



BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR



Photo credit: David Moore

FINAL EVALUATION

COOPERATION ON FAIR, FREE, EQUITABLE EMPLOYMENT (COFFEE) PROJECT

April 2024

Grantee: Verité

Project Duration: December 2017 – March 2024

Fiscal Year and Funding Level: FY 2023: \$2.5M

Lead Evaluators: David Moore and Jonathan Renshaw

Evaluation Fieldwork Dates: November 17, 2023 - December 9, 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This report describes the final evaluation of the Cooperation On Fair, Free, Equitable Employment (COFFEE) Project. Fieldwork for this evaluation was conducted in November and December 2023. The COFFEE Project is financed by the US Department of Labor (USDOL) and is implemented by Verité, an independent non-profit civil society organization (CSO) based in Massachusetts. The Project objective is to “improve implementation of social compliance systems that promote acceptable conditions of work and the elimination of child labor and forced labor in coffee supply chains.” Verité designed the Project’s technical cooperation and pilot projects to strengthen the capacity of civil society to address abusive labor practices. conducted this independent evaluation in collaboration with the project team and stakeholders. WI-HER prepared the evaluation report according to the terms specified in its contract with USDOL. The evaluation team would like to sincerely thank all the parties involved for their support and valuable contributions.

Submitted by:

WI-HER, LLC

8212 Old Courthouse Rd. Suite A

Vienna, VA 22182, USA

www.wi-her.org

Contact Person: Taroub Harb Faramand, MD, MPH

President & Founder

Funding for this evaluation was provided by the US Department of Labor under contract number 47QRAA22D005K. This material does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the US Department of Labor, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	1
LIST OF ACRONYMS	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
1. PROJECT CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION	12
1.1. THE PROJECT	12
1.2. TIMELINE AND BUDGET	12
1.3. VERITÉ	14
1.4. THE COFFEE TOOLKIT	15
1.5. DESIGN AND PREPARATION OF THE TRAINING MODULES	16
1.6. THE PILOT PROJECTS	17
1.7. SECURITY	19
1.8. MONITORING AND EVALUATION	19
2. EVALUATION PURPOSE	20
2.1. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION	20
2.2. METHODOLOGY	21
2.3. THE SURVEY	21
2.4. STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP AGENDA AND PARTICIPANTS, AND ROUND-UP WORKSHOPS	21
3. EVALUATION RESULTS	21
3.1. RELEVANCE AND COHERENCE	21
3.1.1. THEORY OF CHANGE	21
3.1.2. UNDERSTANDING OF THE COFFEE SECTOR AND SUPPLY CHAINS	22
3.1.3. RELEVANCE TO THE PRIORITIES OF THE TARGET GROUPS	22
3.1.4. ADAPTATION TO CHANGING CONDITIONS	23
3.1.5. ANALYSIS OF RISKS	23
3.2. EFFECTIVENESS	24
3.2.1. PRIMARY OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES	24
3.2.2. CAPACITY BUILDING	25
3.2.3. STRENGTHENING COMPLIANCE	25
3.2.4. CHALLENGES	26
3.3. EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY	26

3.3.1.	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	27
3.3.2.	THE COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN (CMEP)	27
3.3.3.	THE MID-TERM EVALUATION (MTE)	28
3.4.	IMPACTS	28
3.4.1.	ASSESSMENT OF THE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 1	28
3.4.2.	CMEP DATA ON IMPACT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 1	29
3.4.3.	ASSESSMENT OF THE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 2	29
3.4.4.	CMEP DATA ON IMPACT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 2	30
3.4.5.	ASSESSMENT OF THE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 3	30
3.4.6.	CMEP DATA ON IMPACT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 3	32
3.4.7.	IMPACTS OF THE PILOT PROJECTS	32
3.5.	SUSTAINABILITY	33
3.5.1.	FACTORS AFFECTING SUSTAINABILITY	34
3.5.2.	IMPACT OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION	34
3.6.	EQUITY AND INCLUSION	35
3.6.1.	MARGINALIZED AND UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS	35
3.6.2.	DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT	35
3.6.3.	KEY FACTORS	36
3.6.4.	THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC	36
3.6.5.	EQUITABLE ACCESS FOR MARGINALIZED AND UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS	36
3.6.6.	GENDER EQUITY AND WOMEN'S RIGHTS	37
3.6.7.	STEPS TO ENSURE ACCESS FOR MARGINALIZED AND UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS	37
4.	LESSONS LEARNED AND PROMISING PRACTICES	37
4.1.	LESSONS LEARNED	37
4.1.1.	THE TOOLKIT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS	37
4.1.2.	THE PILOT PROJECTS	38
4.2.	SECTOR SPECIFIC ISSUES	39
4.2.1.	VULNERABLE POPULATIONS	39
4.3.	PROMISING PRACTICES	40
4.3.1.	PROACTIVE ADAPTATION OF THE TOOLKIT TO NATIONAL AND LOCAL CONTEXT	40
4.3.2.	ENGAGEMENT WITH THE PUBLIC SECTOR	40

4.3.3.	HIGHER EDUCATION	40
4.3.4.	TECHNICAL STUDIES AND PARTICIPATORY WORKSHOPS	41
5.	CONCLUSION	41
5.1.	PROJECT DESIGN	41
5.2.	COFFEE TOOLKIT AND TRAINING	42
5.3.	PILOT PROJECTS	42
5.4.	SUSTAINABILITY	42
5.5.	EFFICIENCY	43
5.5.1.	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	43
5.5.2.	THE MID-TERM EVALUATION	43
5.6.	IMPACT	43
5.6.1.	OUTCOME 1	43
5.6.2.	OUTCOME 2	44
5.6.3.	OUTCOME 3	44
5.6.4.	IMPACTS OF THE PILOT PROJECTS	44
6.	RECOMMENDATIONS	45
	ANNEX A. EVALUATION DESIGN MATRIX	48
	ANNEX B. DOCUMENTATION FOR IN DEPTH REVIEW	64
	ANNEX C. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	68
	ANNEX D. OUTLINES FOR KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS	77
	ANNEX E. FULL LIST OF THE INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES TO BE SURVEYED BY THE ELECTRONIC QUESTIONNAIRE	81
	ANNEX F. APPROVED SURVEY SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	85
	ANNEX H. DETAILS OF THE METHODOLOGY	92
	ANNEX I. RESULTS OF THE ONLINE SURVEY	93
	ANNEX J. THE COFFEE TOOLKIT	101
	ANNEX K. TERMS OF REFERENCE	104

LIST OF ACRONYMS

A&M	Auditors & Monitors
CLAC	Latin American & Caribbean Network of Fair-Trade Small Producers and Workers
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
CML	Cooperatives, medium and large farms
COFFEE	Cooperation on Fair, Free, Equitable Employment
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
CSG	Civil Society and Government
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
EMATER/MG	Company of Technical Assistance and Rural Extension in the state of Minas Gerais
ES	Espírito Santo State
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FNC	National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia
IDP	Internally displaced people
ILAB	Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILO	International Labor Organization
INCAPER	Capixaba Institute for Research, Technical Assistance and Rural Extension
InPACTO	Institute for the National Pact to Eradicate Slave Labor
INSS	The Brazilian National Social Security Scheme
KII	Key Informant Interview
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

MG	Minas Gerais State
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NGOs	Non-governmental Organizations
NICRA	Negotiated Indirect Cost Ratio Agreement
OTC	Outcome
PMU	Project management unit
PPE	Personal protective equipment
PSA	Pre-Situational Analysis
PSS	Private sector stakeholders
RE-ACT	Risk Evaluation for Action in the Coffee Trade
RBM	Results Based Management
RRT	Retailers, roasters, and traders
SAQ	Self-assessment Questionnaire
SCA	Specialty Coffee Association (USA)
SFC	Small Farmers and Small Cooperatives
S3T	The Socially Sustainable Sourcing Toolkit (since February 2024 called the COFFEE Toolkit)
TOC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPR	Technical Progress Report
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
VSS	Voluntary Sustainability Standards

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The COFFEE Project's objective is to "improve implementation of social compliance systems that promote acceptable conditions of work and the elimination of child labor and forced labor in coffee supply chains." The outcomes include:

1. The adoption of a robust and sustainable social compliance system by private sector stakeholders (PSS) in coffee supply chains;
2. strengthened capacity of PSS to implement a robust and sustainable social compliance system in coffee supply chains; and
3. new social compliance tools on child labor, forced labor, and acceptable conditions of work piloted in the coffee supply chain."

The Project's overall temporal scope was December 2017 to March 2024. USDOL requested that the evaluators not include the original Guatemala project (entitled "Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala") in the evaluation's scope. Following a security incident in Guatemala in March 2018, the Project was modified in June 2019 to incorporate a regional scope. The revised Project, renamed the COFFEE Project (Cooperation On Fair, Free, Equitable Employment), was designed to run for three years, from June 2019 to March 31, 2022, with a budget of US\$2M. The COFFEE Project was extended to June 30, 2023, and then to March 31, 2024, with the pilots in Mexico and Colombia closing in June 2023. The final budget was US\$2.5M.

The Project's technical scope covers the COFFEE toolkit, which changed during the Project's implementation period. Until mid-February 2024, the toolkit used by Verité comprised 17 documents, corresponding to the eight steps of the USDOL Comply Chain model. On February 12, 2024, Verité informed the evaluation team that Verité had launched a new "COFFEE Toolkit" comprising 28 tools, including 20 downloadable documents and seven videos, an interactive risk evaluation dashboard (the RE-ACT Dashboard), and 14 open-access training modules that introduce labor issues and steps to reduce the risk of labor violations.

The Project envisioned the implementation of three pilot projects developed in partnership with PSS and industry associations in Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil. The pilot projects included training to test the toolkit, initiatives focused on improving harvesting and increasing workers' income in Colombia, and measures to prevent recruitment-related risks in Brazil.

The Mexico pilot involved training and the development of training materials. Since much of the training took place during the pandemic, it was almost entirely online, combining self-paced work with some instructor-led classes. Verité offered the training to field technicians, agronomists, company representatives, certifiers, and members of the National Anti-Trafficking Commission. The Colombia pilot worked with the Manos de Café project, which is supported by major international coffee buyers. It included two key studies: the Living Income and Living Wage Report and a Time and Motion study; workshops with smallholder coffee growers and locally recruited workers; piloting harvesting methods intended to increase workers' income while reducing ergonomic risks; and evaluating interventions to improve worker wellbeing, implemented by Manos de Café, including an entrepreneurship program to help workers generate income outside

the harvest season, medical and dental care, and enrollment in government social security programs. The Brazil pilot focused on recruitment-related risks, including a study of labor migration and recruitment in Minas Gerais. The pilot worked with large coffee growers and cooperatives to formalize recruitment and eliminate abuses by intermediaries.

