Independent Interim Evaluation

Pwoteje Kondisyon Travay Moun: PwoKonTraM
Protecting the Working Conditions of People in HAITI

Implemented by:

Catholic Relief Services

Evaluator:

Sandy Wark

Cooperative Agreement Number:	IL-24912-13-75-K
Financing Agency:	US Department of Labor
Dates of Project Implementation:	30 September 2013 - 29 March 2019
Evaluation Fieldwork Dates:	January 15 - February 2, 2018
Total Project Funds from USDOL:	US$ 9,993,289

SFS
Sistemas, Familia y Sociedad
Consultores Asociados

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNEXES

ACRONYMS

AVSI	Association of Volunteers International Service
CLES	Collectif pour la Lutte contre l'Exclusion Sociale (Collective for the Fight Against Social Exclusion)
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
DBMS	Direct Beneficiary Monitoring System
DR	Dominican Republic
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GoH	Government of Haiti
IBESR	Institut du Bien-Etre Social et de la Recherche (Institute of Social Welfare and Research)
ILAB	International Labor Affairs Bureau
ILO	International Labour Organization
IO	Intermediate Outcome
KII	Key Informant Interview
MAST	Ministère des Affaires Sociales et du Travail (Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor)
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MUSO	Mutuelle de Solidarité (Mutual Solidarity)
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
OCFT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking
SFS	Sistemas, Familia y Sociedad
SJM	Services Jésuites aux Migrants (Jesuit Services for Migrants)
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPR	Technical Progress Report
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WRC	Worker Rights Center

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Background

This report documents the main findings and conclusions of the interim evaluation of the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) "Protecting the Working Conditions of People" project (known as *Pwoteje Kondisyon Travay Moun,* or PwoKonTraM, in Creole). In September 2015, the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking (OCFT) awarded a cooperative agreement with a budget of US$ 9.9 million to CRS and its consortium of five locally-based organizations.[1] The project's overall objective is to reduce child labor and improve working conditions in Haitian agriculture.[2] To reach its objective, PwoKonTraM pursued five intermediate outcomes (IO):

IO 1: School attendance increased among beneficiary children;
IO 2: Income increased in beneficiary households;
IO 3: Decent and productive work opportunities increased among beneficiary youth 15-24 years old;
IO 4: Beneficiary households receive social protection services and information on workers' rights; and
IO 5: Government, private sector and civil society prioritization of protection of child and worker rights increased.

PwoKonTraM works in Haiti's North and North East departments and in the communities near the official border areas with the Dominican Republic (DR), including the North East, Center, West, and South East departments.

2. Evaluation Methodology

The main objective of this evaluation is to review project progress toward achieving intended outcomes, identify any lessons learned and good practices, and recommend ways to improve delivery and enhance project impact and sustainability in the time remaining for project implementation. Its primary audiences are OCFT, CRS and its consortium which are expected to consider the evaluation findings when shaping project activities and potential new strategies going forward.

---

[1] The five partners are JURIMEDIA, Association of Volunteers International Service (AVSI), the Collectif de Lutte Contre Exclusion Sociale (CLES), Haiti SURVIE and Services Jésuites aux Migrants (SJM).

[2] While primarily focused on child labor in agriculture and related value chains, it implemented an area-based approach meaning that the project would also help children engaged in child labor in other sectors when such children were identified.

The evaluation was conducted by an independent evaluator, fielded and managed by Sistemas Familia y Sociedad (SFS). The evaluation was framed by the key questions contained in its Terms of Reference (TOR) (see **Annex 2)** and employed mainly qualitative methods including key informant interviews (KII), focus group discussions (FGD) and direct observation. In addition, the evaluator incorporated quantitative data drawn from the project's monitoring system and reports in her analysis (see list of documents in **Annex 4**). The field data collection phase was from January 14 to February 1, 2018 and included meetings with stakeholders in Port-au-Prince and in 12 out of the 17 communes targeted by the project.

3. Key Evaluation Findings

Key Findings on Delivery of Planned Activities and Services

PwoKonTraM is progressing toward or surpassing its main end-of-project education, livelihoods and awareness-raising activity output targets (see table on status of indicator targets in **Annex 1**). Under the social protection component, some planned strategies that relied on referral to existing services, notably for child protection or legal services to address workers' rights violations, did not align with what services were actually available resulting in shortfalls in related targets. The project is likewise behind on the implementation of planned activities related to capacity building for government, private sector and civil society counterparts. With little time remaining in project implementation, the project was not optimistic that it would be able to meet its targets by project end.

Key Findings on Education Interventions

PwoKonTraM provided education subsidies and livelihood support to what appeared to be extremely vulnerable children and households in an effort to overcome economic obstacles to children's school attendance. With project support, many out-of-school children were (re)enrolled in school. Although project subsidies were important to household beneficiaries, caseworkers indicated that personalized and holistic support offered by the project was likewise essential for children's successful reintegration in school. Due to the large number of out-of-school working children in project target zones and limited project resources, the project was not able to support all children in need of its services in target communities. Although grateful for project support, many beneficiaries found the duration of education subsidies insufficient due to the depth of household poverty, reoccurring education costs and the limitations of project support for livelihood improvements.

Although the project reports regular school attendance by the majority of project beneficiary children, caseworkers, teachers and parent/guardians described ensuring regular school attendance as a significant challenge. PwoKonTram intervened to address factors that affect regular school attendance by vulnerable children using a variety of strategies. The project supported transitional education courses, albeit for relatively few beneficiaries and for which the methodology was not well-developed. Over 800 teachers received training; participants reported that the training topics (classroom management and lesson planning) were useful and had contributed to

improvements in their instruction methods. The project also funded school infrastructure improvements and supported school councils, which stakeholders said helped to improve the learning environment in schools. One implementing partner noted that the number of schools reached with a full package of education quality interventions (teacher training, school council support, school improvements) was small relative to the total number schools in which beneficiary children were enrolled in the project zone; some schools received no support, while others received partial packages.

Key Findings on Livelihood Interventions

Outcomes of income generation livelihood support provided to households by the project varied by commune and type of support. Household demand for agricultural activities, originally the main focus of the project's livelihood strategy, was weaker than anticipated and appeared more susceptible to failure than other forms of support. Success rates with commerce kits appeared higher, especially in more dynamic economic zones on the border where the population was more entrepreneurial. A factor that affected agricultural livelihood and small animal husbandry support (goats, seeds), perhaps more than commerce, was the one-time-only nature of the project's contribution for inputs. The latter meant that there was no "second chance" for households whose activities failed due to the vagaries of weather and animal disease. Both households and other key informants praised project support for savings and lending groups, describing many positive outcomes including incentives to save, recourse to a group solidarity fund for emergencies, and access to small loans.

Vocational and life skill training activities for youth, also part of the project livelihood support to households, appeared to have boosted participating youths' skills and self-confidence. However, beneficiaries also identified gaps in the training and follow-up support, which limited their success in finding jobs or starting microenterprise activities. Implementers noted many implementation challenges, including limited vocational training schools and appropriate course offerings in project zones, budget constraints, and insufficient information on the employment market and employment opportunities.

The majority of household livelihood support beneficiaries appeared to have understood the link between the project's livelihood support and its objective to reduce household dependence on child labor. However, many beneficiaries and some KII found project livelihood assistance to be insufficient to adequately improve their revenues, and feared they would not be able to sustain their children in school when project support ended.

Key Findings on Awareness Raising, Social Protection and Legal Services

Awareness of the importance of education, the dangers of child labor and the importance of legal documentation appeared high among most project beneficiaries and counterparts (children, household members, educators, and local authorities). At the household level, beneficiaries mainly attributed their increased awareness to contact with caseworkers. However, some respondents also highlighted that awareness without the alternatives offered by project education subsidies and

livelihood support would be unlikely to result in sustainable changes in their practices. Teachers and school directors said that project workshops enhanced their knowledge of child labor and their roles in discouraging the practice, although a few respondents said they felt powerless to address the problem.

Several project implementers highlighted that planned awareness-raising and other activities focused on workers' rights were challenging to implement, mainly because the topic did not resonate with many project beneficiaries, most of whom worked in the informal sector and/or were self-employed. In addition, implementers indicated that planned referral services to public child protection and labor inspection services were not possible given capacity deficits within the institutions in charge. To help fill the gap in institutional responses, the project had planned to form and/or strengthen child protection committees in each commune where it intervened. According to the project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) data, only two out of five partners made progress in this intervention area, although project management anticipates further progress by project end.

In contrast to legal and social protection referrals, demand for legal identity documentation services far exceeded project expectations and was reported to reach more than 5,000 individuals,[3] which is double the planned number of beneficiaries. Civil registrar officers reported a marked increase in demand for birth certification, even by those who did not receive project subsidies.

Key Findings on Government, Private Sector and Civil Society Capacity Building

Project management highlighted many challenges that affected planned collaboration with the Government of Haiti (GoH) counterparts, including high levels of staff/elected official turn over, project time constraints and their decision to prioritize the initiation of direct services, and lack of GoH counterpart institutional capacity (personnel, means of transportation, and other basic equipment). Although both implementers and GoH counterparts described examples of effective information sharing and collaboration, several government authorities expressed that they would have liked to be better informed, more involved in project implementation and to have received direct support for their institutions.

While not originally planned under the project component on capacity building, PwoKonTraM's cooperation with Civil Registrar Offices included institutional capacity building. Civil registry officers expressed strong appreciation for project support but expressed fear and doubt about what would happen after the end of the project when project support concluded.

Project management likewise reported it had not been able to identify an appropriate private sector partner for social compliance initiatives, which resulted in little progress on both the development of a social compliance model and the planned civil society social compliance advocacy

[3] As of December 31, 2017.

campaign. According to project progress reports, it has not given up on finding an appropriate partner in the time remaining for project implementation.

4. Main Conclusions

Project implementation effectiveness: CRS and its implementing partners were effective in mobilizing and delivering direct services to beneficiary children and households. Overall, the project implementation team demonstrated strong capacity to efficiently set up offices in local communities, identify appropriate beneficiaries, mobilize resources, and deliver planned goods and services.

Education interventions: Individual education subsidies did not adequately address the scale of need in target communities. With its limited resources in time and budget, PwoKonTraM contributed modestly to needed improvements in beneficiary school learning environments. Teacher training, school infrastructure improvements and school council and transitional education interventions were very relevant and addressed education quality issues that, in addition to the cost of education, push children to abandon school and engage in child labor.

Livelihood interventions: With only about two years for interventions and limited resources for livelihood support, project ambitions to improve agricultural yields and increase access to markets were overly ambitious. Adjustments made in its livelihood strategy favoring less risky activities helped to improve results. Project vocational training responded effectively to the aspirations of youth from beneficiary households, but were insufficient to enable youth to find jobs or start income generating activities, although the project plans additional support.

Awareness-raising interventions: Project awareness-raising and monitoring interventions were effective in changing household beneficiary attitudes about the kinds of work children should undertake and the importance of schooling and legal documentation. Persistent and individualized efforts of project caseworkers appear to have played a critical role in making key project messages stick with beneficiary households.

Capacity building interventions**:** PwoKonTraM contributions to GoH counterpart capacity building were weak compared to what was proposed in the project document. CRS underestimated the challenges of working with GoH institutions and the time and resources that would be required for it to be effective. Although unplanned and fairly modest, project capacity building for the civil registry office is a success story, but requires additional efforts to encourage higher level government buy-in for positive results to be sustained.

Social compliance interventions: While stakeholders agree that fundamental labor rights are violated in sugarcane production and related economic activities in Haiti, the project has not yet implemented specific activities to tackle the problem and therefore has not contributed to any substantial changes to date. Because there are few sector-specific issues the project could have addressed effectively, and in light of the prevalence of child labor in a variety of economic activities in target communities, CRS' broader (not sector specific) approach made sense.

Overall contribution to project goal and sustainability**:** Project education and livelihood interventions needed more time and additional resources to effectively increase the resilience of vulnerable households and reduce their dependence on child labor. Taking into consideration the prevalence of extreme poverty in target communities and the GoH's weak capacity to deliver basic services, the project overestimated the potential of one or two years of fairly limited services to address the root causes of child labor in project communities.

Although many project direct beneficiaries received short-term benefits from the project's direct services, they remain highly vulnerable to set-backs in the absence of additional and more long-term livelihood support. Improvements in community-based organizations and institutional capacity were minimal and did not establish a strong base from which to ensure project sustainability.

5. Good Practices and Lessons Learned

CRS and its implementing partners used many good practices that may be replicated with positive results in future projects. These include:

- Regular follow-up on beneficiaries' education and work activities by community-based caseworkers.
- Life skills, entrepreneurship and awareness-raising as a complement to vocational training for youth.
- Co-locating project satellite offices in local government buildings.

The project implementation team likewise highlighted a number of lessons learned that may be used to guide future intervention strategies and programs:

- Interventions should be planned to be delivered over a longer period of time and the quantity and variety of assistance should be increased.
- Gender dimensions of child labor are important and attention should be paid to empowering women and adolescent girls.
- Awareness-raising on workers' rights, while important, is not the most relevant issue affecting child labor in the context of Haitian agriculture and within the project implementation areas.
- Project support for institutional capacity improvements of government agencies can be effective if they are well-focused and include both grassroots interventions and interventions that address systemic deficiencies at the regional and national levels.

6. Recommendations

For CRS and its consortium partners in the time remaining for implementation:

1. After consulting with USDOL, provide additional education/livelihood support to existing household beneficiaries rather than add new beneficiaries. Rather than continuing to serve

additional youth with vocational training courses, focus on post-training support to youth who have already been served.

2. Keep or increase the number of caseworkers as the project draws down and ensure that existing household beneficiaries continue to receive regular visits from caseworkers until the end of project activities.
3. Ensure that all willing household beneficiaries have the opportunity to form and participate in a savings and loan group. Investigate opportunities to increase access to capital by the more advanced existing groups.
4. Document teacher training modules and provide documentation to participating teachers.
5. Ensure adequate support is provided to relevant GoH offices to complete the birth registration process of existing birth registration beneficiaries. Document project good practices and lessons learned on birth registration. Conduct an advocacy campaign for needed improvements in the birth registration process, leveraging CRS' national level partnerships, bi-national networks with the DR and ties with the Catholic Church.
6. Plan knowledge sharing activities with national and local government officials and other nongovernmental organizations active in target zones as part of the close-out strategy.

To be considered by CRS and its implementing partners in *future programs* of a similar nature:

7. Reduce the number of intervention zones to a level that all willing out-of-school children of school age are offered education alternatives. Ensure at least one year of follow-up and monitoring by caseworkers is available during the life-of-project.
8. Include cross-cutting interventions on youth (especially adolescent girls) and women's empowerment.
9. Incorporate additional "community strengthening" and interventions which may include additional efforts to create and/or strengthen child protection committees and other community-based groups in monitoring children, additional support for the formation and strengthening of producer groups, and additional capacity building for schools.
10. Work more closely with relevant local government offices for the delivery of services, including the allocation of more time and resources for institutional capacity building at local levels and basing project offices within local government offices when possible.

