farmers with small or marginal holdings, the private sector or government policy processes, each area of intervention is exceedingly complex and is affected by factors such as climate change, water availability, growing seasons, political change, and financial markets. As a result, programme interventions have had to remain flexible and adaptive. This complexity has had two related implications: no single model could apply across the range of contexts where the programme operates, and initiatives may require longer-term efforts before results are sustainable.

**Context**

The programme has undertaken initiatives in widely differing contexts across three continents. The contextual factors differed within countries and even within a single initiative area. For instance, in Brazil land holdings were larger than those targeted in India. Within India, the programme operated in contexts with different agricultural practices and political priorities. In such cases, the nature of the initiatives, expected results and sustainability varied. For instance, the activities in China were similar to those in India and elsewhere but did not yield the same results and the resources available to farmers in Madhya Pradesh and Brazil differed, leading to differences in the sustainability of their results.

**Partners and staff**

The programme has benefited from partners and staff with mutual appreciation for one another, and both with strong reputations and records. This helped ensure programmatic effectiveness and sustainability. For instance, AKRSP established solid relations with farmer communities in the areas visited by this evaluation for many years before the start of the initiatives. The same has been true for most sampled partners in other areas, as noted in evaluations of individual initiatives such as those in Gujarat. The social capital of the partner allowed for increased effectiveness of programme activities. Further, field staff were likely to remain active in the area even beyond the initiative, potentially providing ad hoc support to farmer institutions, and enabling further sustainability. In contrast, the evaluation of the initiative in China found that the choice of partner was a factor in its failure. Further, evaluation notes from the External Final Evaluation of the Multi-Country Sustainable Cotton Programme implemented by CottonConnect in China, India and Pakistan stated: “Drip-irrigation component capitalised on the experience and approaches of AKRSP which aligned well with CottonConnect”. Therefore, it noted, “the selection of appropriate programme partners who have long-term interest in approaches and results is vital to the programme success.”
7. Gender

The KPIs for the programme included one on gender: the number of women in leadership roles at farm level. About 2,500 women were in farm leadership roles at programme conclusion, compared to a conservative target of 600. Gender has been a criterion for the initiative screening and monitoring. The programme team has also been led and largely staffed by women. However, no explicit strategy for gender equity informed the programme that might “transform harmful gender norms, roles and relations”. In its integration of gender, the programme was at best gender sensitive (level 3 on the World Health Organization’s [WHO] Gender Responsive Assessment Scale).\(^1\)

While the Sustainable Raw Materials programme has not funded gender transformative work, the design of initiatives and their activities duly considered inherent gender roles in agriculture. For instance, AKRSP organised training sessions on farm inputs for men and women separately. In the villages visited for this evaluation, women were able to share details about the training and were generally satisfied with the benefits of organic farming. In Brazil, both sampled partners reported a strong emphasis on gender, and specifically targeted the challenge of women leadership in OPACs, which functions as a certifying agency for organic producers.

In some instances, partners took advantage of opportunities available through their other projects, yielding positive results for gender. For instance, AKRSP utilised a resonance between the foundation-supported initiative and their other projects to organise Self-Help Groups. During the field visit, the evaluation team met with members of two such groups comprising female members of the households where the men were members of FPCs. Self-Help Groups have been organised so that members could contribute savings towards a micro-fund that could be used for mutual loans among members. Several such groups have been organised in other villages and were able to access microcredit through banks. Interviewed members reported several benefits of microcredit – access to credit, improved incomes, access to banking systems, ability to participate in decision making, and overall standard of life. In Tanzania, the initiative utilised the cross-cutting nature of an agriculture-focused initiative to include dialogue with women, including on issues of nutrition and health.

Progress has been made on gender in the partnership with BCI. Activities under the grant established a “breakthrough” understanding of the participation of both genders in better cotton production and of potential pathways to improve gender equality within BCI. One key informant noted that paying attention to women’s empowerment is part of what is needed to come to grips with a range of ethical challenges in the supply chain, including forced labour. Another informant suggested that bringing out the story of women empowered in cotton may help to convey the bigger story of better cotton to fashion consumers.

Overall, the programme has yielded an approach that is considered gender sensitive – it has attended to gender roles, norms and societal needs. However, this approach has not aimed to transform fundamental norms and has not been transformative. This is in part due to the larger social context. For example, a fundamental challenge at the field level in India was that the certification for organic cotton was provided to the farmer who formally held the land. Typically, land has been held in the name of male family members and therefore, participation of female members has been limited institutionally. In Pakistan, gender norms are culturally rooted; the social-cultural context of Pakistan and the relatively small-scale of initiatives resulted in limited advancements in terms of gender. Further, most partners were of the view that it is unrealistic to expect initiatives of limited time and budget to transform entrenched gender norms among rural societies.

---

\(^1\) For more information on the scale considered by this evaluation, please refer to: World Health Organization. (s.d.) \(\text{WHO Gender Responsive Assessment Scale: criteria for assessing programmes and policies. Available at: }\) https://www.who.int/gender/mainstreaming/GMH_Participant_GenderAssessmentScale.pdf
8. C&A Foundation functions

The principal focus of this chapter is C&A Foundation human resource matters, as they were the most relevant to the Sustainable Raw Materials programmes. Monitoring, evaluation and learning and the use of KPIs are also covered.

**Human resources**

The programme was unique in that nearly all programme staff was based in the India office, and nearly all the staff in that office worked for the programme. One programme staff person was based in Brazil, while the India office had one Effective Philanthropy (EP) staff person, as well as a recently recruited staff member for Communications. One programme staff member in the India office had recently transitioned into another programme. A programme consultant was based in Pakistan as India-based staff were not able to travel there due to challenges in the visa process. A programme manager had recently been recruited (outside of the period considered for the evaluation) to advance the advocacy function of the programme. The team included two programme assistants.

Staff members worked closely with one another and reported being able to learn from one another and create a coherent programmatic approach. Representation from EP and Communications in the same office was useful to programme staff, as it strengthened interpersonal relations and provided contextually appropriate functions and support. Some staff members identified the lack of specific human resource guidance as a gap in the functioning of the foundation, but not a serious hindrance to the initiatives themselves. Many programme staff particularly wanted clarity on matters such as flexible work arrangements, travel policy, and other human resources issues, given their implications for programmatic efficiency. Staff reported experiencing pressure to implement a high volume of grants.

**Monitoring, evaluation and learning**

According to partners, KPIs were not entirely useful for monitoring results, mainly because initiatives rarely followed a linear approach. The KPIs have not reflected the full extent of efforts undertaken and results achieved, including the organisation of farmer institutions; environmental benefits of organic farming (including to soil, biodiversity, climate change, water); and enhancement of farmer well-being. They have flagged the matter in the hopes that the foundation will reconsider its use of KPIs as a primary means of monitoring performance.
9. Strategic levers and leverage points

The Sustainable Raw Materials programme identified six strategic objectives during the evaluation period, as listed in “Signature Programme Review – Sustainable Cotton 2018”. These align with the three elements identified in the Sustainable Cotton Programme Strategy (updated in November 2017) and brought into the Thought Starters on 2020-2025 Strategic Planning of February 2019 (Table 9.1).

Table 9.1 Sustainable Raw Materials programme investment by theme and strategic objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>% OF OVERALL PROGRAMME FUNDING AS OF APRIL 2018</th>
<th>OVERALL PROGRAMME FUNDING AS OF APRIL 2018 (IN MILLION €)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Demonstrate the socioeconomic and environmental case for sustainable cotton</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>SO3</td>
<td>Increase production through capacity building and governance support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>SO5</td>
<td>Support initiatives that build the leadership of women farmers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem building</td>
<td>SO4</td>
<td>Foster a policy and regulatory environment that supports sustainable cotton</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem building</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Strengthen industry cooperation to support sustainable cotton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy advocacy</td>
<td>SO6</td>
<td>Strengthen institutions and technologies that support sustainable cotton</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sustainable Cotton Programme Strategy to 2020

The programme has consistently followed the three elements of its strategy, focusing on initiatives within these areas. The highest concentration of effort and results has been in the capacity building of farmers, leading to a high number of farmers certified and audited. The other themes received less attention and are to be emphasised in forthcoming cycles. This is considered strategically appropriate as experience has allowed C&A Foundation to build experience, data, business case and a profile. This should inform the work of the next strategic period, which will be oriented more toward systems change.
During the foundation’s first strategic period, the programme focused primarily on organic cotton, and regarded India and Madhya Pradesh as hotspots. To a lesser degree, the programme also supported initiatives on sustainable cotton, and even less so other raw materials. Those interviewed for this evaluation agreed that this approach has generally been effective, yielding results consistent with the history and scale of the programme, and appropriate, engaging relevant actors and leverage points. The emphasis on organic cotton has allowed the programme to claim a leadership position in India and globally on the crop, and its three-pronged strategy has allowed it to intervene across the supply chain. Although interviewed partners pointed to recurring challenges related to seeds and water, they also conceded that such challenges could not have been foreseen.
10. Conclusions

Through its first five years of experience, the Sustainable Raw Materials programme had undeniable successes and some limited but important failures (in China and its limited connections with brands). However, it has emerged as a global leader of organic cotton discourse. It also has initiated expansion of its portfolio beyond organic cotton to sustainable cotton, as well as into other raw materials. The progress has been impressive and the trajectory is promising.

The programme’s hotspot approach has been promising and should be continued. This approach has supported a critical mass of implementing partners and initiated developing policy advocacy, though much work remains. This has also allowed for the resources to be invested in a common area, leading to complementarity in the results of three strategic areas. Equally important, it has allowed the programme to demonstrate the overall business case for organic cotton.

Some initiatives supported by the programme are only in the first or second cycle of implementation. Given the complexity of contexts and the profundity of the change sought by C&A Foundation, the programme should continue the implementation of its initiatives. A continued commitment to organic cotton should certainly be maintained, but there is room for the programme to continue expanding into sustainable cotton and other raw materials. Doing so, however, should not further strain an already stretched staff. It should also be based on in-house sectoral experience as well as a systems change and hotspot approach. Early contenders include viscose, given the investment already made with CanopyStyle, and alternatives to polyester.

Moving forward, the programme will be challenged to ensure the sustainability of results beyond the period of any one grant. The dimensions of sustainability include the continued accrual of benefits in hotspots as well as sustainable cotton and other raw materials. Addressing contextual challenges beyond India and Brazil, will be important for the programme, and will need to be tackled with thoughtful strategic intent (a resource that is much available in the team), while also developing strategic partnerships with other programmes of the foundation (as being undertaken in Pakistan).

As the longevity of results is considered, another important dimension is gender. While the initiatives focused on farm-level well-being, additional gender consideration may contribute to a holistic approach and greater sustainability of results. Finally, at the level of the beneficiary, the programme should consider an approach that goes beyond organic cotton, and instead considers the overall well-being of the farmer, situated within a wider and more complex system. This may allow the foundation to benefit from a narrative to which it has contributed, by providing benefits of environment, health and well-being. This may also allow for the programme to achieve more effectiveness in other areas, as the narrative is likely to appeal to a variety of partners. Again, this points to the merits of exploring areas of concord with the foundation’s enabling functions (such as, Communications) and other programme teams.
Appendix A. Documents consulted

For each sampled grant, the following documents were reviewed (when available): proposals, due diligence, progress reports, evaluation reports, related research reports, press coverage. The evaluation team also reviewed evaluation reports, as listed in the sampling.


## Appendix B. Stakeholders consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>TITLE / POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argento, Crispin</td>
<td>OCA</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjun</td>
<td>AKRSP (India)</td>
<td>Field officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpit</td>
<td>AKRSP (India)</td>
<td>Field officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghel, Sandeep</td>
<td>AKRSP (India)</td>
<td>Area Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baig, Iqbal</td>
<td>AKRSP (India)</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baruah, Litul</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Analytics Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhardwaj, Manavi</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhat, Devika</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Team Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonfim, Waneska</td>
<td>Diaconia</td>
<td>General Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brennan, Adam</td>
<td>C&amp;A</td>
<td>Unit Leader, Sustainable Chemicals Management – Europe &amp; Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buermann, Hendrik</td>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester, Anita</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Head of Sustainable Raw Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chugh, Puneet</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Team Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhar, Murali</td>
<td>WWF India</td>
<td>Director, Sustainable Agriculture Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducas, Charline</td>
<td>C&amp;A</td>
<td>Unit Leader, Global Circular Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouveia, Taciana</td>
<td>Federação de Órgãos para Assistência Social e Educação</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogue, Jeffrey</td>
<td>C&amp;A</td>
<td>Global Chief Sustainability Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jain, Charu</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Senior Advocacy Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laleeta</td>
<td>AKRSP (India)</td>
<td>Field officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima, Pedro</td>
<td>ESPLAR Centro de Pesquisa e Assessoria</td>
<td>Technical Director &amp; Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louies, Catherine</td>
<td>C&amp;A</td>
<td>Project Management Office Global Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mogare, Bharat</td>
<td>AKRSP (India)</td>
<td>Regional Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondal, Ashis</td>
<td>ASA</td>
<td>Founder Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliveira, Marcus</td>
<td>ESPLAR Centro de Pesquisa e Assessoria</td>
<td>President &amp; Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omkar</td>
<td>AKRSP (India)</td>
<td>Field officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastore, Prashant</td>
<td>Solidaridad</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pereira, Luciana</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips, Bini</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poti, Lashmi</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakash</td>
<td>AKRSP (India)</td>
<td>Field Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>TITLE / POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santiago, Fabio</td>
<td>Diaconia</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawhney, Tinni</td>
<td>Aga Khan Foundation</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxena, Sandeep</td>
<td>AKRSP (India)</td>
<td>Senior Programme Specialist (Agriculture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh, RP</td>
<td>Aga Khan Foundation</td>
<td>Regional Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijay, Shubhi</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadav, Sunil Kumar</td>
<td>AKRSP (India)</td>
<td>Programme Specialist (Marketing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** This case study used data from other interviews conducted by the evaluation, but which were not specifically focused on the Sustainable Raw Materials programme.
Appendix C. Evaluation synthesis

This appendix summarises the evaluation synthesis for the Sustainable Raw Materials programme conducted by the OEE team based on programme evaluation reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timely grant which met BCI’s needs to strengthen its organisation, scale up its membership, enhance uptake of better cotton, and put additional weight behind organisation’s efforts to embed the Better Cotton Standards in country strategic selection.</td>
<td>Significantly added value to BCI’s operational budget. Grant contribution is attributed with significant enhancement of uptake by brands and retailers, beyond expectation. Training modules were successfully cascaded to production unit level in pilot countries, as planned. Good contribution to gender equality work. BCI is making good progress towards its 2020 targets.</td>
<td>Grant spending was within the provided means. The project’s timeframe was seen as optimal for generating outputs and outcomes across three streams feeding into BCI’s Strategy 2030.</td>
<td>Deduced from reporting together with effectiveness.</td>
<td>Grant designed as a self-perpetuating model expected to lead to BCI’s costs being covered (even eventually surpassed) by membership fees. Identified by the evaluation team as an example of good practice to ensure sustainability and amplification of grant results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant to cotton production and environmental sustainability (reduced water)</td>
<td>Beneficiary farmers reported clear economic and environmental benefits stemming from the project</td>
<td>Project outputs were systematically tracked and targets were achieved within planned</td>
<td>Based on almost reaching 100% of targets for area converted to drip irrigation, no default on</td>
<td>The project’s design which was tailored to farmers’ ability to repay loans was identified as a key</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Organic Seed Development

**Report Date:** 11.2017

**Relevance Rating:** Good

**Effectiveness Rating:** Adequate (as deemed by OEE team; good in China, poor in India, although the evaluator rated this as poor)

**Efficiency Rating:** Adequate (as deemed by OEE team, although the evaluator rated this as poor)

**Impact Rating:** Adequate (as deemed by OEE team, although the evaluator rated this as poor)

**Sustainability of Benefits Rating:** Adequate

---

**Objective:** Setting up interest-free revolving loan fund to assist cotton farmers in adopting drip irrigation technique for cotton cultivation. Partner selection (AKRSP) deemed highly appropriate due to its extensive contact and experience working with farming communities in target zone. The project’s outreach was to relevant stakeholders, particularly to Gujarat government to channel subsidies in support of conversion (to drip pool technique).

**Timeframe:** Monitoring and evaluation was undertaken and well-supported project implementation.

**Impact:** Loans, and the economic and environmental benefits experienced by beneficiaries, this project can be judged as having achieved the desired impacts of converting farmers to this technique. Impacts in terms of reduced water consumption and soil erosion can be expected.

---

**Leveraging:** Leverage of micro-finance partners for drip irrigation projects is further evidence of the amplification of project benefits. The implementing partner went on to implement the drip pool project in adjoining regions with the aim of extending coverage.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REEL to BCI Conversion</td>
<td>11.2017</td>
<td>Good Responsible Environment Enhanced Livelihoods (REEL) was a 3-year agricultural training</td>
<td>Good The BCI programme tracked results in terms of changes in key project indicators vis-à-vis Yield, Water Use,</td>
<td>Adequate The conversion to BCI provided more industry credibility to programme interventions and increased opportunities</td>
<td>Good The evaluation team found that even after 5 years of support, the evaluation team rated the project's impact as poor (as deemed by OEE team although the evaluator rated as adequate)</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team although the evaluator rated as adequate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foundation's overall programme goal of promoting sustainable cotton. This project sought to address a key gap facing organic cotton farmers in India and China: availability of organic seeds.

- Aspects overall as good.
- Yield improvements in China were above plan but trials in India failed due to uncontrolled pest invasion which, combined with late sowing and poor weather conditions, led to much lower outcomes than planned.
- Related to the missed opportunity to leverage organisational learning from previous implementation.
- Although tracking was in place and targets were seen as realistic and the implementing partner provided adequate technical support, the evaluation found that Cotton Connect did not use project outcomes from India to revise this project component for organic cotton promoting in India. The Chinese part of the component was deemed successful, but the Indian partner was seen as inappropriate.
- Project exceeded its envisaged outcomes by year 3 (this seems to have been overlooked by the evaluator). In India, the project had only a 1-year duration (not long enough to declare any success or failure).
- The Chinese part of the component exceeded its envisaged outcomes by year 3 (this seems to have been overlooked by the evaluator). In India, the project had only a 1-year duration (not long enough to declare any success or failure).

Indian component of the project had three partners; two of them continued to work on organic seed development after project closure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>course delivered by Cotton Connect to promote sustainable cotton farming practices in India, China, Pakistan. Farming prices promoted by REEL were virtually the same as BCI. This project targeted REEL enrolled farmers to convert them to the Better Cotton Initiative (a wider industry recognised standard, which was attributed to C&amp;A Foundation's association with and promotion of this standard) that would enhance their opportunities for market access. This project filled a gap in terms of educating farmers about use of pesticides and fertilisers lacked proper guidance from agricultural extension services provided by</td>
<td>Pesticide Use and Profit per Hectare. For the most part, there were positive changes in the values of the KPIs over the performance period, for all three countries. In general, BCI farmers achieved better results on a yearly basis than the group of comparison farmers.</td>
<td>verify estimated data. Important note: any KPIs that depended on size of cotton plot (for example, yield, water use, profit) could have estimation errors of unknown magnitude.</td>
<td>for better market access to farmers that participated in the programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td>these projects were not likely to be sustainable due to two fundamental issues: 1) incentives to farmers to follow BCI principles and criteria for local partners to continue with BCI licensing; 2) inadequate strengthening of institutional structures to manage the PUs. It was mentioned that the project implementing agencies would need to gain additional sources of funds to bear the costs associated with project implementation but not indication whether these were available or could be obtained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic Cotton Roundtable</td>
<td>11.2017</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate Key points (Promotion of good agricultural practices, biomass production, good quality organic seed availability, integrity and issues in organic certification) that emerged from the roundtable were reportedly addressed by ensuring their integration into other parts of the programme. While such achievements would normally merit a rating of good, only adequate was assigned because the purpose of establishing the Organic &amp; Fair Cotton Secretariat (OFCS) was to address these questions, but due to the roundtable’s overly ambitious design, the OFCS structure eventually...</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team; this aspect was not rated by the evaluator) The narrative in the evaluation mentioned with respect to efficiency points to deficiencies that would have severely limited impact. The design of the roundtable was seen as overly ambitious and therefore not able to garner collective efforts of various industry stakeholders.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCTFP</td>
<td>11.2017</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by the OEE team, constituted by the combination of good in India. Poor in Pakistan; this replaces overall rating of good of original evaluator)</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team although the evaluator rated this as good)</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team although the evaluator rated as adequate)</td>
<td>Poor (as judged by OEE team although the evaluator rated as adequate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Envisaged results were achieved in India. However, the evaluation indicated that organic cotton in Pakistan was a case of &quot;too little, too early, with insufficient preparation, hence failed&quot;.</td>
<td>Deficiencies in overall programme design with overly ambitious targets for enrolling farmers and subsequent scaling up. C&amp;A Foundation oversight with respect to adequate formulation of indicators and associated targets was identified as lacking.</td>
<td>Although original unrealistic targets were scaled down (reduction of indicator targets to meet goals and objectives), subsequent planned expansion plans for 2015-2016 were also curtailed. Compounding these disappointments, some innovative aspects related to farmer empowerment (formation and strengthening of Self-Help Groups, establishment of Organic Cotton Fund and Micro-Finance Revolving Pool) were dropped, which were reported as radically reducing the quality of the intervention.</td>
<td>The evaluation team stated that CottonConnect was not able to work out a proper exit strategy for the Organic Cotton Farmer Training programme and stated that this would make it very unsustainable. The practices that were taught by the training programme are just as relevant for conventional or GM cotton, which typically have higher yields than organic cotton. So without a market incentive for certified organic cotton, farmers may be opportunistic and switch back to conventional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Country Sustainable Cotton Programme (China, India, Pakistan)</td>
<td>Baseline 11.2017; Midline 2019. Endline Planning July 2019</td>
<td>Good Given that a key purpose of the Sustainable Raw Materials Programme was to shift the market to organic cotton, this initiative was relevant in that it aimed to develop and test a model to move farmers to organic cotton production certification and to supplement their incomes by enhancing market access, thereby making the conversion a viable option for pursuing</td>
<td>Adequate The programme has its own Theory of Change which is used in tracking/aligning outcomes. The fact that this programme was undertaken over a 6-year period appropriately reflects the 3-year period understood as required for such a conversion, thereby giving the possibility to carry out sufficient preparation, undertake suitable monitoring, and potentially trace the</td>
<td>Adequate Results achieved were commensurate with efforts and money expended.</td>
<td>Adequate Midline data from 6 year project shows farmers in surveyed areas (4 regions in India) are inclined towards organic cultivation due to reduced cost of production and improved health of overall farm ecosystem, which gives confidence of behaviour change on part of farmers that would be needed for sustaining programme’s long-term benefits, although they may get disappointed to not receive price premium which is linked to staple length of the fibre.</td>
<td>Adequate The data available thus far suggests that the increased gross margins (price premium) that farmers are expecting from shifting to organic cotton cultivation will not be realised and can not be counted on as a major driver for conversion (to organic cotton). The key factor for higher price is related to staple length. The market does not differentiate between organic and non-organic produce. Non-organic cotton varieties produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum for the Future: Cotton 2040</td>
<td>3.2019</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Initiative relevant to and well designed for promotion of sustainability initiatives in the global cotton industry.</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team). The initiative created a basis for further stakeholder engagement with standards organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a sustainable livelihood in the mid-term. The programme aimed to trigger adoption of organic cotton cultivation by providing support (in the form of training, financing for certification, organisation of farmer collectives) and linking the conversion to a triple win: economic (gross margin improvement), environmental (improved soil health, reduced water usage), and social (reduced morbidity, less use of child/ women labour, improved working conditions).

Effects of two conversion cycles. Longer staple lengths are not organic cotton. Another negative factor aspect is that labourers employed by farmers do not adhere to hygiene measures that are crucial to maintain integrity in supply chain. Low awareness about organic cotton amongst major ginners (attributed as leading to them having low trust in organic supply chain) represents a risk. The farmer producer organisations promoted under the programme and expected to be key stewards and governors in the value chain are at an early stage of development.

Adequate Initiative tracked and reported on outputs and outcomes compared to expected results in a timely manner. Adequate Results achieved were commensurate with efforts and money expended. Initiative tracked and reported on outputs and outcomes compared to expected results in a timely manner. Adequate (as deemed by OEE team). This initiative created a basis for further stakeholder engagement with standards organisations. Adequate. The sustainable cotton field is becoming increasingly "crowded". Many initiatives depend on financing from a relatively limited pool.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Stakeholders indicated that its main added value was to fill a gap in terms of creating a neutral space for pursuing alignment of sustainable cotton standards and codes in terms of traceability and impacts. | momentum has been built for relevant workstreams.  
• The initiative achieved more than 75% of targets, outputs and outcomes compared to expected results  
• Given the challenges that exist within the sector, this project achieved adequate momentum in facilitating systemic change for sustainability  
• Scenario planning, in particular, was cited by brands as a key factor for generating initial enthusiasm. Industry respondents viewed these efforts as innovative, enabling them to view the cotton and garment sector's potential futures  
• Standards organisations appreciated that the outcomes in a credible, systematic manner. Documentation clear and well organised  
• Evidence and perception of room for improvement in organisational efficiency in terms of stakeholders and staff involved in various processes  
• Long process from conceptualisation to final delivery of key deliverable mitigated by contribution to dialogue among standards Costs commensurate with results. | However, two unknowns were identified that have an influence on future potential: 1) degree to which the Cotton sourcing guide will have an impact beyond early adopters (brands, retailers); 2) further efforts to harmonise measures depends on initiative's ability to foster agreement (between standards organisations and codes-based organisations) and implementation. |
| • Strategies were aligned to C&A Foundation’s vision and mission of economic security, livelihoods, improved environment  
• A thoughtful and well-researched conceptual framework, scenario planning and identification of key issues for future intervention  
• Phased and incremental design was appropriate, particularly during scenario and exploratory phases, but longer-range planning should be | however, financial sustainability is not secured because the initiative emphasises system-wide change rather than providing direct benefits to brands and retailers; therefore, the implementing partner was not able to leverage the full amount of expected funds from brands and retailers. | |

Interesting implication: this programme is evidence of C&A Foundation thinking in a system-wide context, being ahead of brands and retailers who are focusing on short-term economic gains as constituting the pull through lever for change...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RARE: Accelerating Organic Cotton in China by Replicating Behavioural Change + Phase 1</td>
<td>10.2018</td>
<td>Poor Design and approach of the initiative was deemed to be deficient in both relevance and realism. Proposed behavioural changes were developed to include smallholder</td>
<td>Poor • Unrealistic initial targets and inaccurate estimation of net economic benefit for farmers • Behaviour change models and support for economic viability did not achieve intended</td>
<td>Poor • Attempted transfer of learning and knowledge from previous applications of methodologies but many not feasible in the political environment and in the context of large farms with hired</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team) Presumably there was limited impact, based on poor ratings in other categories. Impact was not assessed as a criterion in the evaluation report.</td>
<td>Poor • Component interventions are unlikely to continue after programme funding ends • Future efforts should be focused more intensively on developing viable partnership building to better include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>farmers; approaches not relevant to the context of commercial farms with hired labour • Insufficient initial understanding of the value chain by implementing partner.</td>
<td>results • Scope of initiative smaller than anticipated, but revised KPIs were partially achieved • Dependence on direct training for farmers rather than through proposed TOT model • Continued gaps in engagement of key players within value chain • Policy advocacy deprioritised • There were attempts to build networks with other key actors and identify gaps in existing agricultural outreach system but lacked a systematic approach to building sustainable local capacity • Farm partners experienced losses during transition.</td>
<td>labour • Large majority of funds for core costs; minimal risk-sharing with farm partners • Inappropriate initial selection of geography within the context of current cotton production trends • Limited achievement of results in terms of sustainable cotton transition in Hubei, but core staff remain based there.</td>
<td>organic cotton within existing sustainable materials efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Portfolio review

Figure D.1 Performance of Sustainable Raw Materials programme on KPIs up to mid-year 2019

Source: C&A Foundation, Dashboard May 2019
Figure D.2 Distribution of implementation and core support grants per country for Sustainable Raw Materials

Source: C&A Foundation Portfolio
Appendix E. PPR 2019 results

How would you rate the foundation’s impact on your local community?

![Bar chart showing percentage of potential perfect score for "significant positive impact" for Sustainable Raw Materials, Effective Philanthropy, Forced & Child Labour and Gender Justice, Working Conditions, Circular Fashion, PPR 2016, and PPR 2019.]

How would you rate the foundation’s impact on your field?

![Bar chart showing percentage of potential perfect score for "significant positive impact" for Effective Philanthropy, Circular Fashion, Working Conditions, Forced & Child Labour and Gender Justice, Sustainable Raw Materials, PPR 2016, PPR 2019, and OEE Staff Survey.]

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: C&A Foundation's activities across its signature programmes will positively transform the global apparel system in the next five years.

Overall, how responsive were the foundation staff?
Overall, how fairly did the foundation treat you?

Overall, how transparent is the foundation with your organisation?
To what extent is the foundation open to ideas from partners about its strategy?

Overall, how satisfied are you with your experience with the foundation?
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To what extent do you understand the foundation’s approval process and timeline?

How would you rate the foundation’s impact on your organisation?
As you developed your proposal, how much pressure did you feel to modify your organisation’s priorities in order to create a grant proposal that was likely to receive funding?

How helpful was participating in the foundation’s selection process in strengthening the organisation/Programme funded by the grant?
How comfortable do you feel approaching the foundation if a problem arises?

![Chart showing percentage of potential perfect score for "Extremely Comfortable" across different categories and years.]

How consistent was the information provided by different communications resources, both personal and written, that you used to learn about the foundation?

![Chart showing percentage of potential perfect score for "Completely Consistent" across different categories and years.]
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Proportion of the partners that received comprehensive or field-focused assistance.
Appendix F. Staff Survey results

To what extent have C&A Foundation activities to produce and/or use sustainable raw materials:

To what extent has the Sustainable Raw Materials programme:

[Diagrams showing survey results]
Appendix G. Qualitative comments on alignment of the Sustainable Raw Materials programme

C&A Foundation staff

“For us the work in circularity and organic cotton is very useful.”

“On the positive side, on cotton and FFG [Fashion for Good], we have collaborated and had success. The business has not gone all in enough, possibly because of bandwidth problems and also not being fast enough. We have great relationships with the staff. I can pick up the phone and call them.”

“If it is about products, I am aware of what they do on cotton, but for C&A it is not aligned. We would love to have alignment. Sustainable cotton is among our key messages to our customers, so we would like to be even stronger on that.”

“Strategically it is aligned. Raw material is most aligned in complementarity and reinforcing each other in a distinctive way. We believe in the same solutions – better and organic cotton.”

Owner’s group

“I really put a question mark on cotton, also regarding the future. I don’t know, organic cotton, there are different classes of sustainable cotton. Maybe we should be looking into new technologies.”
B. Forced and Child Labour
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**Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Adolescent Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMI</td>
<td>Centro de Apoio e Pastoral do Migrante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDHIC</td>
<td>Centro de Direitos Humanos e Cidadania do Imigrante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>Effective Philanthropy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Investment Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InPACTO</td>
<td>Instituto Pacto Nacional pela Erradicação do Trabalho Escravo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEE</td>
<td>Overall Effectiveness Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>Partner Perception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG</td>
<td>School Children Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Social Entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Strategic Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRF</td>
<td>Thomson Reuters Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

In February 2019, Universalia was contracted to conduct an Overall Effectiveness Evaluation (OEE) of C&A Foundation (2014/15-2019/20). The purpose of the evaluation was “to assess the extent to which the foundation is making progress towards achieving its vision, mission and strategic objectives”. Given the importance of context in examining the fashion industry’s complex system, the evaluation team undertook five case studies, one for each programmatic area of the foundation’s work.

This case study examines the Forced and Child Labour programme. The initiatives in Table 1.1 (at the end of this section) were sampled for the case study.

The evaluation team collected data for the case study using interviews, document review (documents consulted are listed in Appendix A), the Staff Survey and a field visit. Twenty-two stakeholder interviews were done for the case study (of programme staff and staff of partner organisations, among others, as listed in Appendix B). Interviews done for the overall evaluation also informed the case study. Additional data were obtained through an interview with Associação Brasileira de Varejo Têxtil. In addition, the evaluation considered data from the Partner Perception Report (PPR) 2016 and 20191, Delphi report2, previous evaluations (Appendix C summarises the OEE analysis of initiative evaluations) and research studies. Daniel Braga Brandão conducted the field mission to Brazil from 27 May to 27 June 2019. This field mission included data collection with beneficiaries through an adaptation of the PhotoVoice methodology. Thus, in addition to the in-depth interviews, a total of 13 beneficiary workers were consulted. For details of the case study methodology, please see Appendix A in Volume 1 of this report.

Overview of the programme

The Forced and Child Labour programme had a portfolio of EUR 20.4 million in implementation and core support grants during 2014-18, of which EUR 20.1 million were grants equal to or greater than EUR 100 thousand. The programme has funded grants in a small number of countries. More than half of the value went in India, mostly to large global organisations. Brazil was a close second in number of grants, though to smaller organisations. The programme has a healthy pipeline of grants.

Considering only implementation and core support grants, the average value of grants per year has been uneven, ranging between EUR 385 thousand in 2017 and EUR 1.6 million in 2014 (Figure 1.1A). The average value of grants was among the highest of all programmes. The average grant duration was far above average and the highest of all programmes. After years of particularly long grants (notably in support of Freedom Fund), it then stabilised around 26 months (Figure 1.1B). Core support grants were very few but of relatively high value.

The programme worked to eliminate forced and child labour from the fashion supply chain, as per its expected outcomes and Theory of Change (ToC). Expected programme outcomes were originally described in What We Stand For (2015), under the name Forced and Bonded Labour, which was later changed to address child labour as well. The outcomes were revised in the ToC (2016) and updated in the subsequent Programme Strategy (2019).

---


In accordance with the latest version of the ToC (2019), the expected results of the programme were:

1. Survivors are rehabilitated and attain viable livelihoods
2. Improved policy environment that advances women’s rights and labour rights
3. Communities are strengthened and can prevent forced and child labour
4. Increased awareness and knowledge for accountability
5. Improved brand and supplier practices deter forced and child labour.

Programme strategies have evolved over the lifetime of the programme and have become more attuned to women’s rights as related to labour rights. The ToC outlined four strategies, which were later reorganised into three key strategies with two cross-cutting ones. The most recent key programme strategies are:

1. Transparency and traceability for accountability;
2. Policy change and access to justice; and
3. Field building.

The cross-cutting strategies are: Gender Justice and a Holistic, Ecosystem Approach.

Figure 1.1. Implementation and core support grants provided by the Forced and Child Labour programme, 2014-18

A. AVERAGE VALUE OF GRANTS

B. AVERAGE DURATION OF GRANTS (MONTHS)

Source: C&A Foundation portfolio

Source: C&A Foundation portfolio

---

## Sample of Forced and Child Labour initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sampling</th>
<th>Partner Organisation</th>
<th># grantees</th>
<th>Strategic Objective(s)</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Type of Grantee</th>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Size of Initiative</th>
<th>Value of Initiative</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Cami - Centro De Apoio E Pastoral Do Migrante</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO1 + 4</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€ 313,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Centro De Direitos Humanos CDHIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>€ 79,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>ILO Brazil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>International agency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>€ 141,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Instituto Pacto Nacional Pela Erradicação Do Trabalho Escravo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO3 + 4</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€ 441,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Kadinlarla Dayanisma Vakfi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>€ 141,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Pia Sociedade Dos Missionarios - Missão Paz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO1 + 4</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€ 309,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Repórter Brasil Organizacao De Comunicação E Projetos Sociais</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO1 + 3</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>€ 135,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Thomson Reuters Foundation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SO2 (+4)</td>
<td>Global - general, India</td>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€ 4,132,000</td>
<td>2015, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Sampling</td>
<td>Partner Organisation</td>
<td># grants</td>
<td>Strategic Objective(s)</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Type of Grantee</td>
<td>Type of Support</td>
<td>Size of Initiative</td>
<td>Value of Initiative</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Ashoka (Fabric of Change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Care Trust (Reduction of Worst Forms of Child Labour...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Clean Cotton (Without Child Labour and Exploitation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis + RQA</td>
<td>Freedom Fund (Eliminating bonded and child labour...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>GoodWeave (Ending Child Labour and Forced Labour...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Save the Children India (Trapped in Cotton...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Terre des hommes Germany (Sumangali...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Landscape study Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Landscaping of the Garment Sector in Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Save the Children (Child rights situational analysis...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>University of California,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Berkeley (Research on Forced and Child Labour...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Verite South East Asia (Rapid Appraisal of Key Labor Migration Corridors...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Forced and Child Labour**
2. Relevance, niche, strategic focus and alignment of the programme

The Forced and Child Labour programme was positioned to respond to challenges facing people who have been exploited through various forms of forced labour, including debt bondage, trafficking and other forms of modern slavery. The foundational document What We Stand For: C&A Foundation’s Approach and Priorities\(^1\) stated that although there are no “reliable estimates for the global prevalence of forced labour in the apparel and textile industries, it has been documented at all levels of the supply chain and is particularly prevalent in major sourcing countries, including India, China, Pakistan, and Uzbekistan, which have the highest number of forced labourers in absolute terms across all sectors”.

Table 2.1 is a compendium of the prevalence of modern slavery in four key countries where the foundation has partnered and supported initiatives (presented in descending order of proportion of people living in modern slavery).

### Table 2.1 Prevalence of modern slavery in Forced and Child Labour programme countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>ESTIMATED NUMBER LIVING IN MODERN SLAVERY</th>
<th>ESTIMATED PROPORTION LIVING IN MODERN SLAVERY</th>
<th>RANK BASED ON PREVALENCE OF MODERN SLAVERY(^2)</th>
<th>VULNERABILITY TO MODERN SLAVERY(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>509K</td>
<td>6.5/1K</td>
<td>48/167</td>
<td>51.58/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>7,989K</td>
<td>6.1/1K</td>
<td>53/167</td>
<td>55.49/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>341K</td>
<td>2.71/1K</td>
<td>114/167</td>
<td>57.31/100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>369K</td>
<td>1.79/1K</td>
<td>142/167</td>
<td>36.38/100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Global Slavery Index 2018\(^4\)

In response to this global scourge, C&A Foundation developed the Forced and Child Labour programme. The programme is highly relevant for the fashion industry and for the work of C&A Foundation. With its objective of eradicating forced and child labour from the fashion supply chain, the programme is well aligned with the foundation’s general purpose of making fashion a force for good. It has adopted a holistic perspective, as explained by a C&A Foundation staff member:

“A large piece of the programme is directly addressing forced and child labour in the spinning mills in India. It is a matter of humongous pride. No one was addressing it before in a systemic way. Rescuing child workers, giving them education, making sure that they advocate for their own rights with the government. This entire process, the holistic process from rescue to rehabilitation to advocacy.”

---

\(^1\) C&A Foundation. (2015). What We Stand For: C&A Foundation’s Approach and Priorities - Version 14.01.15 with C&A Foundation Board Feedback.

\(^2\) According to this ranking, the higher the rank, the higher the prevalence of modern slavery.

\(^3\) According to this rating, the higher the score, the higher the vulnerability to modern slavery.
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The geographic distribution of the programme has been appropriate. Using a “hotspot” strategy, initiatives in India were concentrated in Tamil Nadu, a region with a high prevalence of forced labour among mill workers. In Brazil, initiatives were mostly in São Paulo, which has a large concentration of immigrants, especially from Latin America, working in degrading conditions.

The programme is undoubtedly relevant to the sector, as indicated by the strong relevance scores of the evaluations conducted within the programme. On a scale of good/adequate/poor, seven of nine evaluations report a score of good for initiative relevance. However, on strategic focus, an analysis of the programme’s initiatives as well as partner perceptions suggests that the programme has placed greater emphasis on tackling the symptoms of forced and child labour than on addressing its causes. In fact, in the PPR 2019, partners of the programme are the least optimistic regarding the foundation’s potential to positively transform the global apparel system in next five years. The programme also obtained the lowest result in the PPR 2019, scoring 5.44/7, when partners were asked how well the foundation understood the field in which they worked.\textsuperscript{1} The foundation has been working to mitigate this limitation by partnering with local and international organisations with in-depth knowledge of the field.

“\textit{If I think about the forced labour area, in the programmatic areas we are in tune [with the business], but I believe we should be even more explicit. What are the remaining pain points? We could be even more forceful in this area. I would not tolerate if we had to reduce our ambitions or our pace. There is so much happening today. Our foundation can play a huge role in being a voice, where appropriate. It has to be fact based, based on our own experience. There needs to be a bold commitment.”}  
\hspace{1cm} \textit{Owner’s group member}

Sustainable Products, Sustainable Supply, and Sustainable Lives (see Appendix D). The programme has been situated “(1) where the apparel business needed help and where philanthropic capital could help; and (2) where there is a market failure”, as mentioned in \textit{Frankly Speaking: Case Study of an Unusually Impact-Focused Foundation} (2018)\textsuperscript{3}. This programme reflects a point on which the business and the foundation intersect, as explained by one C&A business executive.

“There was research on child labour [funded by C&A Foundation], and there was a press release. There was a call by the foundation. We cannot sell clothes when people believe clothes are made by children. People don’t distinguish between C&A and C&A Foundation.”

One member of C&A Foundation governance pointed to the GoodWeave initiative in India to illustrate high alignment and shared commitment. The initiative consisted in monitoring the conditions of home workers involved in sub-sub-contracting in the fashion supply chain. C&A insisted that its suppliers in the Uttar Pradesh State, as in the rest of the world, make their providers known and participate in the initiative.

\textsuperscript{1} C&A Foundation=5.67; Circular Fashion= 6.00; \textbf{Forced and Child Labour}=5.44; Sustainable Cotton = 5.93; Working Conditions=5.63; Effective Philanthropy=5.71. Source: PPR 2019.

\textsuperscript{2} The four programmes described are: Forced and Bonded Labour; Organic Cotton; Working Conditions and Employee and Customer Engagement.

3. Progress towards results

In order to discuss programme results, this evaluation considered different parts of the programme, from outputs and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to Strategic Objectives (SOs) and outcomes. In the absence of a counterfactual for these real-world results, the evaluation team assessed programme effectiveness in terms of demonstrated outcomes and a triangulated interpretation based on available evidence of the foundation’s work in contributing to those outcomes.

The programme’s performance on KPIs has been uneven: four KPIs exceeded expectations, two were much lower than expected, and one was initially qualitative and thus did not have a quantitative target (“Community structures in place to prevent forced/child labour”). According to dashboard data from May 2019 (Appendix E), the following were noted in the programme review:

1. **Number of survivors and at-risk children enrolled in schools** and **Number of survivors trained and employed with viable livelihoods**. For both KPIs, performance has been much lower than expected: 15 thousand survivors and at-risk children were enrolled in school as of May 2019 against a target of 32 thousand, and 18 thousand survivors were trained and employed with viable livelihoods compared to a target of 47 thousand. The difference was due to investments in direct services to beneficiaries being lower than initially planned, and to the double-faceted nature of the second indicator (counting survivors that were trained and employed), making it difficult to fully achieve. Nonetheless, two partners were responsible for the majority of these accomplishments: Freedom Fund and Terre des Hommes.

2. **Number of female and male workers in rights and empowerment programmes**. The programme reported 70.5 thousand female and male workers enrolled in programmes, compared with a target of 23 thousand. These were mostly in India, due to the work of Freedom Fund and Terre des Hommes, both in Tamil Nadu.

3. **Number of brands collaborating**: Achievements on this KPI have varied, with years where the target was met (2017, 2019) and others where it was not (2015, 2016, 2018). As of May 2019, 34 brands were identified as collaborating compared to a target of 28. Main partners responsible for these results are Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, Freedom Fund Jaipur and Humanity United Working Capital Fund.

4. **Policy improvements in forced and child labour**. The programme far outperformed its target for this KPI: it documented 29 policy improvements compared with a target of seven. Among C&A Foundation programmes, Forced and Child Labour has the highest number of policy improvements. Multiple partners are responsible for this success, particularly in Brazil (among them, Instituto Pacto Nacional pela Erradicação do Trabalho Escravo [InPACTO], Centro de Apoio e Pastoral do Migrante [CAMI], Missão Paz) but not only (as in the case of Anti-Slavery International).

5. **Number and focus of media stories generated**. Performance also exceeded expectations for this KPI, as more than 2,000 media stories focusing on forced and child labour were generated, against a target of 400. Main contributors have been Thomson Reuters Foundation (TRF) and Freedom Fund.

---

1 KPI data result from the compilation by C&A Foundation staff of monitoring data collected by partners.


3 As a partner in Brazil explained, rehabilitation and livelihood are separate matters: “Sometimes to be trained is nonsense. Someone rescued from bonded labour, if a migrant, has a will to leave, to get away. To expect them to stay and be trained is not always feasible. And to be employed depends on companies; it goes far beyond our remit.”
In accordance with uneven KPI performance, the performance of initiatives on effectiveness (as rated through sampled initiative evaluation reports) also varied: 33% were rated good, 56% adequate, and 11% poor. Performance on this criterion related to an initiative being able to implement planned activities and generate the envisaged outcomes.

To discuss these results overall and in detail, this analysis relies on the programme’s four SOs. As SOs are interrelated, many initiatives correspond to more than one SO. For the sake of clarity, they have been discussed separately.

