

30 April 2024

Evaluation services to conduct an endline evaluation of *Com.Direitos* in Brazil

SUMMARY

We are the Freedom Fund

The Freedom Fund is a global fund with the sole aim of helping end modern slavery.

We are a catalyst in the global effort to end modern slavery, working in the countries and sectors where it is most prevalent. We invest in and partner with organisations and communities on the frontlines of ending exploitation.

By partnering with those at risk of modern slavery as well as visionary investors, governments and anti-slavery organisations, we bring together the knowledge, the capital and the will needed to dismantle the systems that allow slavery to exist and thrive.

Through our investments and support, we aim to shift power, so that frontline organisations and communities can shape and drive the change required to bring modern slavery to an end. One of our areas of particular focus is commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC).

Building on the Freedom Fund's globally successful hotspot model, the Brazil CSEC hotspot program, *Com.Direitos*, was launched by the Freedom Fund in 2021. This followed completion of a scoping study by the Freedom Fund which found that CSEC is a vast but invisible problem in Brazil, affecting between 100,000 - 500,000 children. To systematically address CSEC in our Brazilian hotspot of Recife, we are implementing a program funded by the US Department of State's Program to End Modern Slavery (PEMS hereinafter), in direct partnership with local civil society actors, as well as in collaboration with local government and businesses, which sits within the wider "*Com.Direitos*" program (see Annex 2 for details of the wider *Com.Direitos* program). Through our combined work, we aim to drive the strategic changes needed to eradicate CSEC in the Recife Metropolitan Region and demonstrate a workable model that can be used in other regions of Brazil. A mid-term assessment of this program was completed in 2023-2024, and provided valuable insights that were incorporate in the program's strategy review that also took place in 2024.

The endline evaluation described in this Request for Proposals aims to assess our progress in meeting our objectives under our PEMS-funded program with the purpose of informing its future phases (see Annex 1 for details of the PEMS program and its objectives).

The Freedom Fund anticipates that the first draft of the endline evaluation report will be completed in approximately July 2025, and the final report by August 2025. It is hoped that

the consultant(s) will be able to commence work by July 2024, with ethical approval by November 2024 and data collection starting in January 2025. Timelines and evaluation activities are adaptable in response to festive seasons, school schedules, and other related disruptions.

ELIGIBILITY

Individual researchers, organisations and consortia are invited to submit proposals for this evaluation. Applicants must have the capacity to conduct field work in and around the Recife metropolitan area (RMA). Applicants fully or partially based in Brazil will be prioritised. The Freedom Fund is particularly interested in working with consultants/teams that can demonstrate: (a) having members who are from the local communities where the evaluation will take place (b) a gender-balanced team, if applicable, ideally with at least half of the team members being female and (c) commitment to survivor-inclusive approaches.

BUDGET

A fee of approximately USD 130,000 has been made available for this endline evaluation. Budgets will be reviewed with respect to the strength of the proposal in meeting the project objectives in a cost-effective manner - we do not simply prioritise the lowest budget. This is a fixed price, fee for service contract.

PROPOSAL DEADLINE

Proposals should be submitted via email to Matilde Chora (mchora@freedomfund.org) no later than 1st July, 5pm Brazil time. Proposals should be no more than 6 pages, plus CVs and annexes.

Background to our work on commercial sexual exploitation of children in Brazil

The Freedom Fund is a global non-profit organisation that identifies and invests in the most effective frontline efforts to end human trafficking. We select key geographic areas - our hotspot programs - known to have high rates of trafficking and exploitation, and where our interventions are most likely to be impactful.

An estimated 100,000 to 500,000 children in Brazil are forced into situations of commercial sexual exploitation. Despite the staggering scale of the problem, CSEC remains almost invisible in the country. There are few official data recorded by law enforcement or government agencies. This lack of reliable data makes it difficult to develop effective public policies or program responses. Furthermore, the invisibility of CSEC is compounded by widespread community attitudes that either trivialise the problem or regard it as "normal"

practice. Linked to this, there is very little known about perpetrators of CSEC, including who they are and why they choose to engage children in acts of commercial sexual exploitation.