The following recommendation is for USDOL:

11. If consideration is given to funding additional programs on child labor in Haiti, target at least some of the same communities that were served by ProKonTraM. Additional time and resources are needed in these communities to consolidate gains contributed by the project.

I. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.1 Project Background

This report documents the main findings and conclusions of the interim evaluation of the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) project entitled "Protecting the Working Conditions of People" (known as *Pwoteje Kondisyon Travay Moun,* or PwoKonTraM, in Creole). In September 2015, the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking (OCFT) awarded a cooperative agreement with a budget of US$ 9.9 million to CRS and its consortium of five locally-based organizations, including: JURIMEDIA, Association of Volunteers International Service (AVSI), the Collectif de Lutte Contre Exclusion Sociale (CLES), Haiti SURVIE, and Services Jésuites aux Migrants (SJM).

The overall objective of the project is to reduce child labor and improve working conditions in Haitian agriculture. Based on its needs analysis, CRS designed and is delivering an integrated set of interventions aimed to overcome the economic, social, and legal causes of child labor and workers' rights violations. To reach its objective, PwoKonTraM pursued five specific intermediate outcomes (IO):

IO 1: School attendance among beneficiary children increased;

IO 2: Income increased in beneficiary households;

IO 3: Increased decent and productive work opportunities among beneficiary youth 15-24 years old;

IO 4: Beneficiary households receive social protection services and information on workers' rights; and

IO 5: Increased government, private sector and civil society prioritization of protection of child and worker rights.

PwoKonTraM intervenes in Haiti's North and North East departments, and in the communities near the official border areas with the Dominican Republic (DR), including the North East, Center, West, and South East departments. Its main strategies include:

- Awareness-raising on child labor and workers' rights, the importance of education and of having legal identity documentation;
- Support for vulnerable children's education, including both education subsidies for individual children and interventions to improve education quality (teacher training, school councils, and school infrastructure improvements);
- Support for vulnerable household livelihood improvements, mainly providing inputs and technical advice for household economic activities, vocational training for youth, and forming community savings and loan groups); and
- Legal services, mainly for birth registration and legal identification.

The project was officially launched in June 2016 in Cap Haïtien, although actual delivery of project services began in September 2016, mostly in the education component. Project services are delivered directly by CRS implementing partners' specialists and case managers, who work out of 17 community-based hubs. For a limited number of activities (mainly awareness-raising and birth registration), the project also supports the efforts of government counterparts. All project partners engage in awareness-raising activities; four of five CRS partners offer similar, multiple service packages (education, livelihoods, and legal services) to project beneficiaries in communities located in the North and North East departments of Haiti. One partner, SJM, only provides legal services in the border areas. CRS ensures overall project coordination and technical support through project managers and specialists based in Port-au-Prince.

1.2 Context

This project was originally conceived to be implemented in the Dominican Republic (DR) but was moved to Haiti two years after the initial award by OCFT. In September 2013, CRS was awarded a cooperative agreement to address child labor and working rights in sugarcane production in the DR where children, including Haitian children and Dominican-born children of Haitian descent, work on commercial sugarcane plantations and live in communities that often lack adequate housing and basic services.[4] In 2015, due to changes in the implementation environment in the DR which were beyond the project's control, USDOL and CRS agreed to assess the feasibility of transferring implementation to Haiti. CRS has been operational in Haiti since 1954, carrying out both relief and development programming. One of the conditions of transfer was that the project respect the outcomes outlined in the original Request for Applications.

In 2015, representatives of USDOL carried out in-country consultations with key ministries[5] in Haiti and received positive feedback and support for the project. A rapid assessment carried out by CRS in 2015 found that child labor is prevalent in agricultural activities in Haiti, including in sugarcane production in the North. The rapid assessment found that 46% of sampled children in the North were involved in child labor; about one third of these children engaged in work related to growing and processing sugarcane (clearing the land, carrying sugarcane, processing sugarcane at the distillery, etc.). Findings from the North East indicated that sugarcane is not a major source of economic activity in the region, but still 41% of sampled children were engaged in child labor. Based on the findings of the assessment, CRS and USDOL signed a revised cooperative agreement that transferred project activities to Haiti, with most activities concentrated in the North and North

[4] 2016 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor, Dominican Republic, US Department of Labor https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/dominican-republic, accessed on February 10, 2018

[5] These included the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor (MAST), the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Justice, according to the USDOL's project revision form.

East. It put in place a new project management team and mobilized project partners with relevant experience in Haiti.

The new project in Haiti retained most of the same broad strategies planned in the original DR-based project document (integrated education, livelihoods and legal services), the same overall budget and initially, the same period of implementation. Originally the project was scheduled to end in September 2017, roughly two years after its transfer to Haiti. A project revision later extended the end date to March 2019 (44 months including close-out). The original project in the DR had planned to provide about 18,600 children and adolescents with education services, mainly through referral to State-supported programs, 5,800 households with livelihood services, and 21,000 individuals with legal assistance. In Haiti, CRS planned to reach 10,000 children and youth with education services, 5,000 households with livelihood assistance, and 2,500 persons with legal assistance. USDOL later approved a reduction in the education services target from 10,000 to 7,560 beneficiaries, and a reduction in the livelihood services target from 5,000 to 3,780 households, taking into consideration the reduced implementation period and other contextual differences between the DR and Haiti.

Contextual differences between Haiti and the DR affecting project implementation

Some key differences in the project implementing environment between the DR and Haiti are highlighted here as a backdrop to later analysis of PwoKonTraM's performance in meeting its overall and immediate objectives.

Haiti is poorer: Poverty rates are significantly higher in Haiti than in the DR. Haiti is the poorest country in the Americas, with close to 60% of the population living under the poverty line (versus 30% in the DR) and 24% living under the national extreme poverty line.[6] Roughly 50% of Haiti's population is undernourished. Haiti is behind the DR in most human development indicators, with an overall ranking of 163 compared to 99 in the DR.[7]

The nature of labor exploitation in sugarcane production is different**:** In contrast to the DR, where Haitian children and children of Haitian descent are reported to work as paid, seasonal labor on commercial sugarcane plantations, in Haiti most children who work in agriculture are unpaid laborers for their own family's subsistence farming. According to PwoKonTraM's baseline survey, more than 91% of children identified to be engaged in child labor worked without pay in an economic activity operated by a related person living in the same household.[8] In Haiti, sugarcane is a cash crop sold for domestic use, mainly rum production, and is mainly grown on small plots of land employing family labor.

---

[6] http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/haiti/overview, accessed on February 12, 2018

[7] http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries

[8] Baseline Survey on Child Labor, Diagnostic and Development, June 2016.

The capacity of the State to address child labor is less in Haiti: Notably, in terms of the project's education strategy, most schools in Haiti receive minimal government oversight and are expensive relative to average earnings. More than 85% of primary schools are privately managed by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), churches, communities, and for-profit operators.[9] In addition, labor inspectors and child protection agents in Haiti lack sufficient resources, such as vehicles and fuel, to carry out inspections. Social protection programs to combat child labor are also insufficient to adequately address the extent of the problem.[10]

[9] Education Fact Sheet, January 2016, USAID Haiti.

[10] https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/haiti

II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Evaluation Objectives

The main objectives of this interim evaluation are:

- To review the ongoing progress and performance of PwoKonTraM (the extent to which immediate objectives and outputs are being achieved);
- To examine the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and targets by the project's end;
- To identify ways to improve delivery and enhance coordination with key stakeholders in the time remaining for project implementation; and
- To identify promising practices and ways to promote the sustainability of effective project strategies and positive outcomes.

The evaluation also sets out to describe successes, challenges and lessons learned emerging from this project that may be used to improve the design and implementation of future programs to combat child labor in Haiti or in other countries, as relevant.

2.2 Scope and Intended Users

The scope of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out by CRS and its consortium partners from the transfer of the project from the DR to Haiti in September 2015 until the end of January 2018, which was the period of evaluation fieldwork. Although planned to be an interim evaluation, this evaluation comes nearer to the planned end-of-project implementation than to its mid-point.[11] The primary intended users of this evaluation are OCFT and CRS (the grantee) along with its five implementing partners.

2.3 Methodology

The evaluation was conducted by an independent evaluation consultant, fielded and managed by Sistemas, Familia y Sociedad (SFS), a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) firm contracted by OCFT. The evaluation was framed by the key questions contained in its Terms of Reference (TOR) (see **Annex 2)** and employed mainly qualitative methods including key informant interviews (KII), focus group discussions (FGD) and direct observation of project centers and implementation zones. In

[11] The interim evaluation was originally scheduled for October 2017 but was moved to January 2018 to account for weather-related challenges from conducting fieldwork in the rainy season/holidays.

addition, the evaluator incorporated quantitative data drawn from the project's monitoring system and reports in her analysis (see list of documents in **Annex 4**).

The evaluation data collection phase was from January 14 to February 1, 2018. During this period, the evaluator met with stakeholders in Port-au-Prince and in 12 out of the 17 communes targeted by the project (Anse-à-Pitre, Cap Haïtien, Limbe, Milot, Fort Liberté, Ferrier, Ouanaminthe, Trou de Nord, Caracol, Dondon, St. Rafael, and Capotile). Among key informants and focus group participants were:

- CRS personnel, primarily project managers and specialists;
- Implementing partner personnel, including managers, specialists and caseworkers;
- Regional and local authorities and civil servants from relevant Ministries; and
- Project beneficiaries and participants in training programs including children, households, community volunteers and education personnel (see table 1).

The evaluation schedule and a list of interviews and meetings are included in **Annex 5**.

Table 1: Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussion

Stakeholders	# KI/ FGD	# Males	# Females	Total
Interviews with Key Informants				
CRS	6	6		6
Partners	11	38	10	48
Local Authorities	11	34	10	44
Focus Group Discussions				
Children	3	18	10	28
Youth	3	20	11	31
Households	10	37	58	95
CL Community Committee members	2	12	4	16
Education personnel	5	19	13	32
Total	51	184	116	300

The main purposes of these consultations were to collect qualitative data, covering:

- Stakeholders' perceptions of project challenges and opportunities;
- Validity of project strategies used in the field;
- The quality of services delivered or in-progress;

- Outcomes of project activities to date; and
- Emerging good practices and lessons learned.

The evaluator facilitated a stakeholder workshop in Cap Haïtien on February 3, 2018 which was attended by 27 stakeholders. The evaluator presented the initial findings, good practices, lessons learned and recommendations, and invited feedback from the participants which was incorporated into this draft report.

The evaluation adhered to evaluation norms, standards and ethical safeguards. The evaluator used semi-structured question guides prepared in advance for individual interviews and FGD, which included a protocol for explaining the purpose and use of the evaluation as well as the confidentiality of responses. As far as possible, a consistent approach was followed in each project site. To encourage unbiased feedback, members of the project team (neither CRS nor its implementing partners) were not present during interviews and focus group discussions.

The evaluator mitigated potential bias in the selection of sites, beneficiaries and key informants by providing selection guidance to project management, requesting that both successful and less successful interventions be highlighted. In addition, the evaluator selected the communes to be visited, proposed what intervention strategies were to be investigated in each zone, and in some cases, selected participants in FGD randomly using beneficiary lists provided by the project. She mitigated response bias by prefacing KIIs and FGDs with an introduction explaining the learning nature of the evaluation and that responses would not directly affect participants' access to services, as well as by framing questions that would solicit balanced feedback. Further, responses from each KII and FGD are also triangulated with information from other stakeholders and data sources throughout the report.

III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

3.1 Education Interventions

3.1.1 Overview of Strategy

PwoKonTraM's interventions under IO 1 aimed to increase school attendance among beneficiary children, so that children spend more time in school rather than being exposed to conditions that can lead to child labor. According to the project's problem analysis, the most important barriers to school attendance are insufficient household financial resources and poor school infrastructure.[12] The project planned to address these issues by providing (1) subsidies to cover school fees and scholastic materials and transitional education courses for vulnerable children, and in parallel, (2) offer livelihood assistance aimed to increase household income, while (3) raising household awareness of the importance of education and the dangers of child labor. In addition, the project planned to support targeted schools to improve the learning environment by offering teacher training, creating or reactivating school councils, and supporting school infrastructure improvements.

3.1.2 Key Findings

The project is progressing toward or surpassing its main education component output indicator targets.

Based on project data as of December 2017,[13] PwoKonTraM has achieved 88% of its end-of -project target for the number of children receiving at least one education service (6,680 children supported). It has supported 20 transitional education mechanisms, or 83% of its end-of-project target. It has also achieved 72% of its end-of-project target for support of school infrastructure improvements (104 schools supported) and has provided support to nearly three times the number of school councils planned (82 schools versus 30 planned). It has likewise surpassed its end-of-project target for the number of teachers trained, reaching 160% (814 teachers trained out of 510 planned).

In the delivery of project services, late and partial payment of beneficiary school fees was cited by school directors as a source of financial distress for the affected schools. PwoKonTraM managers confirmed the issue of late payment and explained that it was caused by administrative delays in the approval and disbursement of second year project funds to one of the implementing partners in

[12] PwoKonTraM Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP), May 13, 2016

[13] "Etat de la mise en oeuvre" Powerpoint presentation by P. Gandy Dorival, CRS MEAL Specialist, February 2018; CRS Technical Progress Reports (TPR), January 2018

the North. CRS management explained that because CRS' contract with USDOL was originally scheduled to end in September 2017, the organization was unable to extend its contracts with implementing partners until its own contract was extended. Once the project extension was approved, the contracting process required more time for the implementing partner with the largest share of the budget, due to CRS financial oversight regulations (additional signatures were required from headquarters)

The partial payment of school fees was explained to be an unintended consequence of the policy of one implementing partner to only pay partial school fees with the expectation that families would also contribute; school directors indicated some families were late or failed to pay their share. According to the implementing partner, the policy was designed to encourage household buy-in and promote sustainability, taking into consideration the short duration of project education subsidies and the importance of household commitment to their children's education.

The administrative delays cited above likewise appear to have contributed to slower than planned delivery of direct services (both education and livelihoods) by the affected implementing partner. The latter partner was responsible for the largest share of project direct services, and this explains why not all planned direct services have been delivered at the midpoint of the school year, with only 4-6 months remaining for the implementation of project activities.[14]

Education subsidies targeted extremely vulnerable households.

Participants in household FGD reported that they were unable to send some or all of their children to school because they did not have sufficient resources to cover the cost of schooling. Some also admitted that their children worked to help support the family.

> *I couldn't have put my child in school without project support.*
>
> – FGD, Household Representative

Caseworkers explained that they identified vulnerable, out-of-school children who were engaged in child labor[15] by observing children in the communities and consulting with local authorities and other community leaders. According to one caseworker, the majority of children come from single-headed households, predominantly mothers, who have a very difficult time making ends meet.