**SO 1: Support holistic programming**

A review of programme initiatives revealed that partners have been conducting multiple strategies and activities at community level. These include community-based awareness-raising activities and skills development for rescued individuals (with individual, social and labour market foci). Other activities included the provision of assistance with immigration-related documents, initiatives to improve school attendance, creation of support groups for women, and direct initiatives to educate and guide business owners who have been engaging in forced labour. These efforts have mostly targeted women, in line with the gender imbalance in the fashion industry. The holistic approach embraced by the programme favoured the rescue of victims from situations of forced labour but led to varying results within and between initiatives and did not lead to the achievement of the programme’s KPI targets. This is consistent with the perception of C&A Foundation staff members: 30% of respondents in the Staff Survey rated the programme’s contribution to empowering beneficiaries “high” – none rated it “outstanding” (Appendix F).

The programme’s initiatives achieved uneven results: multiple grants were successful in parts of their holistic interventions but underperformed in others. For instance, evaluations attest to the successes of Freedom Fund (see box above1) as well as Terre des Hommes (in its fight against the Sumangali system2, see box at left), in reducing or contributing to reducing the prevalence of bonded labour in Tamil Nadu. However, Terre des Hommes did not meet its targets for victim empowerment and viable livelihoods and has so far achieved inconclusive results in its school attendance monitoring. Also, the evaluation of GoodWeave states that “while GoodWeave has increased access to education for children in the communities, whether this has reduced incidences of child labour remains to be tested”.3

---


2 Sumangali in Tamil is “a happily married woman”. The employers used this term and scheme to attract young girls and women from vulnerable families under the connotation of a marriage assistance system. Source: Evaluation of “Sumangali: Eradication of Extremely Exploitative Working Conditions in Southern India’s Textile Industry.


---
“These survivors [former Sumangali girls] show an enhanced sense of self-esteem, self-confidence and improved social skills and the agency to take decisions about their lives. These beneficiaries, along with their parents, are highly motivated.”

“However, the project did not achieve the critical indicator for provision of better jobs, […] as committed in the proposal. The data suggests that only 23% of the 347 survivors who have started earning in alternate livelihoods have daily incomes more than INR 300. Also, most of the girls are employed or self-employed in informal employment. Further, none of survivors in employment have contract letters; many get paid less than minimum wages and have long working hours.”

Excerpts from the evaluation report for Terre des Hommes’ grant “Sumangali: Eradication of Extremely Exploitative Working Conditions in Southern India’s Textile Industry”, 2019

“We work with 60 women [Syrian refugees] who have children in child labour conditions. Each woman usually has an average of 3 children. We were able to get 4 children enrolled in schools. This decision [to enrol children in school] is not made by women, but by fathers. When fathers find a job, they don’t send their kids to school.”

Despite its accomplishments, work funded by C&A Foundation has not comprehensively targeted and succeeded at addressing the root causes of forced and child labour: hotspot evaluations indicate that systemic issues that cause it persist. The following issues stand out: a constant supply of labour to replace those rescued; unemployment; lack of alternative safe loans; non-payment of minimum wages; harsh working and living conditions; poor enforcement of existing laws; high vulnerability of inter-state migrant workers; and organised workforce. For instance, in areas where Freedom Fund had success, migrants from other states were drawn into the cycle of forced labour, filling gaps created by rescued victims. In Brazil, the lack of alternatives and the low skill levels of migrants perpetuate the slavery cycle. Another root cause that Forced and Child Labour partners have not addressed is access to healthcare, which draws families into debt, and thus into bonded labour, as observed in the Tamil Nadu hotspot.

While the foundation funded initiatives to provide opportunities for victims and support their close ones, structural challenges were hardly addressed. The recent report Decent Work and Economic Growth in the South Indian Garment Industry summarises the structural challenges involved in combatting forced and child labour:

“The problems are a result of persistent structural conditions that give rise to exploitation. These include demand-led factors (namely, the cost, time and flexibility pressures experienced by producers) and supply-led factors which lead to vulnerability of workers (namely gender inequality, limited economic choices, and limited knowledge of relevant rights and protections among workers).”

Another challenge has been the scale of the results achieved by the programme’s initiatives. In Brazil, partners indicated that the efforts contributed to reducing the prevalence of forced and child labour by empowering migrants, helping them become legal in the country, teaching them languages and skills. However, results were achieved at a very small scale, as demonstrated by the following results from Brazil (dashboard May 2019): Missão Paz reported 50 children attending school (result for 2018-19) and 43 rescued migrants; and CAMI rescued from forced labour, trained and employed 83 migrants (result for 2017-19). Missão Paz and CAMI also struggled to integrate migrants in the workforce. Similarly, work with female Syrian refugees, led by Kadınlarla Dayanışa Vakfı, also led to very small scale results, as the partner explained:

The results have been many. They include relevant contributions for: (i) approval of the new Migration Law at the federal level, (ii) drafting and approval of the São Paulo Migration Law, (iii) mandatory signature authentication and birth registration of all children of migrants, even if not legalised, in the city of São Paulo, and (iv) drafting of the Pact for Decent Work in the Garment Sector.

Excerpt from external evaluation of Missão Paz, 2017
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Structural factors pose an enormous challenge for foundation work, touching on macroeconomic factors, access to credit, cultural norms, and other matters. A foundation’s capacity to change such deeply rooted structures is limited. C&A Foundation’s work is only moderately well positioned for transformation, but its strategy also lacks certain important elements: income generation, access to microcredit, addressing sexism and racism against migrant populations. Challenges of this nature demand coordination with other actors and with funders of social impact initiatives, around the collective impact agenda. In isolation, C&A Foundation’s capacity for change will be limited.

SO 2: Improve policies and access to justice for survivors

Advocacy activities exist in various grants of the Forced and Child Labour portfolio: programme partners recognise that advocacy is important to promote advances and prevent throwbacks relative to the rights of beneficiaries. This programme is the most advanced of C&A Foundation signature programmes in its advocacy efforts, with demonstrated results and a high potential for future impact.

The programme’s advocacy SO covers three areas, as per the 2018 Programme Strategy: advancing ideas, arguing a position and enriching a debate. According to the programme’s comprehensive strategy, the promotion of policy change and access to justice has the following priorities: policy research and analysis, campaigning, community level organising, social assistance, legal advocacy, educational support and psycho-social rehabilitation. These relate well to the proposed outcomes of the programme’s ToC. To assess the programme’s effectiveness, this section reviews its success at creating codes and reviewing standards, agreements or laws to protect people in forced or child labour and to improve their lives.

As noted earlier, the Forced and Child Labour programme achieved outstanding performance in the KPI related to improving policies: it is responsible for 29 policy improvements (either in contents or in enforcement), which represent 58% of all policies improved through C&A Foundation funding. Yet, the programme has a score of 3.94/7 in the PPR 2019, with respect to how it is perceived to have affected related public policies, which is just slightly below other programmes (Appendix G). Respondents to the Staff Survey perceived this area of work as the least effective for Forced and Child Labour. Nevertheless, the programme stands out in the field of advocacy, particularly in Brazil, due to the experience of partner organisations, itself improved through their association with C&A Foundation.

Advocacy efforts have been particularly successful when led by partners seasoned in this type of work, as was the case in Brazil, where programme partners have developed advocacy activities. The core support provided to Missão Paz and CAMI was undoubtedly also a factor in enabling such sustained advocacy work. Examples of achievements include:

- Forced and Child Labour partners (Missão Paz, CAMI, Centro de Direitos Humanos e Cidadania do Imigrante [CDHIC]) were important in advocating for adoption of a bill on migrants’ rights by Congress in 2017, changing the current status of this population in the country. Foundation staff in Brazil and partners themselves reported this change as a highly significant achievement, the most important to which the programme has contributed.

- Missão Paz played a vital role in advocacy as a member of the city committee for bonded labour eradication, in direct collaboration with the Prosecution Service of the state of São Paulo.

- Reportérr Brasil has had a seat on several committees (federal, state and local) and has participated in the drafting, monitoring and implementation of public policies.

- CAMI and Missão Paz contributed to the drafting and approval of Municipal Law #16.478, creating a municipal policy for migrants in São Paulo (see text box above).
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Involving multiple stakeholder types, particularly survivors of forced and child labour, has also proven effective for creating an environment that fosters changes in public policies, which is among the programme’s premises. This has given partners a high level of legitimacy to advocate for change. The report “Unlocking What Works”, which summarises external evaluations of the hotspot initiatives by the Freedom Fund, highlights the role of implementing partners on the ground in Tamil Nadu as a bridge among different stakeholder types: “Our NGO partners were found to be playing an important role in strengthening accountability mechanisms, especially between lawmakers, local officials and marginalised communities.” While Freedom Fund activities have not led to any changes in standards or laws yet, the organisation has achieved its objective to “create an environment” for change and is well positioned to effect change in the future. On the contrary, Terre des Hommes’s work to eradicate the Sumangali system, also in Tamil Nadu, did not sufficiently involve certain stakeholders, for instance employers’ organisations, which limits the potential for adoption – and use – of its draft bill of an anti-Sumangali law.

Results in policy change depend on mid- to long-term work of different natures and at different levels, including campaigns, surveys, occupation of public spaces, and others, which must be adapted to the local context and be responsive to the changing political context. Initiatives in the C&A Foundation portfolio have exhibited these characteristics. In addition, partners present combinations of strengths: they have advocacy as their core activity; have been working on this agenda for a long time; have formal representation in public spaces where policy change issues are addressed; and have participatory action with constant involvement of beneficiaries in lobbying and advocacy activities. Consequently, partners are well positioned to advance changes in laws, standards and regulations, as well as monitor their implementation into the future.

**SO 3: Improve transparency and make people accountable**

**Influencing the practices of brands**

Progress towards improving the practices of brands and suppliers to prevent forced and child labour was at its initial stages and concentrated in Asia during the evaluation period. Of the programme’s results, the impact on the practices of brands was among the least effective, due to the small number of initiatives pursuing this goal and the low effectiveness of the partners that engaged in this area since 2016 (GoodWeave and Terre des Hommes). In the Staff Survey, only 10% of respondents rated the programme’s influence on the behaviour of brands and retailers “high”, no respondents rated it “outstanding”, making it the lowest signature programme in this regard (Appendix F).

This evaluation identified initiatives driving efforts to engage brands and suppliers in deterring forced and child labour within the industry. These included Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, GoodWeave, and Freedom Fund Jaipur. These initiatives have either had a global focus (Business and Human Rights Resource Centre) or been oriented towards changes in Asia (India, Bangladesh and Myanmar).

The effectiveness of the initiatives has been limited by the reluctance of brands to collaborate and improve transparency. In India, where initiatives have focused on the drafting of codes of conduct, enforcement has not been effective so far. The evaluation report of GoodWeave\(^1\) points to an initial engagement of brands

---

towards creating a certification standard and identifying suppliers across the apparel and jewellery supply chains, with a view to detecting and fighting forced and child labour. However, the evaluation concludes that the brands involved had reservations about the pilot project implemented:

“While suppliers expressed an interest in ensuring that there was no child labour in the informal portions of their supply chains, they also expressed concern that if the standard was too onerous then it would put India at a competitive disadvantage globally. There is a risk that supplier participation will cease if it is not required by brands for compliance.”

The evaluation of Freedom Fund (Unlocking What Works) also found that an area for further growth is to engage “sincerely and progressively” with powerful actors, particularly governments, brands and business owners, to secure meaningful commitments and actions to drive systems change.

In Brazil and Mexico, the ambition of engaging brands and suppliers in a common fight against forced and child labour is not addressed by any partner. The absence of initiatives supported by the Forced and Child Labour programme to improve accountability among brands and suppliers in Latin America during the first strategic period of C&A Foundation has been a shortcoming for a programme that aims to pursue a systemic approach.

The main factors limiting the progress of this agenda have been (i) the challenge of ensuring clear and constant communication with all stakeholders; (ii) the fear that the costs involved in monitoring the supply chain for cases of forced and child labour may affect India’s competitiveness in the global market, displace supply chains and create a loss of livelihoods; (iii) the perception that suppliers will only engage in monitoring the supply chain if required by brands as a compliance criterion; and (iv) the non-involvement of brands in the initial study that provided a basis for a standard protocol guiding brands towards best practices, which led to resistance against the proposal and the need for its revision.

Overall, efforts on transparency and accountability have been limited and their effectiveness has been undermined by limited commitments from brands and suppliers. While interest in deterring forced and child labour, especially in outsourced parts of the value chain, is progressively building up, such stakeholders remain highly risk averse.

**Changing the narrative**

C&A Foundation contributed to providing information to shape public opinion about the prevalence and forms of modern slavery through enhanced coverage and quality of media articles on the matter. The programme exceeded its targets, though almost exclusively due to initiatives in India. The coverage in and on India can be taken as a proxy of results contributing to the generation of general awareness on the subject, given that the Global Slavery Index 2018 ranks India as the country with the most slaves in the world.²

The main contributor to the Forced and Child Labour programme’s success in terms of media coverage is TRF. Its two initiatives have resorted to the training of journalists, strengthening their skills in investigating, analysing and publishing articles on modern slavery, in order to expand and qualify media coverage on the matter. The first initiative was evaluated and the report concluded that its achievements were important:

“In Brazil, there are 2 million people in the fashion industry, both locals and foreigners. Small garment shops – high productivity at low cost – offer slavery-like work conditions. C&A Foundation could start, [...] create a global agreement. Many of these small brands do not attend any meeting, they work for themselves. A minimum standard could be created for the industry.”

Forced and Child Labour partner

---


---
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most notably, TRF produced 494 articles in 2017 on the issue of modern slavery, contributing to the 219,085 articles produced worldwide on this topic in 2017 (increase of 28.8% compared to 2015 – 170,132 articles).¹

In addition, modern slavery became the dominant topic for TRF in terms of volume of articles and TRF contributed to the development of a comprehensive discussion on modern slavery in India, while widening the focus to include South Asia and the United Kingdom.² TRF’s second initiative is ongoing and aims to train 255 journalists in six countries (Bangladesh, Brazil, Cambodia, India, Mexico and Thailand), thus widening its focus to include more areas. In Brazil and Mexico, there was no such strategy to advance media coverage during the period of this evaluation, though it appeared to be in development. Nonetheless, two Brazilian C&A Foundation partners have claimed to be constantly sought after as sources for the Brazilian media and academic scholars on both migration and forced labour matters. Overall, as demonstrated in the evaluation of TRF’s media coverage and journalist training, the efforts to raise awareness and inform public opinion have been effective, particularly in India. Such actions help mobilise public opinion and promote advocacy efforts towards structural changes – though such changes have themselves been minor.

**SO 4: Strengthen organisations, develop data, tools, create spaces for learning and collaboration**

**Field building**

C&A Foundation has contributed to field building by providing institutional strengthening to its partners, who then reinforced their implementing partners. Partners have also worked to create and empower community groups who directly fight forced and child labour. Efforts have also been dedicated to improving collaboration among stakeholders. Finally, the programme has built the field by encouraging new players (such as Conectas, Fundo Brasil de Direitos Humanos), with expertise in other fields, to start working in the fashion.

Programme grants for institutional development were concentrated in Brazil, where CAMI, InPACTO and Missão Paz undertook medium-size initiatives to develop their organisational capacities. They all reported progress in this respect, with better internal security, a clearer definition of internal roles, and the design of more assertive strategies. Institutional strengthening also included support in drafting strategic documents, securing funds from new sources, managing fund allocation, and improving governance. A partner explained:

“Core support to CAMI, Missão Paz and InPACTO was important because very few actually pay attention to this in Brazil. Very few address this matter in the country, which restricts our agenda, and they all have institutional difficulties. And there are very few funders. We need to strengthen them to keep on this important work.”

**C&A Foundation staff member**

---
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“We used to work just to help the migrants, but we didn’t take care of ourselves. Nowadays we are learning to take care of the organisation so we can take care of everybody.”

Certain partners of the programme have also proceeded to institutional strengthening with their implementing partners, leading to additional depth in the field. For instance, the hotspot approach in Tamil Nadu has been implemented through the joint work of Freedom Fund and Terre des Hommes with dozens of local NGOs. According to the “Unlocking What Works” report of Freedom Fund (2019), the hotspot approach has among its foundational principles that of “investing in organisations”, which means:

“We prioritise investing in organisations, not just projects. Within every Freedom Fund grant, we allocate resources for our partners to invest in organisational development. Using custom tools, we assess and track growth in partner capacity and help partners to develop policies for child protection, sexual harassment, financial management and human resources. The Freedom Fund also organises regular training events on topics that partners identify as important to their work.”

The strengthening of these local organisations is a great contribution to field building in Tamil Nadu, where forced and child labour in the fashion industry is prevalent. However, external evaluation reports provide little information regarding the development of these local organisations. Available information indicates that, in their work with Freedom Fund, NGOs responsible for carrying out the programme have developed new skills that help them in fighting forced and child labour and in engaging with local communities.1

Training community groups, another dimension of field building, has been an important part of partners' strategies. In Tamil Nadu, partners set up groups in intervention villages in order for them to contribute to preventing and fighting forced and child labour. The Southern India Hotspot Evaluation, found that these groups had reached independence and accomplished an array of actions (including campaigning for better services, monitoring school drop-outs and child marriages, and organising against middle men).2 The strategy was also used by partners in Brazil (CAMI, Missão Paz and CDHIC) to train and empower migrants and migrants' associations, and ultimately raise their political voices through collective action. Repórter Brasil, for its part, strengthened 37 community structures, according to the Forced and Child Labour dashboard as of May 2019, to reinforce their actions within schools. While C&A Foundation does not work directly with such community associations, local partner organisations suggested this may be a field of opportunity to empower populations exposed to forced and child labour.

The programme also began investing in initiatives favouring collaboration among stakeholders such as NGOs, local governments, local groups and the private sector. While this had a high potential to stimulate and facilitate collective organisation, results have been hampered by conflicts and perceptions of competition. As part of its efforts to get stakeholders to collaborate and together transform the sector, C&A Foundation approved in 2019 the implementation of a hotspot approach in Brazil. According to a partner, the programme’s work is already perceptible: “it is hard to gather the people working with migrants like the C&A Foundation has been able to do”. Even in its existing hotspot, the external evaluation of Freedom Fund found that partners “have not generally worked together as well as they should have. There remains a culture of competition”.3 Yet, initiatives beyond local work proved to be more effective, as described in the same report: “the Tamil Nadu alliance, which links to wider NGOs, and other organisations, on the other hand, has been effective”.

---


Finally, C&A Foundation embraced a field building strategy in Brazil that encouraged existing organisations to enter the sphere of forced and child labour in fashion. Through its funding, the programme achieved commitments from local organisations such as Fundo Brasil de Direitos Humanos, CONECTAS and InPACTO. One C&A Foundation staff member explained:

“Our work allowed us to put the fashion industry agenda inside many relevant organisations which were not paying attention to the matter. Without our work, they would not be looking at this issue. Organisations go where the funding is. [...] we have been able to create a local web. And this is super good.”

This approach to field building with new stakeholders is appropriate to generate systemic change, since it expands the subjects covered and diversifies the stakeholders involved in tackling forced and child labour.

**Developing data**

The Forced and Child Labour programme did not prioritise, and made little to no contribution to, advancing research in the field. The programme commissioned very little research, even less than the other C&A Foundation programmes, and what research it did commission was intended for internal foundation audiences or partners.

The programme and its partners have generated empirical knowledge through evaluations. For example, Freedom Fund generated three evaluation reports (one still as a draft). Yet, these reports are not fully accessible on the C&A Foundation website. As per searches conducted on 29 October 2019, only the external evaluations of the GoodWeave, Missão Paz and CAMI initiatives were available on the foundation’s website, while summaries of the GoodWeave and Caritas Internacional evaluations were available. The limited communication of these evaluations externally was a missed opportunity within the strategic cycle to support the field and learn from evaluation studies.

In the PPR 2019, partners rated Forced and Child Labour as the least advanced of the programmes on the state of knowledge in their field. In the Staff Survey, 23% of respondents rated the programme as “high” or “outstanding” in this regard. A comparison between the two surveys reveals that C&A Foundation staff, despite rather low appreciation, are still more positive than partners regarding the programme’s contribution to knowledge in the field (Appendix H). This difference in perception may be explained by the wording of the question in the Staff Survey, which includes conference participation as a form of knowledge advancement.

**Looking to impact**

The programme actively pursued the fight against forced and child labour through four interrelated SOs. Partners perceived the results and impact of the programme as very modest relative to the scale, depth and seriousness of the issue. In the PPR 2019, partners ranked this programme lowest on how much they believe C&A Foundation will positively transform the global apparel system in next five years, due to the challenges in this field (4.89 score for the programme, against a foundation average of 5.38). Partners also assessed the programme impact on their local community as below

“We are new players in the field of garment manufacturing but have grey hair working on gender norms and violence against women. The partnership with the foundation has opened our minds and provided access to a new community and helped us put our mark on the whole concept of working-class women and their struggle. This is a new area of work for us but one which is important for the country where we work – it can help us to have a long-term effect in the community and to expand our scope, if we can sustain work in this field.”

Forced and Child Labour partner in the PPR 2019

“I think C&A Foundation is a very young institution and is working in an arena (global apparel industry) that is deeply flawed in numerous areas […]. These problems took decades to ossify into a global system of exploitation and abuse and will likely not be significantly altered by the level of investment made by C&A Foundation in such a short timeframe.”

Forced and Child Labour partner in the PPR 2019
This is consistent with the foundation's staff perception, as only 14% of respondents rated the programme’s contribution to the transformation of the fashion industry value chain as “high” or “outstanding” in the Staff Survey (Appendix F). However, rated on impact in independent evaluations, the initiatives performed well (56% were deemed good, 44% adequate, none poor). Overall, as the programme is currently designed and implemented, the evaluation team interprets its likelihood of impact as higher in the short- and medium-term, with direct effect on specific individuals and communities, and lower in terms of systemic transformation.
4. Partnership

The Forced and Child Labour programme established partnerships with 38 organisations during the 2014-18 period. The partnership structures varied by country where the initiatives operated. Some partners were global organisations running projects to serve many geographical areas or outsourcing to local NGOs. Others were local partners implementing initiatives directly in communities. Finally, C&A Foundation sat on the boards of two organisations, while engaged on the project committee of another.¹

In India, partners were generally large organisations that operate through local NGOs, which themselves carry out the work in specific regions. This was the case for Terre des Hommes and Freedom Fund, which pursued a hotspot approach. In Brazil, grants were primarily given to local NGOs, which were relatively smaller in size and capacity than the partners in India. In Mexico and Turkey, partnerships were also established with local organisations, but the initiatives carried out in each were stand-alone and not part of a strategic or hotspot approach. Supporting individual initiatives in a country dealing with complex issues, such as the ones related to forced and child labour has proven a limited and not very effective approach to enabling significant change. Overall, C&A Foundation staff members expressed a high level of confidence in programme partners, since 49% of the staff rated as “high” or “outstanding” the extent to which the programme has established grantee-based partnerships with appropriate organisations.

External evaluations were conducted to guide the directions for new support, as was the case for Missão Paz, CAMI, Freedom Fund and Terre des Hommes. The choice of partners was driven by their expertise related to forced and child labour but not necessarily in the fashion industry. Other requirements for the partnerships were their expertise in specific areas of knowledge needed to enhance the programmes’ efficiency, such as advocacy (as in Brazil’s case).

In Brazil, there were also one-year grants, as seen in cases such as CDHIC and Repórter Brasil. Such short-term grants arose from C&A Foundation’s intention to get to know the market and try out new partners, according to staff members: “to start a relationship with organisations and see if they can handle it”. In this sense, these have been pilot initiatives for establishing relationships. This approach mitigated risks and provided security for the foundation, but posed limitations for more bold and robust propositions from the partners due to the limited time for execution.

Partners in Brazil expressed appreciation of the support received from the programme team to advance their work. This has included support in the preparation of grant applications, to ensure compliance. The organisations also expressed concern about how demanding such requirements have often been, as recognised by C&A Foundation staff members, and illustrated by the following:

“One caveat – the process of applying for grants, despite our efforts to help our partners, is centred around ‘you need to speak English, you need to be used to logframes, you need to be an expert at writing reports’. It is a very Western model. If I work with grassroots organisations, it is very challenging for them. The application format is simple for someone based in Europe, but it is hard for people who are not English-educated to understand the nuances of the application requirements and questions. It excludes organisations.”

Comments in the PPR 2019 reinforce this perception of a relationship marked by the support received from C&A Foundation. The PPR 2019 provided 18 comments from Forced and Child Labour and Gender Justice partners. Fourteen of these were enthusiastic about the interaction with C&A Foundation, using words to describe it like: “clear communication”, “nice and responsive”, “committed”, “helpful”, and “constant support”. Interviews conducted with programme partners corroborate this perspective, and, despite the challenges of

¹ Board Member: GoodWeave and InPACTO. Project Committee: ILO Brazil.
the application process, the supportive approach of the foundation was highlighted and appreciated. The remaining comments in the PPR 2019 were critical of C&A Foundation requirements, describing them as follows: “onerous, very limited interaction, pressure to include C&A Foundation priorities, lack of clarity”. In the same report, Forced and Child Labour and Gender Justice partners reported the average time spent “on funder requirements over grant lifetime” to be 155 hours, the highest of all programmes, and well above the 2019 average of 120 hours for all C&A Foundation programmes. These demands on partner time inhibit smaller organisations with less capacity from working with C&A Foundation. The foundation should ensure that its partnerships are well selected to ensure requisite capacity to deliver on their shared purpose, and/or that organisational development support is adequately provided.

Partners particularly highlighted the programme’s pressure to modify their “priorities in order to create a grant proposal that was likely to receive funding”. PPR 2019 results were relatively high for the programme, at 3.22/7, just behind Effective Philanthropy (3.38) and ahead of all the other programmes (Appendix G). According to one partner, “we constantly felt pressure to include the foundation’s priorities over our organisation priorities. We made efforts to adapt and innovate but the pressure continued”. This is recognised by programme staff, with one expressing the following: “Partners still feel pressed to change their priorities to comply with ours. And to adapt to our KPIs”.

PPR 2019 indicators point to other challenges related to how the programme relates with its partners. According to partners, the programme has lacked an in-depth understanding of the field and knows less about partner organisations’ needs and beneficiary audiences than other C&A Foundation programmes (Appendix G). PPR 2019 results are clear on this, supported by interview data. The combined comparatively lower understanding of its partners and the pressure on partners to change their priorities is a risk for the effectiveness and quality of the results of the Forced and Child Labour programme, particularly for its ability to have transformative effect.

At the same time, triangulated data analysis suggests that more could be done to cultivate appropriate networks and alliances specifically geared at promoting systems change and fashion industry transformation. In other words, the programme has been working with appropriate organisations, could certainly develop new partnerships and abandon others (with particular attention to geographic priorities and investments), and should adjust its relational approach with partners to more closely match partner capacities with clearly shared expectations.
5. Sustainability

The evaluation team assessed two aspects of sustainability: the financial sustainability of initiatives and their likelihood of continuing beyond the lifetime of grants, and the sustainability of organisations that received organisational development support from C&A Foundation. The sustainability of results for the Forced and Child Labour programme is growing, with significant results related to co-funding and leverage, and with core support offered to almost half of the partners in its portfolio. Yet, difficult resource mobilisation contexts and short grant duration remain risks to the sustainability of programme results.

Co-funding and leverage

The programme efficiently raised co-funding and leveraged funds. Initiatives raised 148% of co-funding as a measure of what was expected (realised/expected), showing significant capacity to unlock resources before the implementation of initiatives. Leverage performance, which is related to funds raised during the operation of initiatives, also exceeded initial expectations at 109% (realised/expected).

These numbers do not take into account geographic discrepancies. Yet, the local context where grants operate can be a restricting factor for resource mobilisation, as was the case in Brazil. In that country, two factors hindered fundraising abilities: (i) a limited funding market for social initiatives combined with a topic that is considered unattractive,¹ and (ii) C&A Foundation’s own leadership role, which may discourage participation from other brands that are C&A’s competitors in the market.

This quote from a partner illustrates how implementing organisations can feel constrained by the limited pool of funders in certain geographical areas:

“By nurturing multiple fronts and demanding projects to become self-sustainable with the support of other funding sources, it ends up posing a continuity challenge for grantees, which are often restricted to resources from the retail sector… [initiatives] often cannot attract investment. The number of initiatives is large, but the base of funders is the same for all.”

Further, the association between the foundation and the company has made some potential funders uncomfortable, concerned that their initiatives might be primarily generating benefits for the C&A business. This was a concern in Brazil, where funding opportunities are already limited. However, C&A Foundation has succeeded in working in a collaborative manner with other brands and an apparel association (Instituto Renner, Inditex Zara and Associação Brasileira de Varejo Têxtil) to deter forced and child labour. In addition to partners identifying this as a challenge, the Brazil Investment Committee (IC) has also been conscious of this dynamic, as this extract from IC meeting minutes illustrates:

“Eventually, IC members agreed this would be an incredible programme, but that scalability is a huge challenge […] When asked whether partnering with direct competitors is an issue, IC members responded they would have no problem regarding working together with competitors, although they find this very difficult to happen.”

In Brazil, while there are other funders in the fashion and apparel industry, they are investing comparatively small amounts compared to both C&A Foundation and the needs of the sector.² With respect to GoodWeave

---

¹ For example, interviewees raised awareness to the challenges of raising funds from new sources or funders who support work with migrants.

² For instance, Fundação Hermann Hering and Instituto Lojas Renner invested respectively approximately €79K and €2 million in the sector of fashion in Brazil in 2018. In comparison, C&A Foundation invested €8 million in Brazil in 2018, out of which €2.4 million were for the Forced and Child Labour programme. Fundação Hermann Hering. (2019). Relatório Anual 2018. Available at: http://fundacaohermannhering.org.br/img/transparency/relatorio-
and Freedom Fund, two international organisations operating in India, a larger pool of philanthropic resources is accessible, including from the United States, United Kingdom and elsewhere. According to Freedom Fund documentation on its action in hotspots in India, the organisation has eight supporters, two of which are considered “Anchor Investors”. C&A Foundation figures as “Other investors” and is not the main supporter, as is the case with most of its Brazilian partners.

Some of the Forced and Child Labour initiatives present political sensitivities that can affect resource mobilisation opportunities. An initiative working directly with populations like Syrian refugees in Turkey (Kadinlarla Dayanisma Vakfi initiative) can indeed appear unattractive to funders, who may be discouraged by the difficulty in attaining results rapidly in such a political context.

Considered separately or together, the limited pool of funders as well as the difficult political context in which some Forced and Child Labour projects have been deployed can seriously hinder the ability of the Forced and Child Labour programme results and partners to remain sustainable after an initiative’s implementation. Also, symptomatic of the difficult resource mobilisation context in which the Forced and Child Labour programme operates are the results of the PPR 2019. Indeed, Forced and Child Labour programme partners have benefitted more than other programmes from fundraising support: 26% of Forced and Child Labour partner respondents stated having received this kind of support, which brought an advantage in terms of co-funding and leverage. Yet, it is also the programme where respondents expressed the greatest interest in receiving increased fundraising support: 35% of Forced and Child Labour respondents expressed such interest.

**Core support**

Core support is meant to help an organisation achieve its programmatic objectives and mission. The foundation’s support in strengthening organisations in the Forced and Child Labour portfolio, with special attention to those operating locally, has contributed significantly to their sustainability. Among the 37 grants that provided core support to partner organisations, six (16%) were through the Forced and Child Labour programme. A review of the sampled grants for this evaluation indicates that at least 5 of the 11 sampled Forced and Child Labour initiatives received some form of organisational support, either a specific core grant (InPACTO and GoodWeave) or integrated into the budget of a broader initiative (Missão Paz, CAMI, CDHIC).

---

1 GoodWeave has offices in Washington D.C. and Oxfordshire (UK). Freedom Fund has offices in New York and London. The United States ranks 4th in the CAF World Giving Rank Index 2018 and the United Kingdom 6th. This is considered a proxy for the access of organisations to a broader landscape of funders.

2 C&A Foundation Staff: “The few organisations working in this field have many challenges to survive. It is a tough agenda, it is not attractive, it does not bring positive marketing such as education does. There are not many funders and most of the organisations receive their funds via Consent Decree”. This was also confirmed in interviews touching on other’s initiatives, which encountered challenges in raising funds from new funders who support work with migrants.

3 See this extract from the Kadinlarla project one-pager: “Risks (and probability): 1) Male family members impede women from participating in programming (medium); 2) Children drop out of school because of language barriers, financial pressures, and other challenges (medium); 3) State of emergency extends and disrupts programming (low); 4) Decrease in donor funding impedes program sustainability and opportunities to scale (medium)” This is also true for the Centro De Direitos Humanos e Cidadania do Imigrante’s initiative, whose results are contingent on the political will of national authorities: “According to the statements and promises of the elected Government, the expectations of the approval of the PNMRA are low.” Source: Centro De Direitos Humanos e Cidadania do Imigrante. (2017). Final auto-evaluation report.

Most local organisations in Brazil received this kind of support, where much of the programme’s core support has been focused. In India, GoodWeave received a core support grant as well, though results are not yet available.

The foundation’s continuing interest in providing core support is coherent with the observation that the sustainability of organisations and of results are correlated, as the foundation’s Annual Report 2018 concluded. This correlation was confirmed by the Evaluation Synthesis (see Appendix C) where Forced and Child Labour scored similarly low on the “sustainability of benefits” and on the “sustainability of organisations”. Conversely, of the initiatives which went through an independent evaluation, the ones which benefitted from core support rated higher on sustainability (GoodWeave, Missão Paz, CAMI).

**Duration of grants**

The Forced and Child Labour programme produced relevant results, but its long-term sustainability is dependent on continued financial support. On the importance of grant duration to the sustainability of results, the strongest evidence was found in Missão Paz. This was the longest initiative funded by C&A Foundation among sampled initiatives. More broadly, a review of nine evaluation reports from Forced and Child Labour initiative reveals that on a three-point scale, two initiatives scored good, three scored adequate and four scored poor (Appendix I). The main factor hindering sustainability was identified as the duration of the grants.

External evaluations of various initiatives (GoodWeave, Freedom Fund, Terre des Hommes, and others) point to the low sustainability of results and the need for continued support to maintain such results. The following quote from the Terre des Hommes evaluation is illustrative:

> “The momentum created at the village level by sensitizing community level stakeholders to prevent recruitment under the Sumangali scheme will not be sustainable after the project period in the absence of project support. The community level structures, i.e. survivor groups and the stakeholders’ group, are in their initial stages of evolution and are still dependent on the project team and project’s financial support for their regular functioning. More importantly, the capacities of these groups to raise their voice or report exploitation and demand their rights are absent.”

Finally, much of the work conducted by Forced and Child Labour partners – policy improvement and transparency, and accountability enhancement (SO2 and SO3) – involved adopting a long-term perspective, as governmental institutions are not quick to modify or adopt policies, and brands can take time building alliances and moving towards change. As one partner put it: “This action, connected with the public power (government), brings a horizon of sustainability because they begin to implement public policy in another way”. Here, the word “horizon” attests to the fact that working with public authorities requires commitment and patience, as change will necessarily come slowly, but once institutionalised, that change has a higher potential for sustainability.

---

1 The two programmes which had the highest scores in terms of “sustainability of benefits”, Working Conditions and Circular Fashion, also had the highest scores in terms of “sustainability of organisations”.

2 A table with the sustainability rubrics informed by Forced and Child Labour’s external evaluations is presented in 01.

6. Factors of effectiveness and sustainability

A number of factors enabled and hindered the effectiveness and sustainability of the Forced and Child Labour programme initiatives. These are described in this section.

**Enabling factors**

**Field building:** The programme offered core support to a number of initiatives of the portfolio evaluated. Partners recognised this as a factor driving their effectiveness and ability to deliver sustainably. In parallel, the strategy of inviting new organisations, with expertise in other fields, to develop initiatives in the fashion sector helped expand the programme's capacity to carry out more effective and complex changes.

**Use of evaluations and monitoring processes:** Evaluations guided strategic programmatic decision-making on multiple fronts, regarding support to new partners, better understanding of problems linked with forced and child labour, and the continuity of projects. Also, reporting requirements of partners were perceived as the most valued across programmes: according to the PPR 2019, Forced and Child Labour was ranked highest by partners in terms of opportunities generated for reflection and learning through evaluative processes (scoring 6.06/7) (Appendix G).

**Multi-activity strategy:** The adoption of a model that included a diverse and integrated set of strategies focusing on awareness, empowerment, survivors support and advocacy contributed to the results achieved by many partners. These combined strategies allowed the initiatives to reach a relevant and diverse group of stakeholders, including survivors, grassroots organisations, employers and lawmakers, among others.

**Hindering factors**

**Limited stakeholder engagement:** The limited participation of key stakeholders in building standards for the industry has inhibited the effectiveness of results related to influencing brands. Some initiatives did not engage sufficiently with stakeholders, particularly on policy advocacy (with government, business owners and brands, for example). On the other hand, the involvement of survivors in advocacy efforts has legitimated the claims of local partners to develop and qualify public policies. Participatory processes have proven to be effective enablers for the Forced and Child Labour programme.

**Continuity:** The duration of support to initiatives favoured effectiveness, and important results were produced by the programme. Yet, the sustainability of these results is not achieved, as their continuity is contingent upon further financial support, as discussed in various initiative evaluations.

**Staff structure:** The programme is led by a team that partners recognise for its expertise. However, the team has reported being short-staffed and has struggled to manage all grant-making requirements of C&A Foundation.

**Economic opportunities:** The paucity of economic opportunities in areas with a high prevalence of forced labour has constrained the programme’s capacity to foster viable livelihoods for survivors, a key element in breaking the slavery cycle.

**Complexity:** Forced and child labour is present in complex systems, composed of a myriad of players, and deeply connected with cultural and economic matters of the communities in which it is present. Understanding this system has been challenging for C&A Foundation since, among all its programmes, this is the one about which they had the least knowledge of the field, according to partners.
7. Gender

C&A Foundation staff members recognise the Forced and Child Labour programme for its strong integration of gender into its initiatives: 53% of Staff Survey respondents indicated a “high” or “outstanding” level of integration. From the partner organisations’ standpoint, a gender perspective has been incorporated into their activities, although not fully in all initiatives. These partners also highlighted the relevance of the issue, especially as the programme’s beneficiaries have been predominantly female.

Gender-based discrimination is a structural determinant of forced and child labour in the contexts in which C&A Foundation operates, as described in the evaluations conducted within the portfolio. The programme emphasises the need for Forced and Child Labour partners to undertake this agenda in a structured and intentional manner, which is what partners are effectively doing.

According to a staff member, C&A Foundation’s approach specifically emphasised gender, but did not consider an intersectional focus, or the combination of race, caste and ethnicity as aggravating factors of vulnerability. The programme also tended to lean heavily towards women and girls; later, the focus was broadened to consider the participation of men and boys. Such considerations were recommended by two external evaluations, one in Brazil (CAMI) and one in India (Freedom Fund).

Gender-related actions were diversely incorporated in programme initiatives and were clearly related to the strategic lever of “empowerment”. The work was done with groups of women, which led to the emergence of young and adult leaders who served as role models to inspire other women, as seen in initiatives in India, Brazil and Turkey.

Other effects from this agenda were mentioned by partners and discussed in evaluations. In Brazil, CAMI had a clear approach to gender justice and outcomes related to this topic. CAMI’s external evaluation, which reported the empowerment of women through learning Portuguese (since language is a barrier for Latin American migrants in Brazil) and receiving information on the public services network they had the right to access. CDHIC has been training women leaders, some of whom have already raised their voices politically.

In India, the Freedom Fund Project had a specific gender focus and the Freedom Fund’s Mid-Term Review recorded that “the programme also supports women and girls who stopped working at spinning mills with vocational training, mostly on tailoring and sewing to get the skills needed to secure jobs at local tailor shops. Women and girls appreciated this training, and several found jobs”. Also in India, the Terre des Hommes campaigns focused on the Sumangali system, which has a direct and massive detrimental effect on girls.

The Forced and Child Labour programme is therefore classified as between Gender-Sensitive (Level 3) and Gender-Specific (Level 4), according to the World Health Organization’s (WHO) Gender Responsible Assessment Scale for programmes and policies. The programme (i) considers gender norms, roles and relations; (ii) considers women’s and men’s specific needs; (iii) intentionally targets and benefits a specific group of women or men to achieve certain goals; and (iv) makes it easier for women and men to fulfil duties that are ascribed to them based on their gender roles.

---


8. C&A Foundation functions

The principal focus of this discussion on C&A Foundation functions is on Communications as well as Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning, as they were the most relevant to the Forced and Child Labour programme.

Communication

The Forced and Child Labour programme has not had a specific communication strategy. The particular challenge for the programme was in the need to handle a more sensitive and challenging subject compared with other foundation programmes. The Communications function helped solve this difficulty by focusing on forced labour rather than child labour, portraying stories from a gender stance, highlighting women’s trajectories in the fashion industry. This gender-focused approach, however, was not exclusive to the Forced and Child Labour programme. The gender-oriented narrative line tells the story of women working in the fashion sector, who had their lives positively transformed. This approach has been effective and generated media attention from major communication vehicles (such as Marie Claire and, more recently, Glosser).

The Communications Team is global. The presence of team members in Brazil was important to facilitating the relationship with local partners and monitoring the behaviour of media outlets in the country. According to the PPR 2019, communications support was offered to 37% of partners, which is lower than that offered to Sustainable Raw Materials and Circular Fashion programme partners (53% and 44% respectively). Partners also faced the challenge of communicating forced and child labour issues, particularly local organisations with less robust institutional structures. While communications was a strategic tool for advocacy and a major lever for this programme, it was under-utilised.

Monitoring, evaluation and learning

Monitoring, evaluation and learning practices were integrated into the Forced and Child Labour programme and contributed to its maturity, by all accounts.

C&A Foundation allows organisations applying for grants to use either the logical framework or the ToC to express their conceptual structures. Although the ToC methodology is more appropriate for complex system analysis, virtually all partners used the logical framework, which proved to be effective in guiding the design of initiatives. As for all programmes, the programme KPIs are connected to the logical framework and ToCs. They were key to the monitoring of initiatives. However, programme KPIs were brought into question, as their ability to fully express the work carried out by the partners was considered low (see discussion on KPIs in the main report).

Evaluations undertaken were helpful both for the foundation and its partners. The evaluations contributed to deepening C&A Foundation’s knowledge about factors that enable or inhibit programme effectiveness, touching on questions of systems changes (for example, with respect to forced labour of young people in the mills in India with Freedom Fund). Evaluations were properly used to drive decision-making around new support (for CAMI and Missão Paz) and taking initiatives forward in new ways (for Terre des Hommes).

According to the PPR 2019, evaluations were important in generating changes to the Forced and Child Labour programme, even more so than for the Sustainable Raw Materials and Working Conditions programmes. The programme was also effective in incorporating partner suggestions in the design of evaluations. The involvement of partners in the evaluation process was facilitated by having staff members on the ground in different countries. Having an office with Effective Philanthropy (EP) staff in Brazil enabled a direct relationship with CAMI and Missão Paz, the only evaluations conducted in the country. This allowed objectives and methods of evaluation to be aligned, facilitating the use of results by all stakeholders. In

Forced and Child Labour  85
India, an EP presence allowed for a close supervision of the initiative evaluation with GoodWeave, with similar benefits.

Much of the learning undertaken by the programme was programme-specific and staff-led. Learning processes based on evaluation findings were managed by the Forced and Child Labour Team, mainly through in-person meetings. Knowledge exchanges and learning with other programmes were limited.
9. Strategic levers and leverage points

The programme has four SOs, organised in pillars in the programme’s strategy, and two cross-cutting themes. These pillars, themes and SOs are mapped against one another in Table 9.1 (including the extent of investment made).

Table 9.1  Forced and Child Labour programme investment by pillar and SO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PILLAR / CROSS-CUTTING THEME</th>
<th>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>% OF OVERALL PROGRAMME FUNDING AS OF NOVEMBER 2017 (^1)</th>
<th>GRANT VALUE (2015-2017) IN MILLION €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy change and access to justice</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Support holistic programming</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy change and access to justice</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Improve policies and access to justice for survivors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency and traceability for accountability</td>
<td>SO3</td>
<td>Improve transparency and make people accountable</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field building</td>
<td>SO4</td>
<td>Strengthen organisations, develop data, tools, create spaces for learning and collaboration</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Holistic, ecosystem approach</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Gender justice</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


For the Forced and Child Labour programme, the SOs and pillars appropriately reflect the priorities and strategic approaches as they are and should be into the future, with a particular focus on the strategic levers of Empowerment, Transparency and Advocacy.

The programme had successes with empowering individuals through education and knowledge of labour rights and community work. This area of work is core, especially for hotspot initiatives. The programme also succeeded in strengthening local groups and organisations, fostering a social environment to monitor and fight against forced and child labour, although not in a balanced manner across geographies.

Relatively little was accomplished on transparency, specifically on making brands more accountable. Investigative journalism played a major role in delivering results within the partnership with TRF, by increasing media coverage on modern slavery in English publications and training journalists to deliver higher quality articles in the local press. Otherwise, few initiatives of the Forced and Child Labour programme worked on this, and ongoing efforts towards developing mechanisms for improving supply chain mapping and traceability have not been effective so far. For most interviewees, this is a leverage point to achieve broader changes – taking transparency to the next level through accountability and behaviour change for uniting

\(^1\) The statistics cover the years 2015-16 and 2016-17.
efforts by brands. Challenges remain, most notably: mobilising local brands has proved difficult, and there is always a risk that brands operate only in the most visible layers of their supply chain and displace the extreme exploitation into its hidden domains – or that supply chains move to less transparent geographies.