KEY EVALUATION RESULTS

Relevance and coherence: The Project's Theory of Change (TOC) posits that by engaging with private-sector coffee companies and civil society, it is possible to eliminate child labor and forced labor, and promote improvements to the income and working conditions of coffee workers and smallholder farmers. This assumes that voluntary sustainability standards (VSS) will have a greater influence on purchases in coffee supply chains, even though companies and certifiers currently may have little presence in the field and limited capacity to enforce labor standards.

Effectiveness: The COFFEE Toolkit is the most significant component of the Project. The current English version, released in February 2024, comprises 28 tools and corresponds to the eight steps of the USDOL Comply Chain model. It has helped coffee companies, buyers, certifiers, producers, and producer organizations develop, adopt, and/or update their systems of social compliance. However, the toolkit and online training modules must be adapted to the needs of the specific users, companies, organizations, countries, and regions to fully achieve the Project's objectives and outcomes. The toolkit has been most effective in the Brazilian pilot projects, where it was adapted to the needs of the companies and organizations.

Impacts: Almost all informants spoke highly of the training provided. In Mexico, several participants stated that before they took the courses, they had little or no understanding of the definitions of forced labor and child labor and were unfamiliar with the country's labor legislation. However, some informants found the online training to be demanding. In Colombia, the applied studies contributed significantly to discussions between the smallholder coffee farmers, the coffee workers, and the Manos de Café project. Although the proposals for alternative methods to harvest coffee were not taken up, the studies and subsequent discussions identified potential areas that could significantly improve coffee workers' and small farmers' lives and livelihoods.

The Project's impact on Project Outcome 1 is likely to be substantial. Impact data show targets were surpassed for output indicators. The Project's impact on capacity strengthening of coffee stakeholders (Project Outcome 2) includes improved capacity and awareness among stakeholders, with most targets surpassed. The Project's impacts on piloting the new toolkit (Project Outcome 3) include 31 tools piloted in total: in Mexico (12), Colombia (2), and Brazil (17).

Efficiency: The efficiency of the capacity-building components was challenged by redesigning the initial project to become a three-country program within the original budget and a short time frame. In Mexico, the major factors affecting the Project's efficiency were the Covid-19 pandemic and the lack of a Project Management Unit (PMU) on the ground. Verité requested an extension to the Project to June 30, 2023, due to delays caused by Covid-19 and expansion of the Brazilian pilot project.

Sustainability: Sustainability is a key concern. The toolkit and training modules need to be updated, especially the RE-ACT Dashboard, which includes information updated annually. The new Toolkit, launched in February 2024, must be maintained, regularly revised, and expanded to cover new issues. The training has been completed in Mexico and will end in Brazil in March 2024. Verité

may have opportunities to continue or expand the training program, with financial support from PSS.

Equity and inclusion: The pilot projects were intended to benefit some of the more vulnerable groups in the coffee supply chain. The Project worked with private sector projects, certifiers, large and some medium-scale producers, and organized groups of smallholders (cooperatives). The work tended to focus on smallholder producers, who were less likely to hire migrant workers, such as the itinerant workers known as *andariegos* in Colombia or the migrant workers in Brazil. In Brazil, the Project made systematic efforts to engage with the labor brokers but received little or no response. The Project achieved significant progress working with large farms and cooperatives but had less engagement with the middle-range farms where abuses may be more prevalent.

Table 1. Performance Summary

Performance Summary	Rating
Outcome 1: Adoption of a robust and sustainable social compliance system by private sector stakeholders (PSS) in coffee supply chains.	
The Project developed a toolkit. The latest version comprises 28 modules. Although most PSS already have compliance systems and/or work with existing certifiers' systems, the different versions are a useful resource that can support and reinforce these systems. In the pilot project in Brazil, the toolkit and associated training were adapted to stakeholders' needs.	<p>Achievement: ● ——— ● ——— ○ ——— ●</p> <p>Sustainability: ● ——— ○ ——— ● ——— ●</p>
Outcome 2: Strengthened capacity of PSS to implement a robust and sustainable social compliance system in coffee supply chains.	
The Project provided training through the pilot projects in Mexico and Brazil. In Mexico, it included interesting initiatives but with limited impact due in part to constraints imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic. In Brazil, the training workshops and development of manuals strengthened the capacity of key stakeholders, including large-scale producers and smallholder cooperatives. In February 2024, the Project launched 14 new open-access training modules.	<p>Achievement: ● ——— ● ——— ○ ——— ●</p> <p>Sustainability: ● ——— ● ——— ○ ——— ●</p>
Outcome 3: New social compliance tools on child labor, forced labor, and acceptable conditions of work piloted in coffee business operations and supply chains.	
The project offered training using the first toolkit version. In Mexico, the pandemic limited the training scope. It would have been more effective had there been time and resources to follow up. In Brazil, some business operations improved their compliance systems, especially in regard to forced labor. The studies and workshops in Colombia focused on issues related to working conditions.	<p>Achievement: ● ——— ○ ——— ● ——— ●</p> <p>Sustainability: ● ——— ● ——— ○ ——— ●</p>

PROMISING PRACTICES

In Brazil, the Project piloted the toolkit using a participatory methodology and adapted it to the priorities of the companies and cooperatives. The Project produced manuals and helped improve labor contracts, allowing workers to receive better and more secure labor contracts and benefits; the coffee farmers benefited since workers tend to return to the coffee farms yearly. In Colombia, Verité's studies identified areas for future activities, such as a safety net and health support, and using mechanically-assisted harvesting tools to reduce occupational injury and improve occupational health and safety for coffee workers. In Mexico, the project offered training to the Mexican Anti-Trafficking Commission. The Commission would like further technical guidance and support to work at the municipal level.

LESSONS LEARNED

The toolkit is a useful reference for companies, buyers, producers, and labor brokers. However, the toolkit will not achieve the broader objective of improving social compliance systems unless it is adopted and used by the private sector coffee companies, buyers, certifiers, producers, and producer organizations.

In Colombia, the applied studies offered insights and covered issues not addressed in the toolkit. This demonstrates the value of piloting and applying the toolkit locally and engaging directly with the workers the Project intends to benefit. In Mexico, the training had a catalytic effect, which the Project did not follow up. The courses offered to the National Anti-Trafficking Commission allowed members to focus on forced labor in the agricultural sector as well as trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation. Similarly, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Polytechnic University of Tapachula offered the potential to incorporate labor issues into the curriculum for agronomists and agricultural engineers.

Finally, the long-term sustainability of the pilot projects should have been addressed from the beginning of the Project. Even with Verité's standing and reputation, it was initially difficult to establish partnerships with the coffee companies and others in the supply chain. However, once the pilot programs were agreed upon, the Project should have considered how to maintain the programs over the medium- to long-term.

CONCLUSION AND KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The updated toolkit is a valuable resource for future initiatives in the coffee industry and other sectors in Latin America. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems provided data on the Project's progress and achievements. In Mexico, the Project led to initiatives with the Anti-Trafficking Commission and the Polytechnic University of Tapachula. In Colombia, the studies led to an improved understanding of the well-being needs of coffee workers. In Brazil, piloted innovations improved the contracting of migrant and temporary workers. The pilots in the three countries demonstrate interesting initiatives, but progress was incipient and small-scale. The Mexico and Colombia pilots did not always address issues affecting the most vulnerable migrant workers.

The Mexican and Brazilian informants assessed the toolkit's impact positively and wished to learn more about social compliance. However, they stressed there was insufficient time for preparation, actual in-class training, and insufficient practical follow-up to see how the toolkit training could be applied in their work.

PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GRANTEE

1. Adapt future training programs to the country context (legislation, institutions) and the priorities of the people receiving the training.
2. Offer more practical, participatory training with exercises, workshops, and events.
3. Focus the training on producers, cooperatives, and people visiting farms (extension workers and agronomists).

PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DOL/ILAB

4. In future projects, establish a PMU or Coordinator for every country where pilot projects will be implemented to make them viable and more likely to be sustained.
5. Longer implementation time for pilot projects, which would allow for better planning and engagement with potential beneficiaries.
6. Prioritize agriculture students from polytechnics and universities for future training on labor rights.
7. Support projects to engage directly with some key public sector agencies.
8. Support alternative ways to address the situation of migrant workers.
9. Incorporate risk analysis and security procedures and protocols when working in regions with security risks.

1. PROJECT CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION

1.1. THE PROJECT

The COFFEE Project is financed by the US Department of Labor (USDOL) and is implemented by Verité, an independent non-profit civil society organization (CSO) based in Massachusetts. The Project objective is to “improve implementation of social compliance systems that promote acceptable conditions of work and the elimination of child labor and forced labor in coffee supply chains.” Verité designed the Project’s technical cooperation and pilot projects to strengthen the capacity of civil society to address abusive labor practices. Specifically, the Project focused on:

1. developing a toolkit to enable industry actors to implement robust and sustainable social compliance systems based on USDOL’s Comply Chain model;
2. providing guidance and training to key stakeholders in the global coffee sector; and
3. developing pilot projects to test the toolkit in the field.

The Project planned to implement three country pilot projects developed with private-sector and industry associations in Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil. Verité prioritized the pilot projects based on the pre-situational analyses (PSAs) that they carried out. This included studies of the priorities identified: a Living Income and Living Wage Report and a Time and Motion study for Colombia, and a study of labor migration and recruitment in Brazil. The pilot projects drew on research findings funded by major international coffee roasters and Catholic Relief Services (CRS) in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico, along with white papers that identified unscrupulous recruitment practices and piece rate pay as two main causes of labor violations in the Latin American coffee sector.

1.2. TIMELINE AND BUDGET

Verité designed the original project for implementation in Guatemala. Verité and USDOL subsequently redesigned it for implementation in Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil, due to security issues in Guatemala. The present evaluation only covers the revised Project, approved in 2019, which was intended to run for three years, from June 1, 2019 to March 31, 2022, with USDOL covering prior expenditures. The original project budget, as approved in 2019, was US\$ 2,000,000.

On February 5, 2021, USDOL/ILAB authorized a nine-month project extension from March 31, 2022 to June 30, 2023, and a cost increase of US\$200,000 to expand and extend the pilot project in Brazil, focusing on the promotion of ethical labor recruitment (Modification 3). This extension included an increase in the amount allocated for salaries since additional staff were recruited to manage the pilot projects.

On May 12, 2023, USDOL/ILAB authorized another nine-month project extension to March 31, 2024, while also agreeing to close the pilot projects in Mexico and Colombia by June 30, 2023 (Modification 6). USDOL/ILAB also authorized a budget increase of US\$300,000 to refine the toolkit; evaluate the pilot projects in Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil; prepare reports on the lessons learned; adapt a sub-set of six to eight tools for use by smallholder farmers; disseminate the toolkit to 500 farmers in Brazil; and share lessons between the pilot project countries. This modification resulted in a total budget of US\$2,500,000.