Other KII from project management and implementing partners observed that there were many reasons that contributed to the vulnerability of children from female-headed households. Many of

[14] Although the project period of performance was extended to March 2019, at the time of the evaluation, CRS was phasing out service delivery for most implementing partners by June/July 2018.

[15] Caseworkers described selection criteria to be children between the ages of 6 and 14 who were out-of-school and engaged in child labor.

these households had been abandoned by the fathers without providing any form of child support, the tendency of abandoned mothers to form new unions and have additional children that likewise may have ended in abandonment without child support, and more generally, the disadvantaged position of women in rural communities in terms of access to land, training and credit. In the evaluation stakeholder workshops, some participants from among the project implementing partners highlighted that future projects should pay greater attention to these gender dimensions of household vulnerability to child labor.

Before providing assistance, the caseworkers said that they met with the child's parent(s)/guardian(s), agreed on the type of support that the project would provide (usually both education and livelihood support), and signed a sort of contract that committed the household head to sending their child to school. This procedure for identifying and signing up beneficiaries appears to be consistent across all CRS implementing partners.

> *We feel it would have been better if the identification of the children was done with the school. There are children who are selected who do not come.*
>
> – FGD, School Director

Feedback from KII outside the project management team, including local authorities, school directors and civil servants within the government child protection service, indicated that they would like to have been involved in the selection of the children but they did not dispute that the children selected were from very vulnerable families. Project management noted that although it consulted with many stakeholders in the process of selecting beneficiaries, it was reluctant to give over ultimate responsibility for beneficiary selection to stakeholders other than its implementing partners for fear that the decisions of some stakeholders may have been influenced by other factors than need, such as reinforcing political or social standing in the communities.

The project was not able to support all out-of-school children in target communities.

Both KII from CRS implementing partners and FGD with households highlighted that the number of out-of-school, working children in some target zones was much larger than the project's capacity to support the cost of schooling. Caseworkers explained that some beneficiary households continue to contain working, out-of-school children of school age because the project only had resources sufficient to support 1-2 children per household, with some exceptions. High poverty rates coupled with the cost of education to be borne by households (highlighted under project context) help to explain what KII and FGD participants observed.

> *I would like the program to be more far-reaching. When you look at it, it is a drop in the ocean. The children impacted are working children but there are a great number in that situation that are not benefitting.*
>
> – KII, Local Authority

CRS and implementing partner management explained that resources for education subsidies were limited relative to demand, in part because the project was not able to refer children to existing education support

programs as planned. In the words of one project manager, "In the original plan, only 500 children were to receive direct support and the others were to be referred to existing programs but unfortunately, these programs were no longer available." CRS management explained that some education programs had closed between the time it did its rapid assessment and project start-up and/or had never been available in the project target communities. More generally, project management indicated that it had overestimated the potential for referrals in Haiti where both public and NGO social services are relatively few compared to the numbers of vulnerable children and households who need services. Participants in KII and FGD outside the project management team were not able to cite other education support programs currently active in their zone, corroborating that referral services would indeed be a challenge.

Personalized and holistic support is believed to be essential for successful reintegration in school.

Among children integrated or reintegrated into school, caseworkers cited several success stories of previously unschooled children who, after receiving project support to cover education costs, attended school and did well academically. The CRS education expert asserted that these children, even if they may have difficulty covering school fees later on, will likely be able to remain in school because solutions tend to be found for high achievers.

> *I found this child who was 12 and had never gone to school. When I met him, he was coming out of a field carrying wood. This child really wanted me to meet his parents. It was like he had being waiting his whole life for this opportunity. He is doing well in school.*
>
> – FGD, Caseworker

Caseworkers also experienced disappointment when, despite their efforts, they were not able to enroll and retain children in school. One caseworker described a case of a child identified by the project who had never been to school, and through persistence, convinced his parents of the importance of education. Eventually the project was able to assist the child to go to school by covering his enrolment fees. However, because of the family's economic difficulties, the child had to quit school and was eventually moved to the DR.

On the basis of his experiences helping children to (re)integrate in school, one caseworker concluded that the critical factor for successful (re)integration of vulnerable children in school is not school subsidies alone, but getting to know the household, understanding their needs, and tailoring project services to those needs. Another caseworker highlighted the importance of raising awareness and involving the community in monitoring children's participation in school. Numerous caseworker participants in FGD highlighted various types of problems affecting children's schooling, including the attitudes and actions of parents and teachers, other types of personal problems, and their tailored responses to help children and their parent(s)/guardian(s) address the issue.

The duration of education subsidies was deemed insufficient by many beneficiaries.

According to PwoKonTraM progress reports, with existing resources, the project was able to cover school fees and/or related education costs for only one year for most beneficiary children. One CRS partner KII highlighted exchanging school improvements for 1-2 years of tuition-free access by project beneficiaries as a means to make project resources go further, citing this as a good practice.[16] Other implementing partners indicated that they had placed beneficiary children in public schools whenever possible because school fees were lower. At least one implementing partner asked parents to pay 50% of tuition fees.

Many FGD participants, especially when informed of the approaching end of project support, indicated that the duration of project education subsidies was insufficient because of re-occurring education costs (tuition, books, uniforms, shoes) and their still meager resources. Many FGD participants indicated that they would do their best to maintain their children in school but were unsure they would have the required financial resources. Many asked that the subsidies be continued and/or livelihood assistance be reinforced before ending project assistance. As will be highlighted later, some beneficiary households indicated that they had been able to increase household revenues with project livelihood assistance, while others had not. Even some of those who had been able to increase their revenue with project support indicated that having additional time to reinforce their financial situation would be helpful in order to sustain their children in school beyond the end of the project.

School administrators and teachers likewise highlighted the potential negative consequences of curtailing education support too quickly. One school director warned, "Children in the program have grown hopeful. If you close the project after two years, you will be closing a door and this may lead to despair." This was echoed by another school director in a different project zone who said, "I can already anticipate the problems that parents will have to pay tuition… It is terrible to kick children out." Countering beneficiary assertions, one implementing partner indicated that out of the 353 children it supported in the first year, 347 had returned to school the following year without project support. Given the strong contradictory feedback provided by beneficiaries, additional investigation is needed to understand how the partner achieved this reported success and whether it is likely to be sustained. It appears that this implementing partner conditioned livelihood assistance, which had not been dispersed to all households at the time of second year enrolment, on keeping children in school. This may explain the high rate of enrolment.

Ensuring regular school attendance was described as a significant challenge.

Although the project reports overall high attendance rates among its education service beneficiaries, FGD participants (mainly household representatives) and KII (mainly caseworkers

[16] Several of CRS partners negotiated with schools to exchange school improvements for one year of free tuition for at least some project beneficiaries. One partner negotiated two years.

and teachers) said that ensuring regular school attendance by education service beneficiaries is an ongoing struggle. One implementing partner manager reported that less than 1% of beneficiaries had abandoned school, but 37% missed more than one day of school per week. Another partner said only 15% of its beneficiaries had irregular school attendance. Caseworkers described regular follow-up and awareness-raising for parents and schools as critical to maintaining beneficiaries' regular attendance. PwoKonTraM management indicated that caseworkers regularly collect attendance data from schools and follow-up with beneficiary children who are frequently absent.

> *The challenge was not so much keeping beneficiary children from abandoning school but ensuring that they attend regularly.*
>
> – KII, Implementing Partner Manager

Teachers and caseworkers cited children's continued participation in supporting their household's subsistence needs as one of the causes of irregular attendance. They noted high absenteeism on market days when children skip school to help their parent/guardian in the market or stay home to take care of younger siblings, although some KII participants said this problem had diminished since the start of the project. These observations are backed by data gathered in the project baseline survey, which found that school enrollment and child labor were not mutually exclusive in Haiti. The survey found that 89.1% of children engaged in child labor were attending school at the moment of the survey, against 92% of those who were not in child labor. Moreover, the baseline survey found that for some children, work is the only option to be able to attend school. The survey recorded that 29% the children who received wages for their work allocated their income to education, either to pay school fees or to buy school supplies. KII explained the phenomenon of children who both work and attend school as being facilitated by half-day school shifts.

Parents, teachers and caseworkers also highlighted other causes of absenteeism linked with education quality issues, including the child's lack of interest in school, problems with school teachers/administrators, and difficulty learning. The project addressed the latter issues through transitional education, teacher training, school council formation and training, and school infrastructure improvements, as described below.

Transitional education was given to relatively few beneficiaries and the methodology was not well-developed.

Project support for transition mechanisms was designed to ease out-of-school children's reintegration into school and forestall learning difficulties that might cause absenteeism and drop-out. Project reports show that most children, regardless of their age, were integrated directly into school without transitional support. PwoKonTraM management noted that transitional education was not budgeted, since in the project design it was to be provided by community volunteers. The same manager explained that the strategy of using volunteers did not work and so it had to find other, low-cost ways of offering the service. The service was mainly implemented by implementing partner employees. In light of gaps in the availability of transitional education, one CRS implementing partner indicated that it had targeted mostly young children, for whom transition mechanisms were not critical.

In the project document, CRS indicated that older youth from among project beneficiaries would be referred to an accelerated learning program that was in the planning stages, but the program was not up and running in project target communities. Other KII indicated that children were readily accepted in partner schools even if they were over-age for their grade level; one caseworker cited the integration of a teenager who had never attended school into lower primary school as a success story. According to one study, the phenomenon of over-age children is significant in Haiti; among associated problems cited in the report are additional classroom management challenges for teachers and reduced motivation for learning and eventual school dropout for children.[17]

One KII acknowledged that project support for transition mechanisms did not include a specially designed curriculum or training for tutors and that the mechanisms were short-term and ad hoc (i.e. not designed to be sustained beyond the life of the project). During the evaluation stakeholder workshop, implementing partners debated the merits of a more institutional approach to transitional education; most thought some form of informal education was needed to address the needs of out-of-school children in Haiti. One participant suggested other forms of non-formal education, such as after school tutoring, was likewise a need for vulnerable children.

> *Transition mechanisms are very important. If we were going to redo this project, we would try to reinforce them.*
>
> – KII, CRS Implementing Partner Manager

Teacher training was appreciated and deemed relevant by participants.

Early in project implementation, PwoKonTraM managers added teacher training to its education strategies. KII highlighted that many teachers, especially those in private, community-run schools, were not adequately prepared for teaching and that this affected attendance and drop-out rates.

> *The training taught us to open the minds of children so that they can learn.*
>
> – FGD, Teacher

School teacher FGD participants indicated their appreciation for project training. They highlighted the relevance of the topics covered (lesson planning and classroom management) and indicated that it had helped them to improve their teaching practices by spending more time and effort in the preparation of their lessons, varying their pedagogical approaches, and paying more attention to the learning needs of individual students. Nearly all participants asked for more training and several requested written documentation related to the previous training.

[17] The Problem of Over-Age Students in the Haitian Education System: An Overview, Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports Directorate of Planning and External Cooperation, 2000 http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001364/136433e.pdf

School infrastructure improvements and school councils are said to have improved the school environment of target schools.

Participants in teacher and school council FGDs were positive about the project's support for school councils. Participants described the benefits as improved planning, more effective problem-solving, improved trust between parents and school personnel (notably in the context of fundraising), greater involvement by local authorities in school matters, and greater awareness of the needs of vulnerable children by council members. One implementing partner manager viewed the school council intervention as providing sustainable impact. S/he believed more efforts are needed to consolidate school councils before the end of the project.

> *We have learned to see our role as coaches, so that with little means we continue to support the children and encourage parents to make sacrifices.*
> – FGD, School Council Member

School personnel likewise expressed their gratitude for PwoKonTraM's support for school infrastructure improvements. KII highlighted the poor state of many schools, with many lacking basic infrastructure such as desks, chairs, walls separating classrooms, latrines, and doors. Beneficiaries requested additional assistance for other needed infrastructure work as well as for teaching aids and books.

One PwoKonTraM manager noted that the total number of schools that the project was able to support with teacher training, school council strengthening and infrastructure improvements in his/her zones was small relative to the total number of schools that hosted education support beneficiaries. In the case of this implementing partner, about 10% of schools received the entire package of school improvement interventions. These schools were selected because they hosted the largest number of project beneficiaries. Other schools received a partial package or no support other than individual school fee subsidies.

3.2 Livelihood and Youth Employment Interventions

3.2.1 Overview of Strategy

PwoKonTraM's interventions under IO 2 and 3 aimed to improve livelihoods opportunities for targeted households in an effort to provide safe income generation alternatives to child labor. According to the project document, CRS and its implementing partners planned four types of livelihoods interventions: agricultural interventions (support to diversify crops, improve farming techniques, improve market access, increase access to credit, and increase alternative income generating activities); the creation of savings and internal lending communities (known as Mutuelles de Solidarité, or MUSO, in Haiti); vocational training for youth; and employment services for youth and adults.

3.2.2 Key Findings

The livelihood component is progressing toward meeting the majority of end-of-project output targets, with a few exceptions.

According to project data as of December 31, 2017, PwoKonTraM has reached 78.1% of its end-of-project target for the number of households that receive at least one livelihood service (support for both agricultural and non-agricultural income generating activities, employment services and MUSO). It has achieved slightly over 100% of its target for the number of beneficiary households that are members of a savings and loan community, but has not succeeded to link any of these to institutional microfinance lenders (two linkages were planned). The project has supported more than double the planned number of households to integrate in a cooperative or other producer group, but has only reached 10% of its end-of –project target for the number of households linked to the market (notably through participation in sales events like agricultural fairs). PwoKonTraM has slightly exceeded its target for the provision of vocational training to youth 15-24 years old and, in addition, offered life skills training to over 1,000 youth.

Income generation outcomes of household livelihood support varied by zone and type of support.

When identifying project support for livelihoods, household beneficiaries mainly focused on inputs for households (seeds, goats, and commerce kits), project support for savings and loans groups, and vocational training for youth. While the project had assumed that most households would prefer agricultural assistance, demand for commerce kits was higher than expected. Project livelihood specialists attributed this to a greater than expected number of female-headed households and their preference for commerce as an income generation strategy.

In communities where producer group inputs were offered by the project (the purchase of a peanut mill, irrigation equipment), KII in the communities highlighted their potential to improve revenues. Project support for improved cultivation techniques, beneficiary integration in producer groups/cooperatives, and access to markets were rarely highlighted in FGD. Project management KII described challenges associated with the latter services, including beneficiary household resistance to changing traditional cultivation techniques, challenges integrating beneficiaries into existing producer groups, getting legal recognition of newly created groups, and lack of good information on market needs.