This programme also relied on advocacy: it accomplished much more than it is credited for and is more advanced than in the other signature programmes. This was an effective contribution to raising general awareness on this topic. This lever is perceived as one that can effectively address the root causes of forced and child labour and one in which the programme has not yet unfolded its whole potential. Supporting partners with core support contributed to achieving advocacy goals.

The fourth lever, demonstrating the business case, was not much pursued in the Forced and Child Labour programme – only in the programme’s efforts to influence the practices of brands. While the programme achieved a slightly higher number of collaborating brands than targeted, these have only made cautious commitments. While interest in deterring forced and child labour is growing, especially in outsourced parts of the value chain, stakeholders remain highly risk averse and are not yet ready to change their practices.
10. Conclusions

The sustainability of the fashion industry in the mid- and long-term depends on a supply chain in which deeply unjust and precarious labour conditions cease to exist. Forced and child labour has its roots in structural issues of an economic, cultural and geopolitical nature (related to migrations between countries or even states, as seen in India). Its complex nature thus requires systemic solutions. By endeavouring to bring an end to forced and child labour, the programme has clearly been relevant for C&A business, in agreement with the values of the owner’s group, and strategically in line with the purpose of C&A Foundation.

The programme has been combatting forced and child labour in different countries in a myriad of ways. Large-scale interventions were deployed in India, reaching large populations, involving a range of local organisations and mediated by prominent international organisations, with a special focus on hotspots in Tamil Nadu. By comparison, in Brazil the approach implemented smaller projects reaching a more restricted target group, respecting the capacity of local organisations.

The programme has made important strides towards achieving results, notably regarding its central purpose of identifying and rescuing people in situations of forced and child labour. However, the rescue of people through initiatives in the programme’s portfolio is a long way from eradicating this modern form of slavery. Important challenges remain, requiring the continued and strategic work of multiple, congregated actors.

Considering the complexity of the problem, developing isolated projects in some countries, as in Mexico and Turkey, has proven ineffective. The need for a broader, more diverse group of organisations, working on different links of the supply chain, is fundamental to achieving long lasting solutions. This broader articulation has not been forthrightly present across the initiatives of the Forced and Child Labour programme. The absence of any initiative funded by C&A Foundation to engage local brands in Forced and Child Labour programme was a limitation in Latin America. Also, initiatives to generate data and keep track of the fashion supply chain were lacking. Initiatives of this nature, however, were present in the Working Conditions programme. There are clear points of convergence between these two programmes, which hopefully will be developed and capitalised upon as they merge into the Labour Rights programme.

The convergence agenda also relates to the players and organisations that, working together and in networks, represent an important lever for advocacy achievements and to push brands towards better practices in their supply chains. It is essential for networks to continuously be strengthened to enable greater strategic collective action. C&A Foundation is well positioned to take this work forward.

For the Forced and Child Labour programme, good groundwork has been laid towards effective and sustainable results. Longer lasting investments to support partners and strengthen their organisational capacity will serve to further consolidate results.
Appendix A. Documents consulted

For each of the sampled grants, the following documents were reviewed (when available): Proposals, Due Diligence, Progress reports, Evaluation reports, Related research reports, Press coverage. The evaluation team also reviewed evaluation reports, as listed in the sampling.


Save the Children. (2019). Mexico’s progress in ending child labour is a father’s story of progress as well. Available at: https://blog.savethechildren.org/2019/06/mexico-child-labor-rate-cut-by-progress.html


For each of the sampled grants, the following documents were reviewed (when available): Proposals, Due Diligence, Progress reports, Evaluation reports, Related research reports, Press coverage.
# Appendix B. Stakeholders consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>TITLE / POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aparecida Silva Aguilar, Carla</td>
<td>CAMI Centro de Apoio e Pastoral do Migrante</td>
<td>Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campelo R. Almeida, Luciana</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carvalho, Fernanda</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
<td>National Professional Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casteli, Thiago</td>
<td>Repórter Brasil</td>
<td>Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correa, Paulo</td>
<td>C&amp;A Brazil</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomes, Marcel</td>
<td>Repórter Brasil</td>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilbert, Kieran</td>
<td>Thomson Reuters Foundation</td>
<td>Slavery and Trafficking Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapdan, Özgül</td>
<td>Kadinlarla Dayanisma Vakfi</td>
<td>Instructor of Gender and Migration Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La rosa, Thais</td>
<td>Centro de Direitos Humanos CDHIC</td>
<td>Executive Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima, Bruna</td>
<td>CAMI Centro de Apoio e Pastoral do Migrante</td>
<td>Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima, Edmundo</td>
<td>Associação Brasileira de Varejo Têxtil</td>
<td>Executive Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes, Bruno</td>
<td>Centro de Direitos Humanos CDHIC</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Mendesur, Jose Antonio</td>
<td>CAMI Centro de Apoio e Pastoral do Migrante</td>
<td>Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortega, Giuliana</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Head of Instituto C&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parise, Paolo</td>
<td>Missão Paz</td>
<td>General Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patussi, Roque</td>
<td>CAMI Centro de Apoio e Pastoral do Migrante</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requena, Soledad</td>
<td>CAMI Centro de Apoio e Pastoral do Migrante</td>
<td>Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Chowdhury, Anindit</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmuni, Florencia</td>
<td>Centro de Direitos Humanos CDHIC</td>
<td>International Relations Assessor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silva, Mercia</td>
<td>Instituto Pacto Nacional pela Erradicação do Trabalho Escravo</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker, Jill</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Head of Labour Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vargas, André</td>
<td>CAMI Centro de Apoio e Pastoral do Migrante</td>
<td>Management Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Beneficiaries (13)**

**Beneficiaries**: Three PhotoVoice interviews were conducted and a group-meeting was held with ten migrant women.

**NOTE**: This case study used data from other interviews conducted by the overall evaluation, but which were not specifically focused on the Forced and Child Labour programme.
Appendix C. Evaluation Synthesis

This appendix summarises the evaluation synthesis for the Forced and Child Labour programme conducted by the evaluation team based on programme evaluation reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashoka: Fabric of Change</td>
<td>9.2019</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor to adequate</td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The initiative aimed to contribute to more socially and environmentally responsible apparel industry through collaborative entrepreneurship. • It demonstrated the relevance of Social Entrepreneurs (SEs) as a source of innovation for good for the apparel sector • SEs are important for transforming the apparel sector; however, their potential to bring solutions to scale was not well understood • The initiative had an overly ambitious ToC • Expectations between the partners were not aligned. Fabric of Change was described as &quot;an adequately effective initiative that makes mainly indirect contributions to outcomes&quot;. In this context, it supported and empowered SEs to develop and bring to scale their solutions, through substantial and mainly indirect Contributions : • Scarce collaboration between SEs and apparel industry stakeholders was achieved within the initiative timeframe • Apparel industry stakeholders are influenced by the SEs, with an indirect</td>
<td>The initiative’s primary constituents (the SEs) indicated that the initiative generated high value for money for them. However, the initiative did not meet C&amp;A Foundation’s expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation indicated that the initiative’s impact at individual (SE), community, and apparel industry levels can be expected to continue after programme funding has ended. The evaluation also pointed out that the sustainability of the outcomes generated by the initiative was not an aspect examined in the evaluation questions. A positive assessment of this criterion was nevertheless imposed based on the consistent confirmation by SEs interviewed that they were continuing with the implementation.
### CAMI and Instituto C&A: Partnership between Centro de Apoio e Pastoral do Migrante (CAM) – Migrant Support Centre) and Instituto C&A

**Report Date**: 7.2017

**Relevance Rating**: Good

CAMI had a very important role in addressing a highly relevant issue for the Brazilian context and for the objectives of Instituto C&A. CAMI’s greatest relevance related to the empowerment of immigrants. Actions developed were instrumental in countering discrimination and in upholding rights in social and professional relations and with respect to demands for public policy. In the contribution by Fabric of Change.

**Effectiveness Rating**: Good

CAMI’s assistance was able to respond adequately to the immigrants’ most frequent needs. CAMI is perceived as an organisation with great power to exert political influence and advocacy, although not always in the most strategic way. Another point raised by evaluators is external communication, which was identified as a weakness in CAMI’s structure.

**Efficiency Rating**: Fair

The project design greatly contributed achieving the envisaged outcomes. Its initiatives were considered to be very adequate and effective. There were constraints derived from lack of alignment between the objectives and actions developed throughout the partnership.

**Impact Rating**: Good

Projects developed have made a significant impact on the reality of immigrants, either by the direct action of the assistance provided or by the political influence. We highlight five impacts considered the most relevant by beneficiaries, managers and partners of the project: access to rights related to the status of immigrants and citizens: empowerment of

**Sustainability of Benefits Rating**: Insufficient

As far as sustainability of outcomes is concerned. the development and/or improvement of government laws, policies and programmes for immigrants tend to guarantee the sustainability of vested rights. Regarding CAMI, the evaluation identified the financial sustainability of the organisation as its greatest risk. In 2016, the support provided...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brazilian context, CAMI was relevant to the extent that it influenced – either individually or together with other organisations – the formulation and implementation of public policy for all immigrants. Directly related to the interests of Instituto C&amp;A, CAMI’s strategic objectives were linked to the prevention of forced labour through the dissemination of information and various actions aimed at the empowerment of immigrants and support to the Ministry of Labour in the rescue of workers through assistance to the victims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>immigrant women: strengthening of the network of immigrants: development of labour skills and improvement in income generation: countering forced labour. In terms of political influence and advocacy, CAMI actively contributes to the development. public discussion and approval of the Municipal Policy for Migrants in São Paulo. and to the production of data. public debates and mobilisation for the approval of the State Law Against Forced Labour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE TRUST: REDUCTION OF WORST FORMS OF CHILD LABOUR IN TEXTILE SUPPLY CHAINS (SUMANGALI)</td>
<td>9.2015</td>
<td>GOOD (AS DEEMED BY OEE TEAM)</td>
<td>ADEQUATE (AS DEEMED BY OEE TEAM)</td>
<td>GOOD (AS DEEMED BY OEE TEAM)</td>
<td>POOR (AS DEEMED BY OEE TEAM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project was a pilot, the first major rehabilitation effort carried out in Tamil Nadu by a civil society organisation. It was comprised of measures to provide care, education support for re-enrolment in school/vocational training to young girls and women survivors of Sumangali through six sub-regional resource centres, with the aim of reducing the number of girls recruited under the Sumangali scheme. Highly relevant for rescue of individuals; presumably intended to create demonstration effect and modelling. Education and vocational training lead to gainful employment as a realistic alternative to working in the textile mills. To the extent that the alternative options of education and</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team) The project considerably exceeded its target values for outputs. Gender concerns could be more systematically integrated as a cross-cutting issue in order to tackle the underlying causes of Sumangali, in particular gender roles and the dowry system. The demand for care and rehabilitation of Sumangali workers in the project region was much bigger than assumed when the project started.</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team) The project’s first phase was developed for EU funding and was not approved had higher target values and budget. The budget presented to C&amp;A Foundation for funding had a reduced budget. Implementation showed that it was hardly possible to cover the identified needs with the reduced budget but thanks to currency exchange gains and the contributions of volunteers (doing community level activities), it was possible to open up two additional sub-regional resource centres and offer more counselling.</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team) Very positive outcomes observed in psychological conditions of Sumangali survivors; the rehabilitation process opened up new ways for the girls to think about their lives, regain confidence as a precondition for developing a new outlook on life and making informed decisions about their futures (= empowerment). Difficult to accurately measure reductions in number of girls recruited for bonded labour on a larger scale. Poverty reduction achievements were positive with almost 100% of beneficiaries interviewed indicating that they had passed a vocational training</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team) Long-term positive changes were expected at two levels: individual beneficiaries and community level with respect to perception of parents about the right of girl children to education and the empowerment of girls and young women to realise their rights. Protecting families against forced and bonded labour will be sustainable to the extent that young women are able to generate an income. However, the project did not make provisions to achieve financial sustainability of the services. Given the poverty background of the families, asking for fees for these services would jeopardise the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Cotton and Anandi Ganantar: Without Child Labour and Exploitation (CCWCLE)</td>
<td>9.2015</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project design was assessed was being in line with good practice for addressing child labour in the cotton supply chain and based on assumption that prevalence of child labour is due to combination of factors (Poverty. Limited access of children to basic education and social services, discrimination against migrant labourers). This project course and were either self-employed or employed. outcomes of the project. Social services like counselling and rehabilitation will need external funding for a foreseeable future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By end of 3 years, project had achieved most of its expected and in some areas exceeded target values. External challenges to implementation (constantly fluctuating migrant population, coordination with government authorities as villages belonged to different administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive planning, monitoring and evaluation including review and discussion of outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judged against the target to enrol children of migrant communities in bridge farm schools: 75% of total children were enrolled, covering an average of 500 migrant children per year, with up to 600 during cotton picking season which is seen as an indicator of the willingness of migrant families to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCWCLE’s empowerment approaches have shown to be successful frameworks for demanding and enforcing children’s and women’s rights and entitlements. The project outcomes are expected to be sustainable due to changes in behaviour of individuals, changes in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF C&A FOUNDATION EFFECTIVENESS
### VOLUME 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Fund: Results of the Interventions by Freedom Fund and its partners to reduce the prevalence of bonded labour in Tamil Nadu</td>
<td>8.2019</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Worked to create basic conditions and awareness of rights and needs of migrant families and children and enhance access to services for marginalised migrant workers living in hard-to-reach areas.
- Structures in districts, which were not taken into considering for the selection of the project villages) were identified, together with coping strategies. Evidence of need for better understanding of context.

Provide education for their children instead of taking them to work in the fields.

- Engagement of community and government structures, and changes in the enforcement of policies and laws.

Evidence of need for better understanding of context. The hotspot approach was seen as relevant given the programme’s focus on areas of high prevalence where the potential for significant had been identified. This focus allowed a concentration of resources enabling NGOs to provide support to individuals and households, which was needed once awareness had been raised. The intervention was based on a preventative approach that combined awareness, awareness raising and group mobilisation interventions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GoodWeave: Ending Child Labour and Forced Labour in Apparel Supply Chains in India</td>
<td>7.2018</td>
<td>Adequate The initiative was pertinent for some of the following objectives: ending forced and child labour in the supply chain, improving conditions for workers, protecting children and providing them with educational empowerment, and support strategies.</td>
<td>Effectively generated both a motivation and enhanced options for alternative behaviour. Evidence that awareness raising has led to greater knowledge of dangers and confidence to speak out. It has also led directly to action to combat bonded labour.</td>
<td>Requires a different focus of activity.</td>
<td>Requires a different focus of activity. than being spent on paying off previous loans, marriage, housing costs, etc. Overall the programme was reported to display the potential for real long-term sustainability, but weaknesses in its lack of theories of change and scaling, and in monitoring of outcomes for individuals and households. The latter meaning that it is very difficult to judge long-term impact. A major threat to sustainable impact is migration.</td>
<td>GoodWeave has diversified its sources of grant funding to ensure financial sustainability GoodWeave to fund most of the costs of its model through licensing fees, in the long run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate The initiative over 75% of the targeted outputs and outcomes compared to expected results.</td>
<td>Adequate Presence of conditions/ action that support progress towards impact and/or sustainability, but threats and barriers may not have been mitigated.</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by the OEE team; this aspect was not assigned a rating by the original evaluator) While the pilot was effective in increasing access to education for children at risk of...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Missão Paz and Instituto C&A: Partnership between Missão Paz and Instituto C&A; Sustainable Exit from Brazil**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2017</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team, although original evaluator put this as &quot;very good&quot;; narrative description points to adequate)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Reservations expressed by participating brands are a cause for concern. GoodWeave reported discussions with five additional brands interested in the work; however, three of these expressed reservations regarding the pilot. Presence of conditions/ action that support progress towards impact and/or sustainability, but threats and barriers may not have been mitigated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

opportunities. However, the evaluation found that the project, on its own, was insufficient to ensure that children who both work and study are not child labourers. The training provided to homeworkers was only partially relevant to improving working conditions. While the project’s Progress Principles had the potential to do so, they were not required for certification, thereby limiting their ability to directly improve working conditions.

becoming child labourers, it was less effective in ending forced labour and improving working conditions.

Exploitation of immigrant labour in the textile value chain

The partnership was deemed to have very good performance in attaining its expected results. This partnership contributed to strengthening Missão Paz, improving the quality of services for immigrants, and

The design of this intervention proved to be comprehensive and flexible. The

Missão Paz has strong leadership, a capable team, and public recognition in addition to having a large part of the necessary resources to ensure its operations on a medium-term basis. Many of the
**Save the Children India: Trapped in Cotton: Reduce and Prevent at-risk children from Labour in Cotton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2019</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team) This project was deemed relevant in so far that it was aimed at creating the necessary conditions and outputs. The project achieved, or partly exceeded, most expected outputs. Management and monitoring systems were described as efficient and related to a well-developed structure and relationships of the partnership were considered very adequate.</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team) producing and disseminating knowledge, which had a positive influence on legislation and public policies related to immigration. Some improvements could have been made regarding individual and collective empowerment for immigrants, as well as in disseminating the cause to the general population.</td>
<td>Resources allocated were considered adequate. However, they could have been more efficient regarding the timeline and the quality of the implementation of a few activities. The monitoring and evaluation activities had several limitations.</td>
<td>Specialised team that generated great recognition from partners, specialists, the media and immigrants. Since 2006, 67,000 immigrants were legalised with Missão Paz’s help. Its welcoming services and help for the most vulnerable people were expanded and qualified. Missão Paz’s advocacy and mobilisation capacities were extremely effective in influencing programmes and public policies at both municipal and federal levels, which have positively impacted the lives of immigrants.</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team) By the end of the project, of the total child labour and out of school children</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team) The project outcomes will be sustainable through changes in behaviour of individuals, changes in their living conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farms of Madhya Pradesh project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>awareness to address the issue of child labour on cotton farms in two blocks of a district in Madhya Pradesh. The project was furthermore designed to build community capacity and structures to prevent child labour and gender-based discrimination and increase awareness and knowledge for accountability amongst government and private sector actors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>effectively promoted the agenda of school education of child labour and children at risk resulting in enrolment of 1955 children in schools. Furthermore, 107 School Children Groups (SCG) and 36 Adolescent Groups (AGs) at the school and community level were constituted during the project and are in operation. The focus of these groups is to encourage children to attend school, engage with parents and communities to encourage them to send their children to school regularly and discourage working of children in cotton fields or being sent to “dhadki”. The project identified and developed 70 “Child Champions” as key leaders in the SCGs and AGs who</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>logical framework with clearly articulated activities, corresponding outputs and outcomes. The project was able to execute and complete the majority of its activities at village and block level as per original project plans using the provided budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identified during the baseline study, 1955 children (6-14 years old) were enrolled in schools as a result of concerted efforts made by the key stakeholders. By the end of the project, one-third of the total youth who underwent vocational training were employed or self-employed. Children have now started attending school regularly which has led to their reduced involvement in work. Children are now engaged in work only on school holidays and during free time. The practice of sending children for “dhadki” has also substantially reduced in the area with children now mostly engaged in working in the fields owned or leased by their family. These</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in engagement of community, CBOs and government structures, and changes in the enforcement of policies and laws. At present, all of these would require more efforts and strengthening over a period of time. No indication about whether resourcing and commitment was available to do so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forced and Child Labour 101
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not only led their groups but also took the initiative in carrying out key activities of these groups at the school and community level and actively promote the agenda of child rights. Training provided to these “Child Champions” on aspects of “self and identity” “self-confidence and self-respect” which has helped to bring out and demonstrate the leadership qualities in them and enabled them to raise key vis-à-vis school and village authorities on matters of education and child labour.</td>
<td>changes reflected the willingness of families to provide education for their children instead of involving them in farm work. However, the drop-out rates and both full time and part time involvement in the cotton farms continued to be high amongst adolescents in the age group of 15-18 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terre des Hommes Germany: Sumangali – Eradication of Extremely Exploitative Working Conditions in Southern India’s Textile Industry (co-funded by BMZ &amp; C&amp;A Foundation)</td>
<td>6.2019</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Limited sustainability of the structures and institutions created. Limited extent to which positive effects (individual, community and policy level) from the activities were expected to continue after the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>While the project’s overall objective to eradicate the Sumangali system from Tamil Nadu’s textile industry was highly relevant, the project design was described as being inadequate to achieve the project’s overall goals and four sub-goals.</td>
<td>Although there was no project level data to validate this result, communities and the NGO partners cited proxy indicators to report that the reduction of girls joining the Sumangali scheme was significant. The proxy indicators include difficulty in identifying new cases of Sumangali survivors in the project area; reduction in number of vans plying in the project area to transport the women workers. This outcome is partly attributed to the project activities such as trained survivors and community representatives and the NGO partners employing informal methods and persuasive</td>
<td>At micro-level, the project’s performance was considered to be satisfactory. Overall value for money was considered satisfactory as the project was deemed to have made a long-term impact on the lives of beneficiaries and succeeded in stopping a significant number of girls from entering the Sumangali system. The project’s modest resourcing for personnel and activities supported cost efficiency but at the same time, this aspect was identified as limiting the partners’ ability to employ the necessary skills and abilities such as counsellors with technical</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Imputed from narrative concerning effectiveness. Impact was not rated in the evaluation. The key outcome of this project was a reduction in girls and young women joining the Sumangali system from the project area. Despite these efforts, the project has not achieved complete prevention of recruitment under Sumangali scheme in the project area, as systemic issues of Sumangali system still persist and many villages are not fully covered. Factories have changed their recruitment strategies in response to several initiatives against the Sumangali system without any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>techniques to stop families from sending the girls to factories under the Sumangali system. The village level awareness programmes made the girls and their caregivers aware of the deception and harsh working and living conditions in the factories. The results of the rehabilitation strategy also contributed to this sub-goal, as the rehabilitated survivors became role models for other girls and young women in the villages. The project offering financial support for skilling and reintegration to education also motivated girls to quit or not return to factories after their holidays.</td>
<td>qualifications and experience.</td>
<td>significant change in wage or working conditions. The textile industry is increasingly recruiting inter-state migrant workers, both males and females, from India’s northern states.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forced and Child Labour
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomson Reuters Foundation: Fighting Forced Labour and Human Trafficking through Journalism and Media Development</td>
<td>10.2018</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team) This project was deemed highly relevant and useful in terms of enhancing the capacity of local journalists in India to improve the quality and quantity of their coverage of slavery and trafficking. Such media development activities were expected to make a significant contribution to raising the awareness of human trafficking and forced labour amongst journalists and strengthening their knowledge, investigative and analytical skills.</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team) The team’s output consistently exceeded the original target of 780 stories (5 per week) reaching a total of 1,200 original stories in the form of news, longer feature pieces and investigative reports, over three years. The team’s output grew year-on-year with 33% more stories published in year 2 and with a further 15% increase in year 3. All stories were made available for republication by external outlets and distributed on TRF’s own platforms.</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team) Efficiency was mainly discussed in relation to the training component, which was described as “value for money” based on the costs of delivering the training and benefits reported by its graduates and other relevant key informants.</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team) With core funding provided by C&amp;A Foundation, TRF increased its global coverage of the otherwise underreported problem of modern slavery and trafficking by setting up a unique reporting team focused on forced labour and embedding that within the existing Reuters newsrooms.</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team) The self-evaluation indicated that it was “too early to make assumptions about the sustainability of the project outcomes” with the exception of local journalist training outcomes, which were described as fairly standard and were generally considered to be sustainable as long as the trainees did not leave the country or the profession.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Relevance, niche, strategic focus and alignment of the programme

Figure D.1 Sustainability pillars and signature programmes

![Sustainability pillars and signature programmes](source: What We Stand For)

Figure D.2 Strategic focus of the Forced and Child Labour Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A measurable reduction in forced labour and trafficking in designated C&amp;A Foundation hotspots</td>
<td>Survivors are rehabilitated and attain viable livelihoods</td>
<td>Survivors are rehabilitated and achieve viable livelihoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger enforcement of anti-forced labour/ trafficking policies in target countries (such as # of prosecutions, convictions, penalties and sanctions)</td>
<td>Improved policy environment that advances women’s rights and labour rights</td>
<td>Improved policy environment for labour rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stronger grassroots legal capacity to protect the rights of vulnerable (such as # of lawyers and paralegals mobilised to advocate for victims)</td>
<td>Communities are strengthened and can prevent forced and child labour</td>
<td>Stronger communities prevent forced and child labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater public awareness and changed social norms (such as increased consumer demand for responsibly sourced products, forced labour actively and negatively sanctioned at all levels)</td>
<td>Increased awareness and knowledge for accountability</td>
<td>Increased accountability and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved ethical procurement practices within C&amp;A and other brands and retailers, including improved supply transparency, demand for safe labour migration mechanisms, and efforts to ensure compliance beyond the top tiers</td>
<td>Improved brand and supplier practices deter forced and child labour</td>
<td>Improved supplier practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of C&amp;A and C&amp;A Foundation as leaders in efforts to eradicate forced labour in apparel supply chains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. Portfolio review

Figure E.1 Dashboard for the Forced and Child Labour Programme (May 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Indicators - Labour Rights, Forced and Child Labour</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of survivors trained &amp; employed with viable livelihoods</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of workers in rights and empowerment programmes</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of survivors and at-risk children enrolled in school</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of brands collaborating</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community structures in place to prevent forced/child labour</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy improvements in forced and child labour</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: C&A Foundation, Dashboard May 2019

Jill Tucker
Head of Labour Rights

Partners in India and Brazil continue to demonstrate ability to provide rehabilitation and remediation to survivors of forced and child labour but reducing the number of victims and effecting systemic change remains a challenge. WC and F/C/L partners working together spur positive action. The Gram Vaani (WC) program was highlighted by Thomson Reuters Foundation (F/C/L) and then noticed by the National Human Rights Commission of India. The watchdog asked the Tamil Nadu government for a status report on conditions in garment factories, which prompted the govt to inspect 2,000 factories for violations and commit to inspect 5,000 more.
Figure E.2 Distribution of implementation and core support grants by country for the Forced and Child Labour Programme, 2014-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia - general</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global - general</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>€10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: C&A Foundation Portfolio
Appendix F. Staff Survey results

To what extent has C&A Foundation advanced knowledge (for example, through conference participation, research, etc.) on the transformation of the fashion industry, with respect to:

To what extent has C&A Foundation meaningfully affected public policy to enable the transformation of the fashion industry, with respect to:
To what extent has C&A Foundation affected the behaviour of brands and retailers in line with a transformation of the fashion industry, with respect to:

- Production and/or use of sustainable raw materials (27/45)
- Improving working conditions in apparel manufacturing (34/45)
- Alleviating forced and child labour (29/45)
- Creating/embracing circular fashion (26/45)
- Increasing gender justice in the fashion supply chain (25/45)

To what extent has C&A Foundation empowered beneficiaries (such as workers, farmers, etc.) to participate in the transformation of the fashion industry, with respect to:

- Improving working conditions in apparel manufacturing (35/45)
- Production and/or use of sustainable raw materials (31/45)
- Alleviating forced and child labour (30/45)
- Increasing gender justice in the fashion supply chain (27/45)
- Creating/embracing circular fashion (23/45)
To what extent has C&A Foundation contributed to the transformation of the fashion industry value chain, with respect to:

- Improving working conditions in apparel manufacturing (33/45)
- Alleviating forced and child labour (29/45)
- Production and/or use of sustainable raw materials (26/45)
- Creating/embracing circular fashion (24/45)
- Increasing gender justice in the fashion supply chain (25/45)
Appendix G. PPR 2019 results

How would you rate the foundation’s impact on your local community?

- Sustainable Raw Materials
- Effective Philanthropy
- Forced & Child Labour and Gender Justice
- Working Conditions
- Circular Fashion

PPR 2016: 70%
PPR 2019: 70%

How comfortable do you feel approaching the foundation if a problem arises?

- Effective Philanthropy
- Circular Fashion
- Sustainable Raw Materials
- Working Conditions
- Forced & Child Labour and Gender Justice
- PPR 2016
- PPR 2019
- OEE Staff Survey

PPR 2016: 80%
PPR 2019: 80%

Percentage of Potential Perfect Score for "Significant Positive Impact"
Overall, how responsive was the foundation staff?

To what extent was the foundation’s reporting process: A helpful opportunity for you to reflect and learn?
Median hours spent by partners on funder requirements over grant lifetime.
Appendix H. Comparison between the Staff Survey and the PPR 2019

To what extent has the foundation affected public policy in your field?

To what extent has the foundation advanced the state of knowledge in your field?
Appendix I. Sustainability as per the Evaluation Synthesis

Figure H.1 Sustainability of the Different Initiatives Evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initiative/project name</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>Date Evaluation Report</th>
<th>Sustainability of Results rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Without Child Labour and Exploitation</td>
<td>Clean Cotton and Anandi Ganantar</td>
<td>9,2015</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reduction of Worst Forms of Child Labour in Textile Supply Chains</td>
<td>Care Trust</td>
<td>9,2015</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Freedom Fund’s Southern India Hotspot (mid-term review) Eliminating bonded and child labour from the Tamil Nadu Spinning Mills</td>
<td>Freedom Fund</td>
<td>10,2016</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ending Child Labour and Forced Labour in Apparel Supply Chains in India</td>
<td>GoodWeave</td>
<td>7,2018</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fighting Forced Labour and Human Trafficking through Journalism and Media Development</td>
<td>Thomson Reuters Foundation</td>
<td>10,2018</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sumagali – Eradication of Extremely Exploitative Working Conditions in Southern India’s Textile Industry (co-funded by BMZ &amp; C&amp;A)</td>
<td>Terre des Hommes Germany</td>
<td>6,2019</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Trapped in Cotton: Reduce and Prevent at-risk children from Labour in Cotton farms of Madhya Pradesh project</td>
<td>Save the Children India</td>
<td>2,2019</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fabric of Change (categorized by C&amp;A under Forced and Child Labour)</td>
<td>Ashoka</td>
<td>9,2019</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Partnership between Missão Paz and Instituto C&amp;A; Sustainable Exit from Brazil</td>
<td>Missão Paz and Instituto C&amp;A</td>
<td>7,2017</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership between Centro de Apoio e Pastoral do Migrante (CAMI) – Migrant Support Centre and Instituto C&amp;A</td>
<td>CAMI and Instituto C&amp;A</td>
<td>7,2017</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Evaluations 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability of Results rating</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Acronyms

AAR After Action Review
BCWS Bangladesh Center for Workers Solidarity
BGMEA Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association
BLAST Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust
BMI Better Mills Initiative
CBA Collective Bargaining Agreement
CLB China Labour Bulletin
FFG Fashion for Good
HR Human resources
IC Investment Committee
ILRF International Labour Rights Forum
KPI Key Performance Indicator
M&E Monitoring and evaluation
NGO Non-Governmental Organisation
OEE Overall Effectiveness Evaluation
PPR Partner Perception Report
RFP Requests for Proposals
RMG Ready-Made Garments
SO Strategic Objective
TCWF Tazreen Children's Welfare Fund
ToC Theory of Change
VdM Vozes da Moda
WCIF Working Capital Investment Fund
WHO World Health Organization
1. Introduction

In February 2019, Universalia was contracted to conduct an Overall Effectiveness Evaluation (OEE) of C&A Foundation (2014/15-2019/20). The purpose of the evaluation was “to assess the extent to which the foundation is making progress towards achieving its vision, mission and strategic objectives”. Given the importance of context in examining the fashion industry’s complex system, the evaluation team undertook five case studies, one for each programmatic area of the foundation’s work.

This case study examines the foundation’s Working Conditions programme. The initiatives sampled for the case study are listed in Table 1.1 (at the end of this section). The first layer was analysed through interviews and document review (documents consulted are listed in Appendix A), the second through the evaluation synthesis and the last through the research quality assessment.

The evaluation team collected data for the case study using interviews, document review, the Staff Survey, and a field visit. Forty-one stakeholder interviews were done for the case study (covering programme staff, staff of partner organisations and non-grantee partners; see Appendix B), while additional interviews for the overall evaluation informed the case study. In addition, the evaluation considered data from the Partner Perception Report (PPR) 2016 and 2019, Delphi report, previous evaluations and research studies (Appendix C summarises the OEE analysis of initiative evaluations). As part of the case study, Dr. Archi Rastogi undertook a field mission to Bangladesh from 18 June-6 July 2019. Thus, in addition to the in-depth interviews, a total of 18 beneficiary workers were consulted, in and around Dhaka, using the PhotoVoice methodology. Finally, four beneficiaries were consulted during a focus group discussion in Mexico. For details of the case study methodology, please see Appendix A in Volume 1 of the report. Overview of the programme

According to its theory of change (ToC), the Working Conditions programme aims to achieve: “Improved working conditions and wages for every man and woman in the apparel industry”. The programme had a portfolio of EUR 26.6 million in implementation and core support grants for the 2014-2018 period, out of which EUR 24.8 million were grants worth EUR 100 thousand or more. The number of initiatives approved per year increased over time. As of July 2019, the programme had 79 active initiatives dedicated to implementation and core support, which was significantly higher than other foundation programmes at 25 to 40 active initiatives. Throughout the 2014-18 period, the programme was most spread out geographically, both in value and number of initiatives. The programme portfolio was at least EUR 1.5 million in each of the following: Asia, Latin America, Middle East and North Africa, and global initiatives. Half of the initiatives were in Asia – 39 initiatives with a value of EUR 13.4 million. When considering grants above the EUR 100 thousand threshold, the average initiative of the programme was about 27.2 months in duration, and EUR 528 thousand in value, the smallest value across all signature programmes, except Circular Fashion when Fashion for Good (FFG) is isolated (EUR 397 thousand). Compared to other programmes, core support initiatives in Working Conditions were more numerous (10 compared to an average of 3 for other programmes) and represented overall an above average portfolio (EUR 1.5 million). Yet, core support initiatives in Working Conditions were smaller – EUR 150 thousand compared to EUR 530 thousand and above for Circular Fashion and Forced and Child Labour.

---


In practice, the Working Conditions programme has eschewed the language of SOs. Instead, it used pillars as its strategic organisation, along with cross-cutting themes. As a result, in practical terms, the programme was strategically distributed across three pillars: Collective Action, Transparency and Policy Advocacy. Any initiative could have been advancing more than one pillar, which is appropriate for a programme and foundation positioning itself to promote systems change in the fashion industry.
Table 1.1 Working Conditions sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sampling</th>
<th>Partner Organisation</th>
<th># grants</th>
<th>Strategic Objective(s)</th>
<th>Pillar(s)</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Type of Grantee</th>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Size of Initiative</th>
<th>Value of Initiative</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>ABA Rule of Law Initiative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO2 + 5</td>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Public service project</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€ 476,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Bangladesh Center for Workers Solidarity (BCWS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO2 + 5</td>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>€ 95,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust (BLAST)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SO4</td>
<td>Policy change</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€ 1,025,000</td>
<td>2016, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>China Labour bulletin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>Asia - general, India</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€ 715,000</td>
<td>2015, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews + evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Equiception</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Transparency, Policy change</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€ 446,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Fashion Revolution CIC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Transparency, Policy change</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Non-profit social enterprise</td>
<td>Implementation, Core</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€ 1,909,000</td>
<td>2015, 2015, 2017, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Federacao De Orgaos Para Assistencia Social E Educacao - Fase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>€ 89,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>HIP; Prodesc; Semillas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>NGO, NGO, Fund</td>
<td>Implementation, Core</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€ 455,000</td>
<td>2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Instituto Ethos De Empresas E Responsabilidade Social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Public interest CSO</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>€ 113,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Instituto Fashion Revolution Brasil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Transparency, Policy change</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Non-profit</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>€ 26,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>International Corporate Accountability Roundtable (ICAR)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Policy change</td>
<td>Global, United States</td>
<td>Coalition of human rights groups</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€ 1,110,000</td>
<td>2015, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfoliow review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Proyecto de Derechos Economicos Sociales y Culturales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€ 396,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sampling</th>
<th>Partner Organisation</th>
<th># grants</th>
<th>Strategic Objective(s)</th>
<th>Pillar(s)</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Type of Grantee</th>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Size of Initiative</th>
<th>Value of Initiative</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews + RQA</td>
<td>Shimmy Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO4</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Learning and Planning</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>€ 104,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Sociedad Mexicana Pro Derechos de la Mujer, A.C.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SO2 + S</td>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Women's Fund</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€ 201,000</td>
<td>2018, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp; stakeholder interviews + evaluation synthesis + RQA</td>
<td>UP!/AWAJ (Impaccct Limited and BRAC University)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SO2 + S</td>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€ 2,784,000</td>
<td>2014, 2015, 2016, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Better Buying (Feasibility Phase)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Caritas Bangladesh (Tazreen Workers' Children's Welfare Fund)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>IMIFAP (Yo Quiero, Yo Puedo)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>International Labor Rights Forum (Advancing worker leadership...)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Solidaridad (Better Mills Initiative in China)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>WageIndicator Foundation (Transparency through mobile...)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Working Capital (Humanity United)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sampling</th>
<th>Partner Organisation</th>
<th># grants</th>
<th>Strategic Objective(s)</th>
<th>Pillar(s)</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Type of Grantee</th>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Size of Initiative</th>
<th>Value of Initiative</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Aconsa AB (Size Matters…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>BRAC USA (Planning for Mapping RMG Factories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>BSR (Labour Arbitration…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>BSR (Traceability Organization Review)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Centro de los Derechos del Migrante (Scoping Mission…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Enlightened Myanmar Research Foundation (Myanmar Garment Sector…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Girl Determined (Empowering Girls and Young Women…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Glasgow Caledonian University New York (Fair Fashion Center Apparel Industry…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>LaborVoices (Quick Scan Survey Proposal…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Landscape study Brazil Nazdeek (Situational Analysis of Textile &amp; Garment Industry…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>PUM Netherlands Senior Experts (Better leather, better working conditions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Sampling</td>
<td>Partner Organisation</td>
<td># grants</td>
<td>Strategic Objective(s)</td>
<td>Pillar(s)</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Type of Grantee</td>
<td>Type of Support</td>
<td>Size of Initiative</td>
<td>Value of Initiative</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>PUM Netherlands Senior Experts (Training and Development for Social Dialogue...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Royal Holloway (Scale Matters...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Small Enterprise Assistance Fund (Worker Safety Analysis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>South Asian Network on Economic Modeling (Rapid Assessment...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Synergia Consulting and Training (Capacity assessment...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>(Online Buyer Purchasing Practices...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>University of Sussex (A Comparison of Compensation Schemes...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working Conditions
2. **Relevance, niche, strategic focus, and alignment of the programme**

The background for the Working Conditions programme is closely related to that of the foundation itself; both derive from a desire to respond to two disasters – the Tazreen Fashion factory fire in 2012 and Rana Plaza collapse in 2013. Overall, the programme is well aligned with the purpose of the foundation. More specifically, the mandate of the foundation, as expressed in its ToC, has two broad dimensions: the environmental and the social. The Working Conditions programme corresponds directly with the social dimension. In line with this, the “Frankly Speaking” case study identified two major issues that the foundation wished to address, one of which was:

> “Working conditions: these perpetuate injustice and poverty, particularly amongst women. The apparel industry collectively is one of the largest employers of female workers, and over two-thirds of factory workers are women. Many other women work informally, at home, doing piece work with no labour rights.”

The Working Conditions programme aligns well with priorities of the owner’s group, as it covers a fundamental area in the fashion sector. Interview respondents from the owner’s group were generally appreciative of the programme, as reflected by one respondent who stated:

> “It [the programme] is fit with our mission, aligned with the family philanthropy and its mission to push for dignity and justice for all. This is a programme that very clearly has its remit, it fits very clearly with the family foundation.”

Although the programme is an important part of the mandate of the foundation, there is widespread perception among those interviewed that the priorities and actions of the programme have not aligned quite so directly with those of C&A business, with some reporting a sense of conflict, as indicated in the quotes in the text box.

The perception of tension between the business and the programme emerged from a combination of factors:

1. **Divergent mandates of the business:** The mandate given to the foundation and the programme is straightforward and clear. The mandate of the business, however, is of a dual nature. While C&A employees reported intense pressure to reduce costs, this has been in tension with C&A sustainability priorities. Thus, on Sustainable Development Goal 8 related to decent work and economic growth, C&A 2020 Sustainability Goals included:

   a. 100% of our products sourced from A/B-rated suppliers; and
   b. Build capacity and supplier ownership within our supply chain.

---
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The business has implemented these goals through sustainability practices in sourcing, in maintaining reasonably high standards of transparency, as well as adherence to recognised frameworks for decent work and economic growth. The Working Conditions programme has been well aligned with this dimension of the general approach to sustainability of the business, as stated in interviews with staff of the business as well as some owner’s group members:

“We have an emotional connect with these factories and through the foundation we contribute to them. The business could benefit more from this work.” – C&A business staff

“Transparency allows you to be challenged. And that can be uncomfortable, but if you intend to be the best that you can be, you need to tolerate that discomfort. I think the transparency is an important point.” – Owner’s group members

However, this mandate for sustainability has sometimes competed with the nature of the business. Owner’s group members, C&A business leadership and C&A Foundation Investment Committee (IC) members alike explained this programme misalignment during evaluation interviews, particularly in light of the programme pillar on transparency (see text box below).

“I fully get the business reality of what that might mean today in terms of increases in costs. You have to be able to survive in business to be able to fund all that stuff. What is a non-negotiable and what do you sometimes have to say “we can’t be perfect, we need to get the product at a price-point where consumers are willing to buy it.””

Owner’s group member

“The problem is that we are a corporate foundation. I am totally against things like in India, if our brother, the company, goes wrong, we denounce it. In the IC, it is something that I was asked, “if we approve this grant it puts the company at risk” and I told them that their supply chain is on the website, if they have problems in their supply chain, anyone can investigate, that they should fix them.”

IC member

“The social side of the business was the toughest – living wages and minimum wages – and we don’t have an answer for that. We are dealing with extensive working hours... We have to be transparent – it is the right thing... The pressure on cost and price is high.”

C&A business staff

2. Structured interaction among C&A Foundation and C&A business: The perception of misalignment between the programme and the business has been related, in part, to limited opportunity for structured interaction among the two entities. To illustrate, in two initiative countries (Bangladesh and Mexico), staff of the business and foundation reported mutually supportive relationships, based on frequent interaction and dialogue, both structured and non-structured. Evidence of such relationship and exchange were not available from other contexts. As a result of limited structural support for

“I am disappointed. Every two weeks I ask when we can meet the foundation and get no response. I don’t think that is normal.”

“... There is never an opportunity to engage with the foundation... We used to have calls, but no-one saw the value. The disagreement is so much there, that it takes away the good thing.”

“Even the things that put us into trouble, at the end we get it solved. I don’t think they [foundation] know how much energy we spend trying to solve it [working conditions].”

C&A business staff

1 Idem.
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exchanges and collaboration, interaction has been contingent upon interpersonal interactions of business and foundation staff. A whole range of interview respondents raised issues with this unstructured relational approach, both for the foundation and the business.

There are clear tensions between the Working Conditions programme and C&A business, and risks to each – though the relationship can also help address such risks. In reviewing proposals, the evaluation team recorded three specific risks to C&A business:

- Potential conflict of interest if C&A business is one of the buyers from targeted factories
- Visibility of poor working conditions in C&A supply chain
- General risks that the business may face as a result of improved transparency in the sector. Improved transparency also constitutes a potential benefit as results can benefit the C&A supply chain (in the sampled initiatives no serious risk to C&A was identified).

The Working Conditions programme staff recognised the tensions with the business and underscored the challenges faced by the programme as a result. While one staff member stated that the relationship between the C&A business and the foundation overall was “prickly”, another alluded to all of the above issues while saying: “We have long felt that Working Conditions is at odds with the business…The relationship has been less collaborative….We kind of gave up on collaborating. Close collaboration doesn’t work.”

By comparison, partners interviewed for this evaluation found strong alignment between their organisations and the programme for different reasons. Partners supported through the Collective Action pillar were generally grassroots-based or supportive of grassroots-based action. One partner stated: “The grant was centrally aligned. We would be doing this otherwise. It is a grant that allows us to dedicate time. This specific project isn’t funded by other donors.”

Partners engaged under the Policy Advocacy and Transparency pillars, particularly those that were not otherwise involved in the fashion industry, indicated that they built alignment with the foundation while working on their respective initiatives, rather than having had it at the outset.

For the three sampled partners interviewed for this evaluation, working with the programme allowed them to accrue experience in the garment sector, which resulted in development of their own expertise. For these partners, especially when working on labour rights more generally, the garment sector was a small part of the overall portfolio. Such partners welcomed the specific focus on the garment sector. With the right partners, alignment was built and developed, reflecting the value of interconnecting fashion-specific organisations with the labour rights movement more broadly.