In March 2020, after the World Health Organization declared the outbreak of Covid-19 as a global pandemic, governments in Latin America suspended international travel and imposed restrictions

on internal travel and public meetings, making it impossible to hold any face-to-face meetings or workshops.

The Technical Progress Report (TPR) in April 2020 noted Covid-19's impact on the coffee market (e.g., decreased business in cafes, increased home consumption), the labor shortages for the coffee harvest, controls on migrant labor, and the need to provide training and personal protective equipment (PPE) to workers. The report discussed the toolkit's progress and the support received from the world's largest coffee companies. The report also noted that Verité was evaluating an online e-learning system so the Project could present training virtually through an easily accessible, interactive platform.

The October 2020 TPR recognized the impact of the pandemic on coffee prices and the challenges presented by continued low coffee prices but focused on the progress in developing the Socially Sustainable Sourcing Toolkit (then referred to as S3T) in collaboration with a group of 24 leading coffee companies, industry associations, multi-stakeholder initiatives, and seven other key stakeholders, including certifiers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and government institutions. At this stage, the training program had not started since the toolkit was awaiting validation by the partners in the stakeholder group. However, given the uncertainty about the possibility of future in-person training, Verité developed the Project's e-learning capacity, proposing an approach that combined self-learning and instructor-led training.

In December 2020, Verité presented USDOL/ILAB with Modification 3, which was approved in February 2021. Verité requested the extension of the Project to June 30, 2023, due to the delays caused by the pandemic and the expansion of the pilot project in Brazil. The request included a significant reassignment of budget lines.

The next TPR was approved in April 2021 after the mid-term evaluation (MTE), which was based on a review of the toolkit by an expert committee and feedback from two virtual workshops with 10 stakeholders, including senior professionals from the coffee companies, certifiers, and industry associations committed to using the toolkit. The TPR noted that the Project had started to design the core curriculum for the training, which would be presented online and combine self-paced desk work with instructor-led courses; the TPR also outlined the research needed to develop the pilot programs for Colombia and Brazil.

In Colombia, the Time and Motion study was carried out in Antioquia and Caldas during the harvest season (October 2021 to January 2022). The Living Income and Living Wage Report, financed by Keurig Dr Pepper and carried out by the Anker Research Institute with oversight and support from Social Accountability International, also started. In Brazil, the Project engaged in dialogue with coffee producers in Minas Gerais (MG) to identify ethical recruitment initiatives most appropriate for small farmers and large-scale producers.

The toolkit launched at the Specialty Coffee Association (SCA) Expo in April 2022. By this time, eight of the 12 online modules had been adapted for use in Mexico and translated into Portuguese for use in Brazil. The English and Spanish versions were uploaded onto the RISE platform and made accessible on the COFFEE Project webpage.

By April 2022, the Project in Colombia completed the Living Income and Living Wage Report, was finalizing the Time and Motion Study, and was preparing to test different payment models to benefit coffee workers and small farmers. In Brazil, Verité, helped by project partners, began

identifying coffee estates to work with the pilot project and identified three interested estates. The Project developed a baseline survey to assess recruitment dynamics and adapted and translated four online modules for use in Brazil.

Between April and October 2022, the Project partnered with an international coffee buyer in Colombia, providing a grant to cover part of the salaries of the Manos de Café project in Salgar, Antioquia, piloting initiatives to increase productivity and earnings, and helping farmworkers generate alternative sources of income in the off-harvest season. In Brazil, the Project engaged with farms and buyers to identify ways to pilot ethical recruitment practices and provided in-person and online training to field technicians and farmworkers, using and adapting five tools from the toolkit. In Mexico, Verité extended the training program to some government agencies, CSOs, certifiers, and coffee cooperatives.

By April 2023, Verité adapted the toolkit in response to partner feedback and uploaded revised tools and training modules to the Project website. Verité also published a series of articles in the Daily Coffee News based on the toolkit. The training program continued, including training for coffee buyers from at least three international coffee companies. In February 2024, the Project released a new toolkit version, as described below.

In Mexico, Verité extended the training program to include an online program for certifiers working with Rainforest Alliance and training for members of the National Anti-Trafficking Commission of Mexico, and the Project signed an MOU with the Polytechnic University of Tapachula in Chiapas to offer training to students studying to be agronomists and field technicians.

In Colombia, working with the Manos de Café project, the Project tested new coffee harvesting techniques and reviewed the entrepreneurship initiatives implemented by a major coffee buyer through the Ulula Platform. In Brazil, the Project provided training on the toolkit to the Latin American and Caribbean Network of Fair-Trade Small Producers and Workers (CLAC) and producers and cooperatives in Minas Gerais (MG) and Espírito Santo (ES). The initiatives in Brazil are ongoing but expected to finish at the end of March 2024 when the Project ends.

1.3. VERITÉ

Verité has worked in labor rights since 1995. Verité describes its vision as “a world where people work under safe, fair, and legal conditions” and works with corporations, governments, and other CSOs to illuminate and eliminate labor rights violations in supply chains to benefit workers employed in supply chains.

Verité’s goals are to:

1. work with businesses to eliminate child labor, forced labor, and other abuses in the supply chain;
2. help workers advocate for their rights;
3. prepare publicly accessible resources to promote labor rights; and iv) contribute to government labor and human rights policies.

Verité’s activities include research to identify labor risks and abuses in supply chains, work with companies to eliminate abuses and improve working conditions, and developing and implementing training and education programs focused on companies and their suppliers. Verité has worked in over 70 countries and has a network of experts in Africa, Asia, Europe, South America, North America, and Australia.

1.4. THE COFFEE TOOLKIT

In terms of effort, time, and expenditure, the COFFEE Toolkit, previously referred to as S3T, is the most significant component of the COFFEE Project. The current version of the toolkit, released in February 2024, includes 28 tools (20 documents, an interactive dashboard, seven videos, and 14 online training modules). It was drafted in English and corresponds to the eight steps of the USDOL Comply Chain model, as shown in Annex J. Previous toolkit versions are available in Spanish and Portuguese, and the new toolkit is currently undergoing translation.

Verité presented the new COFFEE Toolkit on February 12, 2024, and held a panel discussion with project partners in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico to share lessons learned and key takeaways from the pilot projects. The current toolkit can be viewed online on [Verité's website](#). Even though the new toolkit version had not been used at the time of the evaluation's site visits and online interviews, based on a rapid review of the website, it appears easier to comprehend than the previous version and is more closely tailored to specific audiences. It includes seven simple animated videos primarily aimed at smallholder farmers and members of small cooperatives; six questionnaires for roasters, traders, medium and large farmers, and auditors; and guidance notes, primers, and booklets. The intended users of the toolkit include retailers, roasters, and traders (RRT); Cooperatives, Medium and Large Farms (CML); Small Farmers and Small Cooperatives (SFC); Auditors and Monitors (A&M); Civil Society and Government (CSG).

The first section, entitled Definitions and Background Tools, offers an introduction to the concepts of forced labor and child labor based on ILO Conventions 29 (Forced Labor Convention of 1930), 138 (Minimum Age Convention of 1973), 182 (Worst Forms of Child Labor Convention of 1999), and the UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child (1989). It is designed to explain whether a particular situation qualifies as forced labor or child labor and includes a series of videos aimed at smallholder farmers and small cooperatives.

Step 1 of the toolkit includes a Guidance on Stakeholder Engagement, which is intended for RRT, as well as coffee producers (large and small), compliance auditors and monitors, and CSOs.

Step 2 covers the analysis of risks and impacts, starting with a revised and more accessible version of the interactive RE-ACT Dashboard. The RE-ACT Dashboard allows users to access general information about livelihoods and human rights in each Latin American coffee producing country, and the risks of forced labor and child labor. This section includes two videos aimed at small farmers; three self-assessment questionnaires (SAQs) for coffee traders, producers, and labor brokers; and booklets for producers and labor brokers.¹

Step 3, on codes of conduct, includes sample codes of conduct and social responsibility agreements, and is designed primarily for coffee companies and traders, and large producers and cooperatives.

Step 4 offers guidance on communication and training, and again is designed for RRT.

¹ The evaluators were unable to access the booklets online.

Step 5 covers monitoring and shares guidance on monitoring labor brokers for CML, and a booklet for small farmers.

Step 6, on remediation of violations, includes a document analyzing the root causes of labor violations along with a guidance note on response and remedy. These documents are intended for a general audience: coffee companies, traders, producers, and civil society.

Step 7 covers independent review, and includes guidance for compliance auditors and monitors, and two questionnaires (one for interviewing coffee workers and the other for interviewing labor brokers).

Step 8 offers guidance for RRT, and CSOs on labor standards performance reporting.

The toolkit takes the ILO and UN Conventions as its baseline. There is no discussion of national legislation and standards other than a reference in the summary Definitions and International Standards table that shows which of the 10 major coffee-producing countries in Latin America have ratified the key conventions since, once ratified, they are legally binding for the country.

The documents are well-structured and simple to comprehend; with little additional effort, they could potentially be adapted to the supply chains of other agricultural commodities, such as cocoa, sugarcane, palm oil, or cotton, or even to quite different sectors, such as fisheries, textiles, or the manufacture of electronic goods.

1.5. DESIGN AND PREPARATION OF THE TRAINING MODULES

Verité developed a simple online training course in English, Spanish, and Portuguese that introduces the issues presented in the toolkit.² The current version, launched in February 2024 and summarized in Table 2 below, includes 14 modules. Any user who wishes to access the toolkit can do so with an email address, some basic personal information, and the name of the user’s organization. The course includes a series of simple questionnaires designed to test the user’s understanding of each module. The user must successfully complete a questionnaire to move to the next module. The online course issues certificates to trainees who successfully complete the different sections of the course.

Table 2: Training Modules (As of February 2024)

Module	Type	English	Spanish	Portuguese
Forced Labor and Human Trafficking	Core	Y	Y	Y
Selection and Recruitment of Workers	Elective	Y	Y	Y
Child Labor	Core	Y	Y	Y
Working Conditions	Elective	Y	Y	Y

² The evaluators had to sign up and take the course to access the modules. This was done using the English versions of the original eight modules. They did not access the Spanish or Portuguese versions.

Module	Type	English	Spanish	Portuguese
Wages and Hours	Elective	Y	Y	Y
Introduction to a Gender Perspective	Elective	Y	Y	Y
Data and Information Collection	Core	Y	Y	Y
Introduction to Root Cause Analysis	Elective	Y	Y	Y
Prevention and Mitigation Strategies	Elective	Y	Y	Y
Management Systems & Due Diligence	Core	Y	Y	Y
Mexican Legal Context 1*	Core	Y	Y	N/A
Mexican Legal Context 2*	Elective	Y	Y	N/A
Intro to USMCA Labor Standards*	Elective	Y	Y	N/A
Brazilian Legal Context**	Core	Y	N/A	Y

1.6. THE PILOT PROJECTS

Verité focused the Mexican pilot project on training and developing training materials. Its overall aim was to support the private-sector coffee supply chain stakeholders to formulate labor policies and plans to combat child labor/forced labor.