Based on qualitative data from FGD with households and youth (95 household representatives and 31 youth), as well as feedback from caseworkers, in some cases household livelihood support contributed to modest increases in household incomes, while in other cases households saw no change. Many FGD participants reported that the income generation activities were fruitful (gardens yielded produce, goats reproduced and

> *I have a brother who was staying at home. Now he goes to school. We were able to plant the seedlings. Now we get a revenue.*
>
> – Youth from Beneficiary Household

commerce activities made profits). Many households also reported failure (garden was destroyed in the floods, the seeds did not grow, the goat died). Unfortunately, no quantitative data was available on changes in household income at the time of the evaluation; CRS plans to assess this near the end of the project.

Also based on qualitative data from interviews, the impact of livelihood support on household revenues varied according to the types of assistance provided as well as the intervention zone. Support for agricultural activities, originally the main focus of the project's livelihood strategy, appeared more susceptible to failure than other forms of support. Beneficiaries and project specialists reported variation in climatic conditions, lack of know-how, and in some cases, the quality and timeliness of inputs as among the main causes. Success rates with commerce kits appeared to be higher, especially in more dynamic economic zones on the border, where the population was more entrepreneurial and small inventories of goods for petty commerce activities were more quickly turned-over. According to project management KII, in the second phase of livelihood assistance, these findings had been taken into account and a greater proportion of households received commerce kits.

A factor that affected agricultural livelihood support (goats, seeds), perhaps more than commerce, was the one-time-only nature of the project's contribution for inputs. The latter meant that there was no "second chance" for households whose agricultural or small animal husbandry activities failed. PwoKonTraM project managers highlighted as a constraint the limited budget for livelihood inputs (estimated to be $120-$170 per household) relative to household needs, as well as the number of needy households. One implementing manager underscored the importance of providing a complete package even with limited resources; s/he said they found in the first year when they provided seeds that not all beneficiary households had the resources to use the inputs effectively; the second year, they provided seeds and tools.

Household FGD participants appreciated project support for savings and lending groups and described many positive outcomes, including incentives to save, recourse to a group solidarity fund for emergencies, and access to small loans. Caseworkers reported that in some cases, they had to overcome significant resistance to create the groups, either because of previous negative experiences or the absence of strong traditions of solidarity in some communities. Two or three households whose agricultural activities failed said that they were able to partially recover thanks to small loans that they received from their MUSO, which they used for commerce activities. When asked whether they thought the groups would be able to survive without project or other external support, various participants seemed quite confident that they would. Several FGD participants indicated that they would like to have access to larger loans than what was possible with member-only resources, and requested additional support to expand their capital for loans.

> *MUSO has been very helpful. There were a couple of times last year that I needed funds for an emergency. Also, I was able to get a loan and start a commerce.*
>
> – FGD, Head of Household

Vocational training activities were challenging to implement but well-appreciated by beneficiaries, with some reservations.

The project likewise proposed vocational training for youth as a strategy to boost household revenue by making youth less dependent and more able to earn income to support their households. In the project proposal, CRS planned to assist working or at-risk youth aged 12-14 to enroll in vocational training or accelerated learning programs that provide real-world skills. It also planned to enroll youth aged 15-18 who were engaging in exploitive or hazardous work so that they could obtain decent work with an existing enterprise or as an entrepreneur, and in some cases this was coupled with vocational training. During the implementation phase, CRS focused its vocational training interventions on two age categories: 15-17, and 18-24. Children in the 12-14 year old category were enrolled in formal education.

Implementing partners attested that the vocational training component posed many implementation challenges, including the quasi-absence of appropriate vocational education services in many project communities, budget limitations, youth attitudes and availability, and limited data on employment opportunities due to delays in the delivery of the project market study. On the latter point, CRS managers indicated that they were not satisfied with the draft market study produced by its sub-contractor and had worked with the firm to improve the deliverable, which resulted in late delivery of the final report.

To overcome the challenges identified above, CRS and its implementing partners made some adjustments in their original strategy. According to CRS project managers, the project decided to focus it vocational training services on the older siblings of younger children served by the project. To increase the pool of potential beneficiaries, it raised the age ceiling to 24 years old.

To fill in gaps in market knowledge, CRS implementing partners indicated that they had conducted their own market analysis and assessments of available training programs. To overcome the absence of vocational education services that fit the needs of project beneficiaries, CRS partners adopted a variety of strategies which differed significantly from one partner to another. For example, one implementing partner provided youth with 3-month training courses (200 hours of instruction) with curriculum adapted by government technical and vocation training providers using trainers brought in from Cap Haïtien. Another partner offered only two weeks of residential training during the summer vacation period in Cap Haïtien, using trainers and training facilities located in the city. The short duration of the training was determined in part by the limited budget for training and the logistics of bringing youth from remote villages and hosting them in Cap Haïtien. Two implementing partners also provided vocational training to youth through their own programs and consultants; one in handicrafts and another in agriculture.

Implementers indicated that delays in the delivery of the project market study and challenges with identifying new market niches led them to concentrate most training on traditional occupations like electrician, plumber and mason (which attracted mainly boys) or cook, seamstress, and beautician (which attracted mainly girls), although there were some exceptions (mobile phone repair, flower arranging). Overall, there were fewer girls than boys who received vocational training.

Life skills training was also offered to reinforce needed soft skills such as self-confidence, managing one's emotions, respect for others, and communication. Youth and their parents expressed satisfaction with the training offered by the project, underscoring the usefulness of both technical training and the life skills courses. Skills training and certification appeared to boost participant self-confidence and optimism regarding future career options. One young man affirmed that project training had changed him and he felt we would be able to make something more out of his life.

Based on focus group discussions with youth and their parents, some vocational training beneficiaries had been able to find odd jobs using their newly acquired skill area. However, many youth explained that they had not yet been able to monetize their training, highlighting the need for additional support. Some youth found the technical training to be too short and overly theoretical. Many highlighted the need for additional post-training assistance to find jobs or start up micro-enterprises. Although several youth indicated that they had been put into groups to form a micro-enterprise, their groups had not yet been given other needed forms of support like access to tools or credit. Based on interviews, it appears that some youth received tools while others did not. ProKonTraM noted that it did not plan to support all youth with tools; it opted to support collective work groups in part so that resources could be shared among group members. It appears that the collective groups had only recently been formed at the time of the evaluation; CRS noted that it planned to strengthen its support for these groups during the months that remain in project implementation.

During the stakeholder workshops, some project implementing partners indicated that gender stereotyping in vocational training offerings had not been effectively addressed, and more might have been done to diversify training options for both females and males. However, they also underscored the challenges faced by the project in identifying appropriate vocational training programs in project target communities as a major constraint.

Livelihood beneficiaries understood the link between support and the project objective.

In FGD with beneficiary households and vocational training program participants, the majority of participants showed an understanding that PwoKonTraM's livelihood support was given to enable household children to attend school and reduce their involvement in child labor by boosting household revenues. Out of 13 meetings with households and vocational training recipients, only one group included participants who were not at all aware of the project objective, even though they had received a livelihood service. This was a community where project caseworkers had been let go before the evaluation period and been replaced by community volunteers. In addition, the degree of recognition of the link between the training received and its purpose (to help their younger siblings stay in school) varied among vocational training recipients, some of whom indicated they did not have a younger sibling among project beneficiaries.

> *My goat is going to have offspring. I know that I won't receive tuition but I will have some revenue.*
>
> – FGD, Head of Household

Project household livelihood support was deemed insufficient and unsustainable by many beneficiaries.

Although they expressed gratitude for project livelihood support, many participants in FGD said it was insufficient to surmount their daily subsistence challenges. In the absence of additional assistance, whether school subsidies or livelihood support, several household representatives indicated it would be difficult to sustain their children in school, although some expressed a strong commitment to try.

> *The needs we have are on a daily basis. It is not something you can carry from one year to the next….*
>
> – FGD, Head of Household

During KII it was observed that many beneficiary households suffered from chronic poverty and had inadequate mechanisms to cope with the shocks that frequently afflict Haiti, whether economic, climatic or political. Social problems, some linked to gender discrimination, likewise appeared to be a major cause of vulnerability according to KII with caseworkers and project implementers. As previously noted, a large portion of household beneficiaries were women who said they had numerous (7 or more) children in their charge with no support from an adult male breadwinner. Household beneficiaries likewise included grandparents and foster parents of children whose parents had left to work in the DR.

3.3 Awareness Raising, Social Protection and Legal Services

3.3.1 Overview of Strategy

PwoKonTraM identified perceptions about the role of children and lack of information about child labor, labor rights and social protection as key constraints preventing vulnerable families from protecting their children and improving their situation. It planned mass community sensitization, school-based campaigns, targeted workshops with key stakeholders (local authorities, businesses, community leaders, and local organizations), and advocacy to build understanding and promote behavioral change. The project component on social protection and legal services planned to open Worker Rights Centers (WRC) and through these, refer beneficiary households for legal assistance to defend their rights as workers or to other available social services related to child protection. The WRC were also to provide legal support to workers and their households on issues related to legal documentation. The overall purpose of these planned services was to address human and labor rights issues affecting household economic vulnerability and, as a result, diminish their reliance on child labor.

3.3.2 Key Findings

Awareness raising activities and legal documentation service targets were met while other referral services lagged behind.

On awareness raising, PwoKonTraM reports that it exceeded its targets for the number of information campaigns organized (target was 108) and individuals reached with awareness-raising activities. The project created the planned number of WRC (4) early on in implementation, and in addition opened 13 satellite offices in project communities. While it has reached more than double the number of beneficiaries of legal documents via project support (supporting more than 5,000 individuals[18]), it has not reached its targets for referrals to other social protection services. It also has not identified and/or tracked cases of labor exploitation or trafficking originating in the DR or Haiti. PwoKonTraM managers noted that social protection services are few or nonexistent in project communities and that demand from beneficiaries was low. Also under social protection, the project did not succeed to form or reactivate 12 child protection committees as planned, reaching only 6 to date, although efforts to form additional committees are planned before the end of the project.

Awareness of project messages appears high among most beneficiaries and counterparts.

Based on FGD, most beneficiary households are aware of the principle project awareness-raising campaign messages, including the importance of education, the dangers of child labor (mainly what types of work a child should and should not do), and the importance of legal identity documentation. Youth beneficiaries of vocational training, teachers and school directors who participated in FGD likewise demonstrated understanding of these key project messages. Some local authorities were better informed than others, and this appeared to depend on their degree of cooperation with the project.

> *Children shouldn't be working with machetes or carrying heavy loads because they can get hurt. Also, the more children work, the less they go to school.*
>
> – FGD, Head of Household

At the household level, beneficiaries attributed their increased awareness to the work of caseworkers who came to their houses and organized meetings in the community. Caseworkers affirmed that consistent follow-up with households, children and schools was necessary in order to get key messages across and, more importantly, to translate project messages into changed practices. Many parent(s)/guardian(s) indicated that although they were aware of the importance of education and dangers of child labor, without project support for alternatives, it would be unlikely that increased awareness would result in sustained changes in practices.

[18] This is based on project performance data through December 31, 2017.

Teachers and school directors affirmed that information and discussion on child labor during training workshops had enhanced their knowledge of child labor and their role in discouraging it. Teacher FGD participants showed awareness of key child labor concepts and some indicated they believed project training had made them more sensitive to the educational challenges faced by children from vulnerable families. However, several indicated they felt there was little they could do; for example, one teacher remarked, "The biggest problem that many children have is that they come to school hungry – even the best teacher cannot be effective in this situation."

Posters reinforcing key project messages, developed in Haitian Creole and featuring a good use of graphics to communicate with target populations, were visible in WRC and satellites as well as schools, but not in government offices visited by the evaluator. KII from some implementing partners indicated that they had mobilized community radio operators in awareness-raising and that they had organized commemoration day activities, such as parades (for example on June 12, World Day Against Child Labor) in collaboration with government authorities.

Awareness raising and referrals to address workers' rights abuses and social protection issues were not very relevant in the project context.

In several KII, project implementing partners said they had organized awareness-raising activities on workers' rights. They highlighted that these activities did not resonate with many project beneficiaries, most of whom worked in the informal sector and/or were self-employed. Based on FGD with households, many did not take part in awareness-raising activities on workers' rights, or they had not assimilated key messages. There were exceptions – one household focus group participant, who was a wage earner, said she learned that timely payment of her salary was required by law and some youth indicated that they had learned about working hours, minimum wage and contracts as part of their training program.

Implementers likewise attested that the strategy of using WRC to refer vulnerable households to social protection and legal services related to labor rights did not fit well within the Haitian context. KII from both PwoKonTraM project management and its implementing partners indicated that referral for child protection services was challenged by the lack of available services and the weak institutional capacity of public services. Similarily, project management highlighted that because of capacity deficits, the labor inspectorate was unable to play a meaningful role in responding to labor rights abuses. The issue of human trafficking across the border or within Haiti did not come up in discussion with implementing partners as a significant area of project awareness-raising. One partner, working on the border areas, indicated that it addressed these issues as an organization but not with project funding or through project activities.

To help fill the gap in institutional responses, the project had planned to form and/or strengthen child protection committees in each commune where it intervened. According to the project's M&E data, only two out of five partners recorded achievements in this intervention area. In two of the communities visited by the evaluator, these committees, which included individuals with ties to churches and community-based organizations, appear to have contributed to awareness-raising and to finding solutions to problems affecting vulnerable children. In FGD, members of child

protection committees indicated they would be more effective with additional training and access to resources for activities.

Demand for legal identity documentation services far exceeded expectations.

In contrast to workers' rights and social protection cases, project awareness-raising and services related to legal documentation, specifically birth registration, largely exceeded planned targets. PwoKonTraM's support for legal documentation included institutional support to reinforce the Civil Registrar's office (see Section 3.4 for additional detail), direct subsidies for individuals in project target communities to cover associated fees, and awareness-raising campaigns on the importance of legal documentation. KII from project implementing partners reported that awareness-raising was done as part of project outreach to beneficiary households and through information campaigns, in particular in hard-to-reach communities along the Haitian border.

> *We lost our papers when we were living in the camp. With project support, we got three birth certificates. With a birth certificate, you can get a passport.*
>
> – FGD, Head of Household

When asked about the link between child labor and birth certification, KII indicated that a lack of legal documentation was a factor increasing household and child vulnerability. One KII participant explained that the absence of a birth certificate affects access to education, the right to vote, the right to travel legally outside Haiti, and the right to formal employment, among other fundamental rights. Notably, in some border communities, awareness-raising and support for legal documentation services were the only services offered by the project.

Participants in household FGD reported appreciation for project support regarding birth certification. Some said it had facilitated their child's access to school. After receiving their papers, FGD participants reported paying greater attention to keeping their papers safe. KII from some civil registrar offices reported a marked increase in demand for birth certification, even by those who did not receive project subsidies.[19]

3.4 Government, Private Sector and Civil Society Capacity Building

3.4.1 Overview of Strategy

The project identified weak capacity among key government institutions, notably the Ministry of Social Affairs and Labor (MAST) which is in charge of both labor inspection and the agency that specialized in child protection (the *Institut du Bien-Etre Social et de la Recherche*, or IBESR). It

[19]The civil registrar in Anse à Pitre estimated that 400 individuals had paid for birth registration themselves following project information campaigns.

planned to identify gaps in institutional capacity and address priority areas through training and material support. PwoKonTraM also planned to develop and implement a social compliance model to address violations of fundamental labor rights with at least one private enterprise within the sugarcane value chain. CRS planned to use the experience to expand the model into other agricultural and commercial supply chains. Finally the project planned an advocacy campaign in collaboration with civil society organizations to promote improved social compliance by Haitian businesses.