Among the evaluation reports reviewed1, nine of 11 scored well on relevance (rated good, out of good/adequate/poor). Initiatives that performed well did so because a) they were aligned with C&A

1 The following were considered: Better Buying Feasibility Phase; Yo Quiero, Yo Puedo (I want to, I can); Giving Refugees a Voice; Management of Long-Term Support/Education Support for the Children of Dead and Missing Workers of Tazreen Fashion Tazreen Workers’ Children’s Welfare Fund; Avaliação Adaptativa do Projeto “Vozes da Moda-Agreste 2030” Relatório final (Voices of Fashion Intersectorial Social Dialogues); Humanity United; Advancing worker leadership in supply chain monitoring; Transparency through mobile internet – Gajimu.com; Up!+ Project; Better Mills Initiative in China; and Building Resilience of the Urban Poor.
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Foundation’s strategic levers (for example, the Better Buying online platform was powered by notion of transparency; Yo Quiero, Yo Puedo aimed to build capacity of workers, advocated for women’s and men’s rights and empowerment, fostered stakeholder collaboration; Humanity United leveraged transparency and encouraged investees to become active agents in solving forced and child labour, and promoting accountability); b) planned outreach to and engagement of key stakeholders to assure effectiveness, impact and sustainability (as did Better Mills Initiative [BMI] in China); and c) supported local implementing partners in achieving their objectives (for example, the UP!+ initiative was directly aligned with Awaj Foundation’s goal and mission).

Only two initiatives rated poorly (those led by Equiception and International Labor Rights Forum), both due to poor design. The analysis further reveals that successful initiatives were those that add value, push the field ahead, or take more risks. To illustrate, some examples of successes include: 1) C&A Foundation’s participation in the Tazreen Children’s Welfare Fund (TCWF) which established a niche among the range of other sources of support for Tazreen victims; 2) C&A Foundation taking the role of anchor investor in Humanity United’s Working Capital Fund and by funding the developmental evaluation work during its first two years; and 3) UP!+ initiative was characterised as quite original and appropriate to achieve change at factory level.
3. Progress towards results

The evaluation considered different parts of the programme, moving from outputs and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to SOs and outcomes. Absent a counterfactual for these real-world results, programme effectiveness was assessed based on demonstrated outcomes and a triangulated interpretation based on available evidence of the foundation’s work in contributing to those outcomes. Impact is discussed later in the chapter.

The programme’s performance on KPIs was generally above target for all but one indicator that is itself on target.¹ According to dashboard data from May 2019 (Appendix D), the following were noted in the programme review:

1. **Number of female/male workers participating in our initiatives.** The programme achieved 112 thousand workers against a target of 75 thousand. Good World Solutions (Bangladesh) and OnionDev (India) were the main contributors to these results. Many other partners also contributed, albeit at a smaller scale.

2. **Number of women leading efforts to improve working conditions.** Achievements for this KPI were far above target: 1.1 thousand women were leading efforts as of May 2019, compared to a conservative objective of 200. The majority of the women were in Mexico due to the work of the partners Semillas, Hispanics in Philanthropy and Proyecto de Derechos Económicos, Sociales y Culturales.

3. **Number of workers benefiting from improved working conditions.** Against a targeted 75 thousand workers, the programme reached close to 145 thousand in a portfolio implemented in India, China, Bangladesh, Mexico, Brazil and Turkey. Five organisations (Transparentem, WageIndicator, Awaj, Bangladesh legal Aid and Services Trust [BLAST], and OnionDev) were responsible for the majority of these accomplishments, targeting Indonesia, Bangladesh and India.

4. **Number of collective bargaining agreements (CBAs):** Against a targeted 15, the programme achieved 47 by mid-2019 and these covered a range of worker needs, including salary increases, incremental increases, and festival bonuses, among others. WageIndicator was responsible for 34 new or enhanced CBAs, and targeted Indonesia.

5. **Number of stakeholders working together:*** The programme achieved 379 under this KPI, which targeted 150, and covered stakeholder including brands, suppliers, governments and multi-stakeholder initiatives. Open Apparel Registry and Social and Labour Convergence Project, both working at the global level, were responsible for more than half of the total.

6. **Number of organisations strengthened:** Against a target of 20, the programme strengthened 56 according to latest available data, more than a third of these in Brazil. This refers largely to support provided to sub-grantees of direct partners, beyond core support provided to partner organisations.

7. **Number of disclosure and transparency mechanisms.** The programme was almost exactly on target for this KPI, having achieved 16 disclosure and transparency mechanisms used by the industry compared to a target of 15. Fourteen partners are responsible for those results.

8. **Number of new or improved policies.** Against a target of four, programme initiatives have succeeded in improving or promoting new policies in nine cases. The results are spread evenly among four partners.

Despite high performance against all but one KPI, the performance of initiatives on effectiveness as rated through sampled initiative evaluation report was uneven. It was distributed as follows: 36% were rated

---

¹ KPI data result from the compilation by C&A Foundation staff of monitoring data collected by partners.
good, 36% adequate, 28% poor. Performance on this criterion related to an initiative being able to implement planned activities and generate the envisaged outcomes.

The evaluation analysis relies on the three pillars used by the programme itself, as opposed to SOs. As pillars are interrelated, many initiatives correspond to more than one pillar. For the sake of clarity in this report, they have been discussed separately.

**Pillar 1: Collective Action**

The programme supported this pillar through the empowerment of workers in various ways. This ranged from direct support to workers in legal cafes/support centres, to support for unionisation, and training in negotiation. From among the sampled initiatives, the following key victories were notable during the review period:

- Supported through China Labour Bulletin (CLB), unions in three factories in Bangalore elected representatives, while at two factories, bargaining requests were recognised by management.
- Supported by BLAST, paralegals helped workers to secure improvements in working conditions through conflict resolution and other means in nine factories.
- Through Awaj, 35 members were trained in advanced negotiation and advocacy.
- Two Semillas partners supported worker actions in their factories, for instance through institutional capacity and creating communities of practice.

In the Staff Survey, Working Conditions was among the top performing programmes on the question of effectiveness in empowering workers: 37% ranked the performance either as “high” or “outstanding”. This high result was comparable only with Sustainable Raw Materials and Forced and Child Labour; the other programmes were rated “high” by 8-18% of respondents and “outstanding” by none (Appendix E). Along with advancement of knowledge, this is also where the performance of the programme was rated highest by respondents, including by foundation staff.

While well positioned to promote systems change, the contribution of this pillar to direct systems change thus far has been limited, primarily because of the scale of the challenge it aims to address. It can be argued that the number of workers overall is vast compared to the scope of the programme. Bangladesh alone is estimated to have 4-5 million factory workers, compared to 145 thousand that have accessed programme benefits worldwide in 2019, making the programme efforts seem minuscule. Indeed, according to programme staff and partners, advancements in empowerment have been useful for their “demonstration effect”, or for setting examples that can be followed by others. For instance, having received publicity in

---

1 While the precise number of RMG workers in Bangladesh is not known, a 2011 study by McKinsey&Company suggests that there were 3.6 million RMG workers:


2 Source: 2019 May dashboard.
Bangalore, workers from non-supported factories sought out the partner for further action. Further, there is potential for replication. During PhotoVoice interviews, four respondents drew pictures of the negotiation tables, where they were seated at the same table as the owners and managers of factories. Two female workers recalled mobilising for collective action other workers who did not directly participate in training supported by C&A Foundation. Many of these can be regarded as results that can be replicated by non-beneficiaries.

In sum, while the relative scope of change under this pillar is limited to direct beneficiaries, the utility has been in the demonstration effect. This has aligned with a strategic choice, by which the foundation has eschewed a factory-by-factory approach to transformation, choosing instead to address fundamental and root causes. In an indirect result, this pillar has allowed the foundation to acquire experience and to remain in touch with the workers in diverse contexts, also yielding experience related to the other two pillars. However, these actions, even replicated by others, are not at a scale that can or would enable C&A Foundation to transform the fashion industry, although they are fit in terms of design.

Pillar 2: Transparency

Under this pillar, the programme made an effort to “increase industry accountability through public disclosure of working conditions, purchasing practices and supply chains, in a manner that incentivises improvement”.

Through this pillar, the programme has made some notable achievements, especially in the sampled initiatives, as recognised in the Working Conditions programme Portfolio Review (August 2018) and substantiated through interviews and document review. The achievements include:

- 200 brands participated in the Fashion Revolution 2019 Fashion Transparency Index, and 11 improved their ratings by 10% or more since 2018, with 70 brands publishing supply chain information of first tier manufacturers.
- Financial Diaries is an initiative undertaken by Microfinance Opportunities to track the cash and non-cash monetary inflows/outflows of an individual or household linked to the apparel sector in order to better understand their economic behaviour. The initiative continued into a second phase, with a lower cost of data collection to about 10% of the original, thereby increasing the efficiency and coverage.
- BRAC-led Mapped in Bangladesh launched the beta version of the map of Bangladesh’s ready-made garments (RMG) factories that are directly/indirectly export-oriented, have core RMG processes, and are members of major associations.

In the Staff Survey, the programme was rated higher than others on the question related to the advancement of knowledge on the transformation of the fashion industry. Nearly 42% of respondents rated the performance of the programme as “high” or “outstanding”, when asked about the extent to which C&A Foundation advanced knowledge with respect to improving working conditions (Appendix E). Along with the empowerment of workers, this is the area where the programme was rated the best on the Staff Survey. PPR 2019 respondents also rated the programme slightly above the average of all programmes of the foundation on advancing knowledge (5.33 against the foundation’s average of 5.23), and marginally better

---


2 In a supply chain, first tier manufacturers supply directly to companies. The supply chain can involve multiple other cascading levels. For instance, while a first tier manufacturer may supply garments to C&A business, the manufacturer may source from a second tier manufacturer for textile embroidery or cutting, and a third tier manufacturer for cotton weaving and dyeing, and so on.
than the ratings provided by staff (rated 76% by partners and 68% by staff)(Appendix F and Appendix G).

The efforts and likely results of this pillar were widely appreciated by those outside the foundation, including partners. Transparency is a relatively new area for the sector, and respondents generally agreed that this had the most potential for the sector’s transformation. It is also an area where C&A Foundation has demonstrated leadership by supporting initiatives that encouraged or directly contributed to placing data in the public domain (Fashion Revolution and Mapped in Bangladesh). Stakeholders agreed that C&A Foundation has contributed to an ongoing trend towards increased availability of public domain information. Having such information in the public domain is an important accomplishment for the programme.

However, the impact of this transparency has yet to be realised at the level of the worker. A staff member commented in the Staff Survey: “C&A Foundation partners have influenced brands to become more transparent about their supply chains, which is a modest first step to increasing accountability for working conditions.” Still, the discourse on transparency in manufacturing countries is yet to catch up. A partner in a manufacturing country reminded the evaluation that, “[p]reviously people were not ready to work on ‘transparency’. You cannot expect that one fine morning everything will change, change needs time and maturity.”

**Pillar 3: Policy Change**

Through the third pillar, the programme supported initiatives for “the development and enforcement of policies that foster good working conditions”. This pillar, more recently activated than the others, will surely be a major focus in the future. Through document review and interviews, some notable achievements could be identified:

- “Making Rights a Reality”, a report by University of Sussex, which considered workers’ compensation for death and injury at work, was published and presented at Sedex conference and European Parliament.
- Two information technology tools to provide legal aid for workers and information on labour law were developed. Under this, an app was launched in Bangladesh and a website was slated for launch in Turkey (BLAST; CDM/MUDEM).
- Three policy recommendations were identified by trade unions and self-help groups and sent to the Bangladesh Ministry of Labour via written memorandum through BLAST. Through the same initiative, BLAST organised training for labour inspectors so that factory inspections could go beyond industrial safety and include sexual harassment.

In the Staff Survey, policy change was seen as a more modest area of results. Only 7% of respondents rated the effectiveness of the foundation as “high”, when asked to rate the extent to which C&A Foundation meaningfully affected public policy to enable the transformation of the fashion industry, with respect to working conditions. No respondents rated the performance as “outstanding” (Appendix E).

Policy Change has been one of the areas of least effectiveness for the programme; all other programmes except Gender Justice were rated higher in this area in the Staff Survey. This aligned with results of the PPR 2019, where the programme was rated marginally lower than the average for the foundation (4.00 against the average of 4.05 for the foundation; ratings are presented as a cumulative average score), but partners rated this higher than the staff (staff 39%, partners 57%). This is clearly a matter to be addressed by the programme and the foundation as a whole.

---
1 See Appendix G for additional comments.
Partners echoed the above sentiment during interviews, though suggesting that results of policy change were not yet visible. For instance, one partner commented: “Meaningfully affecting public policy is a long-term goal which will take many years of continued investment. It is unrealistic to expect meaningful change in public policy within the current lifetime of our programmes so far.” During an interview, another partner stated: “Impact is too spread out. Working with 500 workers will not bring much change, rather you can work with policy level and change five million lives. But you have to understand leverage points in policy.” There was general agreement among interviewed partners that policy advocacy a) requires long-term efforts for incremental change or until a policy threshold is crossed (leading to adoption or implementation); b) requires an evidence base, some of which has now been built through the pillar on transparency; and c) is extremely difficult (and therefore a valuable effort) in manufacturing countries, owing to political contexts. Yet, it is a lever that can truly achieve large-scale change in the fashion industry. This insight aligned with conclusions from the Delphi study conducted in parallel to this evaluation, on the merits and importance of extended producer responsibility, the necessity of highly detailed sustainability reporting, and other factors, which can only be realised through the existence of tougher regulations.

In addition to the three pillars, the programme relied on three cross-cutting themes: cross-industry collaboration, strong institutions and gender justice. The first of these was embedded in the pillars, as discussed above. The second one refers to support for the building of worker institutions and unions, and support intent on enabling partners to build their own managerial and administrative capacities. The programme has done both, making contributions that built the capacity of actors while building the ecosystem overall (as further discussed below on partnerships and sustainability). This is further discussed below in the section on “Partnership”. The last cross-cutting theme is addressed in the section on “Gender”.

Looking to impact

Overall results and impact of the programme were perceived by interview and Staff Survey respondents alike as modest. In the Staff Survey, respondents were asked to rate the foundation’s effectiveness in shifting the behaviour of brands and retailers in line with a transformation of the fashion industry, and overall contributions of the foundation to a transformation of the fashion industry value chain. Ratings in response to both questions, as related to Working Conditions were modest: 12% respondents selected “high” for the first question; 22% selected “high” for the second – none selected “outstanding” (Appendix E). In the PPR 2019, the programme area was rated slightly above average when participants were asked to rate whether activities will positively transform the global apparel system in the next five years (Appendix F and Appendix G).

Rated on impact in independent evaluations, the initiatives performed adequately overall, with 20% deemed good, 50% adequate, and 30% poor. Good performance on this criterion was related to successful outcomes for individuals in terms of behavioural change; for instance:

- Awaj’s UP!+ initiative reported improvements in health, finance and confidence which supported an increase in individuals raising disputes in the workplace. Although fewer changes were witnessed in collective outcomes at factory or sector level, improvements in working conditions were made in 74 of 75 factories where trainees worked.

Poor performance on this criterion related to target groups reporting not being influenced, as in the following examples:

- Equiception’s Giving Refugees a Voice – Social media monitoring appeared to be an ineffective tool for supporting Syrian refugees in Turkey.
- Instituto Ethos’ Voices of Fashion Intersectorial Dialogues, which did not succeed in bringing the most important denim manufacturing city in the region to the table to take part in multi-stakeholder
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discussion about taboo subjects like precarious employment, low wages, environmental pollution, poor product quality in a scenario of fierce competition between clothing manufacturers.

Partners clearly recognised that through its active contributions, the foundation had emerged as an active and credible actor in the field. Its work has been designed around three pillars and the design of the programme is mostly well structured to advance systems change. In practice, the foundation has been recognised unequivocally by interviewed partners as a champion of transparency and for its effective work with workers. Looking forward, it will need to increase the breadth of its efforts related to policy change. The complexity of the sector, its massive scale in relation to the size of the programme, the crowded field, and the political challenges have meant that large-scale transformation will require a much larger engagement than is currently the case.

Partner and staff respondents universally agreed that the goal of transformation is very long term. Qualitative responses in the Staff Survey consistently editorialised overall transformation in the following words: “early days” and “too soon to tell”. Indeed, results of the programme were consistent with the relatively young stage of the programme and foundation as a whole, with many initiatives in their first or second grant period. An overall transformation of the sector will require long-term and sustained efforts, as expressed by respondents in the survey and interviews. Given the important work undertaken so far, this also presents an immense opportunity for the foundation, and the programme, to continue playing a leading role into the future.
4. Partnership

The Working Conditions programme has had a high number of partners. Including implementation and core support grants of all values, the 2014-18 programme portfolio included 38 partners and 43 active or closing grants worth EUR 17.8 million as of July 2019. The average size of grants for Working Conditions was the lowest across the foundation (EUR 528 thousand), for grants above the EUR 100 thousand threshold, except Circular Fashion when FFG was isolated (EUR 397 thousand). A high ratio of the portfolio was in Bangladesh and globally.

Programme partners have included both national partners (BLAST, Bangladesh Center for Workers Solidarity [BCWS], Awaj, and BRAC) as well as more internationally focused partners (Fashion Revolution, Microfinance Opportunities). In the sample of initiatives reviewed, only a fraction of partners focused explicitly on working conditions in the fashion sector (Awaj, Shimmy Technology, Fashion Revolution, Instituto Fashion Revolution Brazil). For most of the sampled partners, the association with C&A Foundation resulted in their only project in the fashion sector; their primary focus having been either labour rights in general, welfare of women, entrepreneurship, and/or lobbying. However, as discussed earlier, such partners found alignment with the foundation and the Working Conditions programme.

The nature of a few of these partnerships raised some concerns. Given the relationship of the foundation with a leading business in the fashion industry, multiple partners recalled initial ambivalence about associating with the foundation. Two reported accepting the grant on condition that the foundation would not intervene if the partner’s activities were to highlight the C&A business.

The programme’s partners have been organisations of various types, including multi-stakeholder initiatives, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), labour activist organisations, international institutions and bilateral organisations, and international unions. Programme partners have been recruited through both networks of staff members and Requests for Proposals (RFPs). As described in one After Action Review (AAR), RFPs have been useful in the development of programme visibility but were a burden on staff time. RFPs were sometimes seen as prescriptive by partners, who had their own strategies and priorities. In other words, RFPs were perceived as mixed in their strategic and programmatic value.

By comparison, programme staff commonly approached, and were approached by, a diverse range of organisations working in the sector to explore funding opportunities. Programme staff engaged with partners on the basis of diverse needs, shared visions, fit, and other criteria, to develop proposals for presentation to the IC. However, such engagement has not, on balance, been favourably viewed by partners to the same extent as some other C&A Foundation programmes. In the PPR 2019, participants rated the Working Conditions programme as least appreciated among all C&A Foundation programmes in terms of the high pressure experienced to modify priorities to create a proposal. Ratings were nonetheless above average when asked if the selection process helped strengthen the organisation/initiative eventually funded by the grant.

Table 4.1 provides an summary view of partnership-related results. Areas where the programme scored better than the foundation average are highlighted in green; areas where it scored less so are in red. Areas where the distinction is most dramatic are highlighted in orange.
Table 4.1  PPR 2019 related to partnership – focus on the Working Conditions programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>AVERAGE ACROSS THE FOUNDATION</th>
<th>WORKING CONDITIONS PROGRAMME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you understand the foundation’s approval process and timeline?</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how transparent is the foundation with your organisation?</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How consistent was the information provided by different communications resources, both personal and written, that you used to learn about the foundation?</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how satisfied are you with your experience with the foundation?</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate the foundation’s impact on your organisation?</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How clearly has the foundation communicated its goals and strategy to you?</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As you developed your proposal, how much pressure did you feel to modify your organisation’s priorities in order to create a grant proposal that was likely to receive funding?</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.38¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how fairly did the foundation treat you?</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How comfortable do you feel approaching the foundation if a problem arises?</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the proposal review process help you to improve your proposal?</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How helpful was participating in the foundation’s selection process in strengthening the organisation/programme funded by the grant?</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent is the foundation open to ideas from partners about its strategy?</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how responsive was foundation staff?</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the initiatives sampled for this evaluation included components for implementation, nearly all sampled organisations also received organisational support²; this may have included support for staff remuneration, operational budget and other purposes. For grassroots-based organisations Awaj and BCWS, some of this support was provided outside of the initiatives, for instance through specific technical assistance for website development, training on reporting, and the like. For others, support was provided outside initiatives through speaking engagement, attendance at events, introduction to networks and donors, and by other means.

One type of organisational support that has been particularly called for in AARs and appreciated by the few partners who benefitted from it was leadership strengthening beyond the partners’ leaders. As noted in a handful of AARs, many grassroots organisations are based in the personality of their leader and did not always have strong capacities beyond these individuals. A respondent in the Staff Survey commented: “The foundation should invest in second-tier management in organisations that have great delivery but are founder-focused/personality driven.” Uniquely, initiatives with UP! and BRAC have included components for the development of capacities at Awaj. Such support has been considered crucial by partners for two reasons: a) it has ensured the sustainability of an organisation beyond its leader alone, and b) it is not

¹ This question is negatively worded and therefore highlighted in red, even though the rating is higher than average.

² For the sampled partners, not all initiatives were reviewed. Therefore, it is possible that initiatives other than those included in this evaluation included an organisational support component.
commonly available to grassroots organisations. Such partners considered C&A Foundation an indispensable and much appreciated partner, in part because of this organisational support.

In terms of choice of partners, foundation staff rated the programme fairly high compared to other programmes for partners (55% rated it “high” or “outstanding”), and average for non-grantee partners and networks (39% and 34% respectively)(Appendix E). However, in terms of quality of the relationship between partners and programme staff, in the PPR 2019 the programme was rated close to average (Appendix F).

Partners interviewed for this evaluation perceived C&A Foundation in sometimes exceedingly different ways. For one partner, C&A Foundation was a flexible and understanding partner, while for a few others it was inflexible and micromanaging. The more predominant view among respondents was the latter – one respondent used the word “capricious”, while another described the foundation with a linear worldview wedded closely to KPIs and not necessarily recognising the complexity of context. Another perceived the foundation as too demanding for relatively very few returns, while yet another reported that the foundation did not adequately recognise the relationship between the partner and those that the partner supported (Appendix G). Clearly there is room for reflection and improvement regarding Working Conditions’ partnership approach with partners.

The staff of the programme is highly aware that the foundation can come across as a demanding partner. A survey respondent commented:

“Sometimes we have high contact with partners due to C&A Foundation needs (annual report questions, inputs on events, communications, evaluations). Partners are usually very generous with their time; however, we should be more conscious that our requests can distract them from their important work.”

The pressure exerted by staff on partners has tended to relate to a few factors:

- There is immense pressure on staff to disburse funds and therefore pressure to find partners and initiatives (especially for a programme with relatively small-size grants).
- There is a large diversity of partners with various strategic foci, needing extra support to remain within the focus areas of the programme and foundation.
- The portfolio includes many organisations with weak capacities, which require extra due diligence and engagement to acquire the high standards expected by the foundation (including the IC).
- Some grants have been perceived as disruptive by the business and IC, thereby requiring a high level of engagement by programme staff.
- Many grants have been experimental in nature, requiring engagement to monitor and stay on track.

Programme staff clearly have been willing to go the extra mile to provide support to organisations, where it was understood that this would be of value to the effectiveness of organisations. It appears, however, that the merits of doing so have tended to become clearer to partners only down the line.
5. Sustainability

Assessment of the sustainability of programme results indicates that while exhibiting important vulnerabilities, results are still likely to be sustainable. Two caveats need to be recognised. First, by the foundation's standards, the average value of grants has been low and their duration has been short. Second, the programme's initiatives have been ineffective at securing co-funding, which is one of its principal sustainability challenges. Indeed, from a review of evaluations, it is clear that sustainability of results has been strongly tied to an initiative's ability to secure other sources of financial support during implementation. For instance, the evaluation of Humanity United reported that the sustainability of results was "good": while C&A Foundation was an anchor investor, there was an impressive range of other philanthropic actors. The evaluation of Better Buying, on the other hand, reported "poor" sustainability: the organisation had not sufficiently considered and secured its financial sustainability during the feasibility phase, even though the evaluation indicated that it was possible to move to a start-up phase. Among the evaluations reviewed, on the matter of the sustainability of initiatives, 30% were deemed good, 30% adequate, 40% poor.

Looking deeper at sustainability through the programme pillars, and into the provision of core support, provides a good understanding of the sustainability perspective shared in this analysis.

Pillar 1: Collective Action

Sustainability of Collective Action results may be understood at two levels: individual and institutional. For individual beneficiaries, capacities have been developed through activities such as training and workshops. The sustainability of such results has been dependent upon the depth of the capacity developed and experience acquired. It is clear that the benefits of training have been appreciated and yielding results. For instance, institutions such as trade unions have been a focus under this pillar, and many of these are likely to be sustained.

Partners, however, did not necessarily regard individual-level results as highly sustainable because a) the scale of the sector is immense, and b) there is high turnover among factory workers and not all workers will continue to work in the RMG sector for the long term. Partners have suggested that greater sustainability would come from the creation of structures or institutions that could persist in their provision of training opportunities. One partner said: “Our big challenge is that after 40 or 45 years of age they [workers] retire. There are always newcomers. If we have factory level structure, that will be sustainable.” At the institutional level, questions remained among partners about the power and sustainability of results derived, with a relatively weak understanding of what sustainability might entail.

Pillar 2: Transparency

Results in transparency have been regarded by interview respondents as less visible though expected to be more sustainable down the line, if efforts can be sustained. Respondents widely agreed that this was a relatively new area of work, with results still emergent. For instance, while an increasing number of brands have been making information available, and there is an effort to move data into the public domain, these trends have not yet become the industry norm. One partner insightfully commented: “It is too early for sustainability. It is not practical. Even if they [the programme] have two sustainable projects out of 10, that would be creditable.” Results from this pillar are likely to become available and be sustained in the medium term. The programme is seen as a champion of transparency, and a continuation of its efforts is likely to scale up the results and increase their sustainability.
Pillar 3: Policy Change

The programme has produced limited results with regard to policy change. Partners and staff agreed that as results would be produced, they would likely be sustainable, by their nature. However, new legislation alone cannot be considered an end goal in terms of sustainability of results and the implementation of such laws and regulations will warrant attention.

Cross-cutting: Institutional capacity development

Institutional capacity development has been an important part of the programme’s work, as a cross-cutting theme. It is thus discussed here in terms of sustainability, noting that the highest level of sustainability of results has been seen when C&A Foundation provided some form of core or organisational support to partners. For many of the organisations, the foundation was instrumental in the development of capacities such as reporting, monitoring, communication and financial literacy. This had implications for their ability to produce sustainable results.

At worker level, implementing partners were generally not clear about how sustainability might be ensured, except to indicate that continued work and support would be required. In fact, CBAs, trade unions and other forms of institutionalisation are the markers of emergent sustainability. Among the 11 evaluations reviewed, only one (UP!+) mentioned that part of the grant was explicitly used to strengthen the local implementing partner (Awaj), as opposed to the partner, to enable it to be capable to sustain its work and extend its outreach. As a result, Awaj was rendered more autonomous.

Regarding partners, interviewed donors concurred that there is a dearth of donors willing to provide core support, making such support extremely valuable. A partner whose initiative did not receive such support said:

“People need to pay rent. People have to have jobs. Our staff get paid less than USD 200 a month. The people doing [the project] are decent. But it isn’t sustainable – we can’t keep the staff on. If these staff go to multinational companies, they will take home 10 times the current salary. That is also a realistic thing to think about. As economy changes and as there are more opportunities, it will be harder to keep these staff members. In this political context and with the rapacious government who is not interested in supporting issues around accountability, how is this going to be sustained?”

For organisations that did receive core support, and they were more numerous for Working Conditions than for any other programme at C&A Foundation, it was reported to have contributed to the sustainability of partner organisations themselves, through increased capacity to engage with donors, grant management, and monitoring, such as the case of Awaj. Organisational support also helped to build the field. A partner commented: “If you are strengthening the human resource, this resource is sustainable anyway. They [staff of partner organisation] will work elsewhere. Even if we don’t have funding relation with C&A Foundation, the staff can still contribute.” Thus, institutional capacity development has served as an investment in multiple respects, noting that according to the PPR 2019, C&A Foundation (7%) and the Working Conditions programme (11%) have provided such support far below the average funder (29%).
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6. Factors of effectiveness and sustainability

The Working Conditions programme has a wide and somewhat provocative mandate that addresses fundamental factors in the race to the bottom of the fashion industry. In addressing these factors, a few contextual elements that have affected the effectiveness and sustainability of the programme have to be acknowledged.

External context

The supply chain is extremely complex: while the programme worked with a clear ToC, strategy and vision, it operated in an complex and nonlinear context. At country level, there is additional complexity: the efforts related to transparency and advocacy in local contexts presented unique challenges. For example, the Mapped in Bangladesh initiative was predicated upon cultivation of working relations with the Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BGMEA) as a stakeholder and source of data. However, after the launch of the initiative, this proved an extremely difficult challenge, requiring tremendous efforts from the partner and C&A Foundation. The BGMEA was tough to engage and reluctant to provide data for reasons beyond the control of the programme or the initiative. This challenge was initially underestimated and has since been resolved with the cooperation of the BGMEA.

In another case, the initiative with CLB was to seek partners in China and Cambodia, besides India. However, due to the political context in China and Cambodia, these geographies had to be deprioritised and abandoned respectively by this initiative. The AAR for the initiatives notes the positive and negative implications of the context (Table 6.1).

Table 6.1 Contextual matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Worked</th>
<th>What Did not Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External factors (political situation in China; and no suitable partner and political situation in Cambodia) contributed to narrowing of scope and contributed to making the grant “successful” in its renewed scope.</td>
<td>Significant crackdown on labour advocates in China (from 2015). In Cambodia it was difficult for CLB to identify a partner organisation because of the political situation. The organisation that was initially considered was found unsuitable due to organisational capacity issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although ultimately yielding strong results (CBAs, training, partnership), the design of the initiatives was significantly affected by the external context. This has had important implications for the results and sustainability of the initiative and the programme.

Large sector

The apparel sector is large, with an estimated 4-5 million workers in Bangladesh alone.1 In financial, programmatic and capacity terms, C&A Foundation has been a modest actor relative to the scope of the work. Further, a plethora of actors operate in the areas of worker rights and working conditions. For instance, in Bangladesh, virtually every development partner has active projects in the sector. The number and variety of actors (NGOs, donors, action-oriented groups, multi-stakeholder initiatives, and others) is very high. This crowded space has not seen much strategic alignment among actors; development partners interviewed for

---

1 As discussed above.
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this evaluation reported only moderate and generally non-strategic communication among donors. Therefore, there is an opportunity for the foundation to use its convening power and facilitate greater strategic alignment among actors, including donors in this field. This is an important insight for the programme and foundation more broadly.

Experience and location of partners

There is no shortage of actors in the field of working conditions, and all sampled initiatives were led by partners with strong reputations. However, diverse evidence for this study confirms that the ground-based initiatives were more likely to succeed and sustain when implemented by partners based in-country. This is related to the capacity of a partner to design initiatives based on needs, and to provide continuous engagement on the ground. Further, country-based partners also have the capacity to sustain results of initiatives, beyond the period of the grant.

Longevity and innovation

While innovation is a screening criterion for C&A Foundation initiatives, effectiveness and sustainability are linked to longevity of support. Innovation is considered desirable in foundation funding decisions, especially at the level of the Board and IC. For many initiatives, especially those under the pillar of Collective Action, there is limited link between innovation and effectiveness. While innovation is desirable (and can be expected at the global/policy level), at ground-level (related to empowerment and collective action), innovation is not always possible or desirable. Partners have been very vocal on this matter. One partner commented directly (and others concurred) on the requirement of C&A Foundation for proposals to be innovative, while stating that innovation in building capacities was not always possible or realistic. Further, all beneficiaries interviewed for the evaluation commended the continued provision of workshops or training, rather than their innovative nature. Indeed “innovative” outputs such as a smartphone app have had more limited uptake than training on negotiation and expense management, for instance.

A staff member stated in the survey: “Longer-term funding that enables partners to focus on their work and reduce their scramble for funds can be very important to help them deliver on their purpose.” Yet, Working Conditions has the shortest average duration of all programmes at C&A Foundation (2.3 years compared to an overall average of 2.5 years).

Internal procedures and strategic clarity

C&A Foundation has, on a few rare but important occasions, suffered from a disconnection between its existing grant-making procedures and its strategic priorities. In one key example, C&A Foundation in Bangladesh was part of a discussion with the US Agency for International Development to support a multi-year initiative with a total budget of USD 6.6 million. The AAR indicates that the initiative would have included a USD 2.6 million grant from the US Agency for International Development in support of C&A Foundation partners in Bangladesh, with USD 4.4 million from C&A Foundation. This initiative had potential to establish a relationship with the Bangladesh Ministry of Labour. Foundation staff pursued the partnership for six months before presenting it to the Board, which decided that C&A Foundation should not proceed as the lead agency, resulting in a failed collaboration. Aside from the loss of resources, and notwithstanding contextual political issues in the United States, this also reportedly damaged the relationship with a potential partner. According to the AAR, “[t]here is a need to define the parameters within which and from what types of organisations we can accept funding”. While the Board-level decision may be based on sound reasoning, the AAR points to the need for greater internal clarity and communication of this across the foundation.

“[t]here is a need to define the parameters within which and from what types of organisations we can accept funding”. While the Board-level decision may be based on sound reasoning, the AAR points to the need for greater internal clarity and communication of this across the foundation.

Working Conditions partner

“It was a pilot project and, let us say, after one year of training we can't tell workers it has been shut down. Just because things don't change on the ground in project period, you can't change the programme themes. There should be 3-5 years of work.”

Working Conditions partner
7. Gender

Working Conditions included one KPI on gender equity, where it has performed well against a conservative target. Against a target of 200 women leading efforts to improve working conditions, the programme recorded more than 1,100 women in May 2019. Further, many leaders of grassroots organisations, indeed most respondents of this case study, were women. The programme’s contribution to building the leadership of women helped make them more confident and empowered during the process of engaging with partner organisations. For instance, during PhotoVoice interviews, two beneficiaries provided accounts of their empowerment and dignity (see Appendix I). The gender-related impacts of the programme were therefore incremental and between gender-sensitive (level 3/5 on the WHO’s Gender Responsive Assessment Scale) and gender-specific (level 4/5), but certainly not gender-transformative.1 This score is the highest among C&A Foundation programmes. In the Staff Survey, 56% of respondents indicated that Working Conditions “highly” or “outstandingly” integrated gender considerations into its work (Appendix E).

Yet, the programme has not had an explicit gender strategy and, while it had identified gender justice as a cross-cutting theme, no SO was associated with it. A few contextual factors also need to be considered. First, the number of women is traditionally high in the apparel sector: according to a study by the Centre for Policy Development, the management of factories has generally been male, while the workers have predominantly been female. The initiatives, while designed with gender-sensitive KPIs, have not necessarily addressed fundamental gender relations. For instance, while the majority of targeted beneficiaries of the programme were women, this was inevitable because women are overrepresented in the workforce in the sector.

Second, gender relations in all countries where the programme has had initiatives are entrenched and culturally embedded. There is little evidence of the programme intentionally tackling gender relations in contextually relevant ways. Only 3 of the 11 evaluations reviewed mentioned gender:

- The initiative Voices of Fashion Intersectorial Social Dialogues, implemented by Instituto Ethos, DIEESE, InPACTO and Reporter Brasil, had an aim to reduce gender inequality, although it fell short.
- Equiception’s Giving Refugees a Voice did not sufficiently understand the local context of Syrian refugee women working in the Turkish textile sector.
- Humanity United’s Working Capital Fund used a gender justice lens to improve outcomes for women and economic returns for investors. Their approach aimed at elucidating advantages for male workers at the expense of females and understanding contextual cultural considerations.

Third, Working Conditions funded initiatives suggest that the programme has equated gender and women. Many of the sampled organisations were led by women, with one describing itself as a “women-owned” company. Programme initiatives such as legal clinics and negotiation training were directed to address workplace issues but invariably supported female beneficiaries, and many beneficiaries interviewed for this evaluation were women.

In sum, the programme has empowered many female beneficiaries and organisation leaders. However, these results have been achieved more because of the preponderance of women in the sector, rather than as a

---

1 For details on WHO Gender Responsive Assessment Scale, please refer to: World Health Organization. WHO Gender Responsive Assessment Scale: criteria for assessing programmes and policies. Available at: https://www.who.int/gender/mainstreaming/GMH_Participant_GenderAssessmentScale.pdf

result of an explicit strategy. The initiatives themselves were relatively short in duration, and small in scale and scope, which limited their potential to address structural and deep-rooted cultural challenges related to gender.
8. C&A Foundation functions

The principal focus of this discussion of foundation functions is on human resource issues, monitoring and reporting, and relations with the IC, as these have been the most relevant to the Working Conditions programme.

**Human resources**

Programme staff were based in Bangladesh, India, Hong Kong, Brazil and Mexico, but the programme itself focused on specific geographic regions. Homing in on Bangladesh, the programme had two staff members based there, who were formally affiliated with C&A Sourcing, as the foundation was not registered in the country. This created challenges at the local level, as programme staff were on the payroll of the business but subject to altogether different regulations (remuneration, expectations, and the like).

Also, the support provided by the foundation to local organisations could have been interpreted to counter guidelines provided by the Bangladesh Investment Development Authority. This presents a serious risk, considering that the business is the third largest brand sourcing from Bangladesh, in a very high-profile and politically sensitive sector.

**Monitoring and reporting**

The programme may have been subject to risks to monitoring and reporting that were not clear through the grant-making period (though it was beyond the scope of this evaluation to undertake a thorough examination of such risks). While the foundation supported many actors and organisations at the local level, there remains a potential for double counting towards KPIs in at least two ways, based on stakeholder consultation.

- Any one beneficiary could be counted more than once when accessing different activities of an initiative (for example, through worker training or participation in a complaint mechanism). There does not appear to have been an effective way to avoid such double counting and reporting.
- There was seemingly no effective mechanism in place for ensuring that partners were not using the same activity for reporting to various donors.

**Relations with the Investment Committee**

Due to the tension between the business and the programme, ideas and concepts have been intensely curated before proposals were placed before the IC. This has affected the nature of the work pursued by the programme. In words of a staff member: “Overall, I feel the business limits our work – what we can do and how we can do it.” According to estimates by programme staff, 2 to 5 proposal ideas are rejected internally at programme level for every proposal presented to the IC. A Staff Survey respondent recalled: “Programme staff strive to develop grants which transform the global fashion sector and fill gaps, however truly transformational ideas have sometimes been watered down or even abandoned due to resistance from C&A business.”

As a result, the programme pursued a portfolio where the average size of grants has been small – grants below the EUR 100 thousand threshold, which have not needed the approval of the IC, constituted 41% of the programme’s implementation and core support grants for 2014-18. This is higher than any other programme and higher than the foundation’s overall average (35%). According to a survey respondent:

“It is difficult to approve large and long-term grants when they are viewed as risky, or the partner lacks experience in the apparel sector. This means we end up approving a bunch of smaller grants,
which can be a great start, but are unable to transform the system by themselves. In sum, sometimes our grants are not designed to transform, but are designed to start a process of transformation.”

The misalignment between the IC and the programme has been twofold: misalignment and tensions between the programme and priorities of the C&A business, and perceived lack of familiarity of IC members with the contexts of initiatives.

It is not possible to create a precise counterfactual scenario for funding decisions without this compelling factor. But it is important to recognise this as a factor in the funding decisions made by and for the programme, as well as the impact on relationships with partners when faced with pressure for perhaps excessive justification at the proposal stage.
9. Strategic levers and leverage points

Formally and for reporting, the programme has used five SOs. However, internally, the programme has used three pillars: Transparency, Collective Action and Policy Change. It also used three cross-cutting themes: cross-industry collaboration, strong institutions and gender justice. These pillars, themes and SOs (except the gender justice theme) are mapped against one another in Table 9.1 (including the extent of investment made).

Table 9.1 Working Conditions programme investment by pillar and SO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PILLAR / CROSS-CUTTING THEME</th>
<th>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>% OF OVERALL PROGRAMME FUNDING AS OF APRIL 2018</th>
<th>GRANT VALUE (2015-2017) IN MILLION €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Increase industry accountability through public disclosure of working conditions, purchasing practices and supply chains, in a manner that incentivises improvement</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Help to amplify worker voice and participation in improving working conditions, especially women</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Change</td>
<td>SO4</td>
<td>Support the development and enforcement of policies that foster good working conditions</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting</td>
<td>SO3</td>
<td>Promote industry cooperation to support better working conditions</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting</td>
<td>SO5</td>
<td>Improve capacity of organisations working for better working conditions and wages</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Support women leading efforts to improve working conditions in order to increase representativity</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the view of the majority of interviewed partners, the three pillars were well conceived for the overall goals of the programme. “Collective action and worker empowerment” has been an essential building block for the transformation of the fashion sector towards improved working conditions. As noted earlier, the scale of the industry and concomitant challenges remain immense, and this pillar and the programme alone are not likely to resolve the challenge of collective action. For increased effectiveness, the programme has explicitly eschewed a factory-by-factory approach, focusing instead on creating on higher level activities such as building grassroots organisations that can support workers directly. This pillar has allowed the programme to build credibility, reputation and experience for the other pillars, but it should not remain as significant as it has been in terms of value of investment.

The second pillar, Transparency, is highly challenging. Respondents working at the local levels generally agreed that transparency was a relatively new concept, but of tremendous utility for the future. At the global level, however, Transparency has rapidly grown as a shared value if not yet a norm, and one that is espoused and championed by C&A Foundation. The third pillar, Policy Change, was deemed essential by most respondents but has so far had limited results. Policy Change will assume a larger focus in the forthcoming strategic period. The Working Conditions programme so far does not include a focus on changing the fashion narrative, which has emerged as a key potential strategic lever for C&A Foundation, in line with the recommendations of the Delphi assessment. The Working Conditions programme has aimed to focus on the root causes of issues and use strategic levers to tackle these, adopted a pioneering approach by embracing transparency and using it as a lever to improve conditions in the apparel industry.

As discussed earlier, another strategic cross-cutting theme has been organisational support, which is SO5. Many of the reviewed initiatives included a component for administrative or institutional support, however according to the PPR 2019, the Working Conditions programme and C&A Foundation allocate many fewer core support grants than the average funder. The grassroots organisations that received such support from the foundation highly appreciated its contribution to their effectiveness and longevity. This spawning and strengthening of organisations has been a valuable feature of the programme.

Finally, in an illustration of the cutting-edge nature of the programme, at the country level a handful of respondents pointed out that the foundation ought to focus on automation as the forthcoming change within the sector. These partners implied that as demand for factories to be more efficient and profitable, increased automation is expected to change the nature of factory work. This automation may result in unemployment of many factory workers. However, the Working Conditions programme has already had an active grant within the sample that considered automation and solutions for the future. Along with such this anticipatory attention to issues, and supported by a vast variety of partner and contexts, the programme has been deemed to work with the appropriate levers and leverage points for systemic change.
10. Conclusions

The Working Conditions programme, through a wide-ranging portfolio, has positioned itself well, delivered many important outputs and made a modest contribution to setting the course for a transformation of the fashion supply chain. For the next strategic period, the programme should consider shifting its focus from “worker empowerment and transparency” towards “policy change, transparency and changing the narrative”. In addition, some of the challenges and solutions worthy of consideration are noted below.

The relationship between the Working Conditions programme and the C&A business would likely benefit from clarification through intentional and structured engagement. A clear agreement of collaboration would prove strategically insightful for the programme as it engages with other brands; it may also provide valuable intelligence to the business about concerns and challenges to be addressed in the future.

The programme has done important work to strengthen the foundation’s partners, with beneficial effect, and there remains much more to be done. Perhaps more importantly, C&A Foundation should take note of the value derived from supporting organisations in their development, and the implications this will likely continue to have on the effectiveness and sustainability of results. Of course, this will be of limited value if the programme and foundation continue to support comparatively short-term initiatives or if they insist on seeking innovative initiatives over proven strategies.

The foundation, and the Working Conditions programme in particular, has been criticised for being overly prescriptive in its partnership approach. In response, the programme may wish to revise the quality, quantity and depth of engagement sought and undertaken with partners, mindful of staff capacities. Such a shift would allow for a more strategic and supportive engagement. There is no one organisation operating in isolation in this field, as the programme knows, and there is much scope for the programme to use its convening power to enable greater linkages among its partners. The creation of further networking opportunities among partners may yet enable additional synergies among them, building a stronger field of action, for creating opportunities for change along its three strategic pillars and three cross-cutting themes.
Appendix A. Documents consulted

For each of the sampled grants, the following documents were reviewed (when available): Proposals, Due Diligence, Progress reports, Evaluation reports, Related research reports, Press coverage. The evaluation team also reviewed evaluation reports, as listed in the sampling.


