International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

Legal Compliance in Child-Centric NGOs: Enabling the Organisation to Protect the Child

Avani Malhotra

The Shri Ram School Moulsari

DOI: 10.46609/IJSSER.2026.v11i08.005 URL: https://doi.org/10.46609/IJSSER.2026.v11i08.005
Received: 29 July 2026 / Accepted: 11 August 2026 / Published: 16 August 2026

ABSTRACT

Child-centric non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in India operate at the intersection of healthcare, welfare, and child-protection law, yet their legal-compliance infrastructure remains fragmented and under-enforced (Srivastava "An Overview"). Existing scholarship on child rights highlights both the robustness of India's statutory framework, stretching from the Constitution and the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (JJ Act) to the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (POCSO), and the persistent gap between legal guarantees and on-the-ground implementation (BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms"). This paper argues that, for child-focused NGOs, legal compliance must be reframed from a bureaucratic burden into a preventive safeguarding architecture that structurally reduces the risk of institutional harm to children (Roy 438). Using a mixed doctrinal and case-based methodology, it analyses statutes, rules, and policy instruments alongside practice-informed insights from CanKids, a child-centric NGO, to propose a practical compliance framework that links child-rights obligations, organisational governance, and funding-linked due diligence (Srivastava "An Overview"; Manoharan 117–30). The paper's central contribution is the normative claim that rigorous, child-centred compliance enhances both programmatic integrity and long-term organisational sustainability, thereby aligning legal duty with mission-driven work (Bal Raksha Bharat, "Key Factors").

Keywords: Child protection; NGO governance; legal compliance; safeguarding; India; CanKids

1. Introduction

1.1 Child-Centric NGOs and the Indian Child Protection Landscape

Child-centric NGOs in India act as critical intermediaries between statutory child-protection systems and vulnerable children, delivering services ranging from health and education to psychosocial support and community mobilisation. In many contexts, especially where state

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

infrastructure is thin or unevenly distributed, children depend on NGO-mediated programmes as their primary access-point for care and protection (Srivastava "An Overview"). At the same time, this work unfolds within a dense regulatory environment shaped by constitutional provisions, international conventions, and specialised child-protection statutes.

India's child-rights framework is anchored in constitutional guarantees–such as Article 15(3), Article 39(e)–(f), and Article 21A–and international commitments under the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which are operationalised via the JJ Act, the POCSO Act, and the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (RTE Act). The National Policy for Children, 2012 further designates every person below the age of eighteen as a child and places the "best interests of the child" at the centre of decision-making (PIB, "National Policy"). Within this landscape, NGOs function as *quasi-state actors*: they implement child-centric programmes while also bearing statutory and voluntary obligations relating to registration, governance, and safeguarding (Srivastava "An Overview"; Roy 438).

1.2 Problem Statement: When Compliance Failures Harm Children

Weak or partial legal compliance in child-centric NGOs can enable safeguarding failures, rights violations, and institutional abuse that disproportionately affect already vulnerable children. Comparative assessments of child-protection systems in South Asia note that regulatory breaches often *precede* direct harm, creating latent risk pathways that only become visible after an incident occurs (BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms"). For example, gaps in staff vetting, weak or absent mandatory-reporting protocols under POCSO, and informal work-arounds in child-protection policies can all undermine the very mechanisms designed to prevent abuse (Srivastava "An Overview"; ComplyKaro, "POCSO Act").

Moreover, where compliance is treated as a purely administrative formality, NGOs may retain formal licences to operate while remaining structurally exposed to reputational damage, funding withdrawal, and legal sanctions when safeguarding lapses surface (Rai; Bal Raksha Bharat, "Key Factors"). This misalignment between legal form and substantive child-protection practice signals a broader governance failure: norms that exist on paper are not consistently internalised as organisational behaviour or organisational culture (Roy 438). This paper contends that revisiting compliance as a *preventive* architecture–not merely a reactive or administrative requirement–is essential to protect both children and the organisations that serve them.

1.3 Research Questions

The primary research question is:

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

- How can legal compliance be re-imagined and operationalised as a preventive safeguarding architecture within child-centric NGOs in India to better protect both children and the organisations themselves?

Supporting sub-questions include:

- What are the core legal and regulatory obligations imposed by child-protection statutes, organisational-governance regimes, and donor-linked frameworks on child-centric NGOs?
- How do current patterns of non-compliance and informal work-arounds create specific risk pathways leading to child harm or institutional abuse?
- What institutional-governance and safeguarding-infrastructure arrangements enhance consistent compliance and child-centred practice, drawing on a case-based example (CanKids) and broader NGO-sector literature?
- To what extent can a tiered, scalable compliance framework be designed that is feasible for small and growing NGOs while remaining aligned with child-rights obligations?

1.4 Methodology, Sources, and Scope

This paper adopts a mixed doctrinal and case-based methodology. Doctrinal analysis focuses on statutes, sub-legislative instruments, national-level policy documents, and international instruments that shape child-centric NGO operations in India.. These include the JJ Act, the POCSO Act, the RTE Act, the National Policy for Children, 2012, and sources on child-centred social work and restorative practices.

The case-based dimension draws on CanKids as a practice-informed example of a child-centric NGO working in childhood-cancer care, allowing the paper to illustrate how doctrinal norms translate into internal governance structures, safeguarding policies, and compliance mechanisms. Ethical safeguards–such as anonymisation of sensitive data and, where applicable, informed-consent protocols for interviews or document-sharing–will be outlined in the methodology section and appendix.