3.4.2 Key Findings

Little progress was made on capacity building targets.

PwoKonTraM reports no progress on its capacity building indicator targets as defined in its CMEP, whether for Government of Haiti (GoH) institutions, the private sector or civil society organizations. Project management reported that it assessed needs and is in the process of procuring equipment for MAST and IBESR regional offices, which may result in additional progress toward meeting indicator targets. To date, the project reports that it has not identified a private company with which to collaborate on social compliance issues, but will continue its efforts to identify an appropriate counterpart. No advocacy campaign on social compliance issues in partnership with civil society organizations has yet been planned. With little time remaining in project implementation, the project was not optimistic that it would be able to meet its targets by project end.

Government counterparts believe collaboration with project could be improved.

> *It was the role of the municipality to orient the project. It would have been better to consult the city before starting the project.*
>
> – KII, Municipal Authority

While confirming project activities to be highly relevant to their constituencies' needs, several GoH authorities expressed that they would have liked to be better informed, more involved in project implementation and to have received direct support for their institutions. One implementing partner remarked that more might have been done by CRS to bring in central authorities during the implementation phase as a means to reinforce sustainability. Another implementing partner expressed strong opinions that collaboration with local authorities might have been improved. The main challenges affecting potential collaboration that were highlighted by project management and GoH counterparts included high levels of turn over in some key partner agencies and among local authorities (the latter, following local elections), project time constraints and its decision to prioritize the initiation of direct services, and a lack of institutional capacity (personnel, means of transportation, and other basic equipment) among GoH institutions.

PwoKonTraM project managers reported that CRS consulted with national authorities during the design phase of the project, citing project support for school councils as one outcome. All implementing partners likewise indicated that they had informed local authorities about their

planned activities; one implementing partner also provided written quarterly updates to local government counterparts, a gesture that was repeatedly praised by local authorities during KII interviews. Based on interviews, some officials were better informed than others, even within the same office.

Civil servants from the MAST reported tha there was little direct collaboration with the project on the delivery of services to households and children, with the exception of joint awareness-raising activities such as those carried out on the National Day for Children in 2017. Project management and several government counterparts confirmed that regional and local authorities took part in project launch activities, CMEP workshops, and some quarterly meetings, and in some target zones, participated in community meetings and activities involving the distribution of project support. In KII with local elected officials, some reported collaborating with caseworkers to address issues affecting project implementation, such as administative approvals for school infrastructure work. In an effort to engage more strongly with local government authorities, one implementing partner located WRC satellite offices within local government offices after procuring desks and other basic materials for the offices.[20]

> *As local authorities, we don't have many means – we can monitor the action and participate in awareness campaigns, but we cannot take on the burden.*
>
> – KII, Local Elected Official

Support for the Civil Registry Office was a successful government counterpart capacity building initiative.

While not originally planned under the project component on capacity building, relative to its work with other government counterparts, PwoKonTraM's cooperation with Civil Registrar Offices was extensive and included project support for institutional capacity building. At the community level, civil registry officials reported receiving project support for badly needed basic materials used to record births (registry books, forms) and assistance to increase clerical support as well to improve linkages with intermediary offices within the Ministry of Justice. One project implementing partner explained that in order for birth records to be registered, records generated at the community level must follow several steps involving government offices in regional capitals before reaching the National Birth Registration Archives. If all steps are not completed, the birth certificate recipient will not be able to obtain national identification

> *Our situation was bad before, mainly because I did not have registry books. Since 2008, I rarely sent a book to be registered in the national archives. Since last year, I have sent eight.*
>
> – KII, Civil Registry Official

[20] In the last 6 months of the project, the implementing partner also transferred the WRC to the main local government office in the commune.

cards and passports. PwoKonTraM tackled this issue by facilitating the flow of documentation between these offices and providing training and awareness-raising to workers in intermediary offices about their role in birth registration.

Civil registry officers expressed strong appreciation for project support, which they credited with empowering them to do their job. One civil servant reported that he had been on the job for ten years and had never received a registry book from the government. However, the same civil servants expressed fear and doubt about what would happen after the end of the project, when materials provided by the project run out.

> *If the project ends, I will have problems again.*
>
> – KII, Civil Registry Official

3.5 Project Baseline Survey

As part of its grant agreement, CRS planned to carry out a baseline and endline child labor prevalence survey in its target communities. After the project launch in 2015, CRS carried out the baseline survey in collaboration with a Haitian research firm contracted for this purpose. Under the supervision of CRS, the firm carried out the survey in late 2015 and early 2016. According to KII from the project management team and the firm itself, data collection occurred as planned. CRS managers indicated that it wanted from the start to provide strong supervision of the data collection process in order to ensure the contractor followed its proposed methodology. A USDOL informant provided different information on the data collection process; s/he indicated that data collection was delayed and that CRS had strengthened its oversight of data collection because of these data quality issues.

All key stakeholders involved in the report validation process noted that it took a long time and required multiple revisions, including input from USDOL, before the report was in its final form. The USDOL informant noted that the quality of the initial draft report was very low in terms of technical standards and the clarity of the narrative. All stakeholders indicated that it was necessary to clarify some of the definitions used to analyze the survey data.

The finalization of the report took longer than expected. Reasons given for this delay included the need to refine data analysis (discussed above), the need to address commentary from multiple stakeholders (CRS project staff, HQ, and USDOL), the availability of research firm personnel responsible for addressing different rounds of comments, and changes in USDOL personnel in charge of validating the survey report.[21] Project management reported during KII that the final

[21] USDOL noted that if the report had been completed within the planned time framework, final approval of the report would not have been affected by personnel turnover.

survey report responded to its expectations and had been approved just prior to the interim evaluation fieldwork.

To improve the efficiency of the endline, project management plans to provide more supervision to the firm during data collection and to provide more rapid feedback on initial drafts of the report. CRS project management underscored the importance of providing supervision for the data collection process to ensure that the methodology proposed by the firm was effectively implemented by the enumerators and other survey personnel. The data collection firm likewise affirmed the important of close collaboration between itself and the project throughout baseline implementation as critical to achieving intended results.

Even though the final report came late in project implementation, the project indicated it had shared data from the draft report with its implementing partners and together they had used key findings to design some project interventions. For example, project management indicated that its decision to include education quality interventions was partly influenced by data from the baseline survey.

At the time of the evaluation, the report had not yet been shared with government counterparts. According to project management, it intends to disseminate the report but had not yet decided how this would be done, whether via a workshops or a simple distribution of the report.

IV. MAIN CONCLUSIONS

CRS and its implementing partners were effective in mobilizing and delivering direct services to beneficiary children and households. To date, less than two years after the PwoKonTraM's official launch in June 2016, CRS and its five implementing partners have made steady progress in delivering education and livelihood services to a large number of project direct beneficiaries. Overall, the team demonstrated strong capacity to efficiently set up offices in local communities, identify appropriate beneficiaries, mobilize resources, and deliver planned goods and services.

With its limited resources in time and budget, PwoKonTraM contributed modestly to needed improvements in beneficiary school learning environments. While individual education subsidies for children appeared to have been a drop of water in an ocean of need, teacher training, school infrastructure improvements and school council and transitional education interventions were very relevant and addressed educational quality issues that, in addition to the cost of education, push children to abandon school and engage in child labor. These interventions were made in a relatively small number of schools but have potential to have lasting impact in those schools.

The project's initial strong focus on improving household revenues from agriculture did not adequately consider the weather-related risks and other challenges to increasing small-scale farmers' revenues. With only about two years for interventions and limited resources for livelihood support, project ambitions to improve yields and increase access to markets were overly ambitious. The project did well to realign its strategy and increase its support for activities with fewer short-term risks and greater potential for quick yields, such as small animal husbandry and petty commerce activities. Its decision to support a greater-than-planned number of households to form savings and loan groups likewise has helped to reinforce the effectiveness of its livelihood support initiatives.

Project vocational training responded effectively to the aspirations of youth from beneficiary households to widen their vocational horizons, but is unlikely to be sufficient to enable youth to find jobs or start income generating activities. With a relatively small budget and few available training institutions, the project implementation team showed creativity in adapting available vocational offerings to the context of the project. The weaknesses in the technical training and post-training support identified by some participants (insufficient hands-on training, insufficient support for the creation of microenterprises, limited access to tools and credit) will likely limit access by youth to regular employment/income generation activities in absence of additional support.

Project awareness-raising and monitoring interventions appear to have been effective in changing household beneficiary attitudes about the kinds of work children should undertake and the importance of schooling. Caseworkers played a critical role in making key project messages stick with beneficiary households. Even if they doubted their capacity to keep

their children in school and stop them from having to work, most parents/guardians consulted during the evaluation fieldwork appeared to be convinced of the importance of making an effort.

With some exceptions, PwoKonTraM contributions to capacity building for GoH counterparts were weak. The project's biggest gaps in performance are under its capacity building component. Some performance gaps may be explained by errors in the project design – when adapting the project strategy planned in the DR, CRS under-estimated the challenges of working with GoH institutions, which are significantly weaker than those in the DR. In addition, its analysis of the potential and overall relevance of planned social compliance initiatives was poor given the characteristics of the Haitian economy and labor market. Given the time that remains for project implementation, it is unlikely that the project will catch up and meet its targets under this component. On a more positive note, the unplanned capacity building intervention with the Civil Registrar's office contributed to tangible improvements in an essential government service in project communities. To sustain the benefits, follow-up and advocacy efforts by CRS and its partners are needed.

Although many project direct beneficiaries (households, children, and youth) received short-term benefits from project direct services, they remain highly vulnerable to set-backs in the absence of additional and more long-term livelihood support. The project offered sufficient short-term economic and social incentives to convince large numbers of parents/guardians to send their children to school. Based on anecdotal evidence, project support may have long-lasting benefits for a few of the children served. However, PwoKonTraM's short-term school subsidies and livelihood support are unlikely to be sufficient to sustainably overcome economic barriers to education faced by a large number of beneficiary households, especially in light of the mixed outcomes of project household livelihood activities.

The project period of implementation was too short and its resources spread too thinly (too many households, communities). Project education and livelihood interventions needed more time and additional resources to effectively increase the resilience of vulnerable households and reduce their dependence on child labor. Taking into consideration the prevalence of extreme poverty in target communities and the GoH's weak capacity to deliver basic services, the project overestimated the potential of one or two years of fairly limited services to address the root causes of child labor in project communities.

V. GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

5.1 Good Practices

Regular follow-up on beneficiaries' education and work activities by community-based caseworkers: Community-based caseworkers played an important role in ensuring that project education, livelihood and awareness-raising strategies contributed to changes in household practices. Regular visits by caseworkers to share and reinforce project messages and address problems affecting children's school attendance were described by households as an important service provided by the project. Although caseworkers described challenges reaching some households due to distance and limited transportation options, they said their caseload generally made it possible to visit each household at least once a month, and more often when follow-up with schools indicated that household children were missing school.

Life skills, entrepreneurship and awareness-raising as a complement to vocational training for youth: When offered, life skills, entrepreneurship training and awareness-raising effectively addressed knowledge, attitudinal and cross-cutting skills deficits among youth.

Co-locating project satellite offices in local government buildings: Even though the practice did not radically strengthen the role of local authorities during project implementation, locating project offices within government premises sent the right message to both government officials and beneficiaries that project activities were not to be seen as another NGO activity that did not concern or involve elected officials or civil servants. In addition, it enabled the implementing partner to invest project resources in local government facilities that would be left behind after the project ends.

5.2 Lessons Learned

Interventions should be planned to be delivered over a longer period of time and the quantity and variety of assistance should be increased: Evaluation findings show that although the project offered education and livelihood services to households, many participants in KII and FGD indicated that these services were not sufficient to make a sustainable change in households' capacity to pay for their children's schooling after the end of project subsidies. One implementer remarked that project assistance was diluted because it focused heavily on offering individual and household services. With so many vulnerable households to be reached with limited resources, this pushed implementers to spread resources thinly in order to reach the maximum number of children and households.

Other stakeholders likewise said that project's support was given over too short a period of time. There was broad consensus among implementers, stakeholders, and beneficiaries that more time and additional services would be useful to consolidate project gains, especially with regards to livelihood improvement strategies. Evaluation findings likewise show that individual services are

not sufficient to affect the root causes of child labor, and need to be complemented by broader sets of interventions that address systemic deficiencies in public and other services available in target communities. Educational quality interventions (teacher training, school councils, school improvements), savings and loan groups, and community livelihood improvements (peanut grinder, irrigation) were well received by stakeholders. These interventions were viewed as addressing root causes of child labor and as relatively sustainable by the groups, institutions and communities.

Gender dimensions of child labor are important and attention should be paid to empowering women and adolescent girls: CRS' implementing partners recognized that in the majority of households, livelihood support would be most effective in promoting child welfare and reducing child labor if it was provided to the woman. Findings from the evaluation showed that many female-headed households suffered from extreme poverty and this affected the extent that project livelihood support could make a significant difference. Key informants explained that in many cases, the households included many children fathered by multiple men and described a cycle of dependence that often started with early motherhood, the father abandoning the household, taking a new partner, having more children and again, abandonment. When discussing the issue, project implementers thought that more could and should be done in future projects to empower adolescent girls to avoid early motherhood and strengthen the potential independence of woman breadwinners by improving women's access to training, land and membership in producer groups.

Awareness-raising on workers' rights, while important, is not the most relevant issue affecting child labor in Haitian agriculture within the project implementation areas: Other topics for awareness-raising, related to factors affecting household and child vulnerability, would be more relevant to the root causes of child labor, such as birth certification, women's rights, benefits of smaller families, and the need for greater self-reliance.

Project support for improving the institutional capacity of government agencies can be effective if they are well-focused and include both grassroots interventions and interventions that address systemic deficiencies at the regional and national levels: PwoKonTraM's institutional support for the birth registration process is well-focused on addressing gaps at various levels in the process. The approach, which takes into consideration both the needs at the grassroots level as well as the systemic weaknesses that create the problems, has the best chance of creating effective change.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommended actions are to be considered by CRS and its implementing partners during the time remaining for project implementation:

1. After discussing with USDOL, provide additional education/livelihood support to existing household beneficiaries rather than adding new beneficiaries. This would imply offering a second chance to households whose first year livelihood strategies failed. Likewise, rather than continuing to serve additional youth with vocational training courses, focus on post-training support for already-served youth – such as supporting access to apprenticeship, offering support for acquiring tools, and providing follow-up technical and soft skills training.