The Guardian. (Yvo de Boer). (2013). Improving Worker Conditions in the Global Supply Chain is Good Business. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/improve-worker-conditions-supply-chain-china


World Health Organization. WHO Gender Responsive Assessment Scale: criteria for assessing programmes and policies. Available at: https://www.who.int/gender/mainstreaming/GMH_Participant_GenderAssessmentScale.pdf
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## Appendix B. Stakeholders consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>TITLE / POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akter, Kalpona</td>
<td>Bangladesh Center for Workers Solidarity</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akter, Nazma</td>
<td>Awaj Foundation</td>
<td>Founder and Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alam, Kouser</td>
<td>Bangladesh Center for Workers Solidarity</td>
<td>Communication, Documentation and M&amp;E Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alam, Ovick</td>
<td>WebAble</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arong, Atat</td>
<td>BLAST</td>
<td>Staff Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artuso, Eloisa</td>
<td>Instituto Fashion Revolution Brasil</td>
<td>Education Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayruani, Monoshita</td>
<td>WebAble</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carvalho, Sheila</td>
<td>Instituto Ethos de Empresas e Responsabilidade Social</td>
<td>Human Rights Projects Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choudhuri, Afshana</td>
<td>Centre for Entrepreneurship Development, BRAC University</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chowdhury, Naureen</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dongfang, Han</td>
<td>CLB</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durairaja, Leslie</td>
<td>C&amp;A Sourcing</td>
<td>Senior Hub Manager Sustainable Supply Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferro, Marina</td>
<td>Instituto Ethos de Empresas e Responsabilidade Social</td>
<td>Businesses Practices &amp; Public Policies Executive Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan Nayan, Nahidul</td>
<td>Awaj Foundation</td>
<td>Operations Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hossain, Md. Sabbir</td>
<td>Solidarity Center</td>
<td>Programme Officer (Lawyer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hossain, Sara</td>
<td>BLAST</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huda, Taqbir</td>
<td>BLAST</td>
<td>Research Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurst, Rosey</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Founder and Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussain, Syed Hasibuddin</td>
<td>Centre for Entrepreneurship Development, BRAC University</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krasley, Sarah</td>
<td>Shimmy Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima, Edmundo</td>
<td>ABVTEX – Associação Brasileira do Varejo Têxtil</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mian, Adbur Salman</td>
<td>BLAST</td>
<td>Deputy Director (M&amp;E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullick, Emelda S.</td>
<td>USAID Bangladesh</td>
<td>Project Management Specialist, Labour and Human Rights Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murshed, Faisal</td>
<td>Bangladesh Center for Workers Solidarity</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols, Valerie</td>
<td>CLB</td>
<td>Development and Operations Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quader, Mahjabeen</td>
<td>International Trade and Development. Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor, Economic Affairs and Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahman, Md. Tayebur</td>
<td>BLAST</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**NAME** | **ORGANISATION** | **TITLE / POSITION**  
--- | --- | ---  
Rodríguez, Kelly Fay | Solidarity Center | Country Program Director  
Sautede, Eric | CLB | Development Director  
Simon, Fernanda | Instituto Fashion Revolution Brasil | Country Coordinator  
Singh, Shantanu | C&A Sourcing | Unit Leader, General Manager – Dhaka Hub (Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka)  
Sinha, Ipshita | C&A Foundation | Programme Manager  
Somers, Carry | Fashion Revolution CIC | Founder and Global Operations Director  
Stuart, Guy | Microfinance Opportunities | Executive Director  
Sultana, Zakia | Bangladesh Center for Workers Solidarity | Program Coordinator  
Tuba, Faiza Farah | C&A Foundation | Programme Officer  
Tucker, Jill | C&A Foundation | Head of Labour Rights  
Vander Meulen, Nicole | International Corporate Accountability Roundtable | Legal & Policy Coordinator  
Vuddamalay, Ilan | C&A Foundation | Programme Manager  
Xavier, Mariana B. | C&A Foundation | Programme Coordinator  
Zamil, Md. Mostafa | BLAST | Deputy Director (Program)  
**Beneficiaries (22) – among which:**  
Montes Ramírez, Sara | Colectivo Raíz | Coordinator  
Quiñonez, Julia | Comité Fronterizo de Obrer@s (CFO) | Coordinator  
Ramírez, Reyna | Colectivo Obreras Insumisas (COI) | Director  
Velázquez, Blanca | Centro de Apoyo al Trabajador (CAT) | Director  

**NOTE:** This case study used data from other interviews conducted by the overall evaluation, but which were not specifically focused on the Working Conditions programme.
Appendix C. Evaluation synthesis

This appendix summarises the evaluation synthesis for the Working Conditions programme conducted by the evaluation team based on programme evaluation reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awaj Foundation and Impactt Ltd.: Up!+ Project</td>
<td>2.2019</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good This initiative is considered highly relevant as it responded to the identified needs of the context and beneficiaries and was aligned with C&amp;A Foundation’s Working Conditions ToC, as well as Awaj Foundation’s goal and mission. Awaj, as a grassroots RMG workers organisation with high outreach capacity complemented the work of other workers’ rights initiatives. The pyramidal/stepped up model approach was quite original and appropriate to achieve change at factory level.</td>
<td>Good This initiative is considered highly effective: four out of five training output targets were achieved at 100% or over. Overall, around 15,000 workers were trained, including over 5,100 in this phase of the initiative, and 150 leaders have been created since 2014.</td>
<td>Adequate This initiative was considered to be adequately efficient, although it is important to note that the evaluators adjusted the rating, reducing it to “average” from the previous endline evaluation rating of “good”. The project was delivered on time and on budget, despite obstacles. Cost effectiveness was relatively good and improved with each phase of the initiative. However, the budget allocation between the grantee and subgrantee and the fact that insufficient capacity was built to handover grant management/reporting activities to Awaj hampered efficiency. Although</td>
<td>Good The most notable successes in terms of outcomes were found at individual level in terms of behaviour change related to health, finance and improved confidence, which resulted in an increase on the part of individuals raising of disputes in the workplace. Although fewer changes were witnessed in terms of collective outcomes at factory or sector level, improvements in working conditions were made in 74 out of the 75 factories where trainees worked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER:</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Buying: Better Buying Feasibility Phase</td>
<td>6.2017</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team) Instantiating C&amp;A Foundation’s strategic lever of transparency, this initiative was described as a positive start on a wicked problem that is deeply embedded in the structure of global supply chains. After being trialled for 18 months, this online rating platform for anonymous buyer ratings (of suppliers) was judged “fit for purpose” and seen to have sufficient engagement from stakeholders to move to start-up phase.</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team) The feasibility phase successfully tested the concept over an 18-month period, fulfilling its objective and generating two unintended results that yielded helpful insights for moving into the start-up phase: 1) Better Buying was seen to give ammunition to raise the bar on brand compliance with fair labour standards; 2) the platform’s trial shone a light on buyer practices (seen as a positive upshot). Potential risk: brands were worried that</td>
<td>Not available. The word &quot;efficiency&quot; was not mentioned a single time in the 21-page evaluation report.</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team) The concept appeared to stimulate the desired impact by working with the transparency lever. Better Buying’s job is to signal the problem; but it can not also be expected solve it. Under its approach, the onus was put on the companies (buyers) to remediate problems in supply chains surfaced through the ratings, by internally undertaking a &quot;root cause analysis&quot;. The feasibility phase showed ambivalence of buyers about this setup, as the</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team) Prospects for financial sustainability appeared poor, without philanthropic or other funding. The notion of business model needed substantially further work. Proof of concept involves demonstrating and marketing the value of the rating system in a way that persuades users to pay for it. The evaluators stressed the idea of transforming &quot;as fast as possible&quot; from a non-profit to a for-profit model and adopting the fast-growing social business format of a B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caritas Bangladesh: Management of Long-Term Support/ Education Support for the Children of Dead and Missing Workers of</td>
<td>11.2018</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team; the original evaluator assessed this aspect as good) Given its core objective was related to education support, the project was judged as effective. Based on the sample, the project</td>
<td>Good Despite being designed in an organic manner and without the benefit of previous experience in establishing such a trust fund, the TCWF has been managed by Caritas Bangladesh in an efficient and flexible</td>
<td>Adequate (as deduced by OEE team based on what was reported in effectiveness and sustainability); impact was not evaluated by the evaluation team.</td>
<td>Adequate Assessed by looking at sustainability of benefits of activities after phase-out. By age 18, some children had already phased-out and it seemed that the end of the stipend did not jeopardise investment in the child’s education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: Tazreen Fashion Children’s Welfare Fund (TCWF)</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due to several factors: 1) the fund’s set up/design/approach; 2) the collaboration on which it was based; 3) the fund’s duration; 4) the fund’s target beneficiaries, objectives and management. The amount of the stipend and the fact that it was targeted for education was deemed as particularly well suited to the needs of the affected families. The trust fund managed to identify a clear niche amongst the range of other sources of support (TCA, BGMEA, PMO) that existed for Tazreen victims.</td>
<td>reached its target of 100% of enlisted children continuing their education thanks to the monthly stipend. Guardians used the money in the intended way to cover monthly education expenses and help increase child school enrolment and retention. A factor that strongly impacted effectiveness is that in 2015, beneficiaries were concentrated close to Caritas Bangladesh’s regional office. Just two years later, they were scattered across 21 districts in Bangladesh, creating a major outreach challenge. Project achievements were moderated by insufficient guidance and orientation at handover of accumulated funds for those beneficiaries turning 18. For the objective of “sound physical and mental growth as well as moral formation”, its way, even if several challenges have affected project implementation. The project team’s dedication was highlighted as a contributing factor to the very good level of achievement. As a percentage of the budget, the administrative and implementation costs of the trust fund represented approximately 25% of the overall budget for the first phase, which is seen as reasonable for this style of intervention. Budgeting and planning over a 5-year period were not easy tasks given that the settings were very likely to change over such a long timeframe. Some flexibility was required in the design and budget to make sure that Caritas could continue delivering the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equiception: Giving Refugees a Voice</td>
<td>3.2018</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>This indicator was seen as too ambitious, vague and difficult to assess. Activities such as Psychosocial Support (PSS), though necessary, were not sufficiently resourced to fulfil the envisaged objective. This reflects a need to rethink what it aimed to achieve, how it could be best achieved, and what it would cost.</td>
<td>same quality of follow-up and support to the beneficiaries, even if their location or situation changed.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the project’s objective was relevant for stakeholders (Syrian workers in Turkish apparel sector), its design and ToC were based on unrealistic assumptions about the needs of brands and others that the project was seeking to influence. Poor understanding of Social Media Analysis. Regarding gender: The low number of Syrian women posting on Social Media was seen as too ambitious, vague and difficult to assess. Activities such as Psychosocial Support (PSS), though necessary, were not sufficiently resourced to fulfil the envisaged objective. This reflects a need to rethink what it aimed to achieve, how it could be best achieved, and what it would cost.

The project was impeded by implementation team’s lack of expertise in social media monitoring and working with Syrian refugees in Turkey (these were fundamental areas of required expertise for this initiative to succeed). Delays in project implementation and poor coordination led to a no cost extension. Social Media Brands and others that the project was seeking to influence indicated that they had not been report influenced by the new information and insights provided by the Social Media Analysis to the extent that they would take specific actions. In addition, they and other organisations and actors targeted by the project felt strongly (due to political and regulatory reasons) themselves about their futures, with ambitions to become government officials, physicians, police officers, etc. Findings suggest that many parents continue to send the children to school even if the stipend was stopped (many phased-out children, having received their lump sum, and whose guardians no longer receive the stipend, are still studying at the time of the evaluation).
Facebook was not fully addressed at design stage. Many informants raised questions about the relevance of the project design as it was not set up to ensure that information about women or women’s perspectives would be included. By the new information and insights provided by the Social Media Analysis to the extent that they would take specific actions. In addition, actors targeted by the project strongly felt that they could not publicly endorse any actions to induce supply chain actors to legally employ Syrians, for a number of political and regulatory reasons. The initiative provided some important lessons for taking forward thinking on how to integrate social media monitoring as a potentially important tool in advancing transparency and accountability in opaque supply chains. Analysis was not considered by target stakeholders to be cost-effective. That they could not publicly endorse any actions to induce supply chain actors to legally employ Syrians. Planning to secure funding to carry on its work to support the integration of Syrian refugees, with or without funding, there was no follow-up to know if this aspiration was carried out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMIFAP: Yo Quiero, Yo Puedo (I want to, I can)</td>
<td>3.2017</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team). Initiative was generally delivered on time; however during implementation, there were delays linked to maquila’s participation and working schedules</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This project’s main objective was to promote well-being of Mexican textile industry workers (in maquilas) in order to improve their

Quality of human resources was judged adequate. Quantity in year 2 was much larger than in year 1 due to need for more people to meet a larger

The initiative achieved positive outcomes in several impact domains: (1) job satisfaction and productivity, (2) relationships at work

Three levels of stakeholders (micro: middle and senior managers; meso: maquilas, Chambers of Commerce, brands; macro: foundations,
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>productivity and comply with international code of conduct. IMIFAP’s life skills training programmes used educational, participative, experiential, and ludic methodologies which allowed beneficiaries to discover their potential, identify psychosocial barriers, and learn to overcome them to promote their own development and become agents of change in their environments. While this project was designed before C&amp;A Foundation released its ToC, three of its four key principles were aligned with the foundation’s mission/vision: 1) amplification of workers’ voice and participation; 2) advocacy of women’s (and men’s) rights and empowerment; 3) fosters collaboration between different stakeholders.</td>
<td>that resulted in a 3-month extension in year 2. Lack of involvement of senior managers was a factor on the quality and quantity of maquilas’ participation. Mixed results in terms of achievement of targets during year 1 (exceeded), year 2 (achieved), follow-up with year 1 (50% shortfall). Low commitment was identified as the factor leading to disproportionate effectiveness between maquilas.</td>
<td>number of supervisors coming from new maquilas compared to the original plan (118 vs 46). Capacity issues reportedly pushed the initiative to “take a short-term operational solution” rather than make strategic decisions to preserve the initiative’s quality. M&amp;E practices were detailed and adequate. Organisational learning was highlighted with respect to internal constraints (heavy workloads in the maquilas, little interest of senior managers to participate) and external constraints (chambers of commerce did not have sufficient power to engage industry; widespread public apathy for initiatives aimed at improving working conditions).</td>
<td>and in the household, (3) gender equality, (4) health and self-care, and (5) overall well-being. The initiative did <strong>not</strong> produce positive outcomes in the economic security domain. This was expected and is consistent with the initiative’s ToC.</td>
<td>NGOs, think tanks, governments, academic institutions) were identified as needing to be engaged and relate to each other. Findings showed that less than half of the maquilas that participated in Y1 (43%) stayed in the initiative for Y2, whereas only 23% of supervisors who participated in the formative workshops in Y1, participated in Y2 (56-hour workshop); these figures would have to be increased to achieve sustainability. A key aspect identified as contributing to sustainability related to the fact that supervisors themselves were very satisfied replicating the initiative, and almost all of them had the handbook to replicate the sessions with their personnel. Quantitative findings revealed that the positive changes found...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: Instituto Ethos +3: Avaliação Adaptativa do Projeto “Vozes da Moda – Agreste 2030” Relatório final (Voices of Fashion Intersectorial Social Dialogues)</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2018</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team) This initiative involved four organisations collaborating to improve working conditions in the textile value chain, reduce gender inequalities and promote sustainability by creating alliances with local institutions in the project region and engaging and visiting leaders (DIEESE, an organisation linked to unions; government, women’s secretariats of two prefectures) with the greatest influence over working conditions. Location: northeastern Brazil.</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team) Weaknesses in administration and governance issues. As part of the creation of instruments to improve working conditions and reduce gender inequalities by the 2030 horizon, Vozes da Moda (VdM) fell short of its intended purpose. This limitation was largely due to problems related to project management. Instruments for task distribution, result collection, and deadline control were lacking, which resulted in the delay of one workshop being held, the cancellation of another and the forum being held without all interested parties</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team). There were a mix of instances where resources were used efficiently (Voices of Fashion Forum) and less so (Ethos Indicator Application Workshop). The discussion about efficiency in the evaluation report was at a very detailed level (such as quality of sound and projection system in an auditorium). References were made to what could be characterised as adaptive management.</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team) While the construction of a space for dialogue on taboo subjects (precarious employment, low wages, environmental pollution, poor product quality in a scenario of fierce competition between clothing manufacturers) was described as a major achievement, the team was not able to bring the most important denim manufacturing city (Toritama) in the region to the table,</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team) Sustainability is anchored in stakeholders “owning” the programme. Local actors were expected to have the autonomy to implement and monitor future actions to improve working conditions. Following the programme’s close, Textile Polo Stakeholders and Voices of Fashion (VdM), both nationally visible institutions, were expected to carry on. Further strengthening of the most vulnerable parts of society (leaders who support women workers who are not directly linked to sources of financial and political resources like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PARTNER: GRANT REPORT DATE RELEVANCE RATING EFFECTIVENESS RATING EFFICIENCY RATING IMPACT RATING SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner: Grant</th>
<th>Report Date</th>
<th>Relevance Rating</th>
<th>Effectiveness Rating</th>
<th>Efficiency Rating</th>
<th>Impact Rating</th>
<th>Sustainability of Benefits Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Labour Rights Forum (ILRF), BCWS Bangladesh and CENTRAL Cambodia: Advancing worker leadership in</td>
<td>1.2019</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation team found that, to a certain extent, the intervention’s outcomes and activities differed from the priorities and immediate needs of targeted workers and being sufficiently informed. The demand matrix foreseen in the proposal, as well as the action plan for the project as a whole, were not prepared in a timely manner. The evaluators attributed these limitations to the lack of a single decision-making body that would filter the content deliberated by the board and then direct it to concrete actions. While some workshops carried out were successful, the project was slow to incorporate suggestions to increase effectiveness of actions in its relationship with the business community.

The expected and unexpected results achieved were only partially commensurate with the effort and money spent. A contributing factor was that significant time and business, political parties, governments, trade unions) would be needed to assure their continued voices in the forum.

This intervention has contributed to:
- Development of a concept for a tech tool for workers monitoring (KPI#2).
- Extension and expansion of the Bangladesh Accord.

Results that were achieved related to the development of the white paper may contribute to useful discussions about requirements for workers’ leadership in industry reform but.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>supply chain monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were many factors that shaped the immediate priorities, concerns, short-term interests and needs of workers and their leaders, which likely affected their full buy-in and that impacted possibilities for different levels of dissemination and use of the tech tool. Further factors included: time constraints; the fear of losing their jobs, if or when they spoke out; the lack of language skills; low computer literacy skills; cultural differences; traditional hierocracy; focus on the need to address pending and short-term issues related to cuts in wages; blacklisting of workers who refused more than two hours overtime per day; and discrimination of pregnant workers, which forced them to resign.

Workers, especially women workers, in development, implementation, and governance of initiatives for improving working conditions in Bangladesh and Cambodia. This is so even if the prevailing anti-union environment is improved. The main reason for this is that the work funded by C&A Foundation did not cover the important contextual factors and barriers relevant to workers and their leaders, which is work that the ILRF continued to do under other grants. In addition to a very repressive, anti-union context that hampered workers’ ability to organise and raise their voices, they included weak workers’ organisations; lack of leadership capabilities of worker leaders; poor functioning of efforts were spent in defence of ILRF’s Asian partners in a time of intensified political oppression and to contribute to an extension of the Accord in Bangladesh.

ILRF was lobbying actively for its extension. Three collective bargaining agreements were also signed in Bangladesh and two single-issue agreements signed with employers in Cambodia. (KPI#3)

- Twenty women in Bangladesh and Cambodia were leading efforts to promote working conditions in the garment industry at factory level (KPI#4). It should be noted that women from the two countries did not take the lead in relation to the signing of brand agreements, as foreseen in the project document; however, the quality of leadership remains poor, according to partners’ own assessment.
- Some local unions seem to have been strengthened although strengthening these capabilities was not part of the project does not consider the likelihood of such requirements being enforced. The proposal for the tech tool takes into account the challenges regarding organisational capacity for the uptake, but the financial viability of such tools still remain a challenge for long-term sustainability. Sustainability takes a more careful consideration and integration of the factors mentioned in the section on effectiveness above, which currently hampers workers and their organisations’ ability to lead in the development, implementation and governance of initiatives to improve working conditions and participate in the monitoring of working conditions at their own places of work.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Solidaridad: Better Mills Initiative (BMI) in China | 4.2017 | Good This initiative’s objectives and areas of intended impact areas were judged by all stakeholder (brands, mills, sector associations) to be good and of high relevance. The evaluation showed that two of the most important arguments for mills to participate in BMI are (1) tightened (and upcoming stringent) environmental legislation in China; 2) continued operational importance of addressing environmental risks from brands’ standpoint. | Adequate This rating reflects that the effectiveness of BMI’s approach varied from “good” for the engagement of mills to just “moderate” for the outreach and visibility, and “poor” for its strengthening of the enabling environment. | Poor Due to high programme management costs and high intervention costs for the target group (mills). However, most stakeholders still perceived BMI as “value for money”; this should not be interpreted as being cost-effective. | Adequate Impact was mainly assessed according to the potential of and interest in upscaling the approach. Brands concurred on BMI’s relevance but would only consider upscaling if BMI’s set up could change (which they linked to increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of the action). Alignment with Sustainable Apparel Coalition and ZDHC was identified as imperative to gain the benefits of convergence, avoid duplication, and create synergy. | Good BMI’s sustainability was mainly assessed in relation to the potential of and interest for upscaling the chosen approach. In interviews, all brands confirmed the relevance of upscaling BMI in a certain way, but at the same time, they linked their potential interest to continue their involvement to specific changes that needed to be made in the BMI approach. Most of the participating mills wanted to continue their involvement in BMI but indicated that the initiative would become much more...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER:</th>
<th>REPORT</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wage-Indicator Foundation: Transparency through mobile internet – Gajimu.com</td>
<td>2.2019</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team; original evaluator rated as adequate but this is not supported by the narrative)</td>
<td>Adequate Results that were achieved were merely commensurate with the effort and money spent within the project period. The implementing partner invested significant time and effort to develop, introduce, and train trade union interviewers in the use of the minimum wage/labour law app in order to be able to complete the surveys online and office and carry out technical maintenance of websites and databases.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1) The project’s short duration was insufficient for its overly ambitious results framework. 2) The project’s strong focus on developing an app, database and communication platform, which enabled the intervention to collect and share data amongst workers, employers, brands and other stakeholders, was a good approach but the intervention was not able to capitalise on the platform, which does not create an impact on its own. 3) The intervention had a narrow focus and limited efforts to create ownership within all levels of the partnering trade unions (local, district, national), which was needed to facilitate trade unions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Capital Investment Fund (WCIF): Humanity United</td>
<td>4.2019</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team).</td>
<td>Good (likelihood was deduced by OEE team).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aligned with C&amp;A Foundation’s interest in reducing worker vulnerability and ensuring greater transparency in working conditions. This highly innovative approach (which allowed for risk, supporting C&amp;A Foundation’s big &amp; bold vision) encouraged investees to become active agents in solving Forced and Child Labour and promoting accountability through innovative solutions and collaboration with industry players. Aligned with C&amp;A Foundation’s strategic priority, WCIF used a gender justice lens to</td>
<td>It was asserted that the fund can create a world where information will be far more transparent, cost-effective and highly accurate, thereby creating the preconditions for impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team).</td>
<td>Not available. Efficiency was not addressed in the Monitoring Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As most investees have been in the portfolio for less than 1 year, time series data is not yet available. However, some examples of powerful qualitative impact stories were available (for example, one investee had a supplier suspended from a multi-stakeholder initiative due to poor scores). Assuming that such impact stories could be systematically collected and highlighted, the likelihood of impact is judged to be good.</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team). C&amp;A Foundation is an anchor investor in the WICF, which has served as a validator. Other partners and supports of the fund included: Walmart Foundation, Stardust Equity, Open Society Foundations (Soros Economic Development Fund), The Ray and Dagmar Dolby Family Fund, and The Walt Disney Company. The unique structure of aligning with leading companies as funders helps leverage innovative solutions for sustainable impact for consumers, business and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improve outcomes for women and economic returns for investors. In tackling the various transparency and ethical labour challenges associated with complex supply chains, the fund focused on product traceability, worker engagement, sourcing platforms, risk assessment, and ethical recruiting tools by investing in emerging technologies (such as blockchain, machine learning, artificial intelligence, digital identity, and Internet of Things solutions). The fund aimed to set a new standard of corporate practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D. Portfolio review

Figure D.1 Geographic distribution of operating portfolio

Source: C&A Foundation, dashboard May 2019
Figure D.2 Working Conditions programme progress on KPIs up to mid-year 2019

Source: C&A Foundation, dashboard May 2019

Jill Tucker
Head of Labour Rights

Notable recent achievements include the first country-specific Fashion Transparency Index in Brazil that triggered increased disclosure from Brazilian brands before publication, and improvements in working conditions for 31k workers in 17 factories during the first year of WageIndicator’s Gajimu Initiative. Two major transparency initiatives – Open Apparel Registry (OAR) and Mapped in Bangladesh (MiB) – launched this year and are starting to be used by industry stakeholders. Away Foundation has signed two additional CBAs in 2019 and their strategies and lessons learned shared with the industry through a public case study.
Figure D.3 Distribution of implementation and core support grants per country for Working Conditions, 2014-18

Source: C&A Foundation portfolio
Appendix E. Staff Survey results

To what extent has C&A Foundation achieved the following with respect to improving working conditions in apparel manufacturing:

- Advanced knowledge on the transformation of the fashion industry (33/45)
- Empowered beneficiaries to participate in the transformation of the fashion industry (35/45)
- Contributed to the transformation of the fashion industry value chain (33/45)
- Affected the behaviour of brands and retailers in line with a transformation of the fashion industry (34/45)
- Affected public policy to enable the transformation of the fashion industry (27/45)

To what extent has C&A Foundation empowered beneficiaries (workers, farmers, etc.) to participate in the transformation of the fashion industry, with respect to:

- Improving working conditions in apparel manufacturing (35/45)
- Production and/or use of sustainable raw materials (31/45)
- Alleviating forced and child labour (30/45)
- Increasing gender justice in the fashion supply chain (27/45)
- Creating/embracing circular fashion (23/45)
To what extent has C&A Foundation advanced knowledge (through conference participation, research, etc.) on the transformation of the fashion industry, with respect to:

![Diagram showing the extent of knowledge advancement in various areas of the fashion industry](chart1)

To what extent has C&A Foundation meaningfully affected public policy to enable the transformation of the fashion industry, with respect to:

![Diagram showing the impact on public policy](chart2)
To what extent has C&A Foundation affected the behaviour of brands and retailers in line with a transformation of the fashion industry, with respect to:

![Graph showing the impact of C&A Foundation on various aspects of the fashion industry.]

To what extent has C&A Foundation contributed to the transformation of the fashion industry value chain, with respect to:

![Graph showing the contribution of C&A Foundation to the transformation of the fashion industry value chain.]

172 Working Conditions
In the context of the Independent Evaluation of C&A Foundation Effectiveness, VOLUME 2, the focus is on understanding how effectively C&A Foundation has established partnerships with non-grantee organizations to advance various initiatives.

### To what extent has C&A Foundation established grantee-based partnerships with appropriate organizations to advance:

**Graph showing the extent of partnership success across different priorities.**

- **Sustainable Cotton Programme priorities (31/45)**
- **Working Conditions Programme priorities (36/45)**
- **Forced and Child Labour Programme priorities (34/45)**
- **Overall C&AF priorities (37/45)**
- **Circular Fashion Programme priorities (29/45)**
- **Strengthening Communities Programme priorities (26/45)**
- **Gender Justice cross-cutting priorities (30/45)**
- **ONE cross-cutting priorities (20/45)**

### To what extent has C&A Foundation established non-grantee partnerships with appropriate organizations to advance:

**Graph showing the extent of partnership success across different priorities.**

- **Sustainable Cotton Programme priorities (24/45)**
- **Circular Fashion Programme priorities (21/25)**
- **Working Conditions Programme priorities (28/45)**
- **Strengthening Communities Programme priorities (17/45)**
- **Forced and Child Labour Programme priorities (26/45)**
- **ONE cross-cutting priorities (22/45)**
- **Overall C&AF priorities (32/45)**
- **Gender Justice cross-cutting priorities (21/45)**

These charts illustrate the percentage of successes in partnership establishment across different initiatives, with categories ranging from **Not at all** to **Outstandingly**.
To what extent has C&A Foundation participated in appropriate networks and/or platforms to advance:

- Sustainable Cotton
- Programme priorities (26/45)
- Circular Fashion
- Programme priorities (25/45)
- Forced and Child Labour
- Programme priorities (28/45)
- Working Conditions
- Programme priorities (29/45)
- Strengthening Communities
- Programme priorities (19/45)
- ONE cross-cutting priorities (17/45)
- Gender Justice cross-cutting priorities (22/45)

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

- OutStandingly
- Highly
- Substantially
- Modestly
- Not at all

To what extent have gender considerations been integrated into C&A Foundation work:

- In the Forced and Child Labour Programme
- In the Working Conditions Programme
- Overall
- In the Sustainable Cotton Programme
- On matters of recruitment and staffing
- In the Strengthening Communities Programme
- In terms of organisational culture
- As part of the ONE/Organisational and Network Effectiveness work
- In the Circular Fashion Programme

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

- OutStandingly
- Highly
- Substantially
- Modestly
- Not at all
Illustrative quotes on partnerships

C&A Foundation staff

“We need to do more with ONE.”

“Our proposal development and review process is not efficient – partners and staff spend many hours over preparing for IC presentations because of (perceived) risk of ungrounded rejection. This impacts programme staff ability to adequately support partners in implementation.”

“We need to get better in learning from our lessons and enabling partner to see the value in it.”

“Lessons from grants tend to only be captured after grant completion (through AAR and/or external evaluation) and then remain with direct programme manager/ head of, rather than be shared and applied through the foundation. “

“Lacking support from Effective Philanthropy team in internalizing learning outside of merely commissioning evaluations.”

“There is space for us to become more efficient and innovative in our learning processes and in the sharing of lessons learned.”

Illustrative quotes on involvement of partners in strategy formulation

C&A Foundation staff

“Milan Strategy Meeting – it was a truly inspiring to hear and learn from the partners and their vision for C&A Foundation.”

“We frequently have free/ open strategy discussions with [partner]. He teaches us about successful strategies for collective action and has gotten us to think differently.”

“Quite a few partners have contributed to the adaptation of the C&A Foundation strategy to Brazilian context, in particular, the Working Conditions programme strategy that focuses on women worker leadership.”

“Partners wanting us to work on research without having a plan on how it will spur action.”

“There is need for greater representation of the core beneficiaries (farmers, workers) in the strategy formulation.”

“Frequency of contacting partners varies. Some partners need more hand-holding than others, so it is excessive for some, appropriate for others.”

“Frequency varies greatly depending on the location of our staff and the partner organisation, as well as the nature of the grant. Some partners get intensive contact while others get hardly any.”

“Openness to feedback varies widely between partners, some are not receptive, and others are very receptive. We have learned that openness to feedback at proposal development stage is a good indicator of constructive partnership later.”

“Partners often modify proposals in response to strategic input/ ideas from C&A Foundation however this may be due to need for funding rather than genuine belief in the strategic ideas input. This can result in our input being included in the grant agreement, but not implemented in reality.”

“Generalizing in this way about all grantee partner organisations is difficult and can be misleading as there is a huge variety in their openness.”
Appendix F. PPR 2019 results

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: C&A Foundation’s activities across its signature programmes will positively transform the global apparel system in the next five years:

Overall, how fairly did the foundation treat you?

Percentage of Potential Perfect Score for "Extremely likely"

Percentage of Potential Perfect Score for "Extremely Fairly"
Overall, how transparent is the foundation with your organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Philanthropy</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular Fashion</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Raw Materials</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced &amp; Child Labour and Gender Justice</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR 2016</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR 2019</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Potential Perfect Score for "Extremely Transparent"

Illustrative quotes on partnerships

**C&A Foundation partners**

“Be patient. Don’t expect the world for very limited dollars. Trust but verify, rather than create too many accountability frameworks that make us ‘speak to the script’ and take our eye off the ultimate goal. The world is a nonlinear, complex place.”

“Being clear on expectations of impact from the start (this is probably the case now but wasn’t 2-3 years ago). Being less directive, and, dare I say it, capricious!”

“Co-creation of project[s]...Careful about choosing partner; [choose] partners [from a] relevant field instead of a brand/well known organisation from other field.”

“Considering the size of the supported organisations, the process needs to be faster.”

“Greater flexibility of the rules, according to the type of project and entity involved. Faster project evaluation/approval processes.”

“Having a direct representative in the countries where the foundation works. Informing the headquarters of the apparel brands regarding the projects which are [being] carried out by the local partner.”

“More flexible and core support. Less restrictions in logic frameworks and indicators; more interest in qualitative changes than only quantitative ones.”

“We would suggest that the foundation has to be more diversified and funds should be allocated according to organisational or project activity outcome.”

“It took a lot of time to engage them into the project. Additionally, it’s hard to say that C&A local business is open to cooperation. In terms of case follow-up and results, current situation is not positive.”

“The relationship with C&A, the company, is very positive regarding the exchange of experiences, know-how of processes, and technical support for the implementation of the project, together with a deep knowledge of the field and of the communities.”

“Change of staff, unclear follow-up, causing absolutely extra work on our side we can’t refuse.”

“Communication has been quite open, transparent and to the point. The funding proposal submission and approval processes too bureaucratic and rigid. The project implementation follow-up process is consistent. The follow-up reports are adequate but not flexible.”
“Extremely responsive, strategic, relevant and consultative. Keen to respond to the needs of the organisation whilst aligning with the foundation’s own priorities. Keen also to avoid duplication of funding and effort so working closely with other donors ensure great impact and value for all.”

“Field-based foundation staff are extremely helpful. On the brighter side, at a local level, foundation advice has been extremely helpful in managing political issues. The foundation enables us to do work for which we could not find finding elsewhere, and that is the most important thing to remember. However, working with the foundation is not without its challenges. For example: changes during the course of the grant in terms of expectations on impact measurement caused a large volume of unplanned (and unfunded) work. The foundation can also be very directive in terms of who to partner with. On another grant proposal we spent a huge amount of time and resources putting together a proposal in very short order with a partner suggested by the foundation, which failed, due to lack of shared values between the partners. We felt corralled into doing this.”

“I find they have the right balance between oversight and autonomy. I feel supported when I need help but don’t feel interfered with my work.”

“In an unrelated incident, a foundation staff member has spoken inappropriately and publicly about a new entrant to the space, effectively quashing that entrant’s opportunities with a number of funders, on the basis of a misunderstanding of the entrant’s approach. We thought that this was unfair and inappropriate.”

“In general, our interaction with the foundation has been excellent. We were brought in to pick up work started by [another partner]. Our only major concern was that the [context we were walking in to] was not made clear to us until late the contract negotiation process.”

“Our interactions with the foundation have confirmed their commitment on priorities. My sense, however, is that sometimes there is not a recognition of the limitations in impact a foundation can have, as an outside donor actor – despite the money available, and along with that the negative impact that can result from major infusions of monies in different countries/regions.”

“Partnership with the foundation provides a unique communication based on trust and active interaction wherever needed. Besides, know-how transfer that we got from our colleagues from the foundation so far brought us to an outstanding place within the sector.”

“The foundation pushes for cost-effective results within a limited timeframe. This is good, in that we are all interested in seeing our work have an impact. It is not so good because it creates incentives for grantees to over-promise. There is also a lot of emphasis on the log frame and theory of change to show how we get results, but the foundation staff are not always clear in their own minds what the difference is between the two and how/why not all theories of change work within a linear log frame. Generally, though, the foundation staff are friendly, thoughtful and collaborative.”

“The process is very professional and careful. The problem is in the long times between the start, the negotiation, the proposal and the disbursements.”

“The proposal process was incredibly arduous, and, ironically, nontransparent. The proposal we submitted was changed by the foundation before it was submitted to the Board, after [many] months of very tedious back and forth on the proposal. Several changes were made, including to the co-funding component, which directly impacts our organisation. We are still struggling with the co-funding issue [even now]. I had never had this experience before with a donor. The implementation process is very hands on. I speak to at least one member from the C&A Foundation team several times a week. Interactions have become overbearing... We try to go above and beyond to ensure the success of this highly ambitious project, and instead of receiving praise that we actually pushed things through, the donor voices their lack of satisfaction and questions our organisation's integrity and capacity. My organisation’s team is now very heavily burdened by the amount of support required for this project, though their time is not accounted for in this grant. [...]”

“Very collaborative, which has been appreciated. There was some need to alter our programme to fit with C&A’s impact indicators, which created some confusion in the course of proposal development (different teams asking for a different approach). But that was easily resolved through conversation with each programme team. We have found communication and advice to be very supportive, and all C&A Foundation staff we have found to be very responsive.”

“We found it as a very pleasing experience...We were impressed with the support that the foundation provides to its partners. We were equally impressed with some of the learning workshops we attended, organised by the foundation. Overall, it has been a great learning and sharing experience. We also felt the foundation is keen to learn from its partners from ground, which adds a lot of value.”
Appendix G. Comparison between the Staff Survey and the PPR 2019

To what extent has the foundation advanced the state of knowledge in your field?

To what extent has the foundation affected public policy in your field?
Appendix H. Additional interview and survey comments

Illustrative quotes on transparency

Working Conditions partners

“[Project] has had impact. Raising the issue of supply chain transparency is huge. There was substantial backlash. Folks didn’t want to release the data. But that is important. And for that there to be a dialogue with those who stand to learn.”

“Sector has moved. Around transparency it has improved. Discussion around root cause issues are becoming accepted. You can say purchasing practice. Brands role in all this, and not just blaming factories and manufacturers. It is commonly known now.”

“On transparency – CA&F has a huge contribution.”

“Over the past ten years there is an increase in number of brands disclosing factory list production. Brands are now tracing to the number of products. Not only the number of brands but amount of information disclosed is also increasing.”

“Transparency – we haven’t seen huge change. Workers or federations or partners are used to it. It is necessary to incorporate technical changes in industry and avoid red tape you have to have impact on core pillars.”

“Transparency – information and access and how things have moving. People know how to be accountable and how to get access. Things have changed only little. If you compare with that, it should be faster.”

“C&A Foundation has substantially advanced knowledge on improving working conditions through transparency.”

“I believe the C&A Foundation is highly influential in this field but has very ambitious goals. Improving working conditions in general is extremely tough since not everyone agrees on this as a priority, and brands have a hard time seeing the incentives to guarantee better working conditions throughout their supply chains.”

Illustrative quotes on transformation

C&A Foundation staff

“C&A Foundation has substantially advanced knowledge on improving working conditions through transparency.”

“Meaningfully affecting public policy is a long-term goal which will take many years of continued investment. It is unrealistic to expect meaningful change in public policy within the current lifetime of our programmes so far.”

“C&A Foundation partners have influenced brands to become more transparent about their supply chains, which is a modest first step to increasing accountability for working conditions.”

“I believe the C&A Foundation is highly influential in this field, but has very ambitious goals. Improving working conditions in general is extremely tough since not everyone agrees on this as a priority, and brands have a hard time seeing the incentives to guarantee better working conditions throughout their supply chains. Increasing gender justice is another tough one, where the incentives are hard to understand and cultural/behavioural change is required.”

“Too soon to tell…”

“Transformation of entrenched poor working conditions and decades / centuries of exploitation will take much longer than the five-year lifetime of C&A Foundation.”

“Contributions so far have been modest, but promising. Patient continued investment and partnership is needed to achieve goal of global transformation.”

“Innovation and changes in business models may mean investing in business models that are very different to C&As, and may even represent competition for the business.”

“It is still early days.”
"Transforming the global fashion industry to be a force for good is a very big ambition. Other than this it is unclear how we measure this... Despite saying this is our mission, we normally don't measure the good the industry does... we only look at the problems, and ways to solve/combat them."

**Working Conditions partners**

"Even though the [Foundation] had little prior knowledge about [our specific field], our contact persons at the Institute have always shown great interest in learning and understanding more about the... sector."

"All [of our] projects supported by the C&A Institute were permanent and relevant to [our constituents]. The [products we created] are all products that we can use recurrently with new [constituents]."

"C&A Foundation is a key stakeholder in the global garment industry – I know they are driven, dedicated, and wholeheartedly believe they can support drivers of change. I believe they will continue to create an impact on the fashion industry if they recognise the value of inclusive collective action approaches... I believe the foundation will have a bigger impact when they embrace the complexities of development as they consider the projects they choose to design and fund."

"C&A Foundation is arguably the highest profile private sector donor in our sector. C&A Foundation is funding disruptive and influential initiatives which are pushing the garment and textiles sector to change."

"I think it is too early to tell. The work the foundation is engaged in could have a long-term pay off, but this will take time."

"Our organisation's field is adjacent to the foundation's focus and it's unlikely they will have a significant impact."

"The C&A Institute has a leading role in actions with a positive impact on the fashion industry. It is important to consider that certain specific actions of the C&A Institute that generate expectations of continuity in the community are interrupted after some time due to the difficulty in securing sustainable funding from other sources and with a reduced participation of the C&A Institute. There are frustrated expectations in the community."

"The foundation changes their thematic area so quickly which makes a negative impact on our organisation and community."

"Also, the foundation [places] a budget limitation [on] projects which really impact the project planning and implementation."

"The foundation has good impact on our field, community and organisation."

"Too soon to tell. I think at industry level – some interesting and experimental decisions... have had an effect in terms of bringing more brands to the table. Organisationally, the opportunity to train workers directly outside the factory through a community organisation is very impactful, resulting in real empowerment for individuals and workforces, and is very exciting."

"C&A Foundation has a deep understanding of the labour standards challenges in the garment supply chains. Its theory of change with its emphasis on transparency, traceability and disclosure is disruptive to an industry which has traditionally had fragmented supply chains and low-levels of transparency and traceability."

"C&A Foundation is positive to create and make impact to the global community."

"The foundation is taking some good steps and has got some of the key actors involved in the fashion industry. The most important niche is that it is taking in account the 'circle economy' and looking at sustainability at all levels. The foundation, with its vision, is also challenging the existing paradigm and seeking solutions that may look radical but are definitely needed to address the present problems in the industry."

"I am fully aware of the great push the C&A Institute has given to the improvement of the fashion industry in several dimensions and that it has encouraged other companies in the industry to engage and contribute to the evolution of the production chain. However, given the complexity of this value chain and the existing challenges, the true transformation toward a sustainable fashion industry will not happen in such a short term (five years)."

"I think the C&A Institute is doing unprecedented work with key players in order to promote decent labour conditions and sustainability in the fashion industry."

"I think the field is complex. If the foundation can bring other actors to help the changes, it might work, but is not something that only the efforts of the foundation can achieve. With other actors, I mean the factories, the enterprises. We need them to commit to a change. If they do not do that, will be difficult to achieve the goals we want only with the efforts of the workers or the grassroots organisations in which they have support."
“I think the foundation is focused on the key issues facing the apparel industry and is developing its strategy on a deep understanding of the industry.”

“I would have given this statement an even higher rating except for the ‘in the next five years.’ To my mind, C&A Foundation is attempting systemic change. This takes time and patience. Five years is a short timeline.”

“It is funding pioneering efforts.”

“It’s a big ask, and the positioning of the foundation — as semi-detached from the company — limits its transformative ability. On the one hand, some perceive it as too close to the company (board decision-makers all or largely from the founding family), which means that some will not accept funding or engage. Other business actors are also distrustful of the foundation seeing it as a wolf in sheep’s clothing or an unfair strategy to take ethical pressure off the business. On the other hand, the lack of integration with the business (both C&A and also other businesses) means that the supply chain, in the form of suppliers and buyers, is absent from most of the work, surely limiting impact.”

“One foundation alone can’t make a huge change. The foundation can get more Philanthropy group on board to make this change as practical.”

“We believe that the foundation’s activities will definitely leave positive impact on the system but the collaboration with the movers and shakers should be improved.”

“We do not believe we can ‘transform the garment industry.’”

“We have already achieved a significant breakthrough within just one year, so we strongly believe this will be even more ground-breaking in the next five years.”

“We understand that C&A is a main player and a leader advocating for the necessary changes for the fashion industry to have fairer and more sustainable relationships, not only because of the size and reach of the company but also because of its assertive stance on this matter.”
Appendix I. PhotoVoice reports

I am one Nazia. But there are 1,000 Nazias.

Nazia [name changed to protect the respondent identity]
[name of factory] I work in the sewing department.

This is me, Nazia. These are the people I work for; these days I can talk to them and say the problem. My worker friends and they tell me their problems and I sort them out.

I couldn't have imagined the change.

There was one time, when I worked 20 hours overtime. I got paid for 5 hours and the rest just disappeared. Previously, I would stand like a dumb person. But now things have changed. I have got the confidence. I have transferred to it colleagues. I am Nazia, and owner can kick out one Nazia. I am one Nazia. But there are 1,000 Nazias.

That is what I want. My duty is one hour. After that I am going to leave.

I have created a lot of Nazias like me. What if something happens to me, who is going to stand up for you? Who will stand up for you?

Previously if someone said something, we couldn't stand for ourselves. But now I have brought people to the training and they have got the training. I have told them through the training that I can stand for myself. They can too. Previously we were unaware of the rules on our behalf. We are granted medical leave for 14 days. But previously owner would kick us out for taking be medical leave for three days. Why haven't you given us 3 days of leave? We should get what we deserve.

I have created a lot of Nazias like me. What if something happens to me, who is going to stand up for you? Who will stand up for you?

Previously they used to keep the women after 5 PM and never paid for it. Now we know we are eligible for what we can have. We have learnt to speak for ourselves, if someone gets sick the company should look after, that is the law. It is the company; it should deal with it.

This change will stay. Look, what we have learnt through the training, we are never going to forget it. This change will be forever. We want more training; we are no longer afraid of anyone we know what we are capable of.
Previously I couldn’t make connections. Now I am changed person. I can bring in people. I have made connections. I can call up 50 people and all the 50 girls are going to be there in no time. This is the change I have had. I can do whatever it takes. This is what I am talking about.