The Freedom Fund has conducted in-depth research to contribute to knowledge about CSEC in the RMA. This includes a research project which used different quantitative methodologies to estimate the [prevalence of CSEC in the RMA](#) and a mixed methods research project which explored the [characteristics of CSEC perpetrators in the RMA](#). The findings from both research projects have informed the design and implementation of our PEMS program and wider *Com.Direitos* program. Through our combined work, we aim to build strong effective partnerships with civil society actors to support vulnerable children and survivors gain the information and skills needed to protect themselves from, or safely exit, CSEC.

Evaluation objectives

The overall objective of the endline evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of the components of the program implemented under our PEMS grant (funded by The Department of State's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking). Annex I provides a description of the programmatic objectives and main activities under the PEMS grant.

To ensure an in-depth analysis of the program activities' implementation and outcomes, the evaluation will be guided by the following evaluation questions:

- To what extent has the program influenced the quality of anti-trafficking efforts within the Recife Metropolitan Region? Specifically, is the program leading to improvements in the design and implementation of policies to address CSEC and contributing to better coordination amongst key stakeholders? (Arm 1)
- To what extent has the program contributed to CSEC victims safely exiting situations of exploitation and accessing sustainable livelihoods opportunities? (Arm 2)
- To what extent has the program contributed to the existence of an environment in schools that prevents children and adolescents from entering CSEC and helps them exiting situations of exploitation? (Arm 3)
- To what extent has the program influenced the quality of services available to CSEC victims, as well as survivors' access to these services? (Arm 4)
- Are methodologies applied by the program, especially on prevention and support to survivors, leading to the expected results? Are they scalable? (Arm 5)

Evaluation methodology

The Freedom Fund invites applicants to propose a suitable methodology for achieving the objectives above. Across the five arms, we envision seeking inputs from more than 400 program participants, service users, NGO leaders and policy officials:

1. Government representatives and civil society stakeholders who have been either directly or indirectly influenced by Com.Direitos advocacy	2. Trainees under the apprentice program: economic empowerment outcomes	3. Teachers and students trained under Com.Direitos: changes in knowledge and practices, and reporting of CSEC cases	4. Frontline service workers (e.g. healthcare) trained under Com.Direitos: changes in knowledge and practices	5. Case management : fidelity to and efficacy of new flows and protocols in integrated care of survivors of CSEC
6. Adolescent program participants' own observations and assessment on the effects of Com.Direitos				

Arm 1. A key program objective is that Government and civil society organisations become more coordinated in preventing CSEC, protecting victims, and deterring perpetrators. In addition to information on logistical changes to the coordinated system, we are interested in the perceptions of government and civil society stakeholders, both those who have direct and indirect experience with the program, of whether and how Com.Direitos has contributed to the organising process of CSEC prevention. Key informant interviews will include, but not be limited to, the following areas of inquiry: how the coordinated anti-CSEC (including under SVAC and TIP) effort has changed; the level of stakeholders participation and coordination in new or existing anti-CSEC coalitions; how different actors' roles in that process have changed; whether any new evidence (specifically, research evidence generated by the Freedom Fund) has influenced elements of the coordinated effort, such as perceived urgency; if new policies and plans were put in place to respond to the issue (and if they were informed by program research evidence); how respondents may rate the state of the coordinated anti-CSEC effort compared to similar municipalities or states in Brazil or abroad, and if this is different than how they would have rated the local effort prior to Com.Direitos.

<i>Proposed sample (applicants should comment on this estimated sample size and suggest edits if appropriate):</i>		
Government representatives/employees	15	Key informant interviews
Civil society stakeholders with direct interest in CSEC	10	Key informant interviews
Civil society stakeholders with indirect interest in CSEC (e.g., education or domestic violence stakeholders)	5	Key informant interviews

Arm 2. Trainees who participated in the first life skills cohort at the end of 2022 (n=27) were placed into job positions as apprentices in early 2023 and those who completed the second cohort in early 2023 (n=55) are expected to be placed in apprenticeship positions by end of 2023 or early 2024. After two years working as apprentices, the apprenticeship contracts end, and we are keen to understand the onward impact of the program. The endline evaluation will trace approximately 40 girls who were included as apprentices to understand if the apprenticeship program was effective in supporting children stay out of CSEC during the apprenticeship period, if they were able to secure long-term jobs, ask them about job satisfaction, career goals, satisfaction with the training and apprenticeship program, and stability to do work that both feels dignified and takes care of their social and financial needs. By the time the evaluation data collection begins, we estimate that up to 78 individuals will have started their two-year apprenticeships, of whom 37 will have been in for longer than 6 months, and nine have completed the entire two-year apprenticeship. We hope the evaluation can also attempt to follow up with up to ten enrollees who did not complete the training or apprenticeship, or who did not remain in their job placement, in order to learn more about barriers within the current Com.Direitos approach. Finally, we hope to also conduct one focus group discussion with apprenticeship supervisors and one with post-apprenticeship employers (noting that, in the midterm, some of the supervisors did not know that the apprentices were CSEC survivors, so the members of these focus groups will be selected purposively to avoid outing survivors). We hope to also conduct interviews with up to five family members of traced girls who they themselves identify as in-the-know about both their survivorship status and about the impact of the apprenticeship for the girl and her family.