Secondary sources include peer-reviewed journal articles on child-rights implementation gaps, institutional-mechanisms reviews, and socio-legal analyses of community-level child-friendly governance, as well as NGO-sector guidance on trustworthy child-protection organisations and compliance-oriented practice notes on the POCSO Act. The paper's scope is limited to India-based, child-centric NGOs engaged in health, protection, and welfare services; it does not

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

extend to stand-alone corporate-CSR implementers or schools that are not directly linked to NGO-managed child-protection programmes.

1.5 Structure of the Paper

Sections 2–9 proceed as follows: Section 2 develops a conceptual framework linking legal compliance to child-rights and safeguarding; Section 3 maps the substantive legal and regulatory framework governing child-centric NGOs; Section 4 analyses compliance gaps and risk pathways; Section 5 examines internal governance and safeguarding infrastructure; Section 6 applies these insights to a case-based analysis of CanKids; Section 7 reframes compliance as a child-protection tool; Section 8 proposes a practical compliance framework; and Section 9 consolidates findings and recommendations for NGOs, regulators, and donors.

2. Conceptual Framework: Legal Compliance as a Safeguarding Mechanism

2.1 Defining Legal and Regulatory Compliance in Child-Centric NGOs

Legal and regulatory compliance in NGOs is often reduced to licensing, registration, and periodic reporting; however, for child-centric organisations, compliance must be understood more expansively as a set of ongoing organisational behaviours and governance practices. This includes adherence to statutory obligations–for example, POCSO reporting duties and JJ-Act-related institutional safeguards–as well as internalisation of child-protection policies, monitoring of staff and partner conduct, and continuous risk-assessment (Srivastava "An Overview"; ComplyKaro, "POCSO Act").

In this sense, compliance is less a one-time "approval" and more a governance culture that shapes how decisions are made, how risks are assessed, and how child-centred values are embedded in daily operations (Roy 438; Manoharan 117–30). From a child-rights perspective, compliance becomes a mechanism through which the NGO's mission is legally and ethically operationalised: policies, procedures, and accountability structures turn abstract rights into concrete, enforceable expectations (Srivastava "An Overview"; BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms").

2.2 Child Rights, Duty of Care, and Preventive Protection

Domestically and internationally, child-rights frameworks emphasise that children are not merely beneficiaries of services but bearers of specific, enforceable rights (Srivastava "An Overview"; PIB, "National Policy"). In India, constitutional provisions such as the right to education, protection from hazardous employment, and protection from exploitation underpin specialised laws like the JJ Act and POCSO, which together define the child's right to life, health,

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

protection, and participation. The National Policy for Children, 2012 further embeds the principle of the "best interests of the child" in all actions and decisions affecting children (PIB, "National Policy").

For child-centric NGOs, these instruments translate into a duty of care: an obligation to ensure that programmes do not expose children to avoidable harm and that safeguarding measures are in place wherever risks are foreseeable (ComplyKaro, "POCSO Act"). This duty is not limited to protecting children from external threats; it extends to the NGO's internal environment, including staff, volunteers, and partners (Manoharan 117–30; BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms"). A preventive approach to protection conceptualises compliance as a continuous process of identifying, mitigating, and monitoring risks–rather than waiting for harm to materialise before responding.

2.3 Compliance, Accountability, and Organisational Sustainability

Organisational sustainability for child-centric NGOs depends on programme outcomes, public trust, legal legitimacy, and donor confidence, all of which are shaped by compliance (Bal Raksha Bharat, "Key Factors"). Systematic failures to meet regulatory and safeguarding obligations–for example, untimely reporting, inadequate staff vetting, or opaque financial disclosures–can trigger sanctions, deregistration, funding withdrawal, and reputational damage, undermining the NGO's ability to deliver services (Srivastava "An Overview").

In this sense, compliance is not antithetical to mission-driven work; it is a precondition for the organisation's legitimacy and long-term survival (Srivastava "An Overview"; Manoharan 117–30). However, when compliance is perceived as a bureaucracy-driven "tick-box" exercise, it can generate cynicism among practitioners who view it as divorced from real-world impact (Rai; BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms"). The challenge lies in aligning compliance requirements with child-centred practice so that accountability mechanisms–such as internal reporting channels, grievance committees, and data-protection protocols–are perceived as protective tools rather than administrative burdens.

3. Legal and Regulatory Framework Governing Child-Centric NGOs

3.1 Child Protection and Safeguarding Laws

The primary statutes governing child protection in India include the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 and the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 (JJ Act; POCSO Act). The JJ Act consolidates mechanisms for children in need of care and protection, including those in institutional settings, and imposes specific obligations on institutions relating to registration, monitoring, and reporting of violations (Srivastava "An

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

Overview"). Although the POCSO Act creates a comprehensive statutory framework, its effectiveness within NGOs depends heavily on organisational reporting cultures and staff awareness. Consequently, legal obligations alone cannot guarantee child protection unless they are embedded within institutional practice.

For NGOs, these acts create both direct and indirect obligations: direct obligations when they operate or run child-care institutions, shelters, or care-centres, and indirect obligations when staff, volunteers, or beneficiaries fall within the ambit of reporting or prevention duties (Srivastava "An Overview"; BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms"). Guidance notes and practice-oriented summaries of the POCSO Act stress the need for organisations to adopt internal reporting mechanisms, conduct training for staff and volunteers, and ensure that infrastructure and procedures minimise the risk of abuse (ComplyKaro, "POCSO Act"; Bal Raksha Bharat, "Key Factors").