2. Retain or increase the number of caseworkers as the project draws down and ensure that existing household beneficiaries continue to receive regular visits from caseworkers until the end of project activities.

3. Document teacher training modules and provide the documentation to participating teachers.

4. Ensure that all willing household beneficiaries have the opportunity to form and participate in a savings and loan group. Investigate opportunities to increase access to capital by the existing groups that are more advanced.

5. Ensure that adequate support is provided to relevant GoH offices to complete the birth registration process (identity in national archives) for existing birth registration beneficiaries. Document the project's good practices and lessons learned on birth registration. Conduct an advocacy campaign for needed improvements in the birth registration process, leveraging CRS' national-level partnerships, bi-national networks with the DR, and ties with the Catholic Church.

6. As part of the close-out strategy, plan knowledge-sharing activities with national and local government officials and other nongovernmental organizations that are active in target zones. Include presentations on key findings of the baseline/endline surveys, as well as good practices and lessons learned in the area of education, livelihood and legal services support.

The following recommendations are for actions to be considered by CRS and its implementing partners in *future programs* of a similar nature:

7. Reduce the number of intervention zones to a level that all willing out-of-school children of school age can be offered education alternatives. Ensure that ample time for intervention follow-up and monitoring by caseworkers is available during the life of the project.

8. Include cross-cutting interventions on youth, especially adolescent girls, and women's empowerment.

9. Incorporate additional "community strengthening" efforts and interventions that may include a greater involvement of child protection committees and other community-based groups in monitoring children, additional support for the formation and strengthening of producer groups on livelihood strategies, and additional capacity-building for community and public schools.

10. Work more closely with relevant local government offices for the delivery of services, including allocating more time and resources for institutional capacity building at local levels and basing project offices within local government offices when possible.

The following recommendation is for USDOL:

11. If consideration is given to funding additional programs on child labor in Haiti, target at least some of the same communities that were served by ProKonTraM. Additional time and resources are needed in these communities to consolidate the gains contributed by the project.

ANNEX 1: Overview of Project Progress

Objectives	Indicators	End-of Project Targets and Results as of 9/30/2017	
Project Objective: Reduced incidence of Child Labor in the project's 12 target communes	POH.1 % of beneficiary HH with at least one child engaged in child labor	**Target**	1,500/30%
		Actual	Not available
	POH.2 % of beneficiary HH with at least one child engaged in hazardous child labor	**Target**	Not available
		Actual	Not available
	POC.1 % of beneficiary children engaged in child labor	**Target**	3,000/30%
		Actual	49.4% (male: 54%, female: 43.8%) Most up-to-date figures reported in April 2017
	POC.2 % of beneficiary children working in hazardous child labor	**Target**	3000/20%
		Actual	21.1% (male: 25.9%, female: 15.2%) Most up-to-date figures reported in April 2017
IO1: School Attendance among beneficiary children increased	POC.4 # and % of beneficiary children who regularly (75%) attended any form of education during the past six months	**Target**	5670/75%
		Actual	91% Most up tp date figures reported in April 2017
	POH.4 # and % of beneficiary households with all children of compulsory school age attending school regularly (75%)	**Target**	3,750/75%
		Actual	Not available
	E1 # of children engaged in or at high risk of entering child labor provided education or vocational training services	**Target**	7,560
		Actual	4,803 (male: 2,600, female: 2,203) September 2017
IO1.1 Financial obstacles to school attendance reduced	# and % of beneficiary children covered by project-funded subsidies to cover school fees and standard supplies	**Target**	5,600
		Actual	4,803 (male: 2,600, female: 2,203) September 2017
	# and % of beneficiary households with children covered by subsidy/financial support from the project	**Target**	2,800 (80%)
		Actual	Not available
IO1.2 Increased access to school transition mechanisms adapted to the needs of beneficiary	# of mechanisms set up in communities to facilitate transition of beneficiary children from the informal to the formal education	**Target**	24
		Actual	14

Objectives	Indicators	End-of Project Targets and Results as of 9/30/2017	
children	system		
	# and % of beneficiary children who move from the informal to the formal education system	**Target**	1,008 (70%)
		Actual	490 (34%)
IO1.3 Improved school infrastructure (safety and hygiene)	# and % of targeted schools benefitting from project support for basic infrastructure	**Target**	72/85%
		Actual	85 (% not reported)
IO1.4 Active school councils support children's education	# of active school councils regularly engaged in school activities	**Target**	30
		Actual	32 in April 2017
IO1.5 Increased teacher knowledge of the needs of the project's beneficiary children	# of teachers who demonstrate increased knowledge of classroom management and referral services available at Workers' Rights Centers	**Target**	433/85%
		Actual	887/66% (male: 515, female: 372)
IO2: Incomes in beneficiary HH increased	% of beneficiary households having increased their income by at least 10% from project start to finish	**Target**	3,250/65%
		Actual	
	L1 # of beneficiary households that have received a livelihoods service	**Target**	3,780
		Actual	2,734
	L2 # of adults provided with employment services	**Target**	Not Available
		Actual	
	L3 # of children provided with employment services	**Target**	Not Available
		Actual	
	L4 # of individuals provided with economic strengthening services	**Target**	Not Available
		Actual	
	L5 # of individuals provided with services other than employment and economic strengthening	**Target**	Not Available
		Actual	
IO2.1 Increased production by beneficiary households of agricultural and alternative products	% of beneficiary households having increased production by at least 10%	**Target**	Not Available
		Actual	Not Available
	# of beneficiary households that have engaged in at least one alternative income generating activity	**Target**	2,934
		Actual	441
IO2.1.1 Improved technical skills among producers in both agricultural and alternative income generating activities	# and % of producers who applied techniques learned during training in their production activities	**Target**	2,646/70%
		Actual	Not Available
IO2.1.2 Increased access to	# of beneficiary households participating	**Target**	900

Objectives	Indicators	End-of Project Targets and Results as of 9/30/2017	
micro-finance	for the first time or reintegrating a MUSO group	**Actual**	891
	# of partnerships established with Micro-Finance Institutions	**Target**	3
		Actual	0
IO2.1.3 Increased access to inputs	# of households that receive inputs through project support	**Target**	3,780
		Actual	1,606
IO2.2 Improved linkages among producers, buyers and consumers	# of households that join a cooperative and/or producers association	**Target**	100
		Actual	215
	# of producers participating in sales events	**Target**	4,500
		Actual	20
IO2.3 Improved information available on markets and sales channels for agricultural and alternative products	# of stakeholders (Chambers of Commerce, producers, etc.) who receive the project study on potential markets, sales channels and CL/labor rights awareness	**Target**	90
		Actual	0
IO3: Increased decent work opportunities among beneficiary youth 15-24 years of age	# and % of beneficiary youth 15-24 years old who obtain a decent work opportunity (internship, apprenticeship, individual enterprise or formal sector job)	**Target**	1,050/30%
		Actual	0
	# and % of beneficiary youth 15-24 years old who join a group that promotes collective work (association, workshop, MUSO)	**Target**	140/4%
		Actual	0
IO3.1 Increased knowledge among beneficiary youth of skills required for work	# and % of beneficiary youth 15-24 years of age who are certified at the end of their vocational or technical training program	**Target**	462/70%
		Actual	Not Available
IO3.2 Increased market-based adaptation of vocational training for beneficiary youth	# of vocational or technical training programs that adapt their programs based on labor market needs	**Target**	16
		Actual	7
IO4: Beneficiary households receive social protection services and information on workers' rights	# and % of beneficiary households who receive at least one social protection service (school cantine/nutrition, psychosocial support, legal aid for children/workers, referral to MAST/IBESR-abused children, family reunification)	**Target**	3,024
		Actual	374 as of April 2017
	# and % of beneficiary households who receive information on workers' rights (rights and responsibilities in the context of	**Target**	3,024
		Actual	151 as of April 2017

Objectives	Indicators	End-of Project Targets and Results as of 9/30/2017	
	the Labor Code and/or applicable ILS)		
	# and % of beneficiary households and other persons in border areas receiving legal documents via project support	**Target**	2,500
		Actual	3,724
	% of beneficiary households reporting a positive level of satisfaction with services received from the Centers (survey)	**Target**	3,000/60%
		Actual	Not Available
IO4.1 Increased capacity of the Workers' Rights Centers to provide support services to beneficiary households	# of WRC providing services in line with the Operations Manual (references, legal aid, support to obtain identity documents)	**Target**	4/100%
		Actual	4
	# and % of Center staff trained who demonstrate an understanding of the Center's operations procedures	**Target**	34/0%
		Actual	38/100% reported in October 2016
IO4.2 Increased understanding among beneficiary households of available social protection services and the need for legal documentation	# and % of individuals making requests for legal documentation	**Target**	2,500
		Actual	3,607
	# and % of beneficiary households requesting social protection services	**Target**	4,000
		Actual	2,592
IO4.3 Improved attitude within target communities regarding child labor	# of active local Child Protection Committees working with the project	**Target**	6
		Actual	Not Available
IO4.3.1 Improved dissemination of awareness raising message on negative aspects of child labor	# of persons reached by awareness raising campaigns	**Target**	5,400
		Actual	19,101
	# of dissemination activities organized (by type-radio, focus group, meeting, etc.)	**Target**	108
		Actual	134 reported in April 2017
IO4.3.2 Adoption of an awareness raising message on child labor that resonates with the target population	% of focus group participants who demonstrate understanding of the key elements of the message	**Target**	85%
		Actual	80%
IO5 : Increased government, private sector and civil society prioritization of protection of child and worker rights	# of project interlocutors that demonstrate increased prioritization of rights for workers and children engaged in child labor	**Target**	14
		Actual	0

Objectives	Indicators	End-of Project Targets and Results as of 9/30/2017	
IO5.1 Strengthened capacity to protect child and worker rights within state agencies (MAST, IBESR, BPM, local government)	# of systems/devices installed on the departmental level that will ensure improved follow-up of at-risk populations (children and workers) including computers, databases, pilot child labor monitoring systems, supplies and equipment.	**Target**	4
		Actual	0
	# of MAST and IBESR personnel trained whose post-test results demonstrate increased knowledge of Haitian labor laws and/or ILS and child protection	**Target**	12
		Actual	0
IO5.2 Increased commitment to social compliance within target companies	# of companies who sign a social compliance plan	**Target**	1
		Actual	0
	# of companies that implement their policy of social compliance including safety equipment, prohibition of child labor, etc.	**Target**	1
		Actual	0
IO5.3 Increased involvement by civil society in advocacy to protect the rights of children and workers	# of local civil society organizations engaged in advocacy to protect child and worker rights (NGOs, unions, etc.)	**Target**	3
		Actual	0

ANNEX 2: Evaluation Terms of Reference

Independent Interim Evaluation

Proteje Kondisyon Travay Moun
Protecting the Working Conditions of People
- PwoKonTraM -
in HAITI

Cooperative Agreement Number:	IL-24912-13-75-K
Financing Agency:	U.S. Department of Labor
Grantee Organization:	Catholic Relief Services
Dates of Project Implementation:	30 September 2013 – 29 March 2019
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Interim Evaluation
Evaluation Field Work Dates:	January 15 – February 2, 2018
Preparation Date of TOR:	October 2017
Total Project Funds from USDOL:	US $9,993,289

Vendor for the Evaluation Contract:

Dwight Ordoñez: dwightor@gmail.com

Azure Maset: azure.maset@gmail.com

I. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

USDOL - OCFT

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). OCFT activities include research on international child labor; supporting U.S. government policy on international child labor; administering and overseeing cooperative agreements with organizations working to eliminate child labor around the world; and raising awareness about child labor issues.

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over $900 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 90 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate child labor. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Reducing exploitative child labor, especially the worst forms through the provision of direct educational services and by addressing root causes of child labor, including innovative strategies to promote sustainable livelihoods of target households;
2. Strengthening policies on child labor, education, and sustainable livelihoods, and the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, address its root causes, and promote formal, non-formal and vocational education opportunities to provide children with alternatives to child labor;
3. Raising awareness of exploitative child labor and its root causes, and the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;
4. Supporting research, evaluation, and the collection of reliable data on child labor, its root causes, and effective strategies, including educational and vocational alternatives, microfinance and other income generating activities to improve household income; and
5. Ensuring the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with a high incidence of child labor are withdrawn and integrated into educational settings, and that they persist in their education once enrolled. In parallel, the program seeks to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor. The projects are based on the notion that the elimination of exploitative child labor depends, to a large extent, on improving access to, quality of, and relevance of education. Without improving educational quality and relevance, children withdrawn/prevented from child labor may not have viable alternatives and could resort to other forms of hazardous work.

In FY2010, Congress provided new authority to ILAB to expand activities related to income generating activities, including microfinance, to help projects expand income generation and address poverty more effectively. The addition of this livelihood focus is based on the premise that

if adult family members have sustainable livelihoods, they will be less likely to have their dependent children work and more likely to keep them to school.

The approach of USDOL child labor elimination projects – decreasing the prevalence of exploitive child labor through increased access to education and improving the livelihoods of vulnerable families – is intended to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at-risk of entering exploitive labor.

Project Context[22]

In 2017, 13 million (8.8%) children are engaged in child labor in Latin America and the Caribbean. Agriculture remains by far the most important sector where child laborers can be found (98 million, or 59%), but the problems are not negligible in services (54 million) and industry (12 million) – mostly in the informal economy.[23] In Haiti, the child labor situation overall is serious: an estimated 21% of Haitian children work in sectors such as domestic service, agriculture, including in small farms, and street work.[24] The use of *restaveks* – unpaid child domestic servants living and working away from home – is a widespread phenomenon in Haiti. These children lack all access to basic rights and services, creating a generation of disenfranchised and vulnerable youth.

Catholic Relief Services (CRS) conducted a rapid assessment of select communes in the North and North East Department in April 2015 to further assess the prevalence of child labor in those areas, particularly in the sugar cane sector. CRS' findings in this rapid assessment indicated that 45.6% of sampled children in the North Department are engaged in work, mostly in the agriculture sector. In addition, 33.3% of children working from those sampled were engaged in work on a sugarcane plantation at one level or another (clearing the land, carrying sugarcane, processing sugarcane at the distillery, etc.). Findings from the North East Department indicate that sugar cane is not a major source of economic activity in the region, however, 41.41% of sampled children were engaged in some kind of work.

The Let's Work for Our Rights (LWR) Project targets the North, North East departments and the border areas between Haiti and the Dominican Republic where child labor is very significant. For example, child labor is prevalent particularly in the North department where there are significant producers of sugarcane which rely on smallholder family farms and out-grower schemes. In that region of Haiti, sugarcane is one of the main sectors where children work. They participate at different level in the value chain, not only working in the fields but also participating in the transformation process to the selling in the local street markets. In addition, children working in the sugarcane value chain carry heavy loads and are exposed to alcohol consumption.