<i>Proposed sample (applicants should comment on this estimated sample size and suggest edits if appropriate):</i>		
Apprenticeship graduates/ongoing trainees	40	Individual interviews
Apprenticeship/life skills dropouts	10	Individual interviews
Apprenticeship supervisors	7	1 focus group discussion
Employment supervisors	7	1 focus group discussion
Family members	5	Individual interviews

Arm 3. The influence of educational training in schools is greatly of interest, specifically to (a) assess whether it raised students' awareness of CSEC and how they can prevent it and (b) its impact on reporting flows that come out of schools where training took place.

An estimated 6,000 students will have been reached by the trainings at the time of data collection. The implementing partner will provide data from a light-touch monitoring tool to approximate "pre" data that will support the additional "post" data collected by the external evaluator. Six months after these in school training sessions (*camujerês*) are implemented, the external evaluator will poll a subset of individual students about their retained learning from the session. The evaluator will work with the implementing partner to identify one or more primary outcomes that can be compared to the "pre" data.

Additionally, the implementing partner will provide anonymised monitoring data reflecting the status of the cases that were reported following the activity, including what type of referrals took place.

<i>Proposed sample (applicants should comment on this estimated sample size and suggest edits if appropriate):</i>		
Currently-untrained classrooms	~15	Monitoring data
Individual students	200	Quantitative questionnaire (six months after the training)

The implementing partner also provides training to teachers. We hope to use monitoring data on trainee engagement (for example, number of sessions attended) with the implementing partner's programming to assign schools and/or teachers to categories of low, moderate, or high engagement, then randomly select a small set of teachers from each of the three categories to complete in-depth interviews (totalling ~20 interviews). The analysis can then gauge, to some degree, whether there is an exposure-response relationship (that is, whether higher engagement with the training translates to better real-life use of the trained skills compared to lower engagement with the training). If meaningful, categorisable differences between teachers/schools cannot be established, the "comparison" group may then become teachers at the same schools who did not engage with the training, versus those who were trained and highly involved in the program.

Minimally engaged or disengaged teachers	6	In-depth interviews
Moderately engaged teachers	7	In-depth interviews
Highly engaged teachers	7	In-depth interviews

Arm 4. A similar approach as Arm 2 will be used with other service providers, such as healthcare workers, to determine the impact of the implementing partners' curricula on frontline workers' knowledge and practices. Participating frontline workers will be assigned to prespecified categories based on extent of engagement. Data will be gathered through in-depth interviews (totalling ~20 interviews) to develop an understanding of how engagement did or did not influence service providers in their real-life work.

Minimally engaged or disengaged frontline workers	6	In-depth interviews
Moderately engaged frontline workers	7	In-depth interviews
Highly engaged frontline workers	7	In-depth interviews

Arm 5. The endline evaluation will provide insight into whether the support provided by Childhood for the implementation of the protected listening law has improved coordination among services and the efficiency and/or efficacy of a unified flow and the use of appropriate protocols for integrated care of survivors of CSEC over time.

The main goal of the protected listening law is to prevent the revictimization of children. Its strategic approach involves restructuring the Child Rights Guarantee System, defining guidelines for integrated care for child victims or witnesses of all forms of violence, differentiating between Specialized Hearing (conducted by the service network) and Special Testimony (conducted by police or the courts) and formalizing the rules of Special Testimony. The aspiration is that application of this law will mark a turning point, whereby never again will children under care of the child protection network be subject to revictimization. The implementation of law is expected to solve problems such as: poor coordination among the protection network participants; absence of a unified workflow; poor coordination among the protection network participants with clear protocols for actions of network agencies, to avoid challenges, overlapping or bottlenecks, and thus ensure effective child protection; The manner in which testimony was taken from children caused revictimization and compromised integrity of the record, thereby rarely resulting in conviction of perpetrators.