Previously I used to take leaves of absence from factory without notice. I knew if I placed notice, they wouldn’t pay. Now I know the law. The laws speak for me. There is law that is going to serve me justly.

What I want is that I want to be a voice. I want to be a leader. I want to speak in front of a 1,000 people. I want them to understand – if you work someone owes you something. Even if you work for a minute, someone out there owes you something.

See what I want is that people like you helping [the organisation] more and more so that [the organisation] receives all the help to help people like us. If you plant a tree and it sways by the breeze, it is going to fall. That is not going to help. That is what I want – people like you coming together and helping people like us.

Previously I didn’t understand money. I didn’t know how to save or calculate. All I earned, I would spend. I now have an understanding; I analyse my life. I understand to work I need a healthy body. I don’t just need to eat meat I need to eat fruits and vegetables. Even if I earn 5 BDT, I try to save at least one so that I can fix emergencies.

Previously I used to work at a stretch, I sat down and worked and worked and worked. Now I understand a person needs to have a break. A person needs two glasses of water. I know how the body works. There used to be one-hour lunch. I take breaks. I eat a biscuit and drink water. I used to work all day and used to have problem (gestures towards her back).

If a person comes from a village, there are a lot of things they are unaware of. There are things I know and there are things I don’t know. But I want you to know that I am very very very eager to learn, I want to learn all the time. I don’t want this process to stop. I want to learn, and I want to teach others.

I do not want to ask for anything, why should I ask for something I deserve. People get deceived. I am smart because of the training. There are people who are not smart, and people get deceived. That should stop. You should not be deceived.

There is a latch on the door

Female worker [name withheld to protect the respondent identity]

Whatever we learnt it was good for us, it was great.

This is where I eat my lunch. Previously didn’t have the facilities like fans and tables and chairs. After we took the training we talked to the management and got the facilities. We have running water. Pure water. There is hot water and cold water. In winter there is hot water in summer there is cold water. Previously we didn’t have this facility, but we got this after talking.

This is the sewing section. Previously it used to be clumsy and dirty and supervisor was not nice. He was rude. Now things have changed. we have facilities such as fans and all. Now if anyone faces a problem they can go to management or supervisor and we can sort things out.

This is the toilet for ladies. They have complained box there. If someone is disturbing us or talking behind the back, we can share it. The complaint goes to the person at the top level, directly to them. We have a
head sir, it goes to him. He is an officer. All the complaints are for him to look at. This is the basin, there is a latch on the door, there is soap. The toilet is clean. We have all the facilities. The management fixes problems in 30 minutes. At the most it takes 2 days.

This is the full photo of the office. This is where we ask people to wear masks so that tasks do not affect kidneys. Plus, it is not crowded so that we can move in emergency without being congested.

There is a canteen room. This used to be closed when I took this photo. Usually we buy the food from there. We get roti, banana, cake and things like that. There is a man on the chair who sees to our demands and needs.

I am a member of the trade union. We now have a doctor and nurse for every day. We can get supplies of saline and medicines we need.

Previously we didn’t have all the facilities or good change. People used to give abuses all the time. Now that we have formed the union. Now we know it is a two-way street between the workers and owner. If the owners treat us right, we will give them back.

This is a two-way road. If we work together if the owners see to our demands. We have [partner organisation] as well who can teach and give us knowledge, I think this change is going to be permanent and will stay.

Now we have a day care center and we can leave the children there. In the day care center there are two women. There is one girl and there is another to help her. Previously it was just for show, it was a farce. The owner would just bring out a baby if someone wanted to see it. This year the owner has been different. He gave gifts to children.

Now the owner knows we are aware of the rules and laws. He cannot deceive us and cheat us. We decided to put the demand before the owners. There are a lot of factories without trade union and they face troubles. We don’t have to face troubles because we have trade union.

Every time we ask the owner to give us the facilities we want, the owners asks why do you want so much. I cannot do if the buyer doesn’t want it. For me the profit comes first. Sometimes we see friends go through the problem and cannot work the way she used to earlier. We take to the administrator and share solutions so that she can return the way she used to.

Previously we used to have buyers come into the factories and they used to ask if we get abused. They used to separate everyone and asked these things. Now we have a trade union and we can say what the problems here.

Previously when the buyer came, we used to talk in front of management and owner. After the trade union we talk between us before talk to the buyer. We placed the demands before the owner. Now we talk to the administrator and buy them sometime and if they don’t resolve the issues, then we go to the buyer.

There was a staff member who pushed this guy. He pushed me thrice. He complained to the management, the management said let’s sort things out. the worker said I don’t want that. Why would a staff push me? He called the buyer directly. The buyer telephoned the owner. The staff member was suspended for seven days.
Previously we did not have a bank account at the factory. Before there were two groups of people, some wanted to save money, others thought of this as red tape. We talked these people into saving in the bank. In one instance, we told them if you quit you need to collect the wage from the factory. If you have bank account, your money can be saved in the bank. A lot of people saw that as trouble. On 3rd of June the banks were going to be closed and there was going to be crowd. We said it is better that this once you hand it over to us.

If I didn’t attend any training, I would not have known anything. I wouldn’t know how to talk to owner. All the things I have now is because of the training. Not just me, people from other factories come here too. [Names of staff members of partner organisation] have helped us.

We are grateful to people like [staff member of partner organisation]. As long as there are RMG workers, there should be people like this. Earlier people would be thrown out without wages and they would come to places like this.

I am grateful to people like you as well. you come and look at these pictures and see what it used to be, we can see what changes have happened. I didn’t take picture of medical. That would have been better.

Through the training we got the power

Male worker [name withheld to protect the respondent identity]

Here there are 3 changes. We made a trade union, which was not previously provided for by the company. I have been the organising secretary of trade union for five year.

There is gender discrimination very visible in the factory. Even if the girls work as much as the men, they don’t get paid as much. Men would get better promotions. Gender discrimination is mitigated, and promotion is equal. Now we all get paid the same for same work. It took 3-3.5 years to do that.

Previously we used to resort to protest to get the demand. After the trade union was organised, we discuss with owner of the factory to get the demands fulfilled. The gender discrimination addressing was also done through discussion.

The government proposed that every year salary should be increased by 5 percent. But we demanded it should be increased by 7 percent. By discussion with the owner we got the demand.
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I work in the RMG industry but if you look at my clothes you can't tell I work in a RMG factory. I didn't know there was a world outside. We got training through the [partner organisation]. Before that I didn't understand. I didn't understand what it meant to be working. If I was stitching, I would keep stitching. I got to know that something could be done through the discussion. That changed the mentality. Through the training we got the power.

We learned the rules of the factory, and how to talk to the owner. How to do discussion and negotiate with the owner. We learned about rights of the worker in the country and what is included in the rights and what is not included. At the same time, how working place can be made safe. We learned all this through the training.

So basically, when the training session started, only the workers were about to get trained. This created a gap between staff and worker. Mentalities didn’t match, we proposed training be given to staff and workers. That happened and now we are able to work together.

This is the union president (woman in the picture). There is an organising secretary, vice president, treasurer. What we do is, first we discuss what we will demand to the owner and whether it is feasible. We take consensus. We make a plan and go to the CEO to present our demand.

In the last picture we are all sitting on the same table and talking to the owner.

When Rana Plaza happened, I was at home, I watched it at home. Many workers died. But I didn’t know about the garment sector. I came to Dhaka with an engineering degree. I stayed with my uncle. I got to know about the RMG sector. I got to know that I cannot create the change on my own. So I have to gather other workers as well and create union to make the change.

Basically, I don't work as much in the sector. We often change the job in the sector. I wanted to train someone who can maintain the pace. I am working as a master trainer in the project and I want to maintain at least one person who can maintain the change and keep up with the project.

I worked in the RMG worker. But during weekend and holiday I work as a trainer with the [partner organisation].

The projects have some rules. The projects come from [partner organisation]. They pick a person who works there for training, this will boost the morale of the workers. I work as a worker and also do the training. It was proposed by [partner organisation]. I came to ask for help. They provided assistance and also take our help. They told us how to use flip chart how to train, how to talk.

I want a safe environment and workplace that won't fall under disaster like Rana Plaza or Tazreen. So, another change I want to bring in the workers is the change of lifestyle and stigmatisation. We are known as RMG workers and doesn't allow us to live a normal life. We don't know if we have a healthy life. Or whether we need to save money.

Stigma – this is the atmosphere of Bangladesh. Society will see this as a lower-class job. So, the main thing I want to change is that we don’t get any digital training. The world is getting digitalised. We don’t know how to use an app, a mobile or a laptop. We need this information. We need to know the capability of owner. If we ask for something beyond his capacity the factory will shut down. We need that information to create demands accordingly.

I am very happy to share my story. We will be more happy if you research on these things and interact with us so that it brings new method and skills for us digitalisation.
I want to be a leader

Female worker\(^1\) [name withheld to protect the respondent identity]

[Selfie from the factory, withheld by evaluation team] I was feeling very hot and sitting by the window.

This is a tea stall – we are some of the leaders and go at 10 AM to have some food and discuss.

This is a selfie with my son. I took the picture when we went to the village.

This is a line in the factory\(^2\). We collect money every Eid and decorate the line. This is while the work was going [while the work was under operation]. There are 80 workers in every line. On Eid, we the leaders collect money from other workers and give it to one person to decorate the line.

Line – I wanted to show how workers are there and how many workers are invested in one line. Seeing the work of those workers, portrays the hard work we all do.

This is a lot better from the past.

Earlier there was no discipline. Back then workers would not know about the benefits or labour laws or environment.

I took training at [partner organisation]. Before joining the factory, I didn’t have any experience I was harassed by the staff. We took training on social media, computer usage, sexual harassment. After that I taught group by group to my fellow worker.

I can feel better now. I have more freedom now. I have independence in movement and work. Earlier workers faced harassment but now we are aware of it.

Earlier I had a fear of losing my work. When someone would suggest a bad suggestion to my supervisor, I would not know what to do. Now I know what to do and therefore I can protest.

One day my line chief used a bad slang, but I protested and took him to sir [supervisor]. Sir talked to him and made him understand. Sir said it is not like how it used to be in the past. He [line chief] asked for forgiveness and he still works there.

---

\(^1\) The respondent shared a number of pictures, many of which were selfies and others clearly showed the participant or children. Such pictures are withheld by the evaluation team.

\(^2\) Assembly line.
There have been changes in other groups as well.

Certainly, these changes are to stay. I think if every single worker is aware of laws and knows how to protest, every factory will be a good environment.

Even though everything has not completely changed not just in our factory but others as well. Workers are being harassed. They are being deprived of rights and not being give labour rights. If workers know what to do when they don’t get the right they deserve, we can do something about it.

We want something much better than the [partner’s] training. Given that we are garment workers and we work for long time, we want to the training to be for a long time so that we can develop.

Every person looks for a change. In every factory, this should be brought. I want to be a leader. And want to reach the position of an organiser and learn how to organise and preach among everyone.

They asked me if I had lost my mind

**Female worker** [name withheld to protect the respondent identity]

I got training through [partner organisation]. I have been here for 3 years. I work for this company called [name withheld] limited. Here at [partner organisation] I learned a lot of things, and I talked to other people. I distributed my knowledge. I help them out in their work life.

That day the manager at my factory sent an ill proposal to the colleague of mine. The girl declined. Due to that the guy verbally abused her. The girl came to me and told me about it. I went to the HR [human resources] department and told them about this proposal. They called me back after two hours and said look if people outside come to know of this, this is going stigmatise our name. So, we cannot let this out. So, I proposed that we sit down with all the workers of the floor and management and sort this problem, the management said they would not be able to kick the manager out. Then we said that look the guy doesn’t run the machines here. We are the machinists here. If you keep the guy, all 1,465 of us are going to resign right here. Then the guy was kicked out. I am with the Trade Union. People listen to me and come to me for advice.

**Committee.**

The committee is something that the company uses to control us. The committee listens to whatever the company says to it. Suppose if the supervisor comes to me and asks me to increase the production by 50%, and I tell them I cannot do that because it exceeds my productivity, he will rush to the committee and place a complaint. Then the committee calls me and asks for an explanation. No matter what, the committee listens to the supervisor. The members are always busy with their phone and hang out in the canteen and use their phone to go Facebook and watch video. If we complain to the member, they send us to the HR department, that is all they do.

**We want your cooperation.**

These days we enjoy a lot of facilities. Pure water, ceiling fan, table fan, day care facilities. There are nurses and doctors to look after the children, now we have different toilets for men and women, we have four elevators, two for people and other two for carrying things up and down. There are 8 staircases plus there is a separate room where we can sit down if it is raining outside.

---

1 The respondent declined to share a picture.
I work with the Trade Union. After I got trained with [partner organisation], I called those people [colleagues] to my home. We sat down and talked about things. We went back to the office and raised the issues. Previously we had firefighting training once a year or every six months. Now we get those training ever month. Earlier the place used to be crammed and crowded. Now it is not like that anymore.

When the management got to hear the things I said, I have to say they started putting pressure on me, they asked me where I learned all these things from. They asked me if I had lost my mind or not. If I told them I was with [partner organisation] they would have kicked me out. I told them there was this camp in the area where I live and the teachers there distributed leaflets and told us about these things.

Now they know I am with [partner organisation]. Now they don’t have a problem. There is a new problem now. There is this woman who works at the HR department. Her name is [name withheld]. She tries to verbally and physically abuse the workers. She doesn’t pay heed to any problems. All she does is abuse and try to hit us all the time.

Things are getting bad now. I don’t think these good changes will last. Earlier there was a group of people who were above the HR department who were foreigner. They looked after us and asked if we looked ill or what we had for lunch, now that they have left things are looking bad. The owner where I work is really good. But the people who work under him, they are the culprits. They robbed us of what is due to us. If we have worked until 25th of the month, they will deprive us of the payment if we are supposed to get the payment.

We want the training again. Because it is better for our memory. We forget things. We want to learn from it and teach other people about it.

I am from [name of district in Bangladesh withheld]. I am a very brave person. I can do whatever I think of and I am afraid of no one.

It is getting late, so I have to go.

We want legal support so that truth is spoken

Male worker1 [name withheld to protect the respondent identity]

When I got to know something like [the interview] would happen, I took the pictures. I knew that when you would ask me some questions, so I wanted to give you something.

[Factory management] are supposed to give us the training every month. This picture is taken with a fire fighter. But they do it only after we complain. I posted this picture on social media to complain we were supposed to have training this month.

I plan on uploading it if they are not going to give us the training. But even if we upload it they will complain against us. So even the trainings do not help us.

From [partner organisation] project we learnt how to use computer and that too for free. But the training was only two months long, but we would like to have this again.

[Partner organisation] taught us how to use the computer. It didn’t help with the fire drill. But we learnt to use social media. But after that [management] started harassing us for posting picture. We post everywhere – Facebook and YouTube and WhatsApp. They plan on falsely accusing us and we have to delete them.

1 Picture withheld by evaluation team for anonymity.
Some workers were fired before. The [partner organisation] was trying to come up with solution. I took a picture of the election, right after that I was threatened and harassed that they are going to file cases and harm me. So, I had to delete it.

Out of fear we do not even like it or comment on it.

Before that I would look at a computer, I didn’t know how it works. Now I know how a mouse works and how to type. I want the two months project to be extended.

I learnt about social media that helped to raise awareness by posting.

We were asking for help from [partner organisation] and they have helped us. They assured us that posting like this is not right and if something happens, we will look into it.

There is change. We have a union, we learnt about labour laws. In the training we learnt to use computer and we learnt to protest. Only few attended the training and we got fired for attending, and [management] started to abuse and shout. I was fired for trying to form my union in February.

I was trying to form a union. They would use a lot of slangs on us. We saw on social media that what they were doing is not right. We wanted to form a committee, but they saw what we were doing, and they fired us.

About 15-8 people protested and they didn’t get the salary for 5 months. They took loans from the bank and they could not pay it back. There was Eid last month and could not pay back. They would face legal sanctions from the bank because they can’t pay back.

Like I said, I am not that competent while using a computer. They can increase the training, we would appreciate more advanced training regarding technology.

The main thing is that I learnt about a lot of things, before that I could stare at a computer and not know what to do. Now I have an income source. I can set up a shop. I can download songs and charge people money. If I learn more, I can come up with more income sources.

Can you do something so that we do not face harassment in the future.

Whenever we upload anything, it is the truth. We want legal support so that truth is spoken, and they do not take any action against us.

Whenever we face threat, they can help us legally using the law so that they cannot take action against us.

There is a buyer from H&M who visits the factory. If [C&A Foundation] could say something to H&M to pressure the lawyers to provide the salary to the workers for 5 months. They got rid of us using power and they didn’t pay us a penny for five months. Two reasons – one for using social media and second for using slangs against labour. This is local goon [in the pictures], whose help they use to harass us. This person is from the government. This is from the political party.

I want to get to work. If H&M can put pressure on employer to create more work, I can get the job back. I don’t want to the money, I want to get back to work.
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**Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2C</td>
<td>Cradle-to-Cradle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEI</td>
<td>Gender, Equity &amp; Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>Effective Philanthropy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMF</td>
<td>Ellen MacArthur Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFG</td>
<td>Fashion for Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFF</td>
<td>Good Fashion Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEE</td>
<td>Overall Effectiveness Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>Partner Perception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>Strategic Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDHC</td>
<td>Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

In February 2019, Universalia was contracted to conduct an Overall Effectiveness Evaluation (OEE) of C&A Foundation (2014/15–2019/20). The purpose of the evaluation was “to assess the extent to which the foundation is making progress towards achieving its vision, mission and strategic objectives”. Given the importance of context in examining the fashion industry’s complex system, the evaluation team undertook five case studies, one for each programmatic area of the foundation’s work.

This case study examines the foundation’s Circular Fashion programme. The initiatives sampled for the case study are listed in Table 1.1 (on p. 7). The first layer was analysed through interviews and document review (documents consulted are listed in Appendix A), the second through the evaluation synthesis and the last, through the research quality assessment.

The evaluation team collected data for the case study using interviews, document review, the Staff Survey and a field visit. Forty-one stakeholder interviews were done, covering programme staff, staff of partner organisations, non-grantee partners, and other organisations (see Appendix B). Additional interviews done for the overall evaluation also informed the case study. The evaluation also considered data from the Partner Perception Report (PPR) 2016 and 20191, Delphi report2, previous evaluations and research studies (Appendix C summarises the OEE analysis of initiative evaluations). As part of the case study, Dr. Joyce Miller attended various events during March-August 2019 (Sustainable Apparel and Textiles Conference, 9-10 April 2019, in Amsterdam; Educators Summit, 14 May 2019, and Global Fashion Summit, 15-16 May 2019, both in Copenhagen; C&A Foundation’s convening of Funders/Investors, 17 June 2019, and Circularity 19, 18-20 June 2019, both in Minneapolis). For details of the case study methodology, please see Appendix A in Volume 1 of the report.

Overview of the programme

With EUR 45.4 million in disbursements for implementation and core support grants for 2014-18, Circular Fashion was the foundation’s largest programme by value. Of this, EUR 40 million (87% of programme budget) was channelled into establishing Fashion for Good (FFG) and the Good Fashion Fund (GFF). The programme saw a progressive increase in the annual number of grants approved, from 1 in 2015 to 13 in 2018; however, the average value of grants remained stable throughout (Figure 1.1). Investment in enabling innovations for circular business models increased the most. While grants had a global scope, they mainly were allocated to entities in Europe and North America. This orientation is seen as appropriate for giving the programme’s investment a higher chance of realising the desired impact as innovations generated in developed countries generally stand a better chance of being incubated towards market viability than those coming out of start-ups based in developing countries where the legal and political contexts offer less stability, which is an important factor for investors.

In the fashion industry, factories are often powered by fossil fuel sources; an overwhelming volume of fibre is sent to landfill or incinerated after its use as garments; and large amounts of unregulated, hazardous chemicals are used and then released, causing harm to the environment and people. In this light, the Circular Fashion programme was built on a set of assumptions: that brands, retailers and investors would fund

---


innovations that enable circular business models; that these would enhance livelihoods, facilitate design and production of appropriate products, and could be promoted within existing market paradigms; and that it would be possible to gain support for policies and regulations that challenge the linear business model. The programme’s design also considered several risks, among them that insufficient leadership and coordination of initiatives could dampen pre-competitive change (although the programme’s theory of change [ToC] did not specify in what and by whom) and furthermore, that the lack of business and technical cases could inhibit circular businesses from operating at scale.

Figure 1.1. Implementation and core support grants provided by the Circular Fashion programme, 2014–18

The Circular Fashion programme embraced a relatively new segment of the fashion sector. Its creation reflected an interest of the owners’ group of Brenninkmeijer family members in circularity and the potential they saw for C&A Foundation to catalyse circular activity and shift thinking from an extractive orientation to a more regenerative notion. The programme got off the ground in May 2016 with a EUR 34.2 million spend that significantly dwarfed all other foundation support to a single actor. This funding was used to establish FFG to “accelerate the private sector’s adoption of key innovations that are needed to change the take-make-waste approach of the industry”.1

During its formative stage, when the programme made large and important grants, Circular Fashion was partly managed by the head of Sustainable Raw Materials, the foundation’s executive director (who is also on FFG’s board), and a programme manager in Brazil. In terms of staffing, the programme started with an intern who eventually became a key staff member, alongside another programme manager who joined the team on a part-time basis in 2017, supported by the technical expertise of consultants. The programme gained momentum and prominence with the October 2017 addition of an experienced circular economy consultant to head the programme and guide its growing complexity.

The programme’s purpose focused on promoting a rethinking of the current, predominantly linear, business model and shifting existing (and future) businesses towards a circular business model that “uses and reuses safe materials; restores and regenerates ecosystems and provides dignified work for people making products that are ‘made to be made again’”.2 Following the strategic priority to “build credibility: internally

---

1 For the July 2019 Terms of Reference (TOR) Systems Change Map C&A Foundations’ Circular Fashion, the programme expected 25 proposals in response to this Request for Proposals (RFP) and got 100.

and externally” (Annual Plan 2015-16), “move the needle” (Annual Plan 2017-20), and be big and bold, this programme aimed to not only shift, but also accelerate and scale up the adoption of safe and circular thinking throughout the fashion industry. In this light, the programme had four Strategic Objectives (SOs), with the bulk of investment (85%) channelled towards SO1 (Table 1.2).

Table 1.2 Circular Fashion programme investment by theme and SO (2014/15-2019/20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERARCHING THEME</th>
<th>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>% OF OVERALL PROGRAMME FUNDING</th>
<th>GRANT VALUE (2014-2018) IN €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative innovation and scaling up</td>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>Accelerate innovations that enable implementation of circular business models in the fashion supply chain</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening platforms, institutions and capacities</td>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>Build availability and access to data and methodologies that enable implementation of circular business models</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO3</td>
<td>Create conditions that will scale the implementation: build awareness, demand and capacity amongst decision-makers for circular business models</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy advocacy</td>
<td>SO4</td>
<td>Create conditions that will scale implementation: advocate for short- to long-term enabling governmental policies for circular economy and circular fashion</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Outside main strategic objectives</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Circular Fashion’s mapping of grants against strategic objectives

Two main thrusts – “creating the conditions” and “building the new” – were woven into the SOs’ narrative description. These appeared to identify the foundation’s trajectories for transforming choices about materials, chemicals, manufacturing, retail, and use for the fashion industry to deliver its “big audacious

---

1 This framework appears in the foundation’s 2014-2017 Strategic Plans/Annual Plans: establish the base, build credibility, move the needle.
goal" of a net positive impact on ecology, economy, and people. However, a formal strategy knitting together the key levers and intervention points had not yet been elaborated by the time of this evaluation, which is indicative of the early stage of the programme. Recently initiated efforts to develop this footing within the upcoming strategy cycle (2020-25) could be expected to bring further coherence and clarity regarding the programme’s approach for pursuing its purpose.

---


## Table 1.1 Grants sampling for assessment of the Circular Fashion programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sampling</th>
<th>Partner Organisation</th>
<th># grants</th>
<th>Strategic Objective(s)</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Type of Grantee</th>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Size of Initiative</th>
<th>Value of Initiative</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp;</td>
<td>Bridging the GAP group (WRI, LWARB, Circle Economy, Forum for Future)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SO3</td>
<td>USA, UK, Global, Asia</td>
<td>Research organisation, Board, social enterprise, non-profit</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€ 1,194,000</td>
<td>2018, 2018, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp;</td>
<td>Ecopreneur.eu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO4</td>
<td>Europe (Western) - general</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>€ 75,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp;</td>
<td>Ellen MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>SO3</td>
<td>Global - general</td>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>Learning and planning</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>€ 735,000</td>
<td>2016, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp;</td>
<td>Fashion for Good BV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO1 + 2</td>
<td>Global - general</td>
<td>Innovation platform</td>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>Very large</td>
<td>€ 24,198,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp;</td>
<td>Fashion for Good Foundation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO1 + 2</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€ 9,000,000</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp;</td>
<td>Good Fashion Fund</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SO1 + 2</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Returnable grant</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€ 6,500,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio review &amp;</td>
<td>Stichting ZDHC Foundation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>SO3</td>
<td>Global - general</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Implementation, Core</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>€ 2,700,000</td>
<td>2016, 2017, 2017, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholder interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Healthy Building Network (MaterialWise)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Cattermole Consulting Inc. (Technical Advice...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Centro de Inovacao em economia circular (Transition towards circular fashion in Brazil)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>DRIFT (The transition to good fashion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Promotion of Circular Economy in the Mexican Apparel Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Circular Fashion**
2. Relevance, niche, strategic focus, and alignment of the programme

Based on the range of evidence, including stakeholder consultations, the programme’s niche (and related contributions) includes:

- Making significant grant commitments to multi-stakeholder initiatives (which totalled just over EUR 37 million during 2016-18), acting on the assumption of its ToC that “companies believe in and are willing to collaborate and share knowledge and methodologies that enable circular business models”.

- Focusing on processes needed for the discovery and development of these new business models and mechanisms for bringing their implementation up to speed and scale.

- Strategic convening to stimulate alignment among similar initiatives competing for the same limited resources and attention of the brands.

- De-risking projects in areas where others were not prepared to go, which provided strategic insights or proved a concept, where C&A Foundation had a shared interest in creating circular fashion.

The programme’s strategic focus is as follows:

- **Level of intervention**: The programmatic strategy has been expressed in a way that reflects a more systemic approach to philanthropic activities. According to the Circular Fashion team and external stakeholders, the programme has worked primarily at the level of systems change as it was fundamentally focused on changing business models and their associated responsibilities. Set in a context where there was lengthy, ongoing discussion about what circular fashion might look like, where significant effort was being put on comparatively more shallow questions about how to diminish waste or improve recycling in the fashion sector, this programme took a bold decision to foreground relevant economic issues. In effect, it was promoting **asset management** as a key element of the circular business model. Applied to the fashion industry, this notion would serve to maintain the value of inputs through every stage of use, including end of use, thereby logically resulting in a

---

1 From C&A Foundation. (s.d.) Circular Fashion ToC.

2 According to a C&A Foundation partner: “There are certain organisations in the circular economy world, specifically in textiles, where C&A Foundation has done a nice job of bringing them into the fold. Previously, they have not played nicely with others. C&A Foundation has been encouraging them to be more collaborative and has been really focused on that. This is a really good role for C&A Foundation. In its absence, that collaboration probably doesn’t happen.”

3 As quoted from Fiennes, C.; Owen, H. (2018). Frankly Speaking: Case Study of an Unusually Impact-Focused Foundation: “Where the foundation funds start-ups, pilots or risky work, it is often the sole funder. This is because it is consciously going where others are not yet going. It aims to eventually prove the concept, and then bring in other funders, as has happened with FFG, for example. By contrast, when it is supporting more established work, C&A Foundation rarely funds alone.”
better, longer and more intensive use of materials and products that would eventually become resources and gain new lives in future products.

- Orientation of the portfolio: Internally, the programme was perceived to have grown organically and approved grants that “made sense”. While some grants (such as Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals [ZDHC], MaterialWise and CanopyStyle) appear to have been grandfathered into the portfolio, given their legacy links to fibres/chemicals, their support has been justifiably linked to the enormous and pressing issues related to chemicals, pollution and degradation of biodiversity that also need immediate attention and leadership in the fashion industry. The portfolio to this point has been coherent with its concentration on circular business models and systems change. Moreover, within this, the programme has been moving towards funding initiatives that are longer-term and imagine the future, together with grants that focus on fixing present day problems, while also bridging to a wider set of concerns that go beyond the fashion sector (such as chemical management, climate change and sustainable land use). In this light, the programme appears well-placed to advance the foundation’s priorities.

- Breadth of scope: The programme has been directed at the fashion/textile sector, which is consistent with the foundation’s current scope and focus on the industry. There has been ongoing discussion within the C&A Foundation Leadership Team about the merits of adopting a cross-sector approach, linked to cross-pollinating ideas about how organisations need to change their day-to-day practices. While initiatives have been put in place to recycle glass, plastic, cars, batteries and electronic waste, stakeholders mentioned that the fashion sector is the first material and production sector to pioneer a complete set of measures to support circularity and could therefore help the world understand what those processes might look like.¹

In light of the above, the Circular Fashion programme’s contributions, focus and interventions are deemed to be on a suitable trajectory. The programme has been built on analysis of the root causes of the problems and an understanding of the systems that create them. In the PPR 2019, the ratings of Circular Fashion partners trended higher than for other signature programmes on several measures, suggesting a comparatively higher appreciation of the programme’s niche, relevance and alignment with their own priorities. It has been validated with all the sampled stakeholders that the programme has added value by pushing beyond understanding “why” the fashion sector needs to embrace circular thinking to the actual “how” to do it. Accordingly, its grants have supported actors that are in the process of developing and testing detailed actions and strategies with potential for scaling. This is particularly evident in the programme’s intentional development of a collective initiative, the Bridging the Gap learning group, where it has underwritten actions to test new concepts and territories and demonstrate and achieve fashion’s alternative future.

Appendix G contains a sample of perspectives on the programme’s alignment, with perceptions differing by cohort. The programme has had high alignment with the objectives of partners, with its shared vision regarding the evolution of the apparel sector from linear to circular and the envisaged environmental, social and economic impacts sought. Furthermore, the catalytic strength coming out of their joint efforts was recognised. There has been a continual striving to avoid duplicating what already existed and to instead,

¹ Such ideas were also foregrounded by speakers at the Sustainable Apparel Conference (Amsterdam) and the Copenhagen Fashion Summit.
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scope and fund distinctive initiatives that fed the programme’s strategic objectives, with the clear potential for scalability.

“Alignment around circular is at a very high level on how to transform but as to where the focus needs to be put, we don’t align. C&A Foundation has a narrow focus on new business models. We are not convinced that this is the only thing to focus on. For us, this is one element. For them, it is the core. I have tried to challenge it, but not succeeded. They’re not wrong; they have too much emphasis on it. We work a lot on the policy side; there, we are very aligned. We share everything. They always try and make sure that we can benefit from what they do. Sometimes it is not possible because we are not ready, or it is not a priority.”

C&A business staff

The programme was also highly aligned with the convictions of the owner’s group of Brenninkmeijer family members regarding the pursuit of circularity. This programme instantiated their belief about the need to fundamentally rethink what was referred to by a member as “society’s pillars” (economic, cultural, and others) and to demonstrate leadership and responsibility in doing so.

The programme was moderately aligned with C&A business, with the relationship reported by a C&A Foundation staff member as “continually under tension since the foundation has a generic purpose based on systems change”, which appeared to generate challenges for the business. Across the stakeholders consulted and the documents reviewed, there was a shared view that C&A business could be a testing ground for pilots.

More specifically, it has been recognised that the programme’s grant support for delving into and developing business models to bring the apparel sector into the future has been a benefit for C&A and other brands. At the same time, this engendered worry among those actors about not being ready for the disruption to current business models that this might entail. Furthermore, areas where the Circular Fashion programme potentially touches on aspects related to working conditions and labour rights were seen to have the potential for sensitivity among brands. With the emergent opportunity for stronger collaboration between Circular Fashion and Working Conditions/Labour Rights programmes in light of the June 2019 RFP to explore the impacts of circular business models on people, this dimension could be expected to generate further (creative) tension and perhaps opportunity as well.

1 Such fear of disruption was explicitly mentioned by fast fashion brand leaders at Circularity 19.

3. Progress towards results

The evaluation considered different parts of the programme, moving from outputs and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to SOs and outcomes. Absent a counterfactual for these real-world results, programme effectiveness was assessed based on demonstrated outcomes and a triangulated interpretation on available evidence of the foundation’s work in contributing to those outcomes. Progress on impact is discussed in section 3.1.

KPI tracking began relatively recently for the Circular Fashion programme, in 2017. Since then, FFG has tracked and reported its performance regularly. The programme itself began reporting on KPIs in 2018.

The programme’s performance on KPIs has been uneven, despite the relatively conservative targets. Two KPIs were on track, three below target and one did not have a target (Investment in enabling innovations for circular business models – the programme however reported EUR 68 million invested).\(^1\) According to dashboard data from May 2019 (Appendix D), the following were noted in the programme review:

1. **Number of initiatives promoting a circular economy livelihood.** The programme reported one initiative in 2018, but none in 2019, compared with a target of seven.
2. **Number of actionable and open-access data sources and methodologies.** In the dashboard, the programme reported six data sources, spread out among multiple partners, against a target of seven.
3. **Number of senior executives reporting increased demand and Number of policymakers reporting increased demand and capacity.** While the programme was on track for the former KPI (15 senior executives compared to a target of 12), it was lagging behind for the latter (5 policymakers against a target of 26).
4. **Number of governmental policies facilitating a circular economy.** This KPI has not been reported against since the beginning of the programme (the target is three for 2019).

Progress against targets reflects the early stage of the programme, as does the number of evaluations conducted (only one, where the initiative was rated “poor” on effectiveness, that is, its ability to implement planned activities and generate the envisaged outcomes).

Regarding FFG, all KPIs were on track as of March 2019, apart from one (GFF set up and funding commitment of EUR 20-30 million). See Appendix D for detail.

The evaluation analysis relies on the programme’s four SOs. As the SOs are interrelated, many initiatives correspond to more than one SO. For the sake of clarity, they are discussed separately in this report.

**SO 1: Accelerate innovations enabling implementation of circular business models in fashion supply chain**

The establishment of FFG in 2017 is widely agreed to have been a defining initiative for C&A Foundation. It has had a pivotal role in building the foundation’s credibility internally and externally on the landscape it wants to transform. Putting this stake in the ground has been credited with leading “to a surge in circular activity”. Including C&A Foundation as a founding partner, building a museum and exhibition space, launching and housing the Organic Cotton Accelerator and GFF are indicative of the boldness of this action, particularly in light of the initiative fatigue

---

\(^1\) KPI data result from the compilation by C&A Foundation staff of monitoring data collected by partners.
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Identified by the foundation’s own 2017 survey. An evaluation informant explained: “there’s an increasing trend of zombie organisations in this sphere that are the living dead; they have just enough money to stick around but not enough money or buy-in to make any impact.” Conceived as a one-stop platform to inspire, support and accelerate the adoption of circular fashion in the apparel value chain, FFG reflected the programme’s purpose to promote a rethinking of the predominantly linear business model, and shift existing (and future) businesses towards implementing a model that “uses and reuses safe materials; restores and regenerates ecosystems and provides dignified work for people making products that are ‘made to be made again’.”

There is evidence that this global multi-stakeholder initiative has contributed to building a “coalition of the willing”, including brands, producers, retailers, suppliers, non-profits, innovators and funders. Nevertheless, during the 2014-18 period, only 1% of the Circular Fashion programme’s grants were categorised as “convening”. FFG, while not marked as “convening”, represented a significant investment to unite these actors in a genuine ambition to make fashion a force for good. Change at this level takes time, depends on changes in mindset and behaviour, and would be an outcome of a multiplicity of actors working towards shifting the execution of the fashion industry to a net positive orientation. In addition to strengthening its internal capabilities and external credibility, FFG was intent on creating new opportunities for engagement and behaviour change. Its most recent reporting indicated that it was on track on its indicators seen to drive global movement, with 88% of respondents reporting a change in behaviour as a result of visiting the FFG Experience Centre. While going in the right direction, this is a minuscule effort in light of the magnitude of change in mindset and behaviour to fully embrace circular approaches that is required.

The programme has been strategic about orchestrating this global system of organisations and actors, recognising that a fundamental gap in pursuing transformation relates to scale; this is where FFG has started and can be expected to continue playing a vital role in coalescing brand support to scale. Its legitimacy in this respect has started close to home. FFG worked in partnership with C&A business, among others, on six enablers identified as key for systemic change. These were technology to recover pure fibres, consumer participation in collecting used clothing, higher value of down-cycled textiles, automated sorting of materials collected, capabilities to reduce post-industrial waste, capabilities to reduce and sort post-industrial waste. Accordingly, FFG focused on incubating and accelerating relevant circular technologies and had reported the following tangible achievements:

- Scouted over 700 innovators; engaged more than 75 start-ups in support programmes; launched fifth accelerator round in March 2019
- Held 500+ business development sessions with innovators and corporate partners
- Conducted 10 in-depth technical due diligences and invited three innovators into FFG’s Scaling Programme
- Opened Circular Apparel Cluster, with over 150 active community members and more than 90 permanently resident co-locators

---

4 FFG Report to its Board, 2 September 2019.
Collaborated with more than 50 organisations, including 13 corporate partners (adidas, Bestseller, Group Galeries Lafayette, C&A, Kering, Otto Group, PVH Corp, Stella McCartney, Target, Zalando) representing over EUR 86 billion in annual revenues

Produced over 10 reports and open source tools (Good Fashion Guide) enabling brands to embrace circular apparel principles, develop Cradle-to-Cradle (C2C) products, and contribute to a good fashion future

Completed market research and pitch book for GFF; started fundraising activities

Built a network of 50 technical experts and mentors

Supported C&A in developing and launching the first two C2C Certified Gold t-shirts at a value retailer price point

Set up the FFG website and social media channels, which has generated significant traffic (over 400 thousand hits)

Drew over 23 thousand visitors (15% above target) to the “state of the art” FFG Experience since October 2018

Developed a programming concept with regular events with more than 50 participants around circularity

Kicked off South Asia expansion and implementation of EUR 1.5 million adidas “plastics” 3-year grant in 2019

Realised a 15 times catalysis effect from the EUR 559 thousand invested in 13 innovators, totalling EUR 8.3 million

Catalysed over EUR 28 million in additional financing for its innovators, described as “no small feat, given the complexities of attracting private sector investment into an industry considered risky with relatively low margins” (Annual Report 2018)

Stakeholders reported that FFG had “done well in identifying some key technologies”, “supporting the right things”, and was described as propelling several important innovations and innovators from conceptual stage through to young and growing businesses. While there was no compelling evidence that the supported innovations had, so far, been scaled, a further 5-10 years was mentioned as the feasible horizon for realising the expected transformative changes. Through FFG, the foundation has contributed to building understanding, promoting knowledge-sharing, and developing pre-competitive collaboration. A stakeholder mentioned that FFG could, in effect, be seen as generating a pipeline to C&A Foundation for grant support, to facilitate the development and scaling of circular business models. If leveraged, this could strengthen the partnership of C&A Foundation and FFG and their collective role in advancing circular technology.

**SO 2: Build availability and access to data and methodologies enabling implementation of circular business models**

This component reflected the foundation’s push towards public disclosure of data, which has been seen as a key driver for industry-wide accountability and for creating opportunities to reward shifting choices about materials, chemicals, manufacturing, retail and use. The developing circular business models have advocated for both of these. Circular Fashion’s support for initiatives like ZDHC, Material Wise, and Planet Tracker aimed at ensuring that trusted approaches and data would be available so that implicated actors along the value chain could make informed choices. C&A Foundation’s investment in MaterialWise enabled its team to co-design (with industry coalitions) and undertake three pilots linked to the establishment of a global harmonised repository for chemical hazard assessment profiles. It held the promise of accelerating movement towards safer chemistry, seen as a prerequisite for circularity.
“C&A Foundation funding is starting to move the needle through ZDHC. Membership is increasing. We had an issue of alignment with the chemical industry. The timing of C&A Foundation support was critical. We were at a point where brands were going to diverge... C&A Foundation was able to turn that around... This grant is the most successful in the area. ZDHC is creating impact.”

C&A business staff

ZDHC started out as a coalition of six brands joined in a common vision to eliminate hazardous chemicals from the apparel supply chain through its Manufacturer’s Restricted Substances List. This has since become the single reference accepted throughout the apparel industry. 1 C&A Foundation’s four grants (2016-18) to ZDHC totalling EUR 2.7 million supported the development of its tools and its role as the main coordinating vehicle for the fashion industry’s collaboration on chemistry. This investment, which included EUR 1.857 million in core funding (68% of the overall funds) represented the highest grant provided to a single initiative under the Circular Fashion programme, apart from FFG and GFF. Now with 43 value chain affiliates and 24 brands, ZDHC is highly trusted by its members and outside stakeholders alike and is widely seen as the best-placed group to work with the brands to disclose information, act on poor performing suppliers, and encourage movement towards safer chemistry. 2 Characterised as complementary to other initiatives funded by C&A Foundation, such as FFG and Ellen MacArthur Foundation’s (EMF’s) Make Fashion Circular, ZDHC is positioned as “raising the industry’s ambition level” and is part of building an “unstoppable momentum towards a circular textiles economy by designing out waste, improving and increasing clothing use and recycling, and restoring and regenerating natural systems”. 3 Evaluation informants observed that C&A Foundation “could have funded ten different organisations; in deciding to support ZDHC, they actually created much more impact” related to tangible progress in “closing the gap between brand intention, brand commitment, and brand follow-through”.

SO 3: Create conditions that will scale implementation: Build awareness, demand, capacity among decision-makers for circular business models

The sampled grants can be described as laying ground and setting the direction for catalytic transformational impact. For example, following the lead of other entities, C&A Foundation channelled funding to the EMF to support the publication of “A New Textiles Economy: Redesigning Fashion’s Future”. Co-launched by Dame Ellen MacArthur and Stella McCartney in 2017, this report highlighted the potential and principles of a circular system that could “not only [put] a stop to these damaging trends, but also [summon] the power of the fashion industry to develop a new textiles economy”. C&A Foundation’s association with this report – which had the support of industry leaders, including H&M Group, Lenzing and NIKE Inc. as core partners, and the contributions and endorsement of more than 40 other influential fashion brands, leading businesses, NGOs, public bodies, and experts – is seen to have been timely and effective in feeding into notions around strategic convening. In its grant reporting, EMF contended that there are many excellent individual company efforts, industry projects and innovations, but in isolation, these efforts will not lead to

“...If it wasn’t for C&A Foundation, the current dialogue on circular economy would be stuck in a high-level hype, buzz word type of conversation. If it wasn’t for C&A Foundation’s Circular Fashion programme, there wouldn’t be much of an impact or a focus on the actual benefit of circular economy. I give them a lot of credit for taking it from an idea to bringing it to a real impact on the ground.”

Circular Fashion partner

---

1 ZDHC one-pager, proposal, mid-year report, end-of-year report; monitoring information: Core Support for ZDHC 2018.

2 C&A Foundation Plan 2019 Narrative, progress reported in 2017 Annual Report, ZDHC grant description from Porticus, interviews with apparel brands.

changing the entire system. While it is still too early to detect resulting system-level changes, this initiative served to build a coalition of actors and offered “a direction of travel on which the industry can agree and focus its efforts”.

Of course, the foundation recognised that it could not single-handedly transform the fashion sector, that most innovation was not getting to scale, and that system-level issues would be best tackled in coalition. In seeking out structures and actors that could partner in this endeavour, the foundation built Bridging the Gap, which brought together four organisations, leading voices in their own right, to cross-fertilise each other in developing circular business models. This learning group is a tangible example of C&A Foundation addressing “the disconnect between people saying that we need to work on circular economy and actually doing it”. While still only part-way through the initiative, group members were confident that their outputs would stimulate the interest of the wider fashion sector, which “overall has accepted the theoretical notion of circular economy but is not getting on board and moving into it”.

One Bridging the Gap member reported that C&A Foundation funding was pivotal to increasing its capacity to deliver transformative impact for the apparel sector and that it was testing a new approach that brings key stakeholders together in “Challenge Labs” to learn more about what is effective for realising system change. To bridge the gap between interest and moving to action on implementing reuse business models, another Bridging the Gap member reported that it had made steady progress on developing a framework that could be used to estimate the potential environmental and social impacts of clothing reuse business models. Its July 2019 monitoring report indicated that a few companies and experts had offered to test this framework in real-world situations. Results were expected later in 2019. Yet another member reported that it had successfully engaged four brands (spanning sportswear, haute couture, tailoring, outdoor, ranging from start-up to major global players) to help demonstrate the scalability of circular business models in different markets, businesses and approaches.