3.2 Organisational Registration and Governance Law

Child-centric NGOs in India typically operate either as societies under the Societies Registration Act, as trusts, or as Section-8 companies under the Companies Act, 2013. Each of these forms imposes distinct governance and compliance obligations, including requirements for registration, maintenance of accounts, filing of annual returns, and responsibilities of trustees, directors, or managing committees. In practice, however, many NGOs struggle with board-level engagement, leading to weak oversight and inconsistent implementation of safeguarding standards (Rai; BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms").

3.3 Labour, Employment, and Volunteer Regulation

Labour and employment compliance is a critical but often under-prioritised aspect of legal-risk management for child-centric NGOs. Minimum-wage laws, social-security mandates, and workplace-safety regulations apply to NGO employees, and selective non-compliance can create liability even where the NGO's primary mission is social-welfare-oriented (Srivastava "An Overview"). For child-centric organisations, the stakes are higher: the presence of inadequately vetted staff or volunteers can create direct safeguarding risks for children (ComplyKaro, "POCSO Act").

The POCSO Act and NGO-sector guidance both emphasise the importance of background checks, verified credentials, and safe-recruitment practices as part of institutional safeguarding. Many NGOs are advised to adopt vetting protocols, reference-checks, and, where applicable, police verification for staff and volunteers who work in close proximity to children (Manoharan 117–30; BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms"). These practices translate into specific compliance obligations, even if they are not always codified in a single statute, because failure to

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

take “reasonable steps” to prevent abuse can weaken the organisation’s legal defence and public credibility (Srivastava “An Overview”; ComplyKaro, “POCSO Act”).

3.4 Data Protection, Confidentiality, and Consent

Handling of children’s health, personal, and programmatic data raises distinct legal and ethical issues. India’s Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (or equivalent framework) applies to NGOs that process personal data, with special caution required when data relates to children, particularly in health-related contexts (Srivastava “An Overview”). Child-protection frameworks generally require that information about children be treated as confidential, disclosed only on a need-to-know basis, and stored securely to prevent misuse or unauthorised access.

In addition, consent and assent mechanisms must respect the child’s evolving capacity and the role of guardians. NGOs collecting photographs, medical records, or case-study-type information are expected to obtain informed consent from parents or guardians and, where appropriate, child assent, ensuring that children understand, in age-appropriate language, how their data will be used (Manoharan 119–21). Non-compliance in this area can lead not only to reputational damage but also to violations of privacy-related rights and, in some cases, breaches of donor- or sponsor-imposed contractual obligations.

Child-centric NGOs are therefore encouraged to adopt written data-protection policies that specify retention periods, access controls, and secure disposal procedures, as well as to train staff on confidentiality and the sensitive nature of child-related information (Manoharan 124–26; ComplyKaro, “POCSO Act”). Where digital storage is involved, NGOs should align with national-level data-protection frameworks to minimise the risk of unauthorised access, leaks, or misuse of child-sensitive data (Srivastava “An Overview”).

3.5 Donor, CSR, and Funding-Linked Compliance

The funding ecosystem in India–especially Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) mandates under the Companies Act, 2013 and regulations governing foreign contributions (e.g., FCRA, where applicable)–imposes additional layers of compliance on NGOs (Srivastava “An Overview”). Donors and CSR-mandated companies increasingly require NGOs to demonstrate legal registration, clean financials, and robust child-protection and safeguarding practices as part of their due-diligence process (Bal Raksha Bharat, “Key Factors”; “Why Bal Raksha Bharat”). For child-centric organisations, this means that failure to meet safeguarding standards can directly affect eligibility for grants or partnerships.

Donor-linked compliance typically includes: submission of audited accounts, periodic progress reports, evidence of child-protection policies, and adherence to non-discrimination and inclusion

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

criteria (Bal Raksha Bharat, "Key Factors"). NGOs that systematically align their internal compliance architecture with donor-monitoring expectations are more likely to retain long-term funding relationships and to build institutional credibility beyond the statutory minimum (Srivastava "An Overview"; Roy 438).

4. Compliance Gaps and Risk Pathways

4.1 Patterns of Non-Compliance in Child-Centric NGOs

Existing assessments of child-protection systems in South Asia note that compliance failures in child-centric NGOs often stem from structural resource constraints, understaffed governance bodies, and a lack of clarity about which norms are binding versus aspirational. Many organisations adopt formal child-protection policies but fail to embed them into day-to-day operations, training, or supervision routines, leaving safeguards under-implemented.

Informal practices–such as ad hoc staff recruitment, reliance on unpaid volunteers without background checks, and patchy documentation of incidents–often replace formal safeguarding mechanisms, especially in smaller or under-resourced NGOs (Rai; Srivastava "An Overview"). In such settings, the absence of a dedicated compliance or safeguarding cell, combined with weak board-level oversight, permits non-compliance to persist without immediate institutional consequences (BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms").

4.2 Risk Pathways Leading to Child Harm

Where compliance failures concentrate around staffing, vetting, and reporting, they create clear risk pathways to child harm. For example, failure to conduct background checks on staff or volunteers who work directly with children increases the likelihood that individuals with prior misconduct or predatory behaviour may access child-centric spaces (ComplyKaro, "POCSO Act"; Manoharan 119–21). Weak or absent internal reporting mechanisms can then delay or prevent the detection of harmful behaviour, allowing patterns of abuse or neglect to continue undetected.