First, the contracted evaluator will review the baseline service assessment, existing administrative data, flows, protocols, and other documents to generate a chronological narrative of the life of the funded project. The grant to Childhood has covered the Establishment of Municipal Joint Management Committee, Diagnosing the Network, Design of an integrated service workflow (which is essential for ensuring prompt protection for child victims or witnesses of violence and minimizing the risk of revictimization), and Development of Protocols to orient the actions of each component of the Child Rights Guarantee System, so that they understand not only the background but also the path forward for each child, tailored to the specifics of each case (understanding what actions to avoid and knowing the appropriate measures to take). We anticipate that

Childhood will have completed the protocol co-creation process by September 2024, so this arm will be the last rolled out for data collection. The evaluation will seek to learn: what proportion has implemented the flows and protocols six months after roll-out; how good is the fidelity to the flows and protocols; if the level of coordination among the protection network participants has improved and the commitment and capacity of the members of the Municipal Joint Management Committee to the implementation of the flows.

Where partners report that they have had instances to use the new protocols, we hope to interview staff on how this process has gone (e.g., deviations or unexpected wins); where real-world examples are sparse or where a partner has not successfully implemented the new protocols, we would like to ask interviewees to walk through practice case studies and gauge their knowledge of the newly established flow, how they would respond to an accidental gap or disruption in the flow, and what supports they would still need.

Flow/Protocol end-users	30	Case study practica and/or in-depth interviews
Implementing organisations	NA	Review data shared by participants
Municipal Joint Management Committee members	15	In-depth interviews

Arm 6. Adolescent program recipients will have the opportunity to provide—and interpret—data on the effectiveness of Com.Direitos. Focus group discussions, co-led if possible by trained adolescent peer researchers, will gauge adolescents' experiences of services (estimated sample of roughly 30 youths, mostly girls). The adolescent peer researchers will also work alongside senior researchers to review the data and findings from arm #1-5 above, and be involved in interviewing approximately 20 further adult staff and stakeholders about the perceived impact of Com.Direitos. Approximately seven such peer researchers will be nominated from across all grantee organisations that directly serve adolescents, using a matrix of selection criteria (age, gender, race, and lived experience) to generate a diverse Child Advisory Committee.

Adolescent peer researchers (i.e., the Child Advisory Committee)	7	Data collectors and data interpreters
Adolescents who used 1+ services	30	Focus group discussions
Adolescents from schools whose teachers received the curricula	20	Focus group discussions/interviews
Adult staff and stakeholders	20	Focus group discussions

The contracted evaluator will adapt an existing safeguarding protocol for engaging adolescents from this same population in participatory research. Protective measures

include that only the staff from the nominating organisation will advise on the lived experience status of the adolescents volunteering for selection (i.e., it will not be discussed with the adolescents); adolescents will be paid for their time; a series of age-appropriate trainings will be provided; supports for instances of retraumatisation will be available via an on-call counsellor; participating adolescents will co-determine the rules and responsibilities for their group. The participants will also only engage in data collection for the focus groups with adolescents who are not definitionally survivors of CSEC in order to protect those focus group participants (e.g., they would not participate in any focus groups with apprenticeship recipients).

In summary, the chosen evaluation team will be responsible for:

- 1) Developing a suitable methodology to answer the evaluation objectives outlined above. This should be presented as a detailed evaluation protocol which includes a sampling strategy, all relevant data collection tools, and a detailed overview of ethical considerations.
- 2) Preferably, obtaining suitable ethical approval from a recognised institution (with any related fees to be covered by the contracted partner);
- 3) Hiring and training all data collection staff;
- 4) Piloting all data collection tools, amending them as required;
- 5) Undertaking all data collection, including monitoring the quality of data and data collection, as well as providing compensation to research participants where necessary;
- 6) Undertaking data analysis of all collected data using appropriate methods of analysis;
- 7) Producing a written report as per a structure pre-agreed with the Freedom Fund. The report should include clear findings and recommendations for an agreed-upon list of stakeholders, including the Freedom Fund's local hotspot partners and the project donor.
- 8) Facilitating a validation workshop in Recife following the first draft report. It is expected that this will be co-developed with the Child Advisory Committee.