An important lesson emerging from the work thus far is the importance of taking brands through the process in small steps, as stepping back and considering the prospect of implementing an entirely different business model could lead to panic about the scale of this undertaking. In its most recent grant reporting on concrete achievements, The Circle Economy indicated that it had joined forces with FFG to drive the formation of a global “Switching Gear Enabling Network”, which had confirmed participation of 16 members with a further 16 applications pending by June 2019. Its Switching Gear initiative (funded by C&A Foundation) had engaged four of six participating brands in running pilots until October 2021, which involved helping them design and launch rental and re-commerce business models. While it was still too early to report on KPIs for

---

1 Monitoring Report submitted by EMF, 15 November 2018.
4 World Resources Institute’s Baseline Setting and Mid-Year Monitoring Report (July 2019) for Clothing Reuse Market Makers.
testing and validating these models, this partner had reported progress in launching multi-stakeholder circular activation teams and mentioned that 1,189 Knowledge Hub users had been recorded by May 2019.\(^1\)

The Circular Fashion programme’s foresight was commended by stakeholders for giving a voice to manufacturers and suppliers in the upstream part of the value chain to develop more “agency”. With their different vantage point from the brands, fashion schools and designers, these actors were seen to have a pivotal transformational force that has, as yet, not been tapped with respect to changing the fast fashion narrative. While not yet available during this evaluation, the case studies that members were developing are expected to showcase the economic, environmental and social opportunities within the circular economy framework and galvanise movement, thereby delivering systemic change.

**SO 4: Create conditions that will scale implementation: Advocate for short- to long-term enabling governmental policies for circular economy and circular fashion**

A minor portion of the programme portfolio was invested in areas related to policy advocacy, despite the foundation’s recognition of its power as a strategic lever for change. C&A Foundation has supported traditional policy advocacy through its grant to Ecopreneur (European Sustainable Business Federation). This led to the March 2019 publication of a report that laid out policy instruments (innovation policies, economic incentives, regulation, trade policies, voluntary actions) to accelerate and mainstream a European circular fashion system.

According to one of the KPIs for this grant, its advocacy was aimed at ambitious and harmonised circular economy policies across all 28 European Union (EU) member states.\(^2\) A key respondent said Ecopreneur’s European Advocacy for a Circular Economy report caught the attention and imagination of 200 experts in a May 2019 conference in Vienna, including representatives from the producing industry, who embraced all five pillars of the report and their underpinning argumentation related to facilitating circular economy models. This important endorsement has built momentum for the lobby agenda related to extended producer responsibility, which, if successful, would lay the ground for an enabling policy framework that would allow circular economy to mainstream.

**Looking to impact**

When asked in the PPR 2019 about the potential of C&A Foundation’s signature programmes to positively transform the global apparel system in the next five years, Circular Fashion partners were the most optimistic of all programmes (with 86% of potential perfect score). However, while there is clear potential for impact, the programme remains in early stages and so are its funded projects (under Bridging the Gap group, for example).

Monitoring reports at this early stage focus more on describing progress on planning milestones, related lessons learned and challenges ahead, rather than on tangible progress on envisaged outcomes. The programme’s only initiative evaluation did not assess impact, as the project was a pilot. The Circular Fashion team also indicated that the programme operated far more in the process of ideation than realisation. As a result, when speaking of actual achievements, only 13% of respondents in the Staff Survey rated the foundation’s contribution to transforming the global fashion industry chain through creating/embracing circular fashion as “high” or “outstanding”.

---

\(^1\) The Circle Economy’s Mid-Year Monitoring Report (1 November 2018 to 31 May 2019) and Logframe Results for Switching Gear: Empowering brands to master the process of Circular Business Model Innovation.

\(^2\) Ecopreneur’s Project Progress Half Year Report, 27 September 2018.
In stakeholder interviews, the Circular Fashion team’s vision, expertise, guidance and networks were linked to its effectiveness. Appendix G contains comments on the perceived impacts of the foundation in the Circular Fashion domain. Partners particularly valued the extent to which the programme team was networked with other actors and experts working on similar projects in the apparel sector and were quick to establish connections between these other actors and its partners. The establishment of the Bridging the Gap learning group was frequently cited by partners and C&A Foundation staff alike as testament to the team’s forward thinking about how to leverage the capacities of multiple organisations and cross-fertilise their thinking in developing circular business models. This is taken as evidence of progress towards implementing the foundation’s 2020 Vision set out in its 2015/16 plan for C&A Foundation to be “known (internally and externally) as an independent and ‘go to’ expert on key issues and a serious (and results-driven) contributor to global efforts to create a more sustainable apparel industry”. On the basis of the available data, it was not possible to gauge the extent to which the foundation was being actively approached in the capacity of a “go to” expert, but there is growing anecdotal evidence that this is the case.

“C&A Foundation is regarded as a leader in advancing thinking across the entire fashion supply chain. Having the support of the Foundation for our work lends great credibility to [our] work in the space…any stakeholder who engages with us is very quickly able to establish our legitimacy and understand our value and ability to draw them into a global network of sustainable fashion leaders.”

Circular Fashion partner
4. Partnership

Grant-making sought to align partnerships with the programme’s strategic objectives. The programme consequently engaged with a panoply of actors: from small non-governmental organisations (NGOs) or non-profits with little global name recognition (Bangladesh Fashionology Summit, Ecopreneur, Healthy Business Network, Planet Tracker) to world-renowned charities (EMF, Forum for the Future, C2C Products Innovation Institute). Others included a social enterprise cooperative (Circle Economy), a public actor (London Waste and Recycling Board), a small research outfit (Ex’tax Project Foundation) to a globally recognised one (World Resources Institute). Others included national/regional platforms (Materia Brasil, ColaborAmerica) and global umbrella, multi-stakeholder initiatives (including ZDHC, FFG, Connect Fashion, Sustainable Apparel Coalition, Circle Fibres Initiatives and European Clothing Action Plan).

While these actors had different capacities and varied positioning within the fashion industry and circular economy space, the logic for their engagement was linked to the programme team’s conviction that funding these initiatives would make a difference as they were seen to “contribute to the foundation’s push to the whole fashion industry to think significantly more in a systemic manner, challenge the root causes of the industry’s issues, and bring something transformative to the sector”. As an “engaged grant-maker”, the foundation had its own goals for circular fashion and showed itself open to funding any type of organisation that could deliver on its KPIs, help it test a new domain, better understand a particular issue, or be otherwise linked in a powerful way to the strategic levers that have been defined for meaningfully transforming the fashion industry.

The C&A Foundation model is rooted in partnership. When assessing the Circular Fashion programme’s establishment of partnerships with appropriate organisations, 34% of Staff Survey respondents indicated that it had done so to a “high” or “outstanding” extent for grantee partnerships and 47% for non-grantee partnerships. Similarly, 32% of survey respondents perceived that the programme was participating in appropriate networks or platforms to a “high” or “outstanding” degree (Appendix E).

Results from the PPR 2019 (Appendix F) consistently ranked Circular Fashion at the highest level across the signature programmes on responsiveness of foundation staff; fairness of treatment; transparency; openness to ideas from partners about strategy; understanding the foundation’s approval process and timeline; consistency of information; degree of comfort to approach the foundation if a problem arises (only Effective Philanthropy [EP] scored higher on this dimension); and overall satisfaction. Gains were also apparent since the PPR 2016. Among the foundation’s programmes, Circular Fashion partners experienced the least degree of pressure to modify their proposals to assure funding. This result reflects improvements since the decision to refer to grantees as partners and treat them accordingly, in response to findings of the PPR 2016.

On balance, the evidence shows a link between the investment in partnership, the quality of partnership, and the effectiveness of results. There were still instances where the power structure of the relationship was perceived as more traditional. For example, a partner reported, “It feels like C&A Foundation is in charge. They need to make sure the money they supply to us is being used in the right way. If they’re doing it as a partnership, it’s not partnership in a traditional way, that’s for sure.” Despite the high levels of satisfaction reported through the PPR 2019, within the programme, there were still instances where the foundation was perceived to hold the upper hand and was paternalistically providing inputs. This suggests that the investment in partnership needs to be continued and monitored.

Circular Fashion contains important evidence of innovation in partnership with the Bridging the Gap group. With EUR 1.194 million in grants across the four members, each of which had its own independent grant relationship, a desirable partnership structure, this endeavour fully reflected C&A Foundation’s philosophy to “look for interventions where a relatively small contribution could make an accelerative impact on the
whole system”.

All members indicated that they were learning together and from each other, thereby gaining better results. Through this community of practice, they were developing understanding of the “how” to do circular business models and sharing knowledge. Based on the high level of trust and exchange that had been built, they indicated that they were also increasingly representing each other in public venues. For example, one member co-hosted a meeting in June 2019 with another member and was helping teach one of the classes for another one of the members.

---

5. Sustainability

Sustainability of results and partner organisations were priorities for C&A Foundation. The former relies to a large extent on framework conditions and the degree of traction and uptake by other actors throughout the value chain. The latter is linked to the structure, resources and capacities of partners, among other dimensions. A key factor to keep in mind is the timeline for gauging sustainability. According to an experienced evaluator interviewed for this evaluation:

“Sometimes, you can measure success in 3-4 years; for other projects, you need a longer timeline, like 20 years. Circular Fashion probably has that kind of timeline. The important thing is to have set the appropriate benchmarks.”

As the Circular Fashion programme was relatively new and none of its initiatives had been evaluated, little information was available to gauge the sustainability of the results or partner organisations. The sustainability of its 100% equity investments (FFG and GFF) was particularly hard to gauge as the investments are at an early stage and were not structured to be independent of C&A Foundation.

An important factor for sustaining organisations is their ability to survive and thrive post-grant. Partners identified three key factors of sustainability: adequate funding, core support and longer-term support. For 2014-18, more than a third of the 23 implementation and core support grants under the Circular Fashion programme (excluding FFG) spanned a year or less, which was consistent with their exploratory nature and location within C&A Foundation’s grant development process, which saw deepening relationships following a successful pilot phase, and presumably exit, leaving initiatives in the hands of partners and others to scale up.

Mechanisms that coalesce brands around sector-wide action are seen as particularly powerful in sustaining results. In this light, ZDHC’s activities in coordinating the fashion industry’s collaboration on chemistry hold promise, particularly as this organisation strengthens its mandate and ambition in promoting safer chemistry, which is a vital ingredient for circularity. FFG and The Circle Economy have also taken steps in fostering convergence, having managed to attract some key brands and other actors, who are widely seen as needed to get any meaningful system-level initiative off the ground and scale.

The Ecopreneur study, funded by the Circular Fashion programme, contains a lobby agenda for eight policy aspects. Its five recommendations have been positively received by European policymakers. If implemented, this would create incentives that support circular economy, as the true price of a product or service would be reflected through new taxes on (especially virgin) resources and polluting materials (eco-tax), which, together with traceability, pave the way for rapid adoption of circular economy. By definition, this would leverage and sustain the benefits of C&A Foundation’s grant investment in promoting circular fashion business models

The sustainability of recipient organisations depends to a large extent on their leadership, capacities, positioning and organisational maturity. The foundation has aimed to address this through core funding, which enables an organisation to implement its strategy and get the organisational elements in place to stand on its feet for the longer-term. Across the foundation’s signature programmes, Circular Fashion has allocated the highest value to core support (four grants, with an average value of EUR 540 thousand). The three-year core grant of EUR 1.875 million provided to ZDHC carried the explicit notion of strengthening the organisation, giving it the opportunity to develop its own funding model, and preparing it to wean off philanthropic funding. The foundation’s EUR 476 thousand grant to Forum for the Future was described by its recipient as enabling it to accelerate its return to financial resilience and build its capacity to deliver transformative impact. In so doing, it was able to generate additional grant funding from new relationships
with trusts and other foundations.\(^1\) The foundation’s grant support to MaterialWise served as a validator that enabled the team to raise funding from other philanthropic sources, seen as vital to provide the runway for it to eventually sustain itself on revenue from participating organisations.\(^2\) Circular Fashion followed the foundation’s lead in encouraging recipient organisations to assure 25-50% co-funding. As C&A was, by far, the largest foundation in the circular fashion, partners had flagged the challenge for finding other sources of funding, which could represent a risk for sustaining results for those partners who operated without secured sources.

Finally, non-financial support (for coaching, communications) was also identified as a key factor for sustainability. Almost 80% of the Circular Fashion programme’s partners indicated through the PPR 2019 that they had received comprehensive or field-focused assistance (for example, encouraged or facilitated collaboration, exchange of insights, introduction to relevant actors, convened in strategic meetings or workshops).

---


6. Factors of effectiveness and sustainability

The evaluation team identified three factors for programme effectiveness: context and scope, balancing short- and long-term results, and crossing silos.

Context and scope

The programme operated in a changing environment where ideas of what circular fashion might be in the future, in a circular economy, were nascent yet evolving rapidly. At the same time, circularity spanned a large domain and lacked the definition of other signature programmes that could more easily delineate their system boundaries, aided by their longer time in existence and the presence of so many other actors.

From its outset, the Circular Fashion team struggled to nail down its positioning, scope and direction. While a ToC had been in place, the programme strategy was less elaborated and detailed compared to the other signature programmes, which was noticed by stakeholders as well, as a member of the owner’s group reported:

“The biggest elephant in the room is Circular Economy. Initially, we had three pillars, sustainable supply, lives, products, and then the idea of Circular Economy came. Was it going to be a pillar? Was it to be at the bottom of everything, or an external foundation? Circular economy is so important and so big. We are at over EUR 50 million in terms of impact on the ground, but the needs are so much higher. It is like going to Mars. It is a very big leap that we are thinking of taking, but what does it really look like? It is good to dream, but how do we get there? We need to do a mapping. I am missing that. We do wonderful with FFG, maybe these seeds can grow into mighty acorn trees. It is lacking a clear strategy.”

The programme team indicated that the Leadership Team’s vision was an important influence on the programme’s effectiveness, which had the potential to be substantially enhanced through more alignment on the scope and nature of the programme’s remit. There was unresolved tension between the foundation’s push for approving more and bigger grants aimed at delivering results and impact, and the opportunity to channel small grants to small organisations and engage in more experimentation and risk-taking.

Balancing short- and long-term results

The programme team has had to navigate a tricky terrain, continuously balancing the pursuit of the foundation’s vision with the Leadership Team’s drive for results. The focus on KPIs and drive for short-term results risks not measuring system change. This created situations where pressure to deliver and measure short-term results worked against delivering results at scale. The challenge for programme managers to design audacious grants and demonstrate short-term results is highly complex. The grant to the EMF was big and bold; yet three years into the grant, the programme team perceived that it still had not been able to show how the results have or will contribute to the foundation’s vision.

The recent Delphi survey findings on the industry’s future sustainability indicated that more radical efforts probably will be needed to accelerate change and achieve the foundation’s vision for a net positive change. This points to the likely need for further ideation, which is at odds with a focus on rapid results. Identifying these more radical efforts would presumably come through exploratory forays and piloting in risky topics, as opposed to big bets, given the dynamism and lack of certainty in the current context.
Crossing silos

More strongly embedding other aspects of the foundation’s work into the Circular Fashion programme represents an enormous opportunity to gain traction. Given Circular Fashion’s legacy link to the Sustainable Raw Materials programme, where it had its birth, and the fact that one of the first Circular Fashion programme managers (in Brazil) played this role on both teams in the early phase provides good ground on which to build. With the recent shift of the CanopyStyle initiative from Circular Fashion to the Sustainable Raw Materials portfolio, this could provide impetus to develop discussion between the leadership of the two programmes, crossing current silos.

Another area that could build (or diminish) effectiveness relates to the extent of social inclusion into circular economy business models, to ensure that marginalised groups do not lose out even further. As circular is meant to benefit everyone and the belief of circular is that it is about doing “more good”, without more attention and progress on this dimension, the programme risks losing credibility. To date, it was reported that no actor has significantly addressed this area, although it is understood that the foundation planned to delve more deeply into the topic having received over 100 proposals in response (four times more than expected) to its recent RFP to look into the consequences of circular fashion for labour. This level of response suggests that there is keen interest among many actors to work on this topic. Another RFP was announced recently on how circular economy may affect jobs and women. Given that a Circular Fashion team member has recently shifted to the Working Conditions team, this creates a high potential for pursuing synergies.
7. Gender

Circular Fashion has no KPI related to gender equity. FFG reports on one KPI that ties to it, though not in a transformative manner: “proportion of employees who are female” (see Appendix D). The Staff Survey found that among the foundation’s programmes, gender considerations had been least integrated into Circular Fashion. Some 65% of respondents rated this integration as “modest” or “not at all”. The programme team appeared very aware of its priority and value, concerned to make the link between gender and circularity, and contended that “everyone is struggling with this topic”.

Within the team, there was a gap in understanding how to enhance inclusion of under-represented groups in funded initiatives, how gender and social inclusion should be addressed to live up to the foundation’s vision and commitments on gender, equity and inclusion (GEI), and how the impacts of the transition to circular economy would have an influence, positive or negative, on under-represented constituencies. Based on the elements reviewed, Circular Fashion is between gender-blind (level 2/5 on the World Health Organization’s [WHO] Gender Responsible Assessment Scale for assessing programmes and policies) and gender-sensitive (level 3/5). In the words of the scale, some initiatives “ignore gender norms, roles and relations” and are “based on the principle of being ‘fair’ by treating everyone the same”, while others “consider gender norms, roles and relations” but “do not address inequality”.

C&A Foundation’s grant application appropriately asks the following questions: “What experience do your organisation and your partner organisations have in strengthening gender equality and women’s rights? What additional capabilities do you need?” In a telling and illustrative example, they were answered: “Since this is not a core objective of [our organisation] nor this initiative, impacts on gender equality and women’s rights are generic and incidental to this initiative.” Some grant applications for Circular Fashion did not include questions related to gender or GEI. The programme team was stymied on how to raise the priority of GEI.

Business for Social Responsibility had been retained to provide support on these questions. The Circular Fashion team indicated that the consulting company was working with representatives from the programme’s Women’s Empowerment Team and Consumer Goods Team to identify entry points for gender within circular economy and to determine areas and ways in which C&A Foundation could help to build the capacity of partners. Further research was in the works to investigate and characterise what future jobs might look like in the circular economy; presumably this inquiry would intersect with the gender lens although this was not clear.

While awaiting the further insights and guidance expected from Business for Social Responsibility, the programme used the gender lens that had been adopted by the foundation. Practically speaking, within the proposal template, partners were asked to explain how the grant would affect gender or take gender issues

---

1 WHO. (s.d.). WHO Gender Responsive Assessment Scale: criteria for assessing programmes and policies. Available at: [https://www.who.int/gender/mainstreaming/GMH_Participant_GenderAssessmentScale.pdf](https://www.who.int/gender/mainstreaming/GMH_Participant_GenderAssessmentScale.pdf)
into consideration, including reaching out to the actors and beneficiaries that they would eventually touch through their activities. As no evaluations had yet gauged the results, it was not possible to verify that promises were kept to “strive to ensure balanced gender representation on teams” and to “give preference to brands that have a proven track record on the topic of gender equality”.

What could be ascertained was the immediate impact of using the gender lens in the grant-making process. For instance, Bridging the Gap members indicated that the foundation’s interest in addressing gender equity came through strongly in the RFP. Members reported that this had an important signalling effect as well as driving the priority of this topic within their own organisations, indicating “this gave us the opportunity to develop, emphasise, and adequately resource that part in our proposal”. The foundation’s recently announced RFP on how circular economy may affect jobs and women could be expected to generate further insights about gender.
8. C&A Foundation functions

The principal focus of this discussion on C&A Foundation functions is on Communications; Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning; and Research.

Communications

Recognising the importance of sharing goals and strategy with partners, the programme’s efforts paid off in perceptions reported through the PPR 2019 regarding a high level of clarity, consistency and utility of communication. This followed the trend observed since the PPR 2016 that the quality of the foundation’s communication services had improved.

While these improvements were acknowledged, it appeared that there was still room to strengthen communications. In the case of large-scale multi-stakeholder initiatives like Bridging the Gap, partners pointed to the power of joint communications, indicating the need for overarching communications and messaging designed from the outset.

“An important enabler for the Bridging the Gap group is joint communications. More communications support would enable more collaboration between partners…. We need to provide coaching and support, and through communications, we can do this… but this is also beyond our existing capacities, particularly as its effects should also be measured.”

Circular Fashion partner

Circular Fashion team members themselves pointed to opportunities where collaboration (and presumably results) could be enhanced through further communication support. However, this was seen to be outside existing capacities.

Monitoring, evaluation and learning

Circular Fashion has adopted the foundation’s rigorous approach to accountable learning and confirmed that EP had provided suitable training and support on monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and logical frameworks. Through the PPR 2019, partners gave the highest rankings (close to 100%) to Circular Fashion for the responsiveness of foundation staff. Among signature programmes, Circular Fashion partners appeared to experience the foundation’s reporting as the most straightforward, highly adaptive, highly aligned with the timing of their work, with relevant questions and measures with respect to the grant, providing substantive opportunities for discussion. Partners indicated that the M&E reports that they were asked to complete and submit were a burden but also called these “a worthwhile burden as they keep us on track in terms of knowing when we’ll have to show results”.

When it came to organisational learning, programmatic team members (including Circular Team members) expressed uncertainty regarding EP’s expectations and the value added: “The EP Team is moving in the right direction, but what is this learning thing? It feels a bit exhausting; we are learning, and we are not being recognised for it.” This statement was related to the mismatch between the KPIs used to assure that grants were on track for delivering results and impact, which were also used to channel the priority and focus of the programmatic team, without putting sufficient recognition and resource aside to facilitate individual and organisational learning.
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The foundation’s priority on learning was taken up and put at the heart of the Bridging the Gap group. In addition to the substantive outcomes envisaged, this group also gives C&A Foundation a highly pertinent experience to manage its expectations about the process, deliverables and resourcing needed to optimise organisational learning. In the setting in which the foundation finds itself, having realised that system-level change requires multi-stakeholder action, Bridging the Gap assumes even higher utility. The four partners all indicated that this initiative had been highly effective in cross-fertilising perspectives, expertise, and experience in developing innovative circular business models. While these results have yet to be seen, all partners reported that the facilitated learning experience was extremely helpful in breaking down silos between their different organisations. One partner shares an insight about the planning and pursuit of learning:

“It was always assumed that organisational learning is something that partners will do, when getting grants, without assigning specific funds to that. The Circular Team wanted to do learning and included that in the RFP. The specifics of how such a learning group might work came into their thinking only at a later stage. These things are not always well thought about beforehand.”

Circular Fashion partner

Each grant agreement had a learning objective with a deliverable to create case studies about the work that members were doing. Each member signed a clause acknowledging the obligation to document their own learning and participate in the learning group. The provision of external facilitation was credited with making sure that the connections were happening and that there was a venue for them. Members described the added value in terms of their increased willingness to meet and understand the work of other members. Other benefits related to networking, cross-pollination and collaboration were also mentioned. While the learning and connections were highly appreciated and added value, all members reported that the time budgets for this endeavour had been seriously underestimated and was currently being counterbalanced by the goodwill of participants.

Building and supporting such a cohort, where multiple organisations are working together to achieve complementary objectives, learning and implementation is resource-intensive. Adequate resourcing remains essential and should continue in order to assure that the expected outcomes materialise.

Research

Research commissioned by Circular Fashion (Drift Report, Origami Study, Transition Towards Circular Fashion in Brazil [Centro de Inovação em economia circular]) was aimed at helping the team design its ToC, develop its strategies, and provide insights into complex questions. Two other research pieces were also associated with the programme (Research for Roadmap towards a Circular Fibres Economy by the EMF; Future of Fashion Feasibility Study by McKinsey&Company).

Expectations for the quality of the commissioned research, consultancy and associated recommendations were very high. Among foundation staff views were mixed regarding the material that was generated, with some perceiving it as sufficient and others not. One of the challenges for those undertaking these mandates was that it was not always clear at the outset how the research and results were to be applied. A foundation staff member explained: “we talk about being a learning organisation, but we are not necessarily producing the stuff that helps us learn.” Deficiencies in adequately scoping research (as with the Drift Report) to ensure its utility were highlighted by members of the programme team as a specific
challenge. While there was a recognition that EP was staffed with personnel “who can help guide on how to commission good research, but the team is very small and doesn’t know the programmes in a lot of detail”.

The sentiments of the team point to the need for greater clarity at the commissioning stage with respect to the envisaged use of the research, which should lead to better scoping. However, this result is illusory in the near term. The circular economy concept is in its infancy and still at a design phase globally and across industry sectors. It is therefore understandable that a lot of pure research, applied research, piloting and prototyping will be needed before reliable, implementable and sustainable solutions can be developed. Also, a bridge is still needed between those engaged in pure research and those wishing to implement demonstration pilots. That translation function would need to have sufficient technical understanding of the fundamental research but also be able to formulate ideas into a language that could be understood by business leaders. This has implications for the outputs of Circular Fashion, particularly in that “most people are not willing or wanting to read full reports. Generally, the busier or senior people don’t get into the details.”
9. Strategic levers and leverage points

Five strategic levers operated across the programme portfolio. These related to (business model) innovation, advocacy (for policy and behavioural change), transparency, collective action, and strategic convening. Apart from the last of these, they mapped closely to the levers applied in the foundation’s other programmes.

There appeared to be ongoing discussion and some disagreement at the foundation, and among Leadership Team members as to whether “convening” should be understood as a lever, with differing understandings as to whether this is a “how” or a “what”; whether it is an “enabler” or a “lever”. Regarding the facilitated learning group (Bridging the Gap), convening was positioned as “a tool for collaboration”. Recent initiatives undertaken in strategic convening (Circular Economy Funder and Partner Workshop in Helsinki, 5 June 2019; Convening of Funders/Investors in Minneapolis, 17-18 June 2019) were internally experienced as involving a huge amount of work and the sort of thing that the programme should be measuring and for which it should be getting credit. Externally, these initiatives were perceived very positively, representative of what a stakeholder characterised as “helping to find alignment around an actual call to action”. This type of convening was cast as very different from the 2018 gathering of all C&A Foundation partners in Milan.

Working from a premise that there are “places within complex systems where a small shift in one thing can produce big changes in everything”1, the evaluation team mapped the programme’s strategic objectives against the levels of intervention outlined by Meadows (1999) to gauge the extent to which the programme is doing the right things in the right locations to have the impact it seeks. In Table 9.1, the programme’s significant investment in FFG and GFF corresponds to level 12 (parameters) in the Meadows framework. The bulk of activities under this strategic objective (SO1), relate to the capacity building and subsidy functions of these two instruments. The strategic objectives gathered under Strengthening Platforms, Institutions, and Capacities (SO2 and SO3) relate to levels 6, 7, 8 insofar as these are aimed at influencing information flows and feedback loops. The strategic objective related to policy advocacy (SO4) directly maps to level 5, reflecting its objective to change the rules of the system.

Digging deeper into the Meadows framework, it is important to recall that it included a hierarchy of leverage points, ordered from least to most effectiveness and the inference that intervention at the lower leverage points, while potentially easier and more accessible, cannot (be expected to) deliver substantial system shifts. It is only by intervening in systems at the highest levels (at the level of changing mindset or paradigm) that a leverage point can totally transform the system.

In mapping Circular Fashion’s SOs by grant value to the levels of intervention (Figure 9.1), it appears that the vast majority of the programme’s portfolio is pitched at the lowest level of effectiveness for systems change. However, this level also has the lowest degree of difficulty to bring into effect. While Meadows indicates that “99% of our attention goes to parameters and there’s not a lot of leverage in them”, she goes on to argue that parameters can be especially important in the short term “when they go into ranges that kick off one of the items higher” on the list. In this light, it could be imagined that the magnitude of C&A Foundation’s investment in FFG, and the way in which it has served to trigger a coalescing of brands around scaling up objectives, could set the stage for a tipping point. In system dynamics, tipping points are conditions that, once crossed, cause system behaviours to radically change performance.

---

This analysis also reveals that an almost insignificant portion of the portfolio has been put towards developing an enabling policy framework. Admittedly, the effects of this level are more difficult to achieve; however, the foundation has recognised its power as a strategic lever for change. Another small portion of the portfolio has been allocated to providing information about the benefits of circular fashion, providing expertise (such as circular business models), and creating feedback loops that guide behaviour towards accountability and informed choices (ZDHC, MaterialWise).
10. Conclusions

The Circular Fashion programme has had high alignment with C&A Foundation’s overall vision and mission to transform the fashion industry and was highly aligned with the convictions of the owner’s group regarding the pursuit of circularity. However, the various programmes of the foundation are not benefitting from the talent, capacities and insights of the Circular Fashion team. Also, the foundation has been geared more towards doing good for the fashion industry of the present, and less towards thinking about what would be good for the fashion industry of the future.

It is important to remember that circular economy is still embryonic and only functioning in confined geographical and economic areas. A wider circular economy has yet to evolve. While the Circular Fashion currently has the technical advisory capacities to contribute thought leadership to the global debate on what a circular economy might look like within the fashion industry, an effective bridging capacity to the rest of the Leadership Team appears to have been missing. This was evidence of siloing at the foundation and is something that should be overcome to bring the whole C&A Foundation forward towards circular economy thinking.

Following Circular Fashion to its logical end will ultimately mean less sales of new garments, leading to lower production levels. This will affect demand for materials and labour. This should be sufficient motivation for the foundation to be more proactive in breaking down its current programmatic silos. The Circular Fashion team has capacity to play a leadership role with the rest of the foundation, notably to explore more aggressively how circular fashion will affect materials, labour and working conditions, and identify partners that would be interested in creating the supply chains and labour force of the future.

Finally, C&A and other brands are already sensitive to the changes being brought about by philanthropic actions such as the foundation’s work in Sustainable Cotton, Working Conditions and Forced and Child Labour. The changes that will be brought about by Circular Fashion are likely to be equally, if not significantly more disruptive and therefore likely to face even more resistance, which will be a huge obstacle to transforming the industry into a force for good. Until there is a genuine embrace of circular business models by all major global brands, the Circular Fashion programme will need a space in which to seriously test the innovations that it is supporting at an economically significant scale. Perhaps this could already build on the nascent space created with the C&A business’ work on C2C t-shirts. It may also need to cultivate partnerships with other brands, or a coalition of brand partners, to take this field radically forward.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>TITLE / POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alahuhta, Tia</td>
<td>The Circle Economy</td>
<td>Fundraising Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argento, Crispin</td>
<td>Organic Cotton Accelerator</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltzung, Anna</td>
<td>Dimpora</td>
<td>CTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bode, Aiko</td>
<td>Fenix Outdoor International AG</td>
<td>Chief Sustainability Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenan, Adam</td>
<td>C&amp;A</td>
<td>Sustainable Chemicals Management – Europe &amp; Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budde, Ina</td>
<td>Circular Fashion</td>
<td>Founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crump, Andrea</td>
<td>London Waste and Recycling Board</td>
<td>Policy and Projects Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, Gwen</td>
<td>The Circle Economy</td>
<td>Programme Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupi, Geri</td>
<td>Mono Chain</td>
<td>CEO and Co-Founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Graaf, Liona</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Team Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin, Holly</td>
<td>International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)</td>
<td>Senior Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastling, Jessica</td>
<td>Better Ventures</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely, Jon</td>
<td>EMF</td>
<td>Philanthropic Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garay, Ricardo</td>
<td>Circular Systems</td>
<td>Agraloop Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghebreab, Sennait</td>
<td>Marangoni School of Fashion</td>
<td>Programme Leader of Fashion Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearne, Shelly</td>
<td>Forsythia Foundation</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogue, Jeffrey</td>
<td>C&amp;A</td>
<td>Global Chief Sustainability Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joustra, Douwe Jan</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Head of Circular Fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiryttotoulou, Natalia</td>
<td>Covox Consulting</td>
<td>Learning Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard, Scott</td>
<td>Indigenous Designs</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ley, Katrin</td>
<td>FFG</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunetta, Margarida C.</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonough, Bill</td>
<td>McDonough Innovation</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGill, Megan</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menand, Lucile</td>
<td>Dimpora</td>
<td>R&amp;D Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metzger, Eliot</td>
<td>World Resources Institute</td>
<td>Senior Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michel, Frank</td>
<td>ZDHC</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Name | Organisation | Title / Position
--- | --- | ---
Midling, Mike | Consultant | Independent
Möllenkamp, Nadine | Designskolen Kolding | Head of Lab for Sustainability & Design
Nichelson, Isaac | Circular Systems | Co-Founder & CEO
Pehrsson, Anna | TEXAID Textilverwertungs-AG | Recycling Project Manager
Rees, Ceri | Ananas Anam/Pinatex | Sales & Marketing Manager
Richardt, Anica | TEXAID ReCommerce GmbH | Retail Solutions
Schlaepfer, Kurt | BlueSign Technologies AG | Head of CRM
Shih, Cynthia | McKinsey.org | Global Director, Sustainable Communities
Souchet, Francois | EMF | Philanthropic Lead
Ten Wolde, Arthur | Ecopreneur | Executive Director
Van Mazijk, Rogier | FFG | Investment Manager
Vuddamalay, Ilan | C&A Foundation | Programme Manager
Williams, Dilys | London College of Fashion | Professor of Fashion Design for Sustainability
Woodcraft, Clare | Woodcraft Associates | Executive Director

**NOTE:** This case study used data from other interviews conducted by the overall evaluation, but which were not specifically focused on the Circular Fashion programme.
## Appendix C. Evaluation synthesis

This appendix summarises the evaluation synthesis for the Circular Fashion programme conducted by the evaluation team based on programme evaluation reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Business Network: MaterialWise</td>
<td>10.2019</td>
<td>Adequate When initially conceived, this project was perceived as filling a gap (identifying and generating assessments of chemicals with high potential for transforming the global fashion sector). Recent developments on the landscape (brand-led momentum around scored chemistry and ZDHC-promoted convergence) made the value proposition seem less relevant to the apparel industry.</td>
<td>Poor The evaluation of effectiveness was mainly based on the present likelihood that targeted results have or could be expected to be achieved and the extent to which the actions had the potential to bring about systemic change. Co-design partners were managed adaptively and expressed satisfaction with their engagement, and the MaterialWise team did run its first pilot successfully from inception through to its conclusion. However, in not publishing the resulting alternative assessment portfolio, due to unresolved legal/organisational arrangements, MaterialWise missed out on a vital opportunity to get market and user feedback on the relevance and utility of its offering. Two further pilots were ongoing, but their continuation was not clear at the time of the evaluation.</td>
<td>Poor This assessment was based on the initiative’s cost efficiency and its delivery of outputs in a timely manner. MaterialWise used its funds judiciously; however, the bulk of its programmed activities and outputs were not fully completed on time: it did not meet its milestones by 10-12 months (these targets were likely too ambitious).</td>
<td>Not Assessed</td>
<td>Poor This aspect was assessed by looking at the likelihood that its results would continue if philanthropic funding were to be depleted or cease. To date, MaterialWise had not arrived at a financially sustainable business model. Further support would be needed to assure continued benefits beyond the lifetime of the C&amp;A Foundation grant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Portfolio review

Figure D.1 Dashboard for the Circular Fashion programme (May 2019)

Key Performance Indicators - Circular Fashion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status ↑ Outlook ↑ Status ↑ Outlook ↑ Status ↑ Outlook ↑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Number of actionable and open-access data sources and methodologies
   - 2018: 0
   - 2019: 0
   - 2020: 0

2. Number of policy makers reporting increased demand and capacity
   - 2018: 0
   - 2019: 0
   - 2020: 0

3. Number of senior executives reporting increased demand and capacity
   - 2018: 0
   - 2019: 0
   - 2020: 0

4. Number of governmental policies facilitating a circular economy
   - 2018: 0
   - 2019: 0
   - 2020: 0

5. Number of initiatives promoting a circular economy that improves livelihoods
   - 2018: 0
   - 2019: 0
   - 2020: 0

6. Investment in enabling innovations for circular business models (m EUR)
   - 2018: 0
   - 2019: 0
   - 2020: 0

Source: C&A Foundation, dashboard May 2019
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Figure D.2 Dashboard for FFG (May 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRESS KPI – ON TRACK (STATUS MARCH 2019)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaling Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Fashion Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFG Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctn. Appeal Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFG Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add. Donor &amp; Funders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: C&A Foundation, dashboard May 2019

OUTCOME KPI – OVERVIEW 2018*

| GOOD MATERIALS | 510+ tonnes of fiber, yarn, or fabric was produced, treated or recycled** |
| GOOD ECONOMY | $27 Mln Revenue generated in 2018 by supported innovators |
| GOOD ENERGY | 34% of energy used is sourced from renewable sources*** |
| GOOD WATER | 63% of water used is recovered in a closed loop |
| GOOD LIVES | 10 Average employees per innovator |

54% of input comes from recycled materials
69% of process chemicals recovered in closed loop

$28 Mln Funding raised from equity in 2018
3 out of 35 Relevant Innovators know their (waste-) water use or treatment due to lab or pilot level maturity
46% Proportions of employees who are female

* Based on surveys among Phase 1, 2, 3 & 4 and Scaling Programme innovators (50 out of 84 possible respondents)
** Based on surveys among Phase 1, 2, 3 & 4 and Scaling Programme innovators (30 out of 54 possible respondents)
*** Cumulative thru 2017 & 2018

Source: C&A Foundation, dashboard May 2019
Figure D.3 Distribution of implementation and core support grants per country for Circular Fashion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>€ 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia - general</td>
<td>€ 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>€ 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>€ 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>€ 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe (Western) - general</td>
<td>€ 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global - general</td>
<td>€ 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>€ 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>€ 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>€ 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(blank)</td>
<td>€ 0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: C&A Foundation portfolio
Appendix E. Staff Survey results

To what extent has C&A Foundation established grantee-based partnerships with appropriate organisations to advance:

![Chart showing the extent of grantee-based partnerships for different priorities.]

To what extent has C&A Foundation established non-grantee partnerships with appropriate organisations to advance:

![Chart showing the extent of non-grantee partnerships for different priorities.]

Outstandingly | Highly | Substantially | Modestly | Not at all
To what extent has C&A Foundation participated in appropriate networks and/or platforms to advance:

- Overall C&AF priorities (35/45)
- Sustainable Cotton Programme priorities (26/45)
- Circular Fashion Programme priorities (25/45)
- Forced and Child Labour Programme priorities (28/45)
- Working Conditions Programme priorities (29/45)
- Strengthening Communities Programme priorities (19/45)
- ONE cross-cutting priorities (17/45)
- Gender Justice cross-cutting priorities (22/45)
Appendix F. PPR 2019 results

Overall, how responsive was the foundation staff?

![Graph showing responsiveness of foundation staff across various categories and years.]

Overall, how fairly did the foundation treat you?

![Graph showing fairness of foundation treatment across various categories and years.]

Circular Fashion
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Overall, how transparent is the foundation with your organisation?

To what extent is the foundation open to ideas from partners about its strategy?

Overall, how satisfied are you with your experience with the foundation?

To what extent do you understand the foundation’s approval process and timeline?
How would you rate the foundation’s impact on your organisation?

As you developed your proposal, how much pressure did you feel to modify your organisation’s priorities in order to create a grant proposal that was likely to receive funding?
How helpful was participating in the foundation’s selection process in strengthening the organisation/Programme funded by the grant?
Appendix G. Additional comments from interviews and surveys

Comments on alignment

C&A Foundation staff

“We are supporting ‘appropriate’ initiatives, but we need to go bigger and bolder, and find ways to do this without having to start with small grants. And it would be great to find a more collaborative way to work with our approval bodies, so that we can get more strategic guidance and buy-in.”

“Alignment with the family and C&A business is continuously under tension, since C&A Foundation has a generic purpose based on market and systems change and translates this in programmes that are ‘fit for purpose’.”

“Society needs to move away from exploit-produce-throw away. I am a deep believer in the circular economy... Fundamentally, we need to rethink the entire narrative of how society works and doing it in our own industry is our first responsibility. Can we be a lighthouse in this regard?”

“I would like the fashion industry to be circular, and our Family to convene CEOs [Chief Executive Officers] in the industry to say, ‘here is how we did it, you should do the same.’”

Circular Fashion partners

“C&A Foundation’s support is highly aligned with our mission. We are both interested to take the learning from what’s happening and take it wider, to accelerate the transition from a linear to a circular fashion model.”

“We see C&A Foundation as a partner...and we have strategic alignment with what we want to see with respect to the evolution of the apparel sector. The types of environmental and social impacts that they’re after are often the same type that we are looking for as well...a lot of their KPIs are the same ones that we have built into our project.”

Owner’s group

“The supply chain was a natural place to give sustainability a grounding and sustainability gave the business a purpose. We have frequently discussed with C&A Foundation regarding how to make sustainability happen. Not only the principles, but the nuts and the bolts of it. From the side of the foundation, C&A is seen as a key partner and is very welcome when we work together. C&A can be the tester for pilots. The foundation is also very clear that they are distinct, they have separate agendas... We sometimes work together; sometimes the foundation is ahead of the game, but we can be aligned.”

IC member

“It feels like the Family wanted to do circular, so the foundation is doing circular. It struggled to establish its ToC. I am a strong believer in ToCs and when I came in, I asked many questions on their overall ToC. Circular is a technique or a mindset. Now they are getting these circular things to be more tangible, but how does it relate to the foundation’s strategy?”

Comments on impact

C&A Foundation staff

“FFG and the Fashion Transparency Index seem to have had an interesting impact on the brands.”

“It’s hard to define what a ‘force for good’ actually means, what it looks like and how much can be attributed to C&A Foundation and what change we expected in 5 years. We have probably enabled elements of movement to do better, but the bar was quite low to start, so I think we are still in the realm of doing ‘less bad’ (which is also needed) than having a highly positive impact.”

“Transformation takes time, and I think the foundation has had a significant impact in putting critical things on the agenda (transparency, forced labour) and bringing others along through new platforms (FFG, Organic Cotton Accelerator). But more time and others are needed – including policy – to get large-scale transformation.”
"Not all grants are leading to systems change. We need to know why and how, and then address the reasons for why they are not leading to systems change. The Bridging the Gap members are all addressing really important things, but is this shifting anything? Do we need to rethink this? Circular fashion is looking at systems change but the foundation is also looking at systems change. So, are all the programmes coordinated and aligned for systems change, and what are the alignments or conflicts, divergence, and inconstancies across the foundation?"

"C&A Foundation has had a critical impact in the past 5 years on the landscape of certification and standards; it’s had a hand in some of the more important defining industry organisms."

**Circular Fashion partners**

"C&A Foundation is regarded as a leader in advancing thinking across the entire fashion supply chain. Having the support of the foundation for our work lends great credibility to [our] work in the space. Specifically for our work with Asia-based manufacturers, while neither C&A Foundation nor [our organisation] might be immediately recognisable names, any stakeholder who engages with us is very quickly able to establish our legitimacy and understand our value and ability to draw them into a global network of sustainable fashion leaders."

"Considering it is a new field of focus for the foundation, they have had a considerable impact in a short number of years."

"They take a proactive role in mapping and identifying the landscape, to understand the levers for change – the latest report is a great example of this. Their understanding of the field (current state, opportunities and bottlenecks) allow them to focus their impact on topics that would otherwise be left untouched."

"…they recognised the need for support and investment [in our field]. Their in-depth level of engagement with the topic at hand means that they have their finger on the pulse and can accurately anticipate the needs of the industry, and support organisations and initiatives that are tackling the riskier themes or topics. Additionally, since they support many organisations who are”

"I think C&A Foundation’s impact on ‘safe and circular’ is emerging. They’re at forefront, seeing connections and making investments that will impact industry beyond fashion. C&A Foundation is playing a critical role"

"The foundation has acted and continues to act as thought-leader and catalyst in our space. A true frontrunner, taking risk where needed and moving the sector forward on a systemic level."

**Owner’s group**

"There is a tremendous amount of stuff being done [by C&A Foundation], but when you ask about impact… we are still young. What will we accomplish in the next five years? What is our branding, what is it that we are going to do? The biggest elephant in the room is Circular Economy. We had three pillars (sustainably supply/lives/products), and then the idea of Circular Economy came. Was it going to be a pillar? Was it going to be at the bottom of everything, or an external foundation? … Circular Economy is so important and so big. We are at EUR 50 million in terms of impact on the ground, but the needs are so much higher. It is like going to Mars. It is a very leap that we are thinking of taking, but what does it really look like? It is good to dream, but how do we get there? We do wonderful in FFG; maybe these seeds can grow into mighty acorn trees."

**IC member**

"The foundation could have a role in getting the industry to look at regenerative impact rather than zero impact as the highest bar. It would be great to see such a powerful organisation start to foster that discussion at forthcoming events. C&A Foundation has such a big impact on how some of the agendas are shaped. They are supporting the NGOs that put these events together, in some cases.”
E. Strengthening Communities
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BRUP Building Resilience of the Urban Poor
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ToC Theory of Change
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1. Introduction

In February 2019, Universalia was contracted to conduct an Overall Effectiveness Evaluation (OEE) of C&A Foundation (2014/15–2019/20). The purpose of the evaluation was “to assess the extent to which the foundation is making progress towards achieving its vision, mission and strategic objectives”. Given the importance of context in examining the fashion industry’s complex system, the evaluation team undertook five case studies, one for each programmatic area of the foundation’s work.

This case study examines the foundation’s Strengthening Communities programme. Initiatives sampled for this case study are listed in Table 1.1 (on p. 7). Unlike other case studies, this work was undertaken without primary data collection with programme partners and beneficiaries. As a result, the sample in the table includes only the second layer (evaluation synthesis) and the third (research quality assessment). Sampled initiatives reflected the programme’s two main activities: C&A Employee and Store Engagement, and Humanitarian Relief.