Another risk pathway arises where data-protection and confidentiality norms are not operationalised: photographs, case histories, or medical records may be shared without proper consent or security, leading to stigmatisation, re-traumatisation, or secondary exploitation of children. Because these risks are often latent, they may only become visible in the aftermath of a specific incident, reinforcing the argument that preventive compliance–not merely post-incident reporting–is essential for child-centred work (Rai; Srivastava "An Overview").

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

4.3 Legal, Reputational, and Operational Consequences

Legal sanctions for non-compliance can range from fines and de-registration under the Societies Registration Act or Companies Act to prosecution under the POCSO Act or the JJ Act where institutional failures facilitate abuse (Srivastava "An Overview"; ComplyKaro, "POCSO Act"). NGOs that breach labour-related obligations–such as failure to pay minimum wages or maintain workplace safety–may also face liability even if their primary mandate is social-welfare-oriented.

Beyond formal sanctions, reputational damage can be severe. Cases of institutional abuse or safeguarding failures are often amplified through media and NGO-advocacy channels, leading to withdrawal of donor support, loss of public trust, and internal organisational instability (Bal Raksha Bharat, "Why Bal Raksha Bharat"). In practice, this undermines the very child-centric missions NGOs seek to pursue, demonstrating that compliance is not a peripheral administrative chore but a core dimension of organisational durability and ethical integrity (Manoharan 127–29; Srivastava "An Overview").

5. Internal Governance Systems and Safeguarding Infrastructure

5.1 Policies and Standard Operating Procedures

Robust internal governance begins with written policies and standard operating procedures (SOPs) that translate legal obligations into concrete, operational steps. Child-centric NGOs are expected to adopt child-protection and safeguarding policies, complaint-redress mechanisms, data-protection protocols, and safe-recruitment SOPs. These documents are crucial because they provide a reference point for staff, volunteers, and managers when faced with ambiguous or high-risk situations involving children.

Policy documents should be periodically reviewed and updated to reflect changes in law, practice, or organisational structure (Manoharan 126–27). In practice, NGOs that systematically circulate, train on, and reference these policies in day-to-day decision-making are more likely to internalise compliance as a routine rather than an ad hoc response (Rai; BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms").

5.2 Boards, Oversight, and Compliance Responsibility

The role of boards, trustees, or managing committees is central to ensuring that legal compliance functions as a safeguarding architecture. Trustees and directors bear fiduciary duties to ensure that the NGO operates lawfully and in the best interests of its beneficiaries, including children. This includes approving safeguarding policies, monitoring their implementation, and ensuring

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

that adequate resources are allocated to compliance-related functions such as training, background checks, and reporting mechanisms (Bal Raksha Bharat, "Key Factors").

In many NGOs, however, board-level engagement on safeguarding remains minimal, with attention focused more on financials and high-level strategy than on day-to-day child-protection practices (BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms"). Establishing compliance or safeguarding committees, assigning clear compliance responsibilities to individual board members, and requiring periodic reporting on safeguarding incidents or near-misses can help bridge this gap (Manoharan 127–29).

5.3 Training, Reporting, and Institutional Culture

Training and internal-reporting mechanisms are the operational backbone of any compliance-as-safeguarding architecture. Child-centric NGOs are advised to conduct regular safeguarding and protection-related training for staff, board members, and volunteers, particularly those who work directly with children or handle sensitive information (ComplyKaro, "POCSO Act"). Training should cover mandatory-reporting obligations under the POCSO Act, how to recognise signs of abuse or neglect, and procedures for escalating concerns internally before involving external authorities where required (BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms").

Internal-reporting channels–such as anonymous grievance boxes, confidential helplines, or designated safeguarding officers–enable early detection and remediation of problems before they escalate into serious harm (Manoharan 125–27). Where these mechanisms are embedded in an organisational culture that encourages speaking up and protects whistleblowers, NGOs are more likely to maintain a proactive, child-centred compliance posture.

6. Case-Based Analysis: CanKids as a Practice-Informed Example

6.1 Methodological Justification and Ethical Safeguards

CanKids is selected as the case organisation because it sits at the intersection of child health, child rights, and NGO-led service delivery, making it a rich site to examine "compliance as preventive safeguarding" in practice. It is a childhood-cancer focused NGO that provides holistic, longitudinal support to children and families from diagnosis through treatment, survivorship, and in some instances palliative care, explicitly framing its work in terms of children's rights to health, education, childhood, participation, and dignified end-of-life care.

Operationally, CanKids works with 141 cancer centres across 57 cities and 22 States/UTs and runs 17 "Home Away From Home" residential care facilities, which creates multiple points of

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

interface between children and a wide ecosystem of adults, including staff, volunteers, interns, partner-hospital personnel, vendors, and visitors. Children with cancer are formally identified as the organisation's primary stakeholders, and the organisation acknowledges heightened safeguarding and protection risks in this context, which makes it directly relevant for a child-protection focused analysis.

The case study is practice-informed rather than a full-scale ethnography: it is grounded in an internship/collaborative engagement that allowed access to internal policy documents, governance and compliance materials, and structured discussions with senior personnel, rather than immersive participant observation or systematic shadowing of frontline workers. Organisational correspondence, internal policy review exercises, and shared governance documents constitute the primary data; individual case files and clinical records of children were deliberately excluded to avoid entering the terrain of medical or psychosocial ethnography and to keep the focus on organisational systems.

Ethically, the study relies on secondary organisational data and policy artefacts rather than primary narratives from children, and therefore adopts anonymisation at the level of individuals and specific incidents. CanKids already uses written consent forms for stories, photographs, and personal information, and beneficiaries retain the right to withdraw consent or request deletion/anonymisation; this case study aligns with those safeguards by not re-using identifiable child-level material and by treating all examples at an abstracted, de-identified level. Staff handling patient information are bound by confidentiality obligations that extend beyond the end of employment, and the research respects these boundaries by confining analysis to documents and discussions that are explicitly shared for governance and compliance review.