The Freedom Fund is particularly interested in working with teams that can demonstrate: (a) having members who are from the local communities where the evaluation will take place, (b) a gender-balanced enumeration team, if applicable, with at least half of the total staff being female, and (c) commitment to survivor-inclusive approaches. The team should also ideally have previous experience evaluating child protection or human trafficking programs, especially programs addressing CSEC, and prior experience designing and overseeing a child-participatory evaluation, particularly if this has been undertaken in Brazil.

Main deliverables and high-level timeline

The proposed schedule outlines the main deliverables:

Main deliverables	Proposed timeline
Draft evaluation protocols that outline the methodological strategies for each arm (including ethical considerations).	August 2024
Preferably, ethical approval from an appropriate ethical approval body, chosen in collaboration with the Freedom Fund	November 2024
Memo confirming that agreed early milestones for Arm 6 have been met	November 2024
Memo confirming start of data collection for Arms 1-4	January 2025
Memo confirming start of data collection for Arm 5	March 2025
Memo confirming all data collection is complete	June 2025
Draft report outlining the key findings and recommendations, based on a structure pre-agreed with the Freedom Fund, incorporating Freedom Fund and other reviewers' comments	July 2025
Validation workshop with the Freedom Fund and key partners in Recife to validate the findings of the evaluation.	July 2025
Final report submitted to the Freedom Fund.	Early September 2025

In addition to the main deliverables listed above, the evaluation team is also expected to discuss with the Freedom Fund any proposed design changes and share regular updates on the progress of field activities.

The evaluation team will be contracted by the Freedom Fund US and supervised by the Freedom Fund's Senior Research & Evaluation Manager based in the US. The Freedom Fund and other funders of the program anticipate working closely with the evaluation team through all stages of the project.

Budget

The Freedom Fund has budgeted approximately USD 130,000 for the evaluation.

Budgets will be reviewed with respect to the strength of the proposal in meeting the project objectives in a cost-effective manner; we do not simply prioritise the lowest budget.

As part of the proposal, please prepare a brief budget with the following breakdown:

- Personnel cost
- Other direct costs (e.g. training workshops, refreshments, reimbursements of participant costs/compensation for their time, computers & tablets, telecommunications)
- Overheads
- All applicable taxes related to provision of services (e.g. VAT or GST)

Proposal format

Interested parties should prepare a proposal of no more than 6 pages plus annexes. Proposals should contain the following sections:

1. **Short biography of project lead(s) and key team members**, outlining relevant subject matter expertise and prior experience leading similar evaluation projects. CV(s) of the project lead(s) should be included in the annex. Past report(s) from similar projects could be included as a link or in a separate annex.
2. **Methodology**, addressing the topics listed in the 'Evaluation methodology' section of this document.
3. **Team structure**, defining the role and time commitment of key project team members.
4. **High-level work plan** with timing of key project deliverables and proposed format of final report.
5. **Proposed budget** in USD.

The proposal must be written in English or Portuguese and sent electronically in Microsoft Office or PDF format.

Criteria for assessing proposals

In reviewing proposals, the Freedom Fund will use the following criteria:

Technical criteria

Weighting

a. Relevant knowledge of the evaluation team, including:	30%
- Proven experience undertaking evaluations on child protection, human trafficking, or human rights projects. Experience conducting evaluations of CSEC projects will be an added advantage.	
- Knowledge of the child rights movement in Brazil, including key civil society and governmental actors.	
- Familiarity with the situation of marginalised groups in urban settings in Brazil, especially the disparity between children of different genders, ethnicities, and sexual orientation.	
b. Technical capacity of the evaluation team, including:	40%
- Experience with program evaluations, with demonstrable experience conducting child-participatory evaluations.	
- Proven experience with conducting field research in the Northeast region of Brazil, preferably in RMA or in Pernambuco state.	
- Proven experience producing detailed research reports in English or Portuguese, with a strong focus on clearly representing qualitative findings.	
- Experience obtaining ethical approval for research studies/evaluations.	
c. Team structure, including:	20%
- Adequate staffing levels to deliver quality outputs within the desired timeframe.	
- Diversity among the team members, including enumerators.	
- Established infrastructure within Recife for collecting data.	
- Portuguese language skills. English skills would be an advantage.	
Financial criteria	
d. Consideration of all potential expenses.	10%
Total	100%

Proposal timeline and submission instructions

**By 1st July 2024
5pm Brazil Time**

Final proposals due.