The training Verité provided in the Mexican pilot was generally well-received. Since Verité developed it during the pandemic, with most training online, good internet access was essential. Informants in Mexico reported it was difficult to engage effectively with coffee producers and agricultural extension workers in the more remote rural areas.

The extension workers and managers found the training useful since their background education in agronomy did not cover labor issues. Some noted that, before they received the training, they had little or no knowledge of Mexico's national legislation on forced labor, child labor, and other labor issues. Some field workers reported that the training was demanding. Some instructor-led courses took up a whole day and were perhaps too didactic.

The members of the National Anti-Trafficking Commission reported that they liked the training they received and that it focused on the definitions of forced labor and child labor. They received the training through online courses that combined self-paced work with three-hour, instructor-led sessions involving groups of up to 20 people, who exchanged opinions via the Chat Box.

Verité developed the Colombian pilot project in coordination with the Manos de Café project. The COFFEE Project and the major coffee buyer started discussions in September 2021 that led to the preparation of two studies:

1. The Living Income and Living Wage Report, commissioned by Verité and financed by Keurig/Dr Pepper, was presented in December 2021.

2. The Time and Motion Study was finalized in June 2022.

The Project activities with Manos de Café led to 13 programs supporting coffee workers, some of whom are small-scale coffee farmers. The programs are funded by a major coffee buyer, with the COFFEE Project covering part of the logistical costs and salaries of two extension workers. The programs included medical, dental, and ophthalmic care; payments into a pension fund; payments into an insurance fund; provision of PPE; training for out-of-season entrepreneurship activities (maintenance of machinery, craftwork, and sewing tarpaulins for use in the harvest); and agricultural extension and inputs to help coffee workers cultivate kitchen gardens to improve their food security. The pilot project also promoted alternative ways of harvesting and transporting coffee, which included the use of tarpaulins and hand-held harvesting machinery. The Manos de Café project is continuing in Antioquia, even though the COFFEE Project's support ended in June 2023.

The Brazilian pilot project prioritized the issue of unethical worker recruitment. In 2021, the project carried out a detailed review of labor migration and recruitment in the coffee sector in MG, which Verité presented in May 2021. The study, funded by a consortium of coffee companies brought together through the Sustainable Coffee Challenge, included a survey of coffee producers and labor brokers. This survey was carried out with assistance from the coffee companies and Rainforest Alliance and received 143 responses, almost entirely from coffee producers. The study looked at labor migration and described the types of arrangements between workers, brokers, and coffee producers.

During 2021, the Project engaged with selected coffee producers, including small (<25 hectares) – most of whom belonged to cooperatives – medium (25-100 hectares), and large farms (>100 hectares), to identify and prioritize ways to formalize recruitment practices and encourage a transition to direct recruitment. The Project also tried to engage directly with labor recruiters, but with little success. In parallel, the Project developed recruitment-related toolkit modules, including a Primer on Recruitment-Related Risks, a Self-Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) for Labor Brokers, Guidance on Screening and Selection of Labor Brokers, and Guidance on Monitoring of Labor Brokers.

Everyone interviewed in Brazil for the evaluation spoke highly of the training provided under the COFFEE Project. They found it relevant and easily understandable. In some cases, the project followed up on the training by collaborating with producers and buyers to prepare manuals, codes of conduct, and contract templates for specific companies or organizations.

Nearly all the training workshops took place face-to-face, critically allowing a more participatory approach compared to the courses in Mexico. Furthermore, the training manuals were later adapted to the specific needs of the companies and organizations that received the training.

Another important element was a dedicated country manager for the pilot project. Moreover, in August 2022, Verité's senior project manager in Brazil took over as director of the COFFEE Project and devoted a significant proportion of his time to working with the pilot project. This approach of a hands-on team in the country and working independently with a wider range of stakeholders (compared to Mexico and Colombia) helps account for the relative success of the Project in working with large coffee-producing companies, some medium-size farms, and smallholder coffee farmers.

Note that the Brazilian pilot project is ongoing until the end of March 2024.

1.7. SECURITY

It is important to mention that security continues to be an issue in many coffee-growing areas of Colombia. In Antioquia, the evaluation team was advised to finish meetings by 4 pm so participants could reach their homes before nightfall and not to visit more distant locations. The Colombian army is engaged in the search for the armed groups involved in extortion (demanding a significant portion of income from the coffee farmers) and kidnapping (for ransom or to force young men and women to join them). The armed groups have killed farmers and workers who refused to pay and young men returning from their military service. The evaluation team was informed that the situation in Antioquia has deteriorated and is worse in Huila, where coffee farmers and workers report being afraid to travel or participate in meetings.

1.8. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

M&E has been important to the COFFEE Project since its inception. The M&E specialist from Verité assigned to the original project in Guatemala devoted 25 percent of her time to the COFFEE Project until March 2022. In October 2022, Verité hired the current M&E specialist as a contractor, with a Level of Effort of 25 percent devoted to the Project. The designation of an M&E officer is standard for Verité and a requirement for all USDOL-financed projects. The M&E officer is responsible for consolidating monitoring reports summarized in the TPRs, which are presented to USDOL every six months. The TPRs are jointly prepared with the support of the national-level program managers.

The TPR includes an annex with a detailed spreadsheet showing the project's quantitative performance indicators and a summary report on the country-level pilot projects, showing the pilot project targets, outputs (efforts), and outcomes. This annex also includes a table for USDOL/ILAB on the training of labor inspectors and law enforcement inspectors. The outcome-level performance indicators include:

- Outcome 1. Stakeholder engagement (by category of stakeholder), research reports, the draft and final tools for the toolkit, and dissemination of the toolkit.
- Outcome 2. Training curricula, individuals trained, and awareness-raising sessions.
- Outcome 3. Pilot projects designed, tools piloted, and reports produced on pilot projects.

A second annex (Annex B) offers an updated analysis of the project's outputs and activities based on the original work plan. Along with the other project outcomes, outputs, and activities, the annex includes information on the Project's Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan's progress.

Although USDOL requires the TPRs to be presented every six months, in practice, the Project prepared interim three-monthly reports using the same results-based framework and updated spreadsheets and tables. The Project also previously held monthly online meetings with the USDOL desk officer responsible for the Project. These monthly meetings were based on a checklist of key issues and did not require report preparation. Above all, the project team used these meetings as an opportunity to keep USDOL informed and seek advice about key issues rather than waiting for a response to the more formal TPR.

The final Project completion M&E report will follow the format of the TPRs and M&E annexes (A and B) in accordance with the USDOL reporting format. Before preparing the report, the Project will hold a meeting/workshop with key partners, such as major coffee buyers in Mexico and

Colombia, and various partners from Brazil. The Project Director and M&E Officer have suggested recommending a simple, one-page summary table for uploading to the Project and DOL websites.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

This final performance evaluation aims to evaluate the COFFEE Project. Specifically, to assess:

1. if the Project achieved its objectives and outcomes;
2. the Project's intended and unintended effects;
3. lessons learned and strategies and models of intervention applicable in future projects; and
4. which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable. The evaluation will provide ILAB, the grantee, and project stakeholders concerned with labor rights in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico with an assessment of the Project's performance and the factors driving the Project's results.

2.1. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation covers the Project described in the 2019 Project Document for the COFFEE Project. A security situation necessitated abandoning the original Guatemala project whose main focus was addressing child and forced labor in coffee supply chains in Guatemala. The Verité Submission for FOA-ILAB-17-07: "Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala," was approved on 11/30/2017 by USDOL. The main change between the original Guatemala project and the COFFEE Project was to expand the focus from child labor in coffee supply chains in Guatemala to fair, free, equitable employment in the coffee sector in three other Latin American countries.

The overall COFFEE Project's temporal scope is December 2017-March 2024, just over six years. However, USDOL asked the evaluation team not to include the Guatemala project in the evaluation's scope (i.e., not to evaluate any activities that took place in Guatemala between December 2017 and April 2019), and to note only that the Guatemala project was transformed into the three-country COFFEE Project.

The Project's technical scope covers the toolkit, which changed during the Project's implementation period. The toolkit version Verité used until February 12, 2024 was known as the S3T, which comprised 17 documents corresponding to the eight steps of the USDOL Comply Chain model. On February 12, 2024, Verité informed the evaluation team that Verité had presented a new "COFFEE Toolkit" and held a panel discussion with project partners in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico to share lessons learned and key takeaways from the pilot projects; this presentation can be accessed online at [Verité's YouTube channel](#).

In this report, the evaluation team refers to the original socially sustainable toolkit as the S3T, following Verité's usage in Project reports and studies. The team applies the new term "COFFEE Toolkit" to the updated toolkit version. Even though the toolkit's new version was not used before February 12, 2024, this evaluation report includes a summary description of the new toolkit (in Section 1 above) and takes into account the new COFFEE Toolkit in the conclusions and recommendations.

This report also refers to some activities, such as the Living Income and Living Wage Report carried out in Colombia, which were contracted or carried out by Verité but not directly financed by the

COFFEE Project. Since these activities represented an important input into the pilot project, and demonstrate the positive commitment of some coffee companies, the evaluation team believes they should be referenced in the evaluation report.

2.2. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team used the following data collection methods during the assessment:

1. an in-depth desk review of all project documents, the S3T tools, and the new COFFEE Toolkit (that Verité released in February 2024);
2. a review and analysis of all relevant M&E data from key implementing partners;
3. a short survey sent to a purposive sample of stakeholders who have used, or been consulted in the design of, the S3T tools;
4. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with informants who have used the S3T and benefited from the projects; and
5. Focus Groups Discussions (FGDs) with key stakeholders in each country (please see Annex H, Details of the Methodology). An overview table (Annex G) lists the interviews and FGDs carried out in the three countries.

2.3. THE SURVEY

The survey instrument is a self-administered questionnaire sent to the stakeholders whose contact details were provided by the grantee (Annex E lists the people invited to complete the electronic questionnaire). WI-HER emailed the questionnaire to 50 people in January 2024. Five replies contained the message: “person has left his position,” leaving 45 potential respondents. After receiving only six responses, WI-HER resent the questionnaire to the stakeholders. WI-HER received five more responses by February 13, 2024. In total, 11 responses were received (for more survey design details, please view Annex F). Unfortunately, the survey response rate was too low to provide meaningful data. However, the fieldwork and interview data compensate for any gaps. The survey data are analyzed in Annex I since the survey is a deliverable for this final evaluation. In Colombia and Brazil, the evaluation team carried out KIIs and FGDs with coffee producers and some coffee workers. In Mexico, the team conducted several high- and medium-level online interviews that provided significant evaluation data.

2.4. STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP AGENDA AND PARTICIPANTS, AND ROUND-UP WORKSHOPS

The start-up workshop with Verité took place on October 27, 2023; the two round-up workshops in Colombia on November 24, 2023; and in Brazil on December 8, 2023.