The evaluation team collected data for the case study using interviews, document review (documents consulted are listed in Appendix A), the Staff Survey and a field visit. Thirty-five stakeholders were interviewed for the study (including programme staff, governance structures of the foundation, and C&A business staff; see Appendix B for a list of those interviewed), additional interviews for the overall evaluation also informed the case study. In addition, the evaluation considered data from the Partner Perception Report (PPR) 2016 and 2019, Delphi report, previous evaluations and research studies (Appendix C summarises the OEE analysis of initiative evaluations). Daniel Braga Brandão conducted two field missions to Brazil through May–June 2019; and Florence Allard-Buffoni and Elis Alquezar conducted a mission to Mexico from 2-10 May 2019. For details of the case study methodology, please consult Appendix A in Volume 1 of this report.

Overview of the programme

Strengthening Communities, the oldest C&A Foundation programme, brings together a number of social initiatives developed even before the organisation’s global sustainability strategy was created. Prior work includes the Store Giving programme (SGP) in Europe and the Employee Volunteering programme (EVP) in Brazil. Since 2014-15, the initiatives were brought under the umbrella of Strengthening Communities, in alignment with C&A Foundation’s new strategy and as per the priorities of C&A business and the owner’s group. The programme was notable in creating a way for C&A’s employees to engage with the foundation’s work.

In 2018, the programme’s strategic approach emerged with the development of its Theory of Change (ToC). It reflects the foundation’s commitment to implementing strategies that can lead to a more dignified life for

---


3 Effective Philanthropy (EP) prepared a draft and then involved the entire team who worked with the programme (managers, analysts and assistants) in Brazil, Mexico and Europe, as well as the Head of Instituto C&A and its grant administration team in Europe (given that it was responsible for managing the financial allocation provided to the programme’s initiatives in the stores). The draft went through successive adjustments before its final release in early-mid 2018. Source: C&A Foundation. (2018). C&A Foundation ToC of the Strengthening Communities programme.
people living in communities through improved livelihoods, improved community capacity to respond to external shocks, and the involvement of C&A employees in social action. The ToC clearly expressed the flow of expected outcomes from programme strategies:

1. Build community capacity to strengthen resilience to internal and external shocks and disaster risk
2. Respond to humanitarian disasters through relevant global and local partners to address community needs
3. Enable and inspire C&A employees in selected geographies to engage within their communities, tailored to local business and country contexts.

In the 2014-18 period, Strengthening Communities had the second largest budget among the foundation’s programmes. The programme’s total portfolio for 2014-18 amounted to EUR 29.5 million, EUR 26.0 million of was for core and implementation grants. Grants worth more than the threshold of EUR 100 thousand totalled EUR 23.7 million (Appendix D).

**Figure 1.2 Proportion of budget per signature programme (2014-18)**

During this period, the programme developed activities in countries where other C&A Foundation programmes already operated – Brazil, Mexico, Bangladesh, India, China, and others. It was not limited to these countries, however; one-off donations were made in a number of countries through the SGP and through Humanitarian Relief.

**C&A Employee and Store Engagement**

Employee and Store Engagement consisted of the EVP, Inspiring World Campaign (IWC) and SGP. Long before C&A Foundation was created, starting in 1991, the EVP was run by Instituto C&A and C&A business in Brazil.¹ It has involved about 2,500 employees from nearly 300 C&A units in 120 cities in 25 of the 27 Brazilian states. In Mexico, EVP is a legacy programme, directly involving Fundación C&A and C&A business,

¹ The ToC of the different parts of Strengthening Communities can be found in Appendix E.
focusing on actions involving employees from the head office, but with less geographic coverage than in Brazil.

The IWC is an annual global campaign run since 2015 and aimed at C&A business employees, entailing joint action between C&A Foundation and C&A business. Originally called Inspiring Women, it initially focused on women’s empowerment. In 2018, it was renamed Inspiring World, in alignment with the company’s sustainability goals and C&A Foundation’s strategies.¹

SGP has been in operation since 2006, launched to celebrate the opening of the 1,000th retail store in Europe. Initially conceived as an unofficial C&A business programme, it was later integrated into C&A Foundation in an attempt to better establish the donations initiative. It has been running in 21 countries in Europe and Turkey, where C&A business has retail stores. However, the initiative is not present in other retail countries, such as Brazil, China and Mexico.

**Humanitarian Relief**

The evaluation team examined programmatic work related to Humanitarian Relief through two initiatives: the partnership with Save the Children and Building Resilience of the Urban Poor (BRUP).

In 2015, a partnership was formed by C&A Foundation, C&A business and Save the Children that focused on humanitarian response and disaster risk reduction in sourcing countries. The partnership was built on the long history of humanitarian philanthropy of the Brenninkmeijer family. Through this strategic partnership, communities (particularly women and children) were supported and prepared to respond to disasters. The initiative was also set up to allow C&A business to encourage its customers and employees to contribute to the efforts of Save the Children.

BRUP was developed in partnership with CARE Bangladesh and its local partner Village Education Resource Centre as a three-year pilot project (from October 2014 to February 2018) in the newly formed Gazipur City Corporation. It aimed to enhance resilience in six targeted urban communities (three in Konabari and three in Tongi areas) and strengthening the capacity of three targeted institutions (Gazipur City Corporation, Ward 12 and 55, and Fire Service and Civil Defence) to plan for and provide services that mitigate the impact of man-made and natural disasters on poor and extremely poor households.

¹ This information can be found on the C&A Foundation’s website. C&A Foundation. (2018). *Inspiring World worldwide campaign gives an insight on how to build a successful employee engagement initiative*. Available at: https://www.candafoundation.org/work/results/publications/inspiring-world
Figure 1.1 Grants sampling for assessment of the Strengthening Communities programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Sampling</th>
<th>Partner Organisation</th>
<th># grants</th>
<th>Strategic Objective(s)</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Type of Grantee</th>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Size of Initiative</th>
<th>Value of Initiative</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>C&amp;A (Inspiring Women)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>C&amp;A (Store Giving Programme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation (Employee Volunteering Programme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>CARE Bangladesh (Building Resilience of the Urban Poor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation synthesis</td>
<td>Save the Children (Global Humanitarian Partnership)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Philanthropy in Action (Report on the Global Volunteer Day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Price Water House Coopers (Urban situational and stakeholder analysis...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQA</td>
<td>Save the Children (8 research pieces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengthening Communities
2. Relevance, niche, strategic focus, and alignment of the programme

The Strengthening Communities programme dates back to the beginning of the volunteering programme in Brazil, alongside the creation of Instituto C&A in 1991. Since the creation of C&A Foundation, the programme has provided an umbrella for disparate initiatives under the common purpose of ensuring that “people in the selected communities are able to lead more decent and dignified lives”, as per the ToC.¹

The programme has been aligned with the C&A global sustainability strategy, more specifically to the Sustainable Lives axis, as articulated in the “What We Stand For” document.²

“We work to help people – from farmer to customer – to improve their lives and livelihoods. In particular, we focus our efforts on those ‘hot spots’ within the apparel industry in which we see deep injustice – from bonded labour in spinning mills to violations of human rights among migrant labour across the industry. Through our humanitarian partnerships, we also work to enable communities in textile-producing areas to become more resilient and recover from shocks (such as disasters). And, with our link to the C&A business, we aspire to inspire our 60K colleagues to contribute meaningfully to their own local communities.”

There is no doubt that the programme has reflected the desire of the owner’s group to advance the general social good. The high value attributed by the family to philanthropic work has always been a guide, along with the company’s values, for C&A Foundation investments. In this sense, the investment in local communities and organisations is connected to the expectation of being closer to people, whether they are consumers, suppliers or business collaborators, and there is widespread perception of this among those interviewed.

Thus, owner’s group members have clearly valued investing in community empowerment as an essential strategy. The shared concern by the members of the family derives from three factors that act together: a sense of social responsibility, a concern with populations in geographic areas where the business is present, and the desire to have positive social impact.

While efforts have been made in recent years to develop a strategic alignment between the programme and the foundation’s very purpose of working to transform the fashion industry, such alignment has remained peripheral, for both C&A Employee and Store Engagement and Humanitarian Relief. The two initiatives have not developed a uniformly strong link with the fashion supply chain. They have focused on the social engagement of C&A business employees (individually and collectively) and with the protection of vulnerable

“More generally, I think the concern for community is essential. How you do that and where you do that is a pragmatic discussion, but I think if there is someone else who is in a better place to do it, then you should question why you are doing it. I think that community is a seriously underestimated and undervalued aspect of our value.”

Owner’s group member

populations (via remediation or disaster prevention). Other companies and their foundations in Brazil and internationally have undertaken similar initiatives, as in the case of Telefônica group.1

According to the Staff Survey2, 35% of staff members consider that the programme has established grantee-based partnerships with appropriate organisations to a “high” or “outstanding” extent, while 31% responded that it was doing so to a “modest” extent (Appendix F). Perception of non-grantee partnerships, on the other hand, is assessed slightly higher: 42% of respondents consider the partnerships “highly” appropriate to advance programme priorities.

On C&A Foundation’s participation in networks or platforms, the programme was the second worst rated among all programmes, only ahead of Organisational and Network Effectiveness (ONE). Almost a third (32%) of participants rated participation as poorly appropriate, while 32% rated it as highly appropriate.

C&A Employee and Store Engagement

The programme’s focus on people includes the company’s approximately 60 thousand employees. In this sense, its priorities on Employee and Store Engagement have been intrinsically connected to those of C&A business, as per its sustainability strategy (advancing Sustainable Lives). Here the evaluation team finds a high degree of alignment between the programme and the business, but the very purpose of the foundation has been variably exhibited, more so for EVP than for IWC and SGP. This was drawn from interviews with various stakeholders, including programme staff, C&A business staff, members of the owner’s group, and Investment Committee (IC) members.

Assessing EVP

In the eyes of local IC members in Brazil and Mexico, the EVP is central to the work of C&A Foundation. In Mexico, for example, when asked about actions taken by Fundación C&A, local IC members (all associated directly with C&A business) promptly mentioned volunteering activities. There is a perception that volunteering actions represent the good work done by C&A Foundation and C&A partnership, and that it is source of pride (Appendix G).3 EVP is also an example of the ongoing institutionalisation of a culture of volunteering in C&A business in Brazil. However, it is beyond the remit of C&A Foundation to promote such a culture at the business.

It is worth noting that the 2016 evaluation led to a greater alignment of the EVP with the fashion industry, as reflected in the updated programme strategy, and resulted in a new ToC.4 According to the ToC, the

---


2 C&A Foundation OEE Staff Survey – Strengthening Communities programme can be found in Appendix F.

3 Statement given in an interview with the Mexico IC: “The actions of the Foundation with the earthquake. It has been a good job, to be proud.”

4 The ToC of the EVP Brazil can be found in Appendix IV.
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programme intended to increase the income and opportunities for personal and social development of beneficiaries and, particularly, to develop their technical knowledge and improve the production chain, all through the use of volunteer work related to partnerships, mentorships and vocational training. In line with this shift towards the fashion industry, the programme team in Brazil developed a project with the Coletivo Transol, a sewing workshop run by transsexual women, but such actions are very limited. Overall, C&A Foundation staff recognise that the programme’s key beneficiaries are business employees.

The alignment with the business is also perceived by employees. In a recent survey conducted as part of the ToC construction process for the Mexico Volunteer Programme\(^1\), 98% of C&A business employees in Mexico said they would like to participate in voluntary activities undertaken by C&A Foundation in Mexico (through Fundación C&A at the time); the main motivations mentioned were “to help others” and “because it is aligned with the company’s values”.

Assessing IWC

The IWC has always aimed “to make positive contribution to C&A’s business performance” and “to make positive contribution to charities”, as per its ToC. The campaign has seen historically good participation of C&A store employees (Table 2.1). While generating over EUR 3 million in donations from 2015 to 2018, these were distributed in small sums among numerous organisations. Nevertheless, in evaluation reports, the campaign is reported to have had some important positive outcomes over the years, including increased awareness of charities working to help women (or to strengthen local communities or improve the environment), increased awareness of the campaign itself, and increased awareness of C&A corporate social responsibility.\(^2\)

Table 2.1 Inspiring World Programme information (2015-18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CAMPAIGN CENTRAL THEME</th>
<th>EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>DONATIONS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CHARITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>“Women who bring out the best in me”</td>
<td>23,616</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>€1,066,000</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>“Women who have taught us something important in our lives”</td>
<td>15,835</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>€398,350</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>“Women who have taught valuable life lessons”</td>
<td>29,356</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>€574,000</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>What’s your dream of a better world for everyone?</td>
<td>32,615</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>€1,001,150</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The main results of the IWC\(^3\) have pertained to the C&A employees themselves, also allowing for the company to communicate its social actions. Programme staff recognise that the campaign has been more in line with the sustainability efforts of the business than with the purpose of C&A Foundation\(^4\). Indeed, the IWC

---


4 Statement given in an interview with a C&A Foundation staff: “Inspiring World is more connected with C&A Sustainability rather than with the Foundation itself.”
has appeared to serve three purposes: encouraging employee engagement, modest social impact in communities (though it has not been adequately measured or evaluated); and providing a halo effect to the business. This triple mandate has sown confusion as to the purpose of the programme and how it aligns with the foundation.

A risk of possible conflict of interests exists, given that the foundation should not be used as a means of generating direct benefits to the parent company. Already, employees and members of the Brazilian and Mexican ICs believe that the programme has generated brand, image and employee satisfaction benefits for C&A business, including increased employee engagement and pride in working at the business. Given the brand overlap between C&A Foundation and C&A business, issues have emerged for the foundation. In some instances institutes and foundations of business competitors in the sector have refused to partner with C&A Foundation because of this, given a perception that this might provide an unfair competitive advantage to C&A business. This is not unique to the Strengthening Communities programme, as it has emerged more broadly with other programmes of C&A Foundation. The proximity of the foundation and business on this programme brings this concern to the fore.

**Assessing SGP**

The main goal of SGP\(^1\) was promoting the sustainability of local communities, with very little connection to C&A Foundation.\(^2\) The programme maintained four outcome categories: corporate level, employee engagement, beneficiary organisations and end beneficiaries. A review of SGP strategies and intended outcomes reveals that their alignment with C&A Foundation priorities was limited.

According to the 2016 evaluation, on the first outcome category, the SGP programme improved C&A’s image as a “good corporate citizen”. In terms of employee-related outcomes, the programme promoted greater (though variable) engagement of store employees with supported organisations. Partner organisations were financially and technically supported in implementing their initiatives. For partner organisations, the programme was able to support them financially and technically in implementing their initiatives but, despite considering their relationship with C&A as positive, they also saw the support offered as limited. As for its target audience, SGP has made a relevant and direct contribution to improving the lives of its end beneficiaries. However, only half of the beneficiary organisations actually aimed at reducing social inequalities, while the other half sought to improve the lives of their target populations through charity-based contributions, without addressing the root causes behind social imbalances and inequalities.

Furthermore, these organisations were not related to the fashion industry. As such, C&A Foundation staff widely considered the SGP to be outside the strategy of the foundation, despite having supported several organisations.

---


\(^{2}\) The ToC of the SGP can be found in Appendix E.
Humanitarian Relief

With a high amount of programmatic investments¹, Humanitarian Relief comprised two of the three strategies described in the Strengthening Communities ToC. Overall, it has been partially aligned with the purpose of C&A Foundation. Both the Global Humanitarian Partnership and the work of CARE Bangladesh – BRUP are discussed below, highlighting the greater alignment of the latter.

The Global Humanitarian Partnership was designed to enable strategic, collaborative work to respond to disasters, using the power of C&A’s employees, customers and business. The results achieved were assessed in a 2017 evaluation² covering four pillars: the partnership, disaster risk reduction (DRR), humanitarian response, and children’s rights and business principles. A few insights from this evaluation speak to the matter of the initiative’s relevance to C&A Foundation.

The partnership itself brought little to the foundation, given that it had little direct focus on the foundation’s priority areas. In fact, the evaluation speaks of a lack of alignment and common vision regarding the progress of the partnership. On DRR, the goal was for mothers and children in (peri-)urban communities to become more resilient to shocks and stresses through the development and testing of innovative approaches to urban risks. The objective of the humanitarian response pillar was to support Save the Children in emergency response, providing fast and flexible funds to mobilise required resources. Finally, the pillar of child rights and business principles was not implemented, although it was identified as a prerequisite. It was overly ambitious considering the context of the partnership. While socially relevant and providing good work, the Global Humanitarian Partnership was completely unaligned with the priority of C&A Foundation to transform the fashion industry into a force for good.

The CARE Bangladesh – BRUP initiative was designed “to support communities affected by disasters in C&A’s sourcing areas in Bangladesh”³. While this initiative was not designed to “transform” the fashion industry into a force for good, it certainly advanced the shared priority of C&A Foundation and C&A business to promote Sustainable Lives, and to do so in communities where the fashion industry is particularly active. Indeed, the C&A business and owner’s group feel a strong sense of responsibility to the communities where the business operates.

The initiative sought to generate greater awareness of urban resilience issues in Bangladesh, including fire risk awareness, while developing community response capacities. The initiative sought to influence attitudes and behaviours about women as a force for urban resilience, supporting them in playing a more active role in the community. In these and other ways, the initiative was designed to advance the shared priorities of C&A Foundation and C&A business.

While the BRUP work was well targeted in Bangladesh, many of the initiatives undertaken in Humanitarian Relief more broadly presented only partial geographic alignment between the programme and the C&A business countries of operations. They were geographically dispersed and did not present clear criteria for resource allocation. There has been little clarity regarding geographic criteria for eligibility, except a

¹ Investments in the Humanitarian Relief front amounted to €31,330,000 (Salesforce) or €29,900,000 (Annual Reports) in the last 5 years. This includes all types of support (implementation, core, evaluations, etc.).
preference for working with communities in textile-producing areas.\textsuperscript{1} Interviewed C&A Foundation staff widely believe that the programme has been unfocused in its choice of resource-receiving countries related to Humanitarian Relief. Over the last five years, the programme has delivered support in a diversity of countries.\textsuperscript{2} According to foundation Leadership Team members, there has been no clear and operational definition of the concept of “communities” guiding this programme.

\textsuperscript{1} The focus on communities in textile-producing areas is articulated in the document \textit{What We Stand for}.

\textsuperscript{2} On the C&A Foundation webpage, in the description of the issues that underpin the programme strategies, the countries where the fashion industry operates are identified. However, the investments made by C&A Foundation in the past 5 years have covered a larger number of countries. Source: C&A Foundation. (2018). \textit{Strengthening Communities}. Available at: https://www.candafoundation.org/impact/strengthening-communities
3. Gender

The Strengthening Communities programme can be classified as gender-sensitive (level 3/5 on the World Health Organization’s [WHO] Gender Responsive Assessment Scale<sup>1</sup>). To use WHO’s language, the programme has considered gender norms, roles and relations. The programme has been pursued with gender awareness, though with little remedial action developed in most of its work. The initiatives of the programme as a whole did not develop a systematic approach to gender with explicit strategies for addressing it (though with important variations). Nevertheless, it is in line with most of C&A Foundation programmatic work in its gender sensitivity. Only 24% of Staff Survey respondents agreed that gender is “highly” integrated into the Strengthening Communities programme. The programmes rated only above the Circular Fashion programme.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the overall rating of the programme, Humanitarian Relief was better thought out in this regard, reflective of an approach between gender-sensitive (level 3/5) and gender-specific (level 4/5). Partnerships with Save the Children and CARE Bangladesh had a gender-specific approach and this was essentially because women and children were identified as the most vulnerable groups in disaster situations and the most powerful in building urban resilience and disaster recovery response.

The partnership with Save the Children placed women and children at the centre of intended impact until 2018. The evaluation process (2017) concluded that Save the Children was clearly responsive to gender issues, generally within a broader community approach. Also, consistent with the strategies agreed in the partnership, the evaluation process developed in 2017 included specific research and gender-sensitive practices. In the experience with CARE Bangladesh, one of the project’s strategic pillars was specifically focused on poor and extremely poor women, considered to be of high relevance. Clear evidence related the development of an active role for women in the community, a change in the balance of power between husband and wife, greater involvement of women in decision-making processes and many other activities at the community level, a change in mindset about the role of women in disaster situations, and women’s access to the formal banking network. Thus, in terms of gender, Humanitarian Relief partially advanced the foundation’s priorities.

A gender focus was less evident in C&A Employee and Store Engagement. Gender was not an organising feature of EVP until 2016, when it started to count women as beneficiaries. The change indicated a transition towards greater alignment with the priorities of C&A Foundation, as well as commitment to a more sensitive approach to gender. In Brazil, an experiment with store managers raised gender in relation to other vulnerability factors. The purpose of this work was to debate the concepts and activities developed by the foundation, from the perspective of gender, and to produce a more permanent reflection on gender relations, intersectionality, and power, and both general and specific knowledge about gender in the fashion industry. The initiative sought to inspire the development of new actions with C&A employees, expanding support opportunities for women, persons of colour, migrants, and the poor by understanding the multiple dimensions of inequalities.

Regarding SGP’s approach to partnership, according to the 2016 evaluation, 77% of partner organisations had target groups aligned with the programme priorities, yet only 26% of them worked with a focus on women. Although significant, this figure is lower than the 33% of beneficiary organisations working with men and young men, groups that do not explicitly fit into the priority target population. Further, most beneficiary

---

<sup>1</sup> World Health Organization. (s.d.). WHO Gender Responsive Assessment Scale: criteria for assessing programmes and policies. Available at: https://www.who.int/gender/mainstreaming/GMH_Participant_GenderAssessmentScale.pdf

<sup>2</sup> C&A Foundation OEE Staff Survey – Strengthening Communities programme can be found in Appendix F.
organisations did not disaggregate their target populations by gender or age. Since 2019, in a strategic redirection, women have been removed from the beneficiary groups and the strategy was then focused on children. As part of this, SGP has had a gender equity criterion, with the following outcome: “girls are empowered and have the same rights and opportunities as boys”.

For IWC, the major scope change of the campaign showed a weakening of the gender approach. Until 2017, the IWC was explicitly associated with a gender perspective. It worked on guiding questions for the campaign such as: “women who bring out the best in me”, “women who have taught us something important in our lives”, and “women who have taught valuable life lessons”, and had specific outcomes. With the change of focus in 2018, the gender-specific approach was removed. The very purpose of the campaign shifted from aiming to make a “positive contribution to charities that help women” to “charities that work to strengthen local communities or improve the environment”.
4. C&A Foundation functions

The main focus of this discussion of C&A Foundation functions is the role of leadership and communications.

The Strengthening Communities programme had a team of seven people, three of whom were exclusively dedicated to the programme, while four shared their workload with other functions, such as communications and Global Operations. Programme staff were based in Amsterdam, Brussels, São Paulo and Guadalajara. The programme leader is also the director of communications. This programme is the only one, as evidenced by C&A Foundation’s organisational chart, which does not have a head.

Its lack of representation on the Leadership Team has been a weakness that directly influenced the programme’s strategic positioning, visibility, and ability to generate more impact. Although the programme has recently been represented by the director of communications on the Leadership Team, the gap was such that the programme has widely been seen by foundation staff as “below” other programmes. According to one Strengthening Communities team member: “If we had someone globally coordinating the programme, it would be stronger”. According to another C&A Foundation staff member:

“Comms has always struggled to represent Strengthening Communities just like the organisation has never known what to do with it.”

Due to the character of the programme, which requires the involvement of employees in campaign development, the team only mentioned the communication function as having a direct relation to the programme. Especially for C&A Employee and Store Engagement, there has been recurring demand for more clarity about the practical activities of the programmes and their criteria for participation. In the evaluation of SGP (2016), for example, evidence indicates that it is not widely known among employees, due to the limited and fragmented approaches to internal communication within the business. Another example is brought about by EVP, that has recommended a more direct language and the use of modern communication channels and tools that can be easily accessed by volunteers.

The few employees interviewed expressed a desire to learn more about C&A Foundation actions and emphasised how internal communication would help engage store staff, especially as it is a younger generation, more aware and connected to social media.
5. Conclusions

The Strengthening Communities programme is for the most part disconnected from the C&A Foundation purpose of making fashion a force for good. It has, however, allowed C&A Foundation to develop its work in more traditional, philanthropic ways aligned with the values of the owner’s group values, priorities of C&A business and expectations of employees, while doing so in some overlapping geographies with the C&A business. For instance, the programme has allowed business employees to be involved in social actions, particularly in Mexico and Brazil, through C&A Employee and Store Engagement.

Overall, many dimensions of the programme’s work are outside the purpose of the foundation, while others raise concerns about too much proximity between the foundation and the business. While the programme reflects the values of the owner’s group, in promoting the social good in a myriad of communities around the world, the foundation’s purpose must also establish boundaries for its work. Two key boundaries are that the foundation must advance a transformative agenda for the fashion industry, and that it does not specifically and intentionally provide benefits to the C&A business. In these two respects, the Strengthening Communities programme raises concerns about its relevance to the foundation.

"Should we have C&A Foundation focused on the fashion industry, and a separate one [philanthropy] focused on C&A brand image through employee engagement programmes? Should we have both?"

C&A Foundation staff member

As C&A Foundation enters its next strategic period, it is essential that these questions are properly answered. If Strengthening Communities is to remain within the programmatic landscape of C&A Foundation, it should be reorganised in a number of strategic and operational ways. Otherwise, it may be more appropriate for this programme, which serves communities in important ways, to become absorbed by the C&A business, as a responsibility of Human Resources, Marketing or Communications, whose more direct priorities it clearly embodies and advances.
Appendix A. Documents consulted

For each of the sampled grants, the following documents were reviewed (when available): proposals, due diligence, progress reports, evaluation reports, related research reports, press coverage. The evaluation team also reviewed evaluation reports, as listed in the sampling.


World Health Organization. (s.d.) WHO Gender Responsive Assessment Scale: criteria for assessing programmes and policies. Available at: https://www.who.int/gender/mainfron/ing/GMH_Participant_GenderAssessmentScale.pdf
## Appendix B. Stakeholders consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>TITLE / POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barroso, Patricia</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Communications Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becerra, Melissa</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Strengthening Communities Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Albert</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Former Chief Operations Officer of Global Supply Chain of C&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Bart</td>
<td>C&amp;A</td>
<td>Various roles, former Chief Operations Officer for Europe division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Clemens</td>
<td>Redevco Nederland BV</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Edward</td>
<td>C&amp;A</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Erik</td>
<td>COFRA Foundation</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Lawrence</td>
<td>COFRA Holding AG; Constanter</td>
<td>Director of Family Leadership and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Martin-Rudolf</td>
<td>COFRA Holding AG</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Matthew</td>
<td>C&amp;A Mexico</td>
<td>Director of Operations and Business Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Maurice</td>
<td>COFRA Holding AG; Constanter</td>
<td>Chair of the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Michiel</td>
<td>C&amp;A China</td>
<td>Director of Sourcing and CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Norman</td>
<td>COFRA Holding AG</td>
<td>Senior Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenninkmeijer, Thomas</td>
<td>Anthos</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgos, Karla</td>
<td>C&amp;A Mexico</td>
<td>Store Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correa, Paulo</td>
<td>C&amp;A Brazil</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa, Márcia</td>
<td>C&amp;A Brazil</td>
<td>HR &amp; Communications VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dávila, Mauricio</td>
<td>C&amp;A Mexico</td>
<td>CFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabregat, Mariana</td>
<td>C&amp;A Mexico</td>
<td>Human Resources Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudio, Rozalia</td>
<td>C&amp;A Brazil (Former employee)</td>
<td>Former Sustainability Senior Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guerrero, Marcos</td>
<td>C&amp;A Mexico</td>
<td>Commercial Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutíñrez, Gustavo</td>
<td>C&amp;A Mexico</td>
<td>Communications Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartley, Katy</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation and C&amp;A</td>
<td>Director of Communications and Philanthropy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ito, Leandro</td>
<td>C&amp;A Brazil</td>
<td>Sourcing, Quality and Sustainability Global Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroger, Kelly</td>
<td>C&amp;A Mexico</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucato, Milton</td>
<td>C&amp;A Brazil</td>
<td>CFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martins, Alessandra</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Strengthening communities Senior Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narciso, Gustavo</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuño, Nestor</td>
<td>C&amp;A Mexico</td>
<td>Store Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortega, Giuliana</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Head of Instituto C&amp;A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
<td>TITLE / POSITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pereira, Luciana</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubio, Fernando</td>
<td>C&amp;A Mexico</td>
<td>Director of Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salgado, Marco</td>
<td>C&amp;A Mexico</td>
<td>Visual In-store Merchandiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sánchez, Alejandra</td>
<td>C&amp;A Mexico</td>
<td>Sustainability Manager (Interim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago, Gabriela</td>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: This case study used data from other interviews conducted by the overall evaluation, but which were not specifically focused on the Strengthening Communities programme.
Appendix C. Evaluation synthesis

This appendix summarises the evaluation synthesis for the Strengthening Communities programme conducted by the evaluation team based on programme evaluation reports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;A: Inspiring Women</td>
<td>11.2016</td>
<td>No discussion in the evaluation report concerning the relevance of C&amp;A Foundation’s support for this initiative.</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team) A total of 15,839 employees participated in the event in 2016 (which represented a 75% participation rate across all areas). This was a significant increase over 2015 participation rate of only 52%. Participation rates in Mexico and Brazil were particularly higher in 2016, rising from 50% in 2015 in Brazil to 83% and from 46% to 64% in Mexico. This data is taken as proxy for effectiveness of the campaign. The two key outcome indicators (increased awareness of charities working to help women and increased awareness of C&amp;A as an international socially responsible company) were met.</td>
<td>No discussion of this aspect in the report.</td>
<td>Good (as deemed by OEE team). The primary aim of the 2016 campaign was to make a positive contribution to C&amp;A’s business performance through increased employee performance and retention. The evaluation indicated that participation in this event increased employee morale, pride in working at C&amp;A and team spirit. Specifically 86% of post-event survey respondents indicated that the event made them feel happier about working at C&amp;A. 82% of respondents indicated that they feel proud to be associated with C&amp;A. 63% of respondents strongly agreed that they are connected with other teams in their organisation.</td>
<td>No discussion of this aspect in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;A: Store Giving Programme (SGP)</td>
<td>12.2015</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team) SGP's implicit objectives were relevant in the context of C&amp;A and C&amp;A Foundation strategies: they corresponded to C&amp;A Foundation's Strategic Framework and its Sustainable Lives pillar and to C&amp;A's 2020 Global Sustainability Framework and its Customer Value Proposition. But the evaluation also uncovered weaknesses in C&amp;A's approach to corporate citizenship. While SGP was &quot;owned&quot; by the business, the foundation played an important supporting</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team) The programme's effectiveness was constrained by its organisational arrangement. The company controlled selection of beneficiary organisations and other related activities while the foundation approved grant proposals and disbursed the funds. Due to variation in employee involvement across countries, with no mechanisms in place to integrate store giving with employees' commercial activities and no incentives available to reward positive performance in relation to managing</td>
<td>Poor (as deemed by OEE team) C&amp;A Foundation had limited headcount to provide advice to C&amp;A employees on operational management and administrative issues. There were no reporting requirements or monitoring systems used to capture implementation performance or results based on objectives or formal guidance, which constituted a risk and left room for irregularities and unintended practices. In Spain and Portugal, there was a substantial misappropriation of funds because SGP's management was</td>
<td>Good Outcomes for various partners were quite good. While not possible to quantify, qualitative data indicated that SGP made a positive contribution to improving the lives of end beneficiaries, and possibly in reducing social inequalities. 51% of organisations interviewed aimed to improve the lives of the target population and have long-term social and health development aims, while 49% sought to improve the lives of the target population through charity, but without addressing the causes behind social</td>
<td>Adequate Through the SGP, C&amp;A provided financial support to organisations that address the needs of vulnerable target groups (children, women, families). This funding contributed to building the financial and technical capability of the selected organisations, thereby enabling them to continue implementing their activities and projects. For the SGP to thrive, its relevance needed to be elevated and better aligned with the objectives and strategies of both the company and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>role through donation administration. While C&amp;A employees welcomed SGP as a positive initiative, the programme was sometimes perceived as a burden due to the pressure of work and lack of incentives. Concerns existed around the C&amp;A / C&amp;A Foundation expenditure on philanthropy at the same time that employees were experiencing cutbacks and low wages. The evaluation implied that the SGP could become a strategic programme for C&amp;A if properly implemented. However, SGP’s scope was currently too broad and the programme was perceived as fragmented. Moving forward, to increase its relevance, the evaluation indicated that the programme would need to be relaunched in a simple,</td>
<td>the SGP, its successful implementation completely depended on the individual motivation of a limited number of employees. Originally, the idea was to allow store employees to select local organisations that provided support to women, children and families in need. However, no official guidelines were issued and each country developed its own implementation mechanism and communication channels. Results of stories that were collected were not fed back to C&amp;A Foundation due to lack of reporting mechanisms.</td>
<td>outsourced to an external organisation with no control or supervision.</td>
<td>inequalities. 88% of beneficiary organisations confirmed they accomplished the results they expected, of which 42% also achieved positive unexpected results. During 2011-2014, 86,500 beneficiaries directly benefitted from C&amp;A grants.</td>
<td>foundation (for example, the broad spectrum of SGP beneficiaries did not relate directly to beneficiaries from the garment industry, as stated in the foundation’s mission). The corresponding organisational arrangement needed review to enhance incentives and reduce risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Independent Evaluation of C&A Foundation Effectiveness

**Volume 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner: Grant</th>
<th>Report Date</th>
<th>Relevance Rating</th>
<th>Effectiveness Rating</th>
<th>Efficiency Rating</th>
<th>Impact Rating</th>
<th>Sustainability of Benefits Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;A Foundation: Employee Volunteering Programme (EVP)</td>
<td>9.2016</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Adequate (as deemed by OEE team)</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having evolved out of a series of individual employee volunteering initiatives into a formal programme to train C&A volunteer employees as citizens in the education of children and adolescents in all communities where the company was present was positively perceived and resonated with employee interest. The EVP was present within company operations across Brazil; it was integrated into the operation of units and employee mobilisation in all sectors at all levels. The company promoted the programme to new employees as part of the onboarding process and allocated working.

The evaluation indicated that there were unrealistic expectations for outcomes in terms of both the social participation of volunteers and their capacity to impact the community. Referring to its ToC, the envisaged outcomes of enhanced volunteer culture and increased quantity and quality of social participation were achieved. The fact that the programme was credited with institutionalising a volunteering culture is evidence of its effectiveness for C&A. However, this was balanced by shortfalls on the side of what was envisaged as outcomes for the.

The evaluation confirmed that the EVP contributed to C&A employees’ social engagement, their personal and professional development, in a way that positively influenced the working environment and team development in the company. It was furthermore confirmed that the programme sustained high levels of internal mobilisation, although the pressures of the business limited the volunteers’ opportunities to participate in social action in the community.

The evaluation points to the importance of both Instituto C&A management and the active involvement of C&A, (also under the new global policy) for ensuring the sustainability of the programme and fostering a culture of volunteering in the company. The EVP, with a marked presence both within Instituto C&A and the company, has contributed to its potential and sustainability. It is integrated into daily operations at retail and non-retail units and is very much in keeping with the company. Internal pressures from the business operations that limit levels of volunteer external engagement,
hours to employees for programme engagement. Although conceptually relevant to the foundation's Sustainable Lives pillar, it was not prominently featured in this light, and the EVP had not been explicitly integrated into C&A's global sustainability strategy at the time. The evaluation indicated that the programme fell short of its envisaged outcomes for actively engaging employees in their communities, in terms of both the social participation of volunteers and their capacity to impact the community. The strategies that had been envisaged regarding volunteer training, implementation of partnerships with community organisations and the frequency of social action were not deemed sufficient to create the conditions necessary for achieving all of the expected results and impacts (such as giving employees the ability to pursue collective social rights and promote systemic change for the common good). In terms of envisaged training opportunities and outcomes in the community. Lack of clear criteria and agreement regarding partnerships with local organisations. Introduction of complex institutional development strategies as part of the expected volunteer action. Volunteer training combines different strategies but has limited ability to enhance volunteer skills to be applied at partner organisations. With tension between the business operation and the EVP growing over employee desires to participate in external social action, this represented a risk that would need to be managed in future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARE Bangladesh: Building Resilience of the Urban Poor</td>
<td>4.2018</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate to poor</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The location of this intervention was judged to be particularly astute as it allowed CARE Bangladesh to position itself as a key player in urban resilience (this directly mapped to CARE’s strategic objectives for 2020). The project’s ToC was predicated on enhancing household outcomes for the community, results for organisational strengthening were poor, although EVP provided highly appreciated new experiences for children. The programme had a predominantly activities-oriented approach rather than one oriented towards results. The evaluation observed that the programme was seen as too complex and demanding for the capacities that were available.</td>
<td>The project reported many advocacy successes [for example, Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) strategies were embedded into the City Corporation Disaster Management Committee; Ward Disaster Management Committees (WDMCs) were approved as part of the national Standing Order on</td>
<td>Considering to be adequately efficient given that this was a pilot and that a large part of the budget was allocated to monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E), learning and knowledge management purposes. The project was efficient in that some features were replicated elsewhere at</td>
<td>The community-based approach, while challenging to implement, was valid and proved that, as in rural communities, it was still possible to rely on communities in urban fragmented settings to self-manage large components of resilience programmes. However, a major opportunity was</td>
<td>Although sustainability was built into the ToC and some elements, such as attitude changes and institutional embedding of DRR, were likely to be long lasting, sustainability remained a key area for concern. Sustainability of the project’s gains was severely impeded by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and community resilience, empowering women and strengthening institutional resilience to enhance the overall resilience of vulnerable communities. The ToC’s institutional and governance approach was deemed relevant and effective, as the institutional level work was aimed at amplifying/ sustaining impact achieved at community level.</td>
<td>Disasters; the WDMC model was replicated in all 57 of the city’s wards. Some unexpected outcomes, such as fostering of social coherence and a ‘sense of community’ amongst residents, were considered a key resilience achievement attributable to the project. There were numerous challenges to project effectiveness (for example, differences between working with Kash land and private land where ‘hardware’ provision was limited; political issues at Gazipur City Corporation governance level, on which the project was dependent).</td>
<td>no cost. However, the evaluators noted that a very high percentage of the budget was allocated to staff salaries. They also noted that there was a fair amount of duplication of roles between CARE Bangladesh and its partner Village Education Resource Centre, which undermined efficiency. Increased integration with other actors and CARE Bangladesh projects in the region of intervention could have reduced costs. Looking only at the beneficiaries reached by the project compared to the total budget and financial resources used, the efficiency of the project is seen to be poor. Knowing the central place of the garment industry in Gazipur, private sector engagement could have increased project efficiency and impact</td>
<td>missed by not engaging with the private sector from the beginning to work on resilience and risk reduction.</td>
<td>the absence of a proper exit strategy and the loss of organisational memory that occurred from staff turnover at the end of the project. The sustainability of this type of project is compromised by being highly dependent on political will and the lack of available public resources. The sustainability of the community’s participation is weakened by the fact that no future community leader was identified, no future training for Urban Community Volunteers was provided for and meeting spaces have closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT</td>
<td>REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Save the Children: Global Humanitarian Partnership</strong></td>
<td>11.2017</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The lack of relevance is linked to insufficient linkages between the partners’ core aims and that of the partnership. Discussion was not included in the evaluation report as to other priorities and interests that presumably led to this partnership, which was described as new territory with several unknowns and a lot of ambition. The partners had a shared understanding of the need to create a better world for women and children. The partnership was generally aligned with the values of C&amp;A, C&amp;A Foundation and Save the Children. However, there was no clear</td>
<td>The partnership was characterised as &quot;diving without the right equipment and without enough air in the tank&quot;. From the outset, all partners realised that they did not have sufficient human resources and structures allocated and in place for the envisaged outcomes. For example, from the outset, C&amp;A did not appoint a Partnership Manager and did not dedicate a marketing and communications budget to activities related to the partnership. Systems were not always in place within each partner organisation. At the start, Save the Children did not have</td>
<td>The evaluation did not explicitly address the topic of efficiency. As part of lessons learned and missed opportunities, instances were mentioned where &quot;campaigns could have been more efficient&quot;, Save the Children could have been &quot;more involved in developing campaigns&quot;, &quot;alignment between cause-related marketing campaigns with overall C&amp;A marketing calendar could have led to improved results&quot;, there were opportunities to develop a more efficient and consistent practice across the</td>
<td>Clear KPIs (Key Programme Indicators) had only been set for the humanitarian response pillar. Only some campaigns had KPIs defined upfront while none of the employee engagement campaigns did. Without KPIs in place, it was difficult to assess if the partnership and its programmes were delivering the expected win-win-win results for the three involved partners, or to gauge the sustainability of the partnership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After 3 years of partnership, there was a general sense that trust and transparency had been built, although these varied across the organisations. The organisational context of the three partners had evolved over the course of the programme and the partners were described as now being better placed to take the partnership forward. C&amp;A Foundation mainstreamed its work with Instituto C&amp;A in Brazil and Fundación C&amp;A in Mexico; C&amp;A had established a Global Sustainability Practice; Save the Children Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTNER: GRANT REPORT DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE RATING</td>
<td>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY RATING</td>
<td>IMPACT RATING</td>
<td>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>articulation between the partnership and each of the individual organisations’ objectives and strategic drivers. A common vision for the partnership was not fully developed. There was a disconnect between global and local teams. For example, in Mexico some felt that there was not enough engagement with local teams in the planning phase. This initiative was viewed as an opportunity to develop disaster preparedness in vulnerable communities. At the time, DRR was not a country priority and would probably not have been part of the Mexican programme if local teams had fully participated in decision-making. The evaluation indicated that it had the potential to develop into a valuable platform for</td>
<td>an integrated internal global financial system to manage donations from different C&amp;A countries. Overall, there were missed opportunities where the partners could have exchanged skills and supported each other to become better at what they do. Fundraising, telling stories, employee engagement, and cause-related marketing are areas where the expectations to learn from each other were not entirely fulfilled.</td>
<td>network and roll-out tools and guidelines based on evidenced practice, need for &quot;more efficient procurement at scale&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany had gained experience in co-leading a significant corporate partnership within the broader Save the Children network. Given this stronger basis for moving forward, the evaluation recommended that C&amp;A Foundation should review the purpose of its support to Save the Children’s humanitarian response considering a more strategic, outcome-driven division of its available funding, while ensuring a significant proportion remains available for seed funding as per current arrangements. The evaluation indicated that there was value in continuing the partnership but that there would need to be equal commitment from all three organisations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengthening Communities 269
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTNER: GRANT</th>
<th>REPORT DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE RATING</th>
<th>EFFECTIVENESS RATING</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY RATING</th>
<th>IMPACT RATING</th>
<th>SUSTAINABILITY OF BENEFITS RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>humanitarian work between the partners, provided that, in future, they operated as equals in an alliance that contributed to their own core aims as well as to the needs of others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. Portfolio review

Figure D.1 Dashboard for Strengthening Communities (May 2019)

Source: C&A Foundation, dashboard May 2019
Appendix E. ToCs for Strengthening Communities

Figure E.1 ToC for the Strengthening Communities programme

Source: C&A Foundation ToC of the Strengthening Communities programme
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VOLUME 2

Figure E.2 Survey on EVP (C&A Mexico)

Source: Move Social, C&A Employee Survey – ToC – EVP.
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Figure E.3 ToC of the Volunteering programme in Mexico

Source: Move Social, C&A Employee Survey – ToC – EVP.
Figure E.4 ToC of the Store Giving programme (2016)

Source: Final Report of Evaluation Store Giving programme
Figure E.5 ToC of the Inspiring Women campaign (2015)


Figure E.6 ToC of the Inspiring Women campaign (2016)
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Figure E.7 ToC of the Inspiring Women campaign (2017)


Figure E.8 ToC of the Inspiring Women Campaign (2018)

Figure E.9 ToC for Urban Resilience (Draft)

Source: ToC of the Disaster Risk Reduction.

Figure E.10 ToC for Emergency Response (Draft)

Source: ToC of the Humanitarian Response.
Appendix F. Staff Survey results

To what extent has C&A Foundation established grantee-based partnerships with appropriate organisations to advance:

[Bar chart showing various partnerships]

To what extent has C&A Foundation established non-grantee partnerships with appropriate organisations to advance:

[Bar chart showing various partnerships]
To what extent has C&A Foundation participated in appropriate networks and/or platforms to advance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Participation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall C&amp;AF priorities (35/45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Cotton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme priorities (26/45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular Fashion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme priorities (25/45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced and Child Labour Programme priorities (28/45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme priorities (29/45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Communities Programme priorities (19/45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE cross-cutting priorities (17/45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Justice cross-cutting priorities (22/45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Outstandingly, Highly, Substantially, Modestly, Not at all

To what extent have gender considerations been integrated into C&A Foundation work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Participation Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the Forced and Child Labour Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Working Conditions Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Sustainable Cotton Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On matters of recruitment and staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Strengthening Communities Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In terms of organisational culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of the ONE/Organisational and Network Effectiveness work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Circular Fashion Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Outstandingly, Highly, Substantially, Modestly, Not at all
Appendix G. Survey on EVP

Figure G.1 Survey on EVP (C&A Mexico)

Desire to participate in volunteer activities fostered by C&A

Three employees said they had no interest in participating in volunteer activities fostered by C&A. They justified their answer by saying it was due to personal reasons.

Source: Survey with employees (n = 188)

Figure G.2 Survey on EVP (C&A Mexico) - continued

Main motivations

Source: Survey with employees (n = 188)
Figure G.3 Survey on EVP (C&A Mexico) - continued

Reasons to foster the Volunteer Program

[Bar chart showing reasons for fostering the volunteer program]

Source: Survey with employees (n = 150)