---

[22]Adapted from Project CMEP

[23]http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/child-labour/lang--en/index.htm

[24]UNICEF. (n.d.). At a glance: Haiti: Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/haiti_statistics.html

During the CMEP 1 workshop, LWR partners identified five major problems which contribute to the prevalence of child labor in Haiti: low economic capacity of households; targeted children are not in school; lack of professional skills among youth 15-18 years of age; limited household access to social protection and legal services; and insufficient protection of child and worker rights by government, private sector and civil society.

Project-Specific Information[25]

In September 2013, the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking (OCFT) awarded a cooperative agreement to the Catholic Relief Services to implement a project entitled "Let's Work for Our Rights" (LWR). It was originally conceived to be implemented in the Dominican Republic, but due to a series of events the decision was taken in September 2015 to move the project to Haiti. Activities were reformulated accordingly and the project was officially launched in June 2016, with a new end date of March 2019.[26]

The project seeks to reduce child labor and improve labor rights and working conditions in Haitian agriculture, including in sugarcane producing areas and in production supply chains, in three regions: The North and North East departments and the borders areas with the Dominican Republic. The project addresses the following factors leading to child labor and violation of workers' rights: poor school attendance; low household income; absence of social protection services; lack of youth employment opportunities; absence of policies and programs addressing child labor issues at local and national level; and lack of awareness on child labor and workers' rights issues in the communities. LWR activities are designed to help curb those factors.

The project uses an area-based approach with services provided through a consortium of five local partners including JURIMEDIA, Association of Volunteers International Service (AVSI), Collectif de Lutte Contre l'Exclusion Sociale (CLES), Haiti SURVIE and Services Jésuites aux Migrants (SJM). Each partner has considerable on-the-ground experience in each of the targeted areas. The area-based approach ensures that all forms of child labor and labor rights violations in the targeted geographic areas of the project are addressed in the life of the program. Building off the successful Workers' Right Center (WRC) model used by CRS in Central America and the Dominican Republic (DR), the project creates community-based hubs that provide awareness raising, legal services, social protection referrals, livelihoods and education interventions to beneficiary households and children. Community-based case managers employed by the project's partners and working in the WRCs identify households and provide ongoing monitoring.

Below is a summary of the project's intermediate and supporting objectives:

---

[25]Adapted from Project CMEP, Cooperative Agreement, and Project Modifications

[26]The changes in geographic location, budget, scope and timeline were agreed upon through a series of project modifications.

AREA 1 : EDUCATION	
IO 1: School attendance among beneficiary children increased	
IO 1.1	Financial obstacles to school attendance reduced
IO 1.2	Increased access to school transition mechanisms adapted to the needs of beneficiary children
IO 1.3	Improved school infrastructure (safety and hygiene)
IO 1.4	Active school committees support children's education
IO 1.5	Increased teacher knowledge of the needs of the project's beneficiary children
AREA 2 : LIVELIHOODS	
IO 2 : Income increased in beneficiary households	
IO 2.1	Increased production by beneficiary households of agricultural and alternative products
IO 2.1.1	Improved technical skills among producers in both agricultural and alternative income generating activities
IO 2.1.2	Increased access to micro-finance
IO 2.1.3	Increased access to inputs
IO 2.2	Improved linkages among producers, buyers, consumers and input vendors
IO 2.3	Improved information available on markets and sales channels for agricultural and alternative products
AREA 3 : YOUTH EMPLOYMENT	
IO 3 : Increased decent and productive work opportunities among beneficiary youth 15-18 years old	
IO 3.1	Increased knowledge among beneficiary youth of skills required for work
IO 3.2	Increased market-based adaptation of vocational training for beneficiary youth
AREA 4 : SOCIAL PROTECTION	
IO 4 : Beneficiary households receive social protection services and information on workers' rights	
IO 4.1	Increased capacity of the Workers' Rights Centers to provide support services to beneficiary households
IO 4.2	Increased understanding among beneficiary households of available social protection services and the need for legal documentation
IO 4.3	Improved attitude within target communities regarding child labor
IO 4.3.1	Improved dissemination of awareness raising message on negative aspects of child labor
IO 4.3.2	Adoption of an awareness raising message on child labor that resonates with the target population
AREA 5 : GOVERNMENT, PRIVATE SECTOR AND CIVIL SOCIETY CAPACITY	
IO 5 : Increased government, private sector and civil society prioritization of protection of child	

and worker rights	
IO 5.1	Strengthened capacity to protect child and worker rights within state agencies (MAST, IBESR, BPM, local government)
IO 5.2	Increased commitment to social compliance within target companies
IO 5.3	Increased involvement by civil society in advocacy to protect the rights of children and workers

II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

Evaluation Purpose

The main purposes of the interim evaluation are:

1. To review the on-going progress and performance of the Project (extent to which immediate objectives and outputs are being achieved),
2. To examine the likelihood of the Project achieving its objectives and targets,
3. Identify ways to improve delivery and enhance coordination with key stakeholders,
4. To identify promising practices and ways to promote their sustainability.

The evaluation should also describe how the project worked to build the capacity of the government, and identify successes, challenges and lessons learned for working with existing government programs in Haiti. The interim evaluation should provide key stakeholders with information to assess and revise, as it is needed; work plans, strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements and resources.

Intended Users

The evaluation will provide OCFT, the grantee, other project stakeholders, and stakeholders working to combat child labor more broadly, an assessment of the project's experience in implementation, its effects on project beneficiaries, and an understanding of the factors driving the project results. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations will serve to inform any project adjustments that may need to be made, and to inform stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future child labor elimination projects as appropriate. The evaluation report will be published on the USDOL website, so the report should be written as a standalone document, providing the necessary background information for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

Evaluation Questions

1. To what extent has LWR been successful in implementing its vocational training and employment services to date? What adjustments were made, if any, from what was planned in the project document?

2. To what extent have LWR livelihoods interventions (especially the provision of agricultural technical packages and inputs) been successful in improving the livelihoods of households, according to evaluation participants? Is the project integrating child labor prevention strategies and activities in its livelihood strategies? If so, to what extent have these been effective? To what extent have livelihoods interventions enabled beneficiary households to take charge or pay for their children's schooling?

3. What are the project challenges and opportunities in working with government officials that the project has encountered to date? To what extent has the project been effective in seizing opportunities and overcoming challenges? Are there any lessons learned? To what extent has the project strengthened government capacity to address child labor/worker and its root causes?

4. Has LWR encountered any obstacles to implementing its planned strategies to address social compliance in agriculture, especially in the sugar cane supply chain? To what extent have the awareness raising campaigns been effective in highlighting workers' rights and the negative consequences of child labor?

5. To what extent has the Workers' Rights Centers legal assistance component of the Workers' Rights Centers, particularly on LWR been effective in the following areas, and what is necessary to sustain these activities beyond the life of the project:

    - Addressing the legal identification problem facing Haiti,

    - Identifying and/or tracking cases of labor exploitation originating in Haiti or the Dominican Republic,

    - Addressing government capacity to reducing vulnerable children and human-trafficking in the area?

6. To what extent have LWR's education referral activities been effective in following-up with referred children and ensuring that the participating schools address the children's education needs and challenges. What role, if any, have school counsels played?

7. What did LWR learn from carrying out its baseline survey in Haiti? How is LWR using or intending to use the baseline survey research and report?

III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

The evaluation methodology will consist of the following activities and approaches:

A. Approach

The evaluation approach will be qualitative and participatory in nature. Qualitative information will be obtained through field visits, interviews and focus groups as appropriate. In addition, quantitative data will be drawn from the CMEP and project reports to the extent that it is available

and incorporated in the analysis. Opinions coming from beneficiaries (teachers, parents and children) will improve and clarify the use of quantitative analysis. The participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among beneficiaries.

The evaluation approach will be conducted by an independent evaluator. Project staff and implementing partners will generally only be present in meetings with stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries to provide introductions. The following additional principles will be applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives will be triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions.
2. Gender and cultural sensitivity will be integrated in the evaluation approach.
3. Consultations will incorporate a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries, allowing additional questions to be posed that are not included in the TOR, whilst ensuring that key information requirements are met.
4. As far as possible, a consistent approach will be followed in each project site, with adjustments made for the different actors involved, activities conducted, and the progress of implementation in each locality.

B. Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will consist of:

1. The international evaluator
2. As appropriate an interpreter fluent in necessary languages will travel with the evaluator

One member of the project staff may travel with the team to make introductions. This person is not involved in the evaluation process, or interviews.

The international evaluator will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with SFS and USDOL; directly conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; analysis of the evaluation material gathered; presenting feedback on the initial findings of the evaluation to national stakeholders during a meeting following the data collection phase and preparing the evaluation report and responding to stakeholder feedback.

The responsibility of the interpreter in each provincial locality is to ensure that the evaluator is understood by the stakeholders as far as possible, and that the information gathered is relayed accurately to the evaluator.

C. Data Collection Methodology

1. Document Review

- Pre-field visit preparation includes extensive review of relevant documents
- During fieldwork, documentation will be verified and additional documents may be collected

- Documents may include:
    - CMEP documents and data,
    - Baseline and endline survey reports,
    - Project document and revisions,
    - Cooperative Agreement,
    - Technical Progress and Status Reports,
    - Project Results Frameworks and Monitoring Plans,
    - Work plans,
    - Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports,
    - Management Procedures and Guidelines,
    - Research or other reports undertaken (baseline studies, etc.), and
    - Project files (including school records) as appropriate.

2. Question Matrix

Before beginning fieldwork, the evaluator will create a question matrix, which outlines the source of data from where the evaluator plans to collect information for each TOR question. This will help the evaluator to allocate time in the field, ensure all possible avenues for data triangulation, and to clearly note how evaluation findings are to be derived. The Contractor will share the question matrix with USDOL.

3. Interviews with stakeholders

The evaluator will interview as many LWR stakeholders as possible including the implementers, direct and indirect beneficiaries, community leaders, donors, and government officials. It is anticipated that meetings will be held with:

- OCFT staff responsible for this evaluation and project prior to the commencement of the field work,
- US Embassy representative, if relevant,
- CRS Country Representative and HQ support staff,
- CRS LWR program managers,
- CRS implementing partner personnel, including program managers as well as child labor monitors involved in assessing whether children have been effectively prevented or withdrawn from child labor situations,
- Government authorities in Cap Haitien and Port Liberté (Ministry of Social Affaires (MAST), Institute for Social welfares (IBESR), Bureau for the Protection of Minors (BPM), Mayor's office)
- Other international and national NGOs and multilateral agencies working in the area with which the project has collaborated,
- School teachers and directors and other education personnel involved in LWR education services,
- Relevant livelihood service providers,
- Project direct beneficiaries (children withdrawn and prevented and members of their households receiving livelihood support),
- Community members in areas where awareness-raising activities occurred.

The evaluator will interview stakeholders in one-on-one key informant interviews (KII) or in focus groups. The evaluator will request that CRS implementing partners assist in identifying potential participants in Focus Group Discussions (FGD). The main target groups for FGDs are direct beneficiary children and households, and participants in awareness raising activities. Should CRS' implementing partners have lists of participants available, the evaluator will randomly select participants from these lists. Should this not be possible, the evaluator will ask CRS implementing partners to target diverse participants, representing different ages, project service category types, and other distinguishing characteristics. Each FGD will include 7-10 participants. To keep the FGDs focused and comparable, all FGDs will follow a common format and will be scheduled to last two hours- maximum, including English-Creole interpretation.

The evaluator will use a purposive sampling approach to identify candidates for KIIs, using criteria such as involvement with LWR and knowledge about the child labor situation in Haiti. The evaluator will strive to strike a representative gender balance among direct beneficiary interviewees. Among key informants, the ET will attempt to interview an even number of men and women, but this may not be possible if key stakeholders (such as GoH officials, program managers) are lopsided toward one sex or another.

4. Data Collection Protocols

Before initiating field work, the evaluator will develop data collection protocols to guide data collection. The purpose of the protocols is: (1) to ensure all key issues are covered during data collection, (2) to elicit rich information from respondents, including on their views of the project's accomplishments, program design, sustainability, and the working relationship between project staff and their partners, where appropriate, (3) to help organize information in a form that can be usefully and efficiently analyzed, and (4) to ensure that sex-disaggregated data is collected and that information is gathered to assess the extent to which the project is effectively addressing the specific concerns of both male and female children and household members. The protocols consist of questions that address the evaluation questions and other issues deriving from the evaluator's document review and its preliminary discussions with USDOL and CRS staff.

5. Site Sampling

The evaluator will select the project sites to be visited based on the following criteria:

- Coverage of all five interventions types: household livelihood support, education, vocational training & employment services, social protection interventions (mainly legal support) and Awareness Raising;
- Inclusion of all three project implementation zones: North, Northeast, and border areas with the DR,
- Coverage of geographic areas where all five national implementing partners work: AVSI (Cap Haitien & surrounding areas), CLES (areas near Port Liberté), Haiti Survie (Port Liberté and surrounding areas), and Jurimedia (areas near Cap Haitien and border areas with the DR).
- Inclusion of two department capitals where government partners have offices.

In addition to the criteria above, the evaluator will make every effort to include some sites where the project experienced successes and others that encountered challenges, as well as a good cross section of sites across targeted CL sectors. The evaluator will not conduct interviews in places to which it may be unsafe to travel. Logistical and time effectiveness factors will also guide the site selection process.

D. Data Analysis Processes and Methods

The evaluator will capture preliminary findings, conclusions, and recommendations in an Excel-based matrix that categorizes analysis by evaluation question. The matrix will organize findings by key themes that arise from the interviews. The matrix: a) ensures that the evaluators prepares a systematic and thorough response to each evaluation question, b) identifies any gaps where additional clarification or analysis may be necessary, and c) serves as the basis for developing the evaluation report. Analytical triangulation approaches will be employed as part of the ET's development of findings and conclusions. Triangulation will enable the evaluator to cross-verify and cross-validate the findings that emerge from various data sources. The ET will employ several data analysis methods to identify key finding from the collected data, as well as to draw conclusions and make recommendations. Likely analysis methods will include trend, gap, comparative, and gender analysis.

E. Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews.

Efforts will be made to include parents' and children's voices and beneficiary participation generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor (http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026) and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children (http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html).

F. Stakeholder Meeting

Following the field visits, the evaluator will conduct a stakeholder meeting that brings together the implementing partners and other interested parties. During the meeting, the evaluator will present the major preliminary findings and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders, including those not interviewed earlier.

The agenda is expected to include some of the following items:

- Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary findings,
- Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the findings,
- Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality,
- Discussion of recommendations to improve the implementation and ensure sustainability. Consideration will be given to the value of distributing a feedback form for participants to

nominate their "action priorities" for the remainder of the project.

The evaluator and project staff will agree on the final stakeholder meeting participant list and agenda during fieldwork.