3. EVALUATION RESULTS

3.1. RELEVANCE AND COHERENCE

3.1.1. THEORY OF CHANGE

The COFFEE Project is predicated on the assumption that the eradication of child labor and forced labor, as well as improving the incomes and working conditions of coffee workers and smallholder farmers, can be promoted by working with private sector coffee companies and civil society.

Major international coffee companies supported the Project, some of which already worked with Verité. These companies see compliance with international labor standards and human rights legislation as an advantage – indeed, as fundamental – to sustaining their place in the market since compliance is a requirement in many of the principal countries that import coffee, as is the case with the US Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015. Customers who buy coffee or visit cafés increasingly demand compliance with Fair Trade and similar standards.

International coffee companies and other stakeholders played a role in reviewing and refining the COFFEE toolkit. Verité designed the toolkit to help coffee companies and other stakeholders address the challenge of monitoring their supply chains, especially at the local level since they have insufficient presence in the field and cannot realistically audit all the producers they buy from.

The pilot project in Mexico also demonstrated potential scope to work with the public sector, universities, and other institutions of higher education that train the agronomists and extension officers who will work in the field.

3.1.2. UNDERSTANDING OF THE COFFEE SECTOR AND SUPPLY CHAINS

Before the current project was drafted, Verité already had experience working with major international coffee companies and was trusted and well-regarded. The preparation of the Project used information from available studies from the three countries, including some studies that Verité carried out funded by CRS, Keuring/Dr Pepper, and Jacob Douwe Egberts.

During the Project's first year, Verité carried out a series of background studies, which were consolidated in the PSA presented in early 2020. The PSA included the results of a stakeholder mapping in the three selected countries and the analysis of a questionnaire for the coffee companies, industry associations, NGOs, certifiers, and some multi-stakeholder initiatives. It also included a re-analysis of data from a survey of 334 coffee workers collected in 2018. More focused studies followed the PSA, such as the Living Income and Living Wage Report in Colombia and the study of labor brokers in Brazil.

While the Project unquestionably demonstrated a good understanding of the coffee sector and its supply chains, there are issues, discussed in more detail below, that are not well documented and more difficult to engage with, including quantitative data on the itinerant workers (*andariegos*) in Colombia and migrant labor and labor brokers in Brazil.

3.1.3. RELEVANCE TO THE PRIORITIES OF THE TARGET GROUPS

The initial pilot projects were broadly focused and designed to eliminate abuses and improve the conditions of all coffee workers. In practice, the pilot projects were identified and implemented with the help of major companies, buyers, certifiers, and NGOs and largely focused on producers who were organized and/or participating in certification schemes.

In the case of Mexico, Verité provided much of the training to the managers, agronomists, and field technicians employed by the coffee roasters, traders, and certifiers. Similarly, in Colombia, the pilot project supported a program financed by a major international coffee buyer who worked closely with producers from a large and well-organized cooperative. In Brazil, the pilot project worked with large-scale producers and smallholders organized into cooperatives or coffee companies and buyers' extension and certification programs.

As a result, the pilot projects did not focus on some of the most vulnerable groups of workers. In Colombia, the pilot project worked with smallholder coffee producers that mainly rely on local labor and rarely employ itinerant *andariegos*, whose concerns and priorities differ from those of the locally hired workers. Similarly, in Brazil, although the pilot project focused on recruitment, it engaged less with medium-scale farms that depend on migrant labor but lack the capacity and resources to demand that the labor brokers comply with all the requirements of the national legislation.

On a positive note, the experience in Colombia clearly demonstrates that the Project could adapt to the priorities of the workers and smallholders who worked with the Project. The workshops that discussed the findings of the Living Income and Living Wage Report and the Time and Motion studies adapted their activities to the priorities of local coffee workers and smallholder farmers who wanted to reduce their vulnerability and improve their food security during the off-harvest season rather than increase their daily income during the harvest season.

3.1.4. ADAPTATION TO CHANGING CONDITIONS

At the time the Project Document was approved in 2019, no one could have imagined there would be a worldwide pandemic. By March 2020, the Project was forced to adapt to the restrictions imposed by the pandemic; therefore, the Project focused on finalizing the PSA, developing the COFFEE toolkit, and adapting to online workshops and discussions with high-level stakeholders from coffee companies, buyers, certifiers, and CSOs.

Implementing the training programs, starting in Mexico, proved more difficult. It was virtually impossible to train smallholder coffee growers and workers in remote areas since few people have access to computers and a reliable Internet service. The Project adopted a hybrid training approach that combined self-paced learning with online workshops presented by an instructor. This system allowed the participants little opportunity to engage with each other and share their experiences. In contrast, the training offered in Brazil, which started after the worst of the pandemic had passed, was face-to-face, much more participatory, and tailored to the requirements of the specific companies, farms, and cooperatives that took part in the training.

During the pandemic, the Project had no direct involvement with the most vulnerable itinerant workers in the coffee sector. In Colombia, the government and the National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia (FNC) prioritized the coffee harvest, providing transport, and screening migrant workers before they left their towns of origin and again when they arrived in the coffee producing areas. This experience could provide a future basis for working with the *andariegos* and incorporating codes of conduct similar to those designed for the Brazil pilot projects. The president of one of the cooperatives thought this was an interesting approach. However, it would require more engagement with the FNC and local governments to make it work.

3.1.5. ANALYSIS OF RISKS

Analysis of risks refers to risks to project implementation. It does not refer to the risk analyses developed by Verité and incorporated into the RE-ACT Dashboard and other documents, which identify the countries and regions where child labor and forced labor are prevalent.

The problem analysis in the Project Document and the reporting in the TPRs include a general analysis of the factors affecting global markets for coffee and prices. The problem analysis also

offers a summary description, later elaborated in the PSA, of the agrarian structure, labor shortages, and issues relating to migration in Colombia and Brazil; however, it is less informative concerning Mexico.

The one issue that receives little or no mention in the Project Document and the PSA is the question of security. This may have been less important in Colombia when the Project was developed. Some interviewees claimed that the situation in some departments of Colombia has deteriorated in the last year or so. It is difficult to assess the situation. From what the evaluation team could glean, issues of security are driven by groups which are not, or are no longer, ideologically or politically motivated, but rather engaged in extortion and kidnapping. In some regions of Colombia, security issues may be linked to organized criminal groups involved in drug production and trafficking. The insecurity in some regions of Colombia has driven people to abandon their homes and farms and seek refuge in safer areas. In one workshop, the evaluation team found internally displaced people (IDPs) working in the coffee harvest. IDPs should be considered as particularly vulnerable (see Section 3.6).

Security is also critical in some regions of Mexico. However, it did not emerge as an issue in the Mexico pilot project since Verité's main focus was on distance learning, mainly with the field staff and managers from ongoing programs.

3.2. EFFECTIVENESS

This section addresses the COFFEE Toolkit, online training modules, and the pilot projects. Note that since the evaluation fieldwork took place, the COFFEE Toolkit has undergone a significant modification. It now comprises 28 tools, including 20 downloadable documents; seven videos in English, Spanish, and Portuguese; the RE-ACT Dashboard; and 14 open-access, online training modules.

3.2.1. PRIMARY OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES

The first version of the toolkit was a valuable resource that helped coffee companies, buyers, certifiers, producers, and producer organizations develop, adopt, and/or update their social compliance systems. However, the toolkit and online training modules must be used by and adapted to the needs of the particular groups of stakeholders for which they are intended, such as field technicians, farm managers, coffee farmers, cooperatives, traders, and roasters, and to the countries and regions who will use the toolkit.

The toolkit has been most effective in the Brazilian pilot projects, where Verité adapted the former to the needs of the companies and organizations that asked for training and whose managers, administrators, extension workers, coffee farmers, or workers engaged in participatory workshops. In some cases, Verité supported these participants to develop training manuals, codes of conduct, and templates for contracts with permanent and temporary workers.

In Mexico, the toolkit was well received by major international coffee companies; a senior manager from a company that has a longstanding working relationship with Verité stated that the training provided by Verité outside the context of the COFFEE Project was good but expensive and that the company would like more, preferably face-to-face, training, and would be willing to cover the costs.

In Mexico, the training offered to the Polytechnic University of Tapachula and the National Anti-Trafficking Commission, although incipient, went beyond the project's primary objectives and

pointed the way for future initiatives involving the public sector and higher education institutions that train agronomists and agricultural engineers.

3.2.2. CAPACITY BUILDING

Almost everyone interviewed spoke highly of the training provided by the project. The online training courses were, however, demanding for some people. They require at least a secondary education, enough time to study the materials carefully, and access to reliable internet. Since the evaluation, the project has produced simplified training materials and videos clips accessible online.

In Brazil, interviewees were positive about the training they received. Interviewees included people working with large farming companies and smallholders belonging to coffee cooperatives. In all cases, the interviewees felt they gained a clearer understanding of the definitions and requirements of the national legislation. Small-scale pilot activities, such as upgrading workers' accommodations on two farms, helped reinforce their understanding and demonstrated that improvements were feasible, within their means, and would allow them to comply with the law. One smallholder commented that he and his colleagues can now sleep more easily since they are no longer afraid of a visit from the labor inspectors.

In Colombia, the Living Income and Living Wage Report and Time and Motion study greatly contributed to the discussions between the smallholder coffee farmers, coffee workers, and the Manos de Café project. Although some proposals for alternative methods to harvest coffee were not taken up, the studies and subsequent discussions identified potential areas that could significantly improve the lives and livelihoods of coffee workers and small farmers. However, the pilot project will require continued support to achieve lasting changes.

The Project prioritized the development of the toolkit and training modules and training for the managers and field technicians of coffee companies, buyers, cooperatives, and certifiers. The toolkit, including the RE-ACT Dashboard, is an important reference for stakeholders in the coffee supply chain; it has been modified to make it accessible to a wider range of stakeholders.

3.2.3. STRENGTHENING COMPLIANCE

The toolkit is easy to access online. Many of the modules are generic and could be applied to other commodity crops or sectors. However, some modules, for instance, on labor brokers, were developed to address specific situations, such as recruitment in Brazil, and recently have been adapted to cover the coffee sector in a wider range of countries in Latin America.

Although Verité developed the toolkit in cooperation with major international coffee companies and NGOs that work on labor issues, other stakeholders have not directly incorporated it into their compliance systems. Rather, the toolkit provided an opportunity for further studies and discussion with a range of stakeholders, which may have impacted the development of their own compliance systems. In Brazil, it provided the basis for the training courses and workshops and opened the door for the Project to help coffee buyers, large-scale farms, and cooperatives develop their own manuals and codes of conduct.

In Mexico, training based on the toolkit provided an opportunity for members of the public-sector National Anti-Trafficking Commission to reevaluate their priorities, which had hitherto focused on

trafficking for sexual exploitation, and provided an opportunity to engage with a range of public-sector entities.