Please submit all documents to Matilde Chora at
mchora@freedomfund.org

with "Proposal for Brazil Endline Evaluation" as the email subject line.

14 July 2024

All shortlisted evaluation teams will be notified.

ANNEX I

Overview of PEMS implementing partners' projects overview

The PEMS-funded program aims to reduce the prevalence of commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) in the municipalities of Recife and Olinda, in Pernambuco. The PEMS grant funds three civil society partners (Coletivo Mulher Vida, Childhood Brazil and Instituto Aliança) to implement various activities which align with the following program objectives:

1. Ensuring that government and civil society organisations are more coordinated in preventing CSEC, protecting victims, and deterring perpetrators.
2. Ensuring that children have access to information, victim-centred and trauma-informed support and livelihood opportunities from the child protection network of services to prevent and safely exit CSEC

To achieve these objectives, our civil society partners funded by the PEMS grant are currently engaging in multiple activities, described in the table below.

Objectives	Activities
Government and civil society organisations are more coordinated in preventing CSEC, protecting victims, and deterring perpetrators.	Network and train 30 government and civil society institutions to tackle TIP
	Support civil society and government for the development of a joint plan to tackle CSEC
	Support the development of a monitoring system for a joint plan to combat CSEC
Children have access to information, victim-centred and trauma-informed support and livelihood opportunities from the child protection network of services to prevent and safely exit CSEC	Train 100 staff of 20 comprehensive care services for survivors of CSEC on trauma-informed and victim-centred methodologies.
	Undertake training in 30 schools to educate 6,000 children to protect themselves and equip 300 teachers and technicians to identify, report, and refer children at risk of and victims of CSEC to services, and support them in the continuity of their education.
	Train 200 health workers of 20 health centres to identify, assist, report and refer children at risk of and victims of CSEC to services.
	Train 50 judicial staff and child protection network in the implementation of Law 13.431/17/ Decree 603/2018, on protected listening and integration of care for CSEC victims, using a victim-centred approach.
	Provide life and digital skills training and support to 120 children at-risk of and survivors of CSEC for recovery and socio-productive inclusion.
	Provide technical support to 20 services assisting 380 children at risk of and survivors of CSEC on providing victim-centred, trauma-informed care.
	Engage 20 businesses and public institutions to meet apprenticeship inclusion targets to include child survivors of CSEC referred by the child protection network.

ANNEX II

Overview of 'Com.Direitos' implementing partners' projects

The Freedom Fund's wider Com.Direitos program, which includes the activities under the PEMS grant, aims to build strong, effective partnerships with civil society to eradicate the commercial sexual exploitation of children in the Metropolitan Region of Recife. To achieve this goal, the following objectives were set for this wider, hotspot program:

1. Improve policies to confront CSEC and greater coordination among stakeholders to hold the government accountable for their implementation.
 2. Scientific knowledge about CSEC and survivors' voices informs policies and programmatic responses.
 3. Vulnerable children and survivors have more support, information and skills to protect themselves from and safely exit from CSEC.
 4. Social acceptance and demand for commercial sexual exploitation of children is decreased.
 5. Frontline organisations and survivor groups are strengthened to work together and improve their responses to CSEC.
-

The program covers a range of prevention and response activities, including:

1. Supporting the coordination and networking of key coalitions such as the Network for Tackling Sexual Violence against Children in Pernambuco.
2. Supporting the development of State and Municipal anti-CSEC plans and monitoring systems.
3. Training staff of child protection services in specialised comprehensive care for CSEC survivors.
4. Training teachers and health professionals to sensitise children on self-protection and to identify, report, and assist children at risk and victims of CSEC and refer them to the network of services.
5. Training law enforcement officials on tackling CSEC, including training on human rights of CSEC victims; updated provisions in the legislation regarding CSEC and human trafficking, and case studies of successful convictions; implementing joint workshops between civil society and law enforcement officials to develop joint action plans.

These activities are currently being implemented by ten civil society partners who receive funding from the Freedom Fund: Casa Menina Mulher, Cendhec, Centro das Mulheres do Cabo, Childhood, Coletivo Mulher Vida, Fundação Roberto Marinho, Grupo Adolescer, Grupo Ruas e Praças, Instituto Aliança and Universidade Católica de Pernambuco. We also work closely with local government and businesses to advocate for the systems changes needed to eradicate CSEC.