The evaluator will organize a debriefing with USDOL following the stakeholder workshop to share preliminary findings and solicit feedback as needed.

G. Limitations

Evaluation fieldwork will last nearly three weeks, from January 15-31. Because she will not have enough time to visit all project sites, the evaluator will make efforts to ensure that she is visiting a representative sample of sites, including some that have performed well and some that have experienced challenges.

Various types of bias –response, selection, and gender may affect the validity of evaluation data. The evaluator will be make efforts to mitigate these by:

- Ensuring that implementing partner staff is not present during interviews. When possible, selecting neutral meeting places (other than project office) for KII and FGDs;
- Randomly selecting FGD participants from lists provided by CRS and its implementing partners and taking opportunities to interview KII in addition to those proposed by LWR managers;
- Considering possible gender preconceptions might come into play during this evaluation, and reviewing how to minimize these during data collection and analysis.

This is not a formal impact assessment. Findings for the evaluation will be based on information collected from background documents and in interviews with stakeholders, project staff, and beneficiaries. The accuracy of the evaluation findings will be determined by the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources.

H. Timetable

The tentative timetable is as follows. Actual dates may be adjusted as needs arise.

Task	2017 – 2018 Dates
Background project documents sent to Contractor	Fri, Oct 20
OCFT submits Evaluation purpose and questions to Contractor	Mon, Oct 23
SFS sends Draft TOR to OCFT and CRS	Thurs, Oct 27
CRS submits Evaluation questions and list of stakeholders to Contractor	Wed, Nov 8
Draft itinerary developed	Wed, Nov 15
Logistics call-Discuss logistics and field itinerary (Contractor will send minutes following the call)	Fri, Nov 17
Finalize TOR with USDOL and submit to Grantee	Fri, Nov 22

Finalize field itinerary and stakeholder list for workshop	Fri, Dec 1
Cable clearance information submitted to USDOL	Fri, Dec 1
Evaluator submits Question Matrix to Contractor	Fri, Dec 15
SFS submits Question Matrix to OCFT and CRS	Fri, Jan 5
Interview call with USDOL	Mon, Jan 8
Fieldwork	Jan 15 – Feb 1
Stakeholder Meeting	Fri, Feb 2
Post-fieldwork debrief call	Wed, Feb 7
Draft report to contractor for quality review	Wed, Feb 21
Draft report to USDOL & Grantee for 48 hour review	Mon, Feb 26
48 hr Comments due to Contractor	Wed, Feb 28
Revised report sent to Contractor	Fri, Mar 2
Revised report sent to USDOL and CRS	Mon, Mar 5
USDOL and stakeholder comments after full 2-week review	Mon, Mar 19
Revised report to Contractor for quality review	Fri, Mar 23
Revised report to USDOL	Tues, Mar 27
Final approval of report	Tues, Apr 10
Editing&508 compliance review	Apr 10-24
Final edited report to COR	Tues, Apr 24
Final edited report to grantee and stakeholders	Fri, Apr 27

IV. EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

Ten working days following the evaluator's return from fieldwork, a first draft evaluation report will be submitted to the Contractor. The report should have the following structure and content:

1. Table of Contents
2. List of Acronyms
3. Executive Summary (no more than five pages providing an overview of the evaluation, summary of main findings/lessons learned/good practices, and key recommendations)
4. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology
5. Project Description
6. Evaluation Questions
    - Answers to each of the evaluation questions, with supporting evidence included

7. Findings, Recommendations and Conclusions
    a. Findings – the facts, with supporting evidence
    b. Conclusions – interpretation of the facts, including criteria for judgments
    c. Key Recommendations - critical for successfully meeting project objectives – judgments on what changes need to be made for future programming
    d. Lessons Learned and Best Practices
8. Annexes - including list of project indicators; documents reviewed; interviews/ meetings/site visits; stakeholder workshop agenda and participants; TOR; etc.

The total length of the report should be approximately 30 pages for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

The first draft of the report will be circulated to OCFT and key stakeholders individually for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final reports as appropriate, and the evaluator will provide a response to OCFT, in the form of a comment matrix, as to why any comments might not have been incorporated.

While the substantive content of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the evaluator, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/OCFT in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR.

V. EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

Sistemas, Familias y Sociedad (SFS), the Contractor, will be responsible for Evaluation Management and Support.

SFS has contracted Sandra Wark to conduct this evaluation. She is an evaluator with more than 10 years of experience in international development. She has wide experience in carrying out evaluations in Africa, Asia and the Caribbean, including Belize and Haiti. She has completed several evaluations of USDOL-funded projects, as well several evaluations on ILO workers' rights-related projects and child labor projects. Mrs. Wark is fluent in English and French.

SFS will provide logistical and administrative support to the Evaluator, including travel arrangements (e.g. plane and hotel reservations, plane tickets, providing *per diem*) and all materials needed. SFS will also be responsible for providing the management and technical oversight necessary, including quality reviews of all deliverables, to ensure completion of the evaluation milestones and adherence to technical standards as well as the clarity and comprehensiveness of the evaluation report.

ANNEX 3: Evaluation Data Collection Matrix

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Methods and Data Sources	Information to be Collected	Analysis Methods
1. To what extent has the project been successful in implementing its vocational training and employment services to date? What adjustments were made, if any, from what was planned in the project document?	**Document Review** **KIIs (up to 1.5 hours)** • USDOL Program Manager • CRS Project Personnel • Implementing Partners • GOH (MAST, IBERS, BPM, local government representatives) • Vocational Training Service Providers • Representatives of other NGOs that collaborate with the project **FGDs (up to 2 hours)** • Participants in vocational training and employment services	• Description of strategy for delivery of vocational training and employment services and progress to date with implementation • Perception of the quality and relevance of interventions/services • Perception of progress relative to indicators: youth obtaining certification, labor market orientation of vocational training programs • Identification of successful and unsuccessful program elements • Perception of inhibiting and facilitating factors for program achievement • Identification of lessons learned and good practices • Suggestions for how interventions might be improved in time that remains before project end	• Content analysis • Trend analysis • Gap analysis • Comparative analysis • Gender analysis
2. To what extent have LWR livelihoods interventions (especially the provision of agricultural technical packages and inputs) been successful in improving the livelihoods of households, according to evaluation participants? Is the project integrating child	**Document Review** **KIIs (up to 1.5 hours)** • USDOL Program Manager • CRS Project Personnel • Implementing Partners (program managers, case workers)	• Description of planned project strategies to improve household livelihoods and progress to date with implementation • Perception of the quality and relevance of interventions/services • Identification of successful and unsuccessful program elements	• Content analysis • Trend analysis • Gap analysis • Comparative analysis • Gender analysis

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Methods and Data Sources	Information to be Collected	Analysis Methods
labor prevention strategies and activities in its livelihood strategies? If so, to what extent have these been effective? To what extent have livelihoods interventions enabled beneficiary households to take charge or pay for their children's schooling?	• GOH (MAST, IBERS, BPM, local government representatives) • Other Livelihood Service Providers **FGDs (up to 2 hours)** Direct beneficiaries of project livelihood services	• Perception of changes among direct beneficiaries: agricultural production levels, alternative income generating strategies, membership in a MUSO, access to financial services. • Perception of inhibiting and facilitating factors for program achievement • Identification of lessons learned and good practices • Suggestions for how interventions might be improved in time that remains before project end • Identification of factors that hinder or facilitate sustainability	
3. What are the project challenges and opportunities in working with government officials that the project has encountered to date? To what extent has the project been effective in seizing opportunities and overcoming challenges? Are there any lessons learned? To what extent has the project strengthened government capacity to address child labor/worker and its root causes?	**Document Review** **KIIs (up to 1.5 hours)** • USDOL Program Manager • CRS Project Personnel • Implementing Partners (program managers, case workers) • GOH (MAST, IBERS, BPM, local government representatives)	• Description of project strategy to building the capacity of government counterparts and progress to date with implementation • Perception of the quality and relevance of collaboration/ capacity building interventions • Identification of successful and unsuccessful capacity building interventions • Perception of changes related to indicators: capacity to follow-up on at risk populations, knowledge of labor and child protection laws • Perception of inhibiting and facilitating factors for collaboration and capacity building	• Content analysis • Trend analysis • Gap analysis • Comparative analysis • Gender analysis

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Methods and Data Sources	Information to be Collected	Analysis Methods
		• Identification of lessons learned and good practices • Suggestions for how interventions might be improved in time that remains before project end • Identification of factors that hinder or facilitate sustainability	
4. Has LWR encountered any obstacles to implementing its planned strategies to address social compliance in agriculture, especially in the sugar cane supply chain? To what extent have the awareness raising campaigns been effective in highlighting workers' rights and the negative consequences of child labor?	**Document Review** **KIIs (up to 1.5 hours)** • USDOL Program Manager • CRS Project Personnel • Implementing Partners (program managers, case workers) • WRC managers • Companies engaged with project • Chambers of Commerce representatives • GOH (MAST, IBERS, BPM, local government representatives) **FGDs (up to 2 hours)** Participants in project awareness raising activities	• Description of planned strategies to address social compliance in agriculture including relevant awareness raising campaigns and progress with implementation • Identification of factors that inhibit or facilitate implementation • Perception of changes in knowledge and awareness on workers' rights and negative consequences of child labor Perceptions of which strategies/campaigns have been most/least successful and why	• Content analysis • Trend analysis • Gap analysis • Comparative analysis • Gender analysis
5. To what extent has the Workers' Rights Centers legal assistance component of the Workers' Rights Centers, particularly on LWR been effective in the following	**Document Review** **KIIs (up to 1.5 hours)** • USDOL Program Manager • CRS Project Personnel	• Description of strategies in legal assistance component • Identification of successful/unsuccessful interventions • Identification of factors that inhibit or facilitate implementation	• Content analysis • Gap analysis • Comparative analysis • Gender analysis

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Methods and Data Sources	Information to be Collected	Analysis Methods
areas, and what is necessary to sustain these activities beyond the life of the project: • Addressing the legal identification problem facing Haiti, • Identifying and/or tracking cases of labor exploitation originating in Haiti or the Dominican Republic, • Addressing government capacity to reducing vulnerable children and human-trafficking in the area?	• Implementing Partners (program managers, case workers) • WRC managers • GOH (MAST, IBERS, BPM, local government representatives) **FGDs (up to 2 hours)** • Beneficiaries of legal services	• Identification of perceived gaps in existing programs to improve working conditions and promote workers' rights • Identification of factors that hinder or facilitate sustainability	
6. To what extent have LWR's education referral activities been effective in following-up with referred children and ensuring that the participating schools address the children's education needs and challenges. What role, if any, have school counsels played?	**KIIs (up to 1.5 hours)** • USDOL Program Manager • CRS Project Personnel • Implementing Partners (program managers, case workers) • School teachers • GOH (MAST, IBERS, BPM, local government representatives) **FGDs (up to 2 hours)** • School Council Members • Participants in teacher training • Direct beneficiary children	• Description of strategies in education component including strategies related to build capacity of school councils • Identification of successful/unsuccessful interventions • Identification of factors that inhibit or facilitate implementation • Identification of perceived gaps in existing programs to ensure participating schools address children's education needs and challenges • Identification of factors that hinder or facilitate sustainability	• Content analysis • Gap analysis • Comparative analysis • Gender analysis
7. What did LWR learn from carrying out its baseline	**KIIs (up to 1.5 hours)** • USDOL Program Manager	• Description of methodology, process of implementation	• Content analysis

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Methods and Data Sources	Information to be Collected	Analysis Methods
survey in Haiti? How is LWR using or intending to use the baseline survey research and report?	• USDOL M&E Focal Point • CRS Project Personnel • Baseline survey implementer • Relevant stakeholders identified as potential users of the baseline data and research (GOH, Implementing partners, other NGOs working on child protection/rights issues)	• Identification of factors that inhibited or facilitated implementation • Description of if/how survey data has been used to date and plans for future use • Identification of lessons learned and good practices	• Gap analysis • Gender analysis

ANNEX 4: List of Documents Reviewed

1. CRS Haiti DR timeline
2. CRS Haiti, Baseline Study Final Report, December 2017
3. CRS Haiti, Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, May 2016
4. CRS Haiti, Detailed Project Document, August 2015
5. CRS Haiti, Presentation of Results-to-Date, Quarterly Implementing Partners Meeting, February 2018
6. CRS Haiti, Rapid Child Labor Assessment - North East North - April 2015
7. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, January- March 2015
8. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, April- June 2015
9. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, July- September 2015
10. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, October-December 2015
11. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, January- March 2016
12. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, April- June 2016
13. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, July- September 2016
14. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, October-December 2016
15. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, January- March 2017
16. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, April- June 2017
17. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, July- September 2017
18. CRS Haiti, Technical Progress Report, October-December 2017
19. Haiti Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, Directorate of Planning and External Cooperation, The Problem of Over-Age Students in the Haitian Education System An Overview, 2000
20. USAID Haiti, Education Fact Sheet, January 2016
21. USDOL CRS Haiti Cooperative Agreement
22. USDOL CRS Haiti Project Revision Form -7 August 2015
23. USDOL, 2016 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor, Haiti
24. USDOL, 2016 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor, Dominican Republic
25. World Bank, Haiti Country Overview

ANNEX 5: Schedule of Field Visits and Stakeholder Meetings

This page is intentionally left blank in accordance with the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) of 2002, Public Law 107-347.

ANNEX 6: Stakeholder Meeting Agenda

Agenda for the PwoKonTraM Project Workshop

Dates : January 31 – February 2, 2018

Wednesday, January 31, 2018

8:30-9:00 AM: Opening of the Session

- Introduction

9:00-10:15 AM: Presentation by SJM

- Presentation of quarterly and overall results
- Presentation of implementation strategies

10:15-10:30AM: Coffee Break

10:30-1:00AM: Presentation by Haiti Survival M&E Officer

- Presentation of quarterly and overall results
- Presentation of implementation strategies

1:00-2:00PM: Lunch

2:00-4:30 PM: Presentation by CLES M&E Officer

- Presentation of quarterly and overall results
- Presentation of implementation strategies

4:30-5:00PM: Closing of the first day

Thursday, February 1, 2018

8:30-10:15 AM: Presentation by M&E Officer

- Presentation of quarterly and overall results
- Presentation of implementation strategies

10:15 -10:30 AM: Coffee Break

10:30- 1:00 PM: Presentation by AVSI

- Presentation of quarterly and overall results
- Presentation of implementation strategies

1:00-2:00 PM: Lunch

2:00- 3:00 PM: State of implementation in a global perspective

3:00-4:00 PM: Finance Perspective and/or General Discussion

4:00-4:30 PM: Closing of the Workshop by Project Manager

Friday, February 2, 2018

9:00-12:30 PM: Feedback workshop on external evaluation

12:30-1:30 PM: Lunch

ANNEX 7: Map of Project Geographic Areas