3.2.4. CHALLENGES

The Covid-19 pandemic had a major impact. During 2020 and much of 2021, Verité could not work in the field, which affected the Project's ability to communicate with smallholder farmers in remote rural areas such as in Chiapas and Veracruz. At the same time, the pandemic encouraged the adoption of online communication for people living in urban areas and with good Internet access, possibly making it easier to engage with senior management of coffee companies, buyers, and large-scale producers. It impacted the Project's timeline, which was subsequently modified to allow for the completion of the pilot project in Brazil (Modifications 3 and 6).

The issue of threats to security is harder to judge. The security situation in the project area of Antioquia, Colombia, is relatively stable and better than some other regions. However, various interviewees suggested that the situation was deteriorating. The presence of armed groups makes it more difficult to organize meetings and workshops and potentially represents a serious risk for the participants, fieldworkers, and project staff. In some coffee-producing communities, armed groups monitor the small-scale farmers and demand 50% of the predicted coffee harvest revenue, a demand that farmers cannot refuse.

Since the pilot project in Mexico mainly involved online training, it was less impacted by security concerns. However, any future activities, especially in areas along Mexico's southern border, should consider the potential risk to project staff from organized criminal groups, including organizations involved in trafficking people from Guatemala and other Central American countries to work as forced labor in coffee or other agricultural activities.

Finally, it is important to recognize that bureaucratic processes, especially in Mexico's federal government, made it difficult to incorporate modules on labor issues into the curriculum of government-run polytechnical universities, such as the Polytechnic University of Tapachula.

3.3. EFFICIENCY AND FLEXIBILITY

Efficiency refers to the balance between salaries and human resources expenditures, the achievement of outputs, and, ultimately, the main outcomes and impacts. As noted in the TOR (Annex K), the evaluator's ability to determine efficiency in this evaluation is limited by the amount of financial data available. So, a cost-efficiency analysis is not included since it requires impact data, which are unavailable. Flexibility in the Project can be defined as the ability of project implementation personnel to think outside the box; i.e., to find simple ways to mitigate challenges and risks that might threaten the Project's progress and achievement of desired outcomes.

Verité deployed most project human and financial resources to design, evaluate, fine-tune, and apply the COFFEE Toolkit, which was recently updated on February 12, 2024. Project Outcome 1, *"Adoption of a robust and sustainable social compliance system by private sector stakeholders in coffee supply chains,"* and its four outputs took approximately four years to achieve, from October 2019 to October 2023. The Covid-19 pandemic was partly responsible for the increased time needed to complete this work.

Annex A in the most recently available TPR, dated October 2023, recorded the target value for Outcome 1 as 80 percent of coffee supply chain stakeholders participating in the project using or

committed to using the tools from the toolkit. The evaluation team could not assess the degree of efficiency in achieving the 80 percent target, as the reporting figures are still outstanding and are envisioned to be reported on at the end of March 2024. However, the numerical values that measure Output 1.1 (number of stakeholders communicating support for the project) suggest the final value of 30 will be surpassed and show that Verité efficiently achieved this result in three years, between October 2019 and October 2023.

Project Outcome 2, “Strengthened capacity of private sector stakeholders to implement a robust and sustainable social compliance system in coffee supply chains,” took two years and six months before the outcome and its four outputs were achieved.

Project Outcome 3, “New social compliance tools on child labor, forced labor, and acceptable conditions of work piloted in coffee business operations and supply chains,” took approximately three years, from October 2020 to October 2023 before the outcome and its one output (later increased to three outputs) were achieved; this timeframe was also the overall time it took for designing and implementing the three pilot projects. Covid-19 restrictions caused this outcome to take nearly two years longer than originally planned.

As described above, Verité’s Modification 3 in February 2021 extended the Project to June 30, 2023; Verité requested this extension due to pandemic-caused delays, and the expansion of the Brazil pilot project. The request included a significant reassignment of budget lines.

The Project adapted quite well to the challenges placed on implementation caused by Covid-19. However, the Project was unable to recoup the lost ground in Mexico because a fourth year was not approved. A fourth year would have allowed the Project to continue consolidating activities with rural-based technicians and agronomists, which emerged as a promising avenue for sustaining the toolkit in Mexico. This approach would have included the applied, adapted toolkit, with Verité support, in the regular M&E protocols used during inspections of coffee farms by agronomists and other coffee technicians in Mexico.

3.3.1. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

In general, Verité professionally designed and implemented the M&E systems which show a clear move towards being useful Monitoring Evaluation and Learning (MEL) systems. ILAB and Verité acknowledged in interviews that the TPRs, although highly informative, tend to be rather long, and their conclusions are not immediately apparent. As a result of the collaboration between Verité and ILAB, Verité included more user-friendly data annexes in the TPRs, which enabled ILAB staff to quickly review the performance indicators for the three outcomes and their outputs over time. Including these data annexes undoubtedly increased the efficiency of the MEL systems.

3.3.2. THE COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN (CMEP)

Verité was contractually obliged to develop the CMEP with USDOL support. The October 2020 TPR report exemplifies how the CMEP was used as a MEL instrument even before finalization. For example, on page 11, the TPR describes how Verité and USDOL regularly reviewed indicators and explains how their definitions and calculations sometimes changed as needed and in response to USDOL technical comments to the CMEP and the TPR drafts.

The M&E specialist organized quarterly M&E sessions and consolidated annually the six-monthly reports against project targets, outputs, and indicators presented in the TPR annexes.

3.3.3. THE MID-TERM EVALAUTION (MTE)

Whether the MTE recommendations led to any demonstrable gains in the Project is not immediately apparent. The MTE concludes, “This learning (i.e., the MTE process) is relevant to the COFFEE Project’s implementation strategy since the three restraining forces (tested approaches, cost neutrality, and impact assessment) will be addressed in the pilot projects in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico.” (MTE p. 20)

In Mexico and Colombia, it does not appear that the MTE learning process led to actual gains and improvements in reducing the costs and length and making the toolkit more user-friendly and less cumbersome, i.e., in rendering the toolkit more cost-efficient, time-efficient, and simpler to use for end users. The MTE learning process was impacted in Mexico by the inability to continue the pilot, where the pilot was underfunded and in Colombia by the lack of Verité technical input to the project implementation led by a major coffee buyer in the Manos de Café project, which only carried out limited piloting of the toolkit. In Brazil, piloting of the toolkit has started.

Some of the MTE recommendations made by the three Expert Committee members have been applied in the Brazil pilots. Two examples are:

1. The Project’s training led to the technical agronomy staff adopting the simplified user manual on big coffee farms in ES and MG that focus on improved contracting and benefits-coverage for short-term harvesters; and
2. The Project’s construction on two coffee farms of cost-effective, socially, and environmentally compliant worker accommodation blocks that serve as demonstration sites for other coffee farms to learn about social compliance regulations.

3.4. IMPACTS

The Project’s impacts are discernible in:

1. informants’ comments made during KIIs, and FGDs;
2. in the Project’s M&E systems;
3. in the Project’s special studies and MEL reports concerning the pilot projects; and in certain key reports, such as the Lessons Learned reports and the MTE.

The CMEP (pp. 4-17) sets out the Project’s Results Based Management (RBM) framework based on performance indicators, targets, and other metrics. The CMEP’s RBM framework is reproduced and updated in the TPRs’ Data Reporting annexes.

3.4.1. ASSESSMENT OF THE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 1

(“Adoption of a robust and sustainable social compliance system by private sector stakeholders in coffee supply chains.”): The level of achievement for Outcome 1 is measured by its indicator: “OTC 1. Percentage of coffee supply chain stakeholders participating in the project that are using or commit to using tool(s) from Toolkit.” Although the final value is not yet known, the level of achievement for Outcome 1’s four outputs is discernible, as shown in the following:

One of the Project outputs is the online COFFEE Toolkit, available on Verité's [website](#), which sets out the eight steps of the original S3T toolkit. Additionally, the RE-ACT Dashboard provides resources and tools for PSS to carry out risk evaluation for action in the coffee trade. The original open-access training on this website comprised eight interactive, self-paced online training modules on international standards related to child labor, forced labor, recruitment, and gender issues, along with good practices in the identification, remediation, and prevention of labor risks, including through data collection at the farm-level, management systems, and due diligence approaches. The recently released version includes the 14 modules described in Section 1.5 and Table 2 above.

The interviewed informants in Mexico stated they highly appreciated the Verité-delivered training programs. At least one Mexican PSS expressed a willingness to pay Verité to provide more training but requested much more hands-on Verité mentoring and practical piloting of the toolkit. The latter concerns how the PSS can manage the practical problems of auditing labor and human rights compliance in a foolproof and accountable way when negotiating with suppliers who recruit laborers in the coffee supply chains.

Mexican and Brazilian informants who were trained in their institutions noted there was too little time for preparation and actual in-class training with a trainer. When probed, informants were unsure how many of their colleagues in government institutions had been trained and whether any of them used the toolkit in their work.

Furthermore, trainees reported they often had little time available for training. They reported they were not always well prepared and found the modules too generic. The Mexican informants, especially those from government institutions, stated they wished the training had a more participatory approach so that the teacher-student exchanges during class could have included more than an open SMS message forum of trainees' reactions to the reviewed modules, which could have led to concrete work assignments in the field to try out the new ideas and best practices.

3.4.2. CMEP DATA ON IMPACT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 1

From the CMEP Data Report Annex (October 2023), the impacts can be summarized as follows:

- Output 1.1. # of stakeholders communicate support for the project. The target of 30 has been surpassed at 33.
- Output 1.2. Research report(s) available (yes/no). The final draft of the PSA report was submitted to ILAB in April 2020.
- Output 1.3. # of tools developed. The target of 15 has been surpassed at 31.
- Output 1.4. # of individuals reached by the toolkit. The target of 500 has been surpassed at 2,140.

3.4.3. ASSESSMENT OF THE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 2

(“Strengthened capacity of private sector stakeholders to implement a robust and sustainable social compliance system in coffee supply chains.”) The level of achievement for Outcome 2 is measured by its indicator: “% of coffee supply chain stakeholders with strengthened capacity.”

3.4.4. CMEP DATA ON IMPACT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 2

From the CMEP Data Report Annex (October 2023), the impacts on capacity strengthening of coffee supply chain stakeholders can be summarized as follows:

- Output 2.1. # of curricula developed. The target of 5 has been surpassed at 9.
- Output 2.2. # of individuals trained. 142 individuals have been trained to date (target is 200 by the end of March 2024).
- Output 2.3. Stakeholders participating in awareness-raising sessions. The target of 200 has been surpassed at 253.

At the end of the training sessions, Verité asked trainees introduced to the new curricula to fill out self-assessment reports, which are included in the TPR. The M&E reports also include self-assessments by other trainees introduced to the toolkit. These self-assessments demonstrate a good level of impact of Verité’s training on people working in the coffee sector; and that trainees were introduced to new ideas on social compliance in coffee chains.