6.2 Governance and Organisational Structure

CanKids operates as a registered Society governed through a Memorandum of Association, placing it within the familiar Indian NGO legal form that combines member-based governance with charitable objectives. Its apex decision-making body is a Governing Board of 10 members that meets at least quarterly, with key office-bearer roles including a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Treasurer, Secretary, and Joint Secretary, signalling a relatively formalised governance architecture.

Below the board, management and programme leadership are supported by committee-based structures, the most salient for this study being the Child Protection Committee, which is mandated to oversee safeguarding design, implementation, and case-handling. The Committee's composition is notable: a CXO-level member, a Lead Specialist (Gender Justice), two regional

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

representatives, and one external child-rights specialist, which embeds both internal authority and external expertise into the safeguarding governance chain.

Formally documented policies are unusually extensive for an Indian NGO of this size and scope, and include a Child Protection Policy (2023), a Whistle-Blower Policy (2025), a Conduct and Confidentiality Code, consent and data-use forms, and Equal Opportunity / Non-Discrimination principles in HR. This clustering of policies around conduct, reporting, consent, and non-discrimination suggests that safeguarding is not treated as a single stand-alone document but as a cross-cutting governance theme anchored in multiple instruments.

6.3 Existing Compliance and Safeguarding Architecture

The Child Protection Policy is the strongest expression of CanKids' safeguarding architecture, applying not only to employees but also to volunteers, interns, consultants, board members, vendors, suppliers, visitors, and partner organisations. The policy articulates a zero-tolerance stance toward child abuse and exploitation, organised around a Prevent–Report–Respond triad, and embeds requirements for safeguarding induction, ongoing staff training, partner orientations, and the dissemination of child-protection materials.

Compliance is also integrated into HR and recruitment: child-protection obligations are built into recruitment processes, with staff required to acknowledge and sign the policy, and these signed declarations are retained in personnel files as proof of awareness and acceptance of safeguarding responsibilities. Reporting mechanisms are intentionally layered: suspected child-protection concerns must be reported within 24 hours through channels that include supervisors, HR, and the Child Protection Committee, while a separate Whistle-Blower framework offers email, hotline, confidential drop-box, and direct reporting options for a broader range of grievances.

The Whistle-Blower Policy specifies procedural timelines—acknowledgement of complaints within 5 business days, and an investigation target of 45 business days—with an annual report to the Board, which demonstrates an attempt to make accountability time-bound and trackable. Data-protection measures cover confidentiality obligations for staff, donors, patients, and families, restrictions on disclosure, password protection, and safeguards for both paper and electronic records, with confidentiality obligations continuing after the end of employment, underscoring a life-cycle approach to sensitive information.

At the same time, visible gaps remain: there is no documentary evidence of systematic background-check procedures, safeguarding audit tools, incident-reporting templates, training attendance records, or compliance metrics such as key performance indicators or monitoring dashboards. The architecture is therefore strong in normative commitments, committee

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

structures, and reporting channels, but thinner in evidence of routine monitoring, independent verification, and measurable indicators of safeguarding effectiveness.

6.4 Operational Challenges and Adaptive Compliance

The scale and spread of operations create intrinsic implementation challenges: working across 141 cancer centres in 57 cities and 22 States/UTs and running 17 residential care facilities means that safeguarding norms must be communicated, interpreted, and enacted by diverse staff and partners in heterogeneous institutional cultures. This dispersion drives monitoring difficulties (how to know what is happening in distant sites), training burdens (how to keep induction and refresher trainings current), and consistency challenges (how to avoid drift or dilution of standards as policies move away from headquarters).

Regulatory and procedural complexity adds another layer: as a health-linked child-rights organisation, CanKids likely navigates child-protection laws, labour and HR regulations, NGO registration and reporting requirements, donor compliance clauses, and health-data confidentiality expectations simultaneously. The existence of distinct policies on child protection, whistle-blowing, consent, confidentiality, and equal opportunity suggests that the organisation is stitching together overlapping compliance regimes into a workable internal system, rather than treating safeguarding as a single-law issue.

Resource constraints surface indirectly: the Whistle-Blower Policy explicitly notes that investigations may exceed the 45-day target in complex cases or where there are “resource limitations”, indicating that staffing, time, or specialist expertise may not always match the normative ambition of the policy. In practice, this appears to generate a prioritisation sequence where child protection is placed first (through a dedicated Child Protection Committee and mandatory 24-hour reporting), reporting systems come second (multiple channels and set timelines), and governance oversight comes third (annual reporting to the Board), with less emphasis on continuous independent monitoring or field-level audits.

These constraints foster informal work-arounds and dependencies that carry risk: there is heavy reliance on HR to drive safeguarding implementation, on staff and volunteers to self-report concerns, and on partner organisations (particularly hospitals and care centres) to align with CanKids’ standards across multiple locations. The limited evidence of independent monitoring or systematic compliance metrics means that the system is vulnerable to under-reporting, variable local practices, and potential blind spots in high-risk environments such as residential facilities, even as the formal architecture appears robust on paper.

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

6.5 Drawn-Out Lessons for the Broader NGO Sector

Several elements of CanKids' approach are readily transferable to other child-centric NGOs. First, the creation of a dedicated Child Protection Committee with both internal leadership and an external child-rights specialist demonstrates that safeguarding can be elevated beyond HR and given a distinct, multi-perspective governance locus. Second, safeguarding is explicitly taken to the Board level through annual reporting and Board Executive Committee review of child-protection matters, signalling that protection is a core governance responsibility rather than a purely operational concern.

Third, the use of mandatory reporting deadlines—24 hours for child-protection concerns, 5 business days for complaint acknowledgement, and 45 business days as an investigation target—operationalises accountability in time-bound terms that can be tracked and questioned. Fourth, multiple reporting channels (email, hotline, confidential drop box, and direct reporting) and formal consent procedures for stories, photographs, and data use together lower the threshold for raising concerns and help protect children and families in contexts where power imbalances and fear of retaliation are real.

Fifth, integrating safeguarding into recruitment through signed declarations embeds protection norms at the point of entry, making child protection part of the implicit "psychological contract" between the organisation and its staff and volunteers. However, some features depend on CanKids' scale and resource base: smaller NGOs may not be able to engage external child-rights experts, rural or grassroots organisations may lack formal HR departments, shelter homes may require more intensive on-site monitoring, and education-focused NGOs may need classroom-specific safeguarding measures that differ from healthcare settings.

In relation to the broader argument of this research, CanKids' experience shows that "compliance as preventive safeguarding" is feasible: a medium-sized NGO can, in fact, put in place dedicated policies, committees, reporting timelines, and consent mechanisms that move beyond minimalist legal compliance. At the same time, the documented gaps in background checks, monitoring tools, training records, and safeguarding KPIs reveal the fragility of such systems when they rely heavily on paper-based policies, self-reporting, and overstretched human resources, especially across a geographically dispersed footprint.

7. Reframing Compliance as a Child-Protection Tool

7.1 Why Compliance Is Perceived as Bureaucratic

Legal compliance in the NGO sector is often perceived as a bureaucratic burden because statutory requirements are presented as technical, paperwork-heavy tasks rather than as integral

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

components of child-centred practice. Many practitioners view registration, reporting, and policy-drafting as "compliance work" that diverts attention and resources away from direct service delivery, especially when guidelines are fragmented or poorly explained (BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms").

This perception is reinforced when regulatory frameworks emphasise punitive consequences–fines, de-registration, or prosecution–without offering clear, positive guidance on how compliance can enhance programme quality and child safety. In such settings, compliance is experienced as a top-down control tool rather than a bottom-up safeguarding architecture that supports the NGO's mission.

7.2 Compliance as Preventive Safeguarding

The paper argues that, for child-centric NGOs, compliance can and should be re-imagined as preventive safeguarding–a structured effort to reduce the likelihood of harm before it occurs. Preventive safeguarding focuses on three core elements: risk-identification (e.g., mapping points where staff-child interactions are unsupervised), risk-mitigation (e.g., vetting, supervision, and reporting mechanisms), and continuous monitoring (e.g., periodic audits and refresher training) (Manoharan 119–23; BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms").

In this framework, legal obligations–such as mandatory reporting under POCSO or child-protection-policy requirements under the JJ Act–are not ends in themselves but instruments that shape safer organisational practices (Srivastava "An Overview"; ComplyKaro, "POCSO Act"). When NGOs systematically operationalise these obligations through internal structures and culture, compliance becomes a visible, everyday practice rather than a periodic, paper-based exercise.

7.3 Integrating Legal Responsibility with Mission Delivery

Far from undermining mission-driven work, rigorous compliance can strengthen child-centred service delivery by fostering trust, transparency, and accountability (Manoharan 127–29; Bal Raksha Bharat, "Key Factors"). When children and families know that the NGO has robust safeguarding and complaint-redress mechanisms, they are more likely to engage openly with programmes, share sensitive information, and seek support when needed (BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms").

At the same time, integrating legal responsibility with mission delivery requires more than a checklist: it requires embedding compliance-oriented behaviours into programme design, supervision, and evaluation processes. For example, CanKids-style NGOs can incorporate safeguarding-related indicators into project evaluations and staff-performance assessments,

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

aligning legal-compliance expectations with programme-quality benchmarks (Manoharan 124–27). This integration ensures that compliance is not treated as a standalone "legal" function but as an integral part of child-centred practice.

8. A Practical Compliance Framework for Child-Centric NGOs

8.1 Core Non-Negotiable Safeguarding Standards

Based on the doctrinal and case-based analysis, this section proposes a set of core non-negotiable safeguarding standards that child-centric NGOs in India must treat as minimum compliance requirements, regardless of size or funding level. These standards are intended to translate child-rights obligations into concrete, enforceable organisational practices rather than abstract aspirational commitments.

1. Written child-protection and safeguarding policy
    - A clear, board-approved policy that defines child abuse, neglect, and exploitation in plain language.
    - Provisions specifying unacceptable behaviours by staff, volunteers, and partners.
    - Explicit procedures for internal reporting, escalation, and linkage to statutory reporting under the POCSO Act and the JJ Act (ComplyKaro, "POCSO Act").
2. Mandatory-reporting protocols
    - Standard operating procedures (SOPs) for staff and volunteers on how to recognise, document, and report incidents or suspicions of abuse, in line with child-friendly procedures and timelines specified under the POCSO Act and JJ Act frameworks (ComplyKaro, "POCSO Act"; BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms").
    - Clear guidance on when and how to involve external agencies (police, child welfare committees, or special courts) without compromising child safety or confidentiality.
3. Safe recruitment and background checks
    - Vetting of all staff and volunteers who have direct or frequent contact with children, including criminal-record checks where feasible, reference-verification, and verification of credentials.