3.4.5. ASSESSMENT OF THE LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 3

(“New social compliance tools on child labor, forced labor, and acceptable conditions of work piloted in coffee business operations and supply chains”). The evaluation team understands that at least 54 coffee business operations and supply chain stakeholders piloted the toolkit.

These 54 stakeholders include private sector, industry associations, multi stakeholder initiatives, NGOs and certifiers, government, and academia. It is likely that the impact accrued from these 54 stakeholders’ exposure to, and piloting of, the toolkit has been considerable.

In Brazil, piloting of the tools has been extensive; in Colombia and Mexico, less so, viz.:

Tools piloted in Brazil include:³

- Definitions and International Standards: 10 producers, 20 workers, 3 labor brokers, 5 farm technicians, 5 administrative staff.
- Primer on Recruitment Related Risks in the Latin American Coffee Sector: 20 cooperative technicians; 10 producers; 20 workers, 3 labor brokers, 5 farm technicians, 5 administrative staff.
- SAQ for Coffee Producers – 5 technical staff from Cooperative and CLAC and 2 small producers.
- SAQ for Labor Brokers - 3 labor brokers
- Guidance on Monitoring of Labor Brokers – 2 producers.

³ Source of the data: Annex A Data Reporting October 2023 on Outcome 3, which provides a narrative description of outputs for Project Outcome 3 up to October 2023. The data recorded cover Years 1-6 of the COFFEE Project cumulatively.

- Guidance on Screening and Selection of Labor Brokers – 1 producer, 4 technical staff, 3 labor brokers.
- Sample Code of Conduct Provisions – 2 technical staff, 20 workers, 3 labor brokers, 5 technical, 2 administrative staff. ⁴
- Management Systems Framework for Preventing and Remediating Labor Risks; Guidelines on Monitoring of Coffee Farms - 2 CLAC staff technicians and 1 commercial manager and 1 field technician from a Cooperative for small producers.

Online training modules (included in the definition of tools) piloted in Brazil:

- Forced Labor and Human Trafficking
- Selection and Recruitment of Workers
- Child Labor
- Working Conditions
- Brazilian Legal Context

Tools piloted in Colombia include: ⁵

- Guidance on Stakeholder Engagement
- Root Cause Analysis of Labor Violations in the Coffee Sector - Guidance on Screening and Selection of Labor Brokers – 1 producer, 4 technical staff, 3 labor brokers
- Sample Code of Conduct Provisions – 2 technical staff, 20 workers, 3 labor brokers, 5 technical, 2 administrative staff. ⁶

Tools piloted in Mexico include: ⁷

- Guidance on Stakeholder Engagement
- Root Cause Analysis of Labor Violations in the Coffee Sector

Online training modules (included in the definition of tools) implemented in Mexico:

- Forced Labor and Human Trafficking
- Selection and Recruitment of Workers
- Child Labor
- Working Conditions
- Wages and Hours

⁴ Source: Annex A Data Reporting October 2023: data on Outcome 3.

⁵ Annex A Data Reporting October 2023 on Outcome 3 op. cit.

⁶ Source: Annex A Data Reporting op. cit.

⁷ Annex A Data Reporting October 2023 on Outcome 3 op. cit.

- Introduction to a Gender Perspective
- Mexican Legal Context 1
- Mexican Legal Context 2
- Management Systems & Due Diligence
- Data and Information Collection

The reports produced on findings from pilot projects include the Time and Motion Study for the manual harvesting of coffee in Caicedo and Salgar coffee farms, Antioquia (Colombia). Verité produced three lessons learned reports, one per country. Verité shared their content in SCA events in Portland and Athens. Verité wrote an additional consolidated lessons learned report, which was delivered to USDOL in August 2023.

3.4.6. CMEP DATA ON IMPACT FOR PROJECT OUTCOME 3

From the CMEP Data Report Annex (October 2023), the impacts on increasing the number of coffee stakeholders piloting the new social compliance tools on child labor, forced labor, and acceptable conditions of work in coffee business operations and supply chains, can be summarized as follows:

- Output 3.1. Pilot projects design completed (yes/no). Pilot project strategy documents and concept notes were developed for all three target countries.
- Output 3.2. # of tools piloted. The target of 15 has been surpassed at 31 (as of October 2023).
- Output 3.3. # of reports produced on findings from pilot projects. The target of 3 has been surpassed at 4.

3.4.7. IMPACTS OF THE PILOT PROJECTS

In Mexico, the impacts of the pilot projects were limited to training. Some interesting initiatives emerged, but little follow-up took place to take them forward.

In Colombia, the tools piloted were offered to project stakeholders in a large coffee cooperative and coffee producers associated with other associations and smaller cooperatives, with the Manos de Café project providing the contacts to individuals and associations identified for training.

The Brazil pilot activities, ongoing through March 2024, have made some measurable impacts. The pilots in ES and MG work with a range of stakeholders, and the activities well received. The positive impacts with permanent workers include:

1. several big and medium coffee farms report that they now use improved, labor-compliant contracts that provide more job security and better benefits for temporary workers; and
2. (improved accommodations in two coffee farms, which have the added benefit of providing a best practice example to other coffee farmers who want to improve their compliance with labor and social conditions for their permanent and temporary workers.

There were few benefits for the migrant coffee harvesters, which was due to Verité being unable to target migrant workers in the Brazil pilot. Some best practices, such as the accommodation blocks revamped for around US\$ 1,500 each, show promise for replication on a wide scale.

3.5. SUSTAINABILITY

One of the most critical aspects of the evaluation is considering the long-term sustainability of the initiatives developed by the Project, including the COFFEE Toolkit, the online training modules, and the pilot projects in the three countries.

The English version of the toolkit, 28 new tools and the training modules, was uploaded to the internet on February 12, 2024 and can easily be accessed. The toolkit is currently being translated. All the tools will likely remain accessible over the medium term.

A key concern concerning the sustainability of the toolkit is ensuring that the documents and training modules are regularly updated. This is essential for the RE-ACT Dashboard, which includes information updated annually from USDOL and UNDP. It is also highly desirable that the other tools are regularly revised and ideally expanded to cover new issues.

If Verité has the resources to expand the toolkit and training modules, it would be useful for Verité to include a brief, focused summary of the labor legislation in each country—not just a list of laws, but a simple explanation of objectives and scope of key legislation. Note that the new training includes two modules on the Mexican legal context. Verité could map out the institutions responsible for ensuring compliance with the labor legislation in the principal coffee-producing countries of Latin America and succinctly describe the capacity constraints and institutional blockages affecting the legislation enforcement on the ground.

Verité would also be advised to include practical suggestions to mitigate institutional constraints, such as the one advanced by Mexican Government officials from the National Anti-Trafficking Commission, who were interviewed by the evaluation team and recommended joint ministerial field trips at the municipal level to enhance cooperation and information-sharing between Anti-Trafficking, Agriculture, Labor Inspection, and Health officials.

The Project training has been completed in Mexico and will end in Brazil in March 2024. However, given Verité's longstanding relations with major international coffee companies, Verité could possibly seek additional training resources from the private sector. A senior manager from one major international coffee company expressed interest in supporting further training for their managers and field workers.

For long-term sustainability, future training programs will need to be better adapted to the target audience and include at least some participatory, preferably face-to-face, workshops that allow participants and instructors to exchange views. This could be combined with limited self-paced online training. From a practical and operational standpoint, a permanent presence on the ground would be required, in the form of a basic PMU, of whoever will conduct the recommended face-to-face training, mentoring, and piloting of training programs and field-based activities.

The pilot project's future in Colombia largely depends on continued support from the Manos de Café Project. The pilot project closed at the end of June 2023. However, Manos de Café continues to support new initiatives to improve working conditions, including alternative options for on-farm

transport and use of appropriate technology for improved ergonomics. In the medium term, Manos de Café continues to support the current social safeguards and food security programs.

3.5.1. FACTORS AFFECTING SUSTAINABILITY

The reputation, contacts, and experience of Verité were relevant, indeed vital, for facilitating contact with major international coffee companies, buyers, certifiers, and other CSOs working in labor and human rights. These contacts were essential for the development of the toolkit and training modules as well as for the implementation of the pilot projects.

The initial three-year timetable was sufficient for developing the toolkit and training modules but not enough to allow for the analysis, preparation, and implementation of the pilot projects after the toolkit had been finalized and uploaded to the Internet. Even without the limitations imposed by the Covid 19 pandemic, it would have been difficult for the Project to identify the priority issues; seek the necessary commitments from coffee companies and other stakeholders; and implement the projects in the allotted time frame.

In Colombia, the sustainability of the pilot project depends on support from major international coffee buyers. Since this is a high-profile model project well documented on the coffee company's website, support for the project beneficiaries will likely continue for some time. Manos de Café is a project that directs the Fair Trade and other premiums to the coffee workers through 13 social programs rather than paying premiums to the producers, which may not necessarily benefit the coffee workers. The main sustainability concern here is whether the social safeguard programs are financially viable and can be scaled up to reach other groups of coffee workers.

Regarding scaling up or replicability, a key concern is whether Manos de Café or similar initiatives could eventually include the vulnerable *andariegos* in training and mentoring activities. This approach would demand a different strategy than the current one of working through smallholder coffee farmers since the *andariegos* tend to work on larger farms. However, the experience in Brazil may offer some useful lessons for Colombia.

For example, the presence of a full-time director and project manager was an important factor in determining the success of the pilot projects in Brazil. The coordinator's personal contact and direct involvement may open the possibility for some coffee companies, buyers, certifiers, and producers or producers' associations to cover the cost of extending the training and support programs. The presence of a full-time director and project manager for each pilot project is a critical issue that should be discussed with these stakeholders before the project ends in March 2024.

3.5.2. IMPACT OF THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

The MTE was an in-house evaluation carried out in consultation with an expert panel and social compliance/social responsibility specialists from major international coffee companies and focused almost exclusively on the toolkit and training modules. It did not directly address the sustained implementation of the toolkit.

3.6. EQUITY AND INCLUSION

3.6.1. MARGINALIZED AND UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS

The toolkit was designed to identify, prioritize, and engage with marginalized and underserved populations. In particular, the module on stakeholder engagement offers guidance on how to identify marginalized and underserved populations.

At the country level, the Project concept owed much to earlier studies that Verité and other institutions conducted and followed up with PSAs and other, more focused, studies of workers in the coffee sector. In Brazil, and to a lesser extent in Mexico and Colombia, one priority was to focus on migrant workers. In Brazil, this included workers brought to MG and ES from poorer states, especially Bahia and, in some cases, Maranhão, and, in recent years, migrants from Venezuela and Haiti. The pilot project intended to address the exploitation of migrant workers by labor brokers.

The background studies on Colombia refer to the itinerant workers known as *andariegos*. In practice, the Project engaged minimally with this workforce sector. This is primarily because the Project worked through a coffee cooperative whose members were smallholder farmers who largely relied on local labor.