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

- A written recruitment policy that explicitly excludes individuals with a history of child-related misconduct from working with children, and provisions for periodic re-verification or re-vetting in high-risk roles.

4. Data-protection, confidentiality, and consent

    - A child-specific data-protection and confidentiality policy aligned with national-level data-protection frameworks, specifying how children's health, personal, and programmatic data are collected, stored, accessed, shared, and destroyed.

    - Standardised procedures for obtaining informed consent from parents or guardians and, where appropriate, age-appropriate child assent, including documentation and periodic review of consent.

5. Complaint-redress and grievance mechanisms for children and caregivers

    - Child-friendly and accessible grievance-redress mechanisms (e.g., written complaint forms, phone- or helpline-based systems, and anonymous channels) clearly explained to children, families, and staff.

    - Defined timelines for acknowledging and responding to complaints, with clear escalation pathways and protection for whistleblowers or reporting children.

6. Board-level safeguarding accountability

    - Formal assignment of safeguarding oversight to the board or governing body, including approval of safeguarding policies, review of incidents, and monitoring of compliance.

    - Periodic reporting on safeguarding-related incidents, near-misses, and compliance-related challenges at board meetings, ensuring that safeguarding remains a strategic priority rather than a technical add-on.

8.2 Scalable Compliance Models

Recognising that not all child-centric NGOs have the same level of human-resource and technical capacity, this section proposes a tiered, scalable compliance model that can be adapted by small and growing organisations.

Tier 1: Minimum-viable safeguarding architecture (for very small or resource-constrained NGOs)

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

Even NGOs with limited staff and volunteers should implement a minimum-viable safeguarding architecture comprising:

- A basic safeguarding policy and reporting SOP, laminated and displayed in common areas.
- A simple, written safe-recruitment checklist for key staff working directly with children (e.g., one-page form capturing identity verification, reference-check, and statement of no-prior-child-abuse-related convictions).
- At least one designated safeguarding focal person who receives basic training on recognising and reporting abuse.

Tier 2: Intermediate-level compliance (for mid-sized or growing NGOs)
NGOs operating across multiple locations or with larger teams should build on Tier 1 by:

- Establishing a safeguarding or compliance cell with clear roles and responsibilities.
- Implementing formal training modules for staff and volunteers on child-protection, data-protection, and mandatory-reporting obligations, updated at least annually.
- Conducting periodic internal audits or "safeguarding-health-checks" to review compliance gaps and incident-reporting patterns (BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms").

Tier 3: Advanced-level compliance (for larger or institutional-level NGOs)
Large NGOs, such as those operating in specialised health-care contexts like CanKids, should adopt advanced-level compliance features, including:

- Segregated safeguarding and data-protection teams, with cross-functional linkages to programme, HR, and finance units.
- Regular external audits or third-party evaluations of safeguarding systems, results of which are reported to the board and, where appropriate, shared with key donors.
- Integration of safeguarding-related indicators into project evaluations and staff-performance assessments, aligning compliance expectations with programmatic outcomes.

The tiered model is designed to be proportionate rather than permissive: smaller NGOs may operate at Tier 1, but they must still meet the core non-negotiable standards; as an NGO grows in

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

scale or complexity, it is expected to move toward Tier 2 or Tier 3 without regressing on core safeguards.

8.3 Building Legal Capacity and Institutional Memory

In addition to written policies and tiered structures, the long-term effectiveness of a compliance architecture depends on legal capacity and institutional memory within the NGO.

Training and capacity-building

- Regular, scenario-based training for staff, volunteers, and board members on child-rights law, mandatory-reporting obligations, data-protection, and safe-recruitment practices.
- Training must be differentiated by role: frontline staff require practical, case-based guidance, while board members receive more strategic-level briefings on legal-risk management and safeguarding-oversight responsibilities (BetterCare Network, “Institutional Mechanisms”).

Documentation and institutional memory

- Comprehensive documentation of incidents, complaints, and near-misses in a centralised, secure register, ensuring that lessons from past events inform future policy-design and risk-mitigation strategies.
- Standard templates for safeguarding-related documentation (e.g., incident-reporting forms, consent-forms, and training-attendance records) that are periodically reviewed and updated.

External legal support and partnerships

- Partnerships with legal-aid organisations, such as those operating under the NALSA Child-Friendly Legal Services for Children Scheme, 2024, can help NGOs navigate complex legal-procedural requirements, particularly in cases involving POCSO-related reporting or child-protection legal-interventions (NALSA, “Child-Friendly Legal Services”).
- Retaining external legal counsel or pro-bono legal partnerships can enhance the NGO’s capacity to interpret and implement evolving statutory and policy-level requirements without over-burdening internal staff.

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

Together, these elements–core standards, scalable models, and capacity-building–constitute a practical compliance framework that aligns legal obligations with child-centred practice, thereby protecting both children and the organisations that serve them.

9. Conclusion and Recommendations

9.1 Key Findings

The analysis in this paper demonstrates that legal compliance in child-centric NGOs should not be treated as a neutral, administrative exercise but as a preventive safeguarding architecture that reduces the likelihood of institutional harm to children. Existing child-rights and child-protection frameworks in India provide a robust statutory foundation–the JJ Act, the POCSO Act, and the National Policy for Children, 2012–yet implementation gaps persist across organisational-governance and safeguarding practices (Srivastava "An Overview"; BetterCare Network, "Institutional Mechanisms").

Case-based evidence, including the experience of CanKids, illustrates that NGOs can operationalise compliance through written policies, safe-recruitment practices, internal reporting mechanisms, and board-level safeguarding oversight. At the same time, resource-constraints and regulatory-complexity create persistent challenges, underscoring the need for tiered, scalable compliance models that are proportionate to an NGO's size and mandate (Rai; Srivastava "An Overview").

9.2 Recommendations for Stakeholders

For NGOs

- Adopt and implement the core non-negotiable safeguarding standards proposed in this paper, treating them as minimum benchmarks rather than optional best practices.
- Develop a tiered compliance architecture suited to organisational capacity, progressively strengthening safeguarding systems as the NGO grows in scale or complexity.
- Invest in regular safeguarding-related training, documentation, and institutional-memory-building, and consider partnerships with legal-aid or child-rights-oriented organisations where internal legal capacity is limited (NALSA, "Child-Friendly Legal Services").

For Regulators

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

- Clarify and consolidate guidance for NGOs on the interaction between child-protection statutes (JJ Act, POCSO Act), data-protection frameworks, and organisational-governance requirements, reducing confusion and overlapping obligations.
- Encourage, rather than merely penalise, compliance by offering technical-support schemes, model safeguarding-policy templates, and capacity-building programmes for NGOs, particularly smaller or grassroots organisations.

For Donors and CSR-Mandated Entities

- Integrate robust safeguarding-compliance criteria into donor-due-diligence frameworks, ensuring that NGOs demonstrate not only legal-registration status but also functional child-protection policies and reporting mechanisms.
- Provide multi-year, flexible funding that allows NGOs to invest in compliance-related infrastructure (training, data-protection systems, safeguarding-focal persons) without compromising core programme delivery.

9.3 Directions for Future Research

Future research could build on this paper's framework by:

- Conducting comparative case-studies of multiple child-centric NGOs across different service domains (health, education, community mobilisation) to examine how compliance-as-safeguarding is operationalised in practice.
- Investigating the impact of tiered compliance models on child-safety outcomes, staff-behaviour, and organisational-sustainability through longitudinal or mixed-methods studies.
- Exploring the role of technology-enabled safeguarding tools–such as digital reporting platforms, secure data-management systems, and child-friendly grievance-redress apps–within Indian NGO-context, and assessing their alignment with legal-compliance obligations and data-protection norms.

Such studies would help refine the compliance-framework proposed here and generate evidence-based guidance for NGOs, regulators, and donors seeking to align legal-responsibility with child-centred mission delivery.

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

Bibliography

1. Bal Raksha Bharat. "Key Factors to Identify a Trustworthy Child Protection NGO." *Bal Raksha Bharat*, 11 Aug. 2025, www.balrakshabharat.org/blog/others/key-factors-to-look-for-in-a-trustworthy-ngo/. Accessed 13 Apr. 2026.

2. Bal Raksha Bharat. "Why Bal Raksha Bharat Is a Trusted Child NGO in India." *Bal Raksha Bharat*, 21 July 2025, www.balrakshabharat.org/blog/others/why-bal-raksha-bharat-is-one-of-indias-most-trusted-ngos-for-child-welfare/. Accessed 13 Apr. 2026.

3. BetterCare Network. "Systematic Review of Institutional Mechanisms for Child Protection in India." *BetterCare Network*, 2026, bettercarenetwork.org/sites/default/files/2026-04/Institutional_Mechanisms_CP_India.pdf. Accessed 13 Apr. 2026.

4. ComplyKaro. "A Guide to the POCSO Act: Legal Provisions & Child Safety." *ComplyKaro*, 19 Nov. 2025, complykaro.com/a-guide-to-the-pocso-act-legal-provisions-child-safety/. Accessed 13 Apr. 2026.

5. Manoharan, Arlene. "Child-Centred Social Work and Restorative Practices." *Child Centred Social Work in India: Journeys and the Way Forward*, edited by Sharmistha B., Routledge, 2023, pp. 117–130.

6. Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India. "National Policy for Children, 2012." *Press Information Bureau*, 17 Apr. 2013, pib.gov.in/newsite/PrintRelease.aspx?relid=94792. Accessed 13 Apr. 2026.

7. NALSA (National Legal Services Authority). "Child-Friendly Legal Services for Children Scheme, 2024." *NALSA*, 2024, cdnbbsr.s3waas.gov.in/s359f78862875fe585ce4b5ef63a3cc887/uploads/2025/07/2025070213333336958.pdf. Accessed 13 Apr. 2026.

8. Rai, Pallavi. "Stepping Up Child Protection: An Assessment of Child Protection Systems in South Asia, Including Reflections from Other World Regions." *SSRN*, 9 Apr. 2025, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5349349. Accessed 13 Apr. 2026.

9. Roy, Smita. "Revisiting Roles of Community Institutions – Socio-Legal Scopes in Making Settlements Child Friendly." *Human Rights and Development Center Journal*, vol. 12, no. 3, Gujarat University, 2025, pp. 438–450.

ISSN: 2455-8834

Volume:11, Issue:08 "August 2026"

10. Srivastava, Pratibha. "An Overview of Child Rights in India." *International Journal of Research in Emerging Social Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2025, pp. 1–12. IJRTI, ijrti.org/papers/IJRTI2505168.pdf. Accessed 13 Apr. 2026.

11. UN. "Child Policy in India: Protecting the Young for a Prosperous Future." *ResearchGate*, 2024, www.researchgate.net/publication/381660353_Child_Policy_in_India_Protecting_the_Young_for_a_Prosperous_Future. Accessed 13 Apr. 2026.