In Colombia, the workshop with coffee workers brought to light the issue of IDPs, a vulnerable group not referenced in the background or project documents.

3.6.2. DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT

The toolkit and training modules are focused primarily on the issue of child labor and forced labor, issues that almost exclusively affect marginalized and underserved populations. In Mexico, the training programs reinforced the toolkit for field workers and the National Anti-Trafficking Commission. The training course sensitized the Commission members to the issue of trafficking for forced labor in the agricultural sector. Previously, the Commission focused on trafficking for sexual exploitation; since learning about Mexico's labor legislation during the Verité training, some of the Commission members have become more aware of the presence of trafficking alongside other labor violations.

Verité explicitly designed the Brazil pilot project to improve the situation of migrant workers. The pilot project adopted a strategy of working through coffee companies and buyers to engage with large-scale farms and smallholder cooperatives that employ migrant workers. This led to improvements through formal contract requirements, such as including workers in the national social security scheme (INSS) and improved accommodations. However, the Project worked with fewer medium-scale farms, where labor brokers may have more freedom to abuse or exploit migrant workers.

In Colombia, the project had little or no engagement with the *andariegos*. However, the workshops and discussions with locally hired coffee workers led to significant modifications to the Manos de Café project to reflect the local workers' needs and priorities.

3.6.3. KEY FACTORS

The strategy of the pilot projects, which worked through existing programs initiated by the coffee companies, buyers, and certifiers, played an important part in determining the groups of workers with whom the project engaged. In Mexico, the training mainly focused on fieldworkers and supervisors from existing programs, which appear stronger in the less conflictive coffee-growing regions. In Colombia, the pilot project worked with one program, which coordinated with a large and well-run cooperative of mainly smallholder farmers.

An alternative strategy – mentioned by one of the interviewees from Mexico’s National Anti-Trafficking Commission and which reflects an experience of the Sub-Secretariat for Human Rights in Mexico’s Interior Ministry – would be to offer training in communities most at risk for trafficking/forced labor. The Sub-Secretariat has organized workshops in an indigenous community in rural Oaxaca that was identified as a community where young people have been trafficked.

3.6.4. THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

The pandemic made it virtually impossible to offer training to coffee workers and smallholder coffee producers in rural areas since they lacked the knowledge, computers, and reliable Internet service needed to access the training modules.

The pandemic, however, led to an interesting experience in Colombia that could offer a template for future initiatives to improve the conditions of migrant *andariegos*.

The coffee harvest was a national priority for Colombia since the families of over 500,000 farmers depend on the harvest and sale of their crops. The FNC is a powerful lobby and coordinated transport during Covid for coffee workers with the relevant departmental and municipal governments. The FNC also organized publicity and a program that involved testing workers for Covid before they traveled to the harvest areas, testing them again when they arrived, assigning them to farms, and ensuring they had PPE and that their accommodation and working spaces allowed for adequate social distancing.

It is possible that a planned program modeled on this experience and incorporating formal contracts or codes of conduct could be used to improve the working conditions and accommodation offered to the *andariegos*. Note that in Colombia, as in Brazil, all the producers interviewed stressed the difficulty of finding enough people willing to work in the coffee harvest. As a result, most coffee farmers would be willing to accept more formal arrangements, such as contracts and codes of conduct, if it would help them find enough workers when they most need them.

3.6.5. EQUITABLE ACCESS FOR MARGINALIZED AND UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS

As already noted, the private sector programs largely determined the selection of the beneficiaries of the Project. In Brazil, the pilot project also worked with large farms that employ many permanent and temporary workers; some temporary workers were migrants hired through brokers. One large farm hired Haitian and Venezuelan migrants as temporary workers for the harvest; they are registered with the Brazilian INSS. However, the administrator noted that there were cases where some migrant workers who came to Brazil during the pandemic were unable to register with the INSS.

3.6.6. GENDER EQUITY AND WOMEN'S RIGHTS

It is important to offer a comment on gender equity. The interviews, workshops, and site visits show that the gender composition of the coffee harvest workforce varies from country to country and, most important, is quite different for locally hired and migrant workers.

In Colombia, much of the locally-hired harvest workforce consists of women who live in the vicinity and whose concerns, reflected in the Manos de Café project, are focused on ensuring an income outside the harvest season and having access to social safeguards programs. The permanent workers are mainly men who live in the same neighborhood, while the migrant workers are almost all men, mainly young and elderly unmarried men.

The pilot project experience in Colombia suggests women would benefit from working in teams using tarpaulins (lonas) to harvest coffee; this could help narrow the gender pay gap.

In Brazil, most migrant workers are men. They do not bring their families with them. The only exceptions we are aware of are Haitian migrants who reportedly bring their wives. The women do not work in the harvest.

3.6.7. STEPS TO ENSURE ACCESS FOR MARGINALIZED AND UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS

The COFFEE Project's strategy of working through private sector and civil society organizations would need to be reconsidered in future similar projects to impact the most vulnerable migrant workers. At the very least, the strategy requires closer coordination between the private sector coffee companies and buyers, the cooperatives, national-level associations, like the FNC in Colombia, and relevant national and local level government agencies.

It would be useful to have more detailed ethnographic studies of migrant workers, which, if possible, should be triangulated with whatever quantitative data are available. These studies may be difficult to execute in regions such as southern Mexico, where migrants move between countries and may be subject to serious threats and abuses.

On a positive note, given the critical shortage of temporary labor in countries like Brazil and Colombia, we believe many farmers would be willing to accept the national legal requirements and implement changes, provided they had a better understanding of the legislation and the changes needed, such as formal contracts and codes of conduct

On February 9, 2024, Verité organized a webinar to share ideas and experiences between the organizations and programs involved in the pilot projects in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico. The webinar can be accessed at Verité's [YouTube channel](#).

4. LESSONS LEARNED AND PROMISING PRACTICES

4.1. LESSONS LEARNED

4.1.1. THE TOOLKIT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

The main lesson learned from developing the COFFEE toolkit, the Project's principal focus, is that improving PSSs' social compliance systems could not occur without the PSS adapting them into their management, monitoring, and business systems

A second related lesson learned is that simplifying the existing toolkit must go hand in hand with Verité advising each PSS how it can practically assist its key staff (managers, administrators, extension workers, and cooperative personnel) to apply the toolkit to their specific social compliance needs. This approach was effective in the Brazil pilot project. The current challenge in Brazil is to scale up the training and engage with a larger number and a wider range of companies and coffee growers, including middle-range producers who are the most dependent on labor hired through intermediaries.

A third lesson is that successful adaptation and adoption of the toolkit requires that the toolkit incorporate the following elements:

1. country-level information, covering national and sub-national legislation;
2. an analysis of the roles and capacity constraints of the main national and local institutions responsible for enforcing labor legislation;
3. analyses of the issues that the producers and other actors involved in supply chains face; and
4. the coffee workers' priority concerns in each geographical region.

A fourth lesson learned is that training and the preparation of in-house manuals, toolkits, and codes of conduct need to be developed in collaboration with coffee stakeholders, whether they be companies, certifiers, buyers, coffee producers, or producer organizations targeted by the Project.

4.1.2. THE PILOT PROJECTS

In Mexico, a primary lesson from the pilot project is the importance of learning how to adapt the training modules to the needs of the target sectors. Online, self-paced modules, such as those on the Project website, can be effective, either if:

1. they are combined with participatory, instructor-led training; or
2. completion of the modules and the questionnaires is obligatory for trainees who take the training course.

The evaluation team finds the former more appropriate for field workers and producers. The latter might be an option for more senior managers of companies that want to participate in specific certification schemes.

The studies prepared for Colombia provide more learning about adapting the toolkit. The Living Income and Living Wage Report and the Time and Motion study offered insights and covered issues not addressed in any detail in the toolkit.⁸ Once completed, the studies were subject to consultation process with small groups of coffee workers and smallholder producers from the Manos de Café project. The lesson learned is that the innovative and complementary studies in Colombia based on the PSA generated a new and different understanding of the priorities of the coffee workers and smallholder producers from the Manos de Café project, which were quite different from the initial pilot project proposals.

⁸ Note that the Living Income and Living Wage Report was commissioned by Verité and financed by Keurig/Dr Pepper.

This new understanding included the coffee workers' emphasis on reducing their vulnerability rather than increasing their income from the harvest and prioritizing social safety nets, food security, and alternative sources of income for the off-harvest season. It offers an important lesson for Verité, demonstrating the need to test project hypotheses through a process of direct engagement with the workers the project intended to benefit. In this respect, the pilot project acted as a catalyst, re-focusing the attention of the externally financed Manos de Café project to a new set of issues.

In Mexico, another lesson learned came from engaging with the Anti-Trafficking Commission, which does not normally work in agriculture and labor rights. After the Mexican Government members of the Commission took part in the training program provided by Verité on the Toolkit focused on the agriculture sector, they were inspired by the training to broaden the scope of their work to include agricultural supply chains (coffee, lemons, avocado, and cantaloupe melons). The Toolkit training served as a catalyst for potentially encouraging inter-institutional cooperation in different Mexican government sectors.

A promising practice that emerged from the Verité training courses offered to the National Anti-Trafficking Commission is that the training generated a concern among the Commission's members that the Commission should also consider forced labor, especially in the agricultural sector, as well as trafficking for sexual exploitation, which had previously dominated the Commission's work. Similarly, a promising practice was the MOU with the Polytechnic University of Tapachula, which had the potential to incorporate labor issues into the curriculum for agronomists and agricultural engineers.

Finally, a critical lesson comes from thinking about the long-term sustainability of the pilot projects from the beginning. Even with Verité's standing and reputation, it was initially difficult for Verité to establish partnerships with the suppliers of international coffee roasters in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico. However, once the pilot programs had been agreed upon, the Project should have considered the continuity of the training courses and other initiatives and discussed how the programs could be maintained over the medium to long term.

4.2. SECTOR SPECIFIC ISSUES

4.2.1. VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

Verité designed the pilot projects to address risks to some of the most vulnerable groups involved in the coffee supply chain. The lesson learned is that unless a specific program or activity is specifically designed to reach the most vulnerable groups involved in the coffee supply chain, the Project will not reach them. By the Project focusing on smallholder producers, the Project excluded some of the most vulnerable migrant workers. This situation happened not by design but by default because the Project worked with existing private sector projects, certifiers, and organized groups of smallholder farmers (cooperatives). The small-scale producers in Colombia were less likely to hire migrant workers, and smallholders in Brazil were less reliant on migrants hired through labor brokers.

A lesson learned in Brazil is that some stakeholders, especially labor brokers, resisted engaging with projects like the COFFEE Project due to a lack of trust. Building trust takes time and is hard to achieve within the kind of timeframe envisaged for the pilot projects. Another lesson from Brazil

is that the project achieved significant progress working with large farms and cooperatives but had less access to mid-sized farms where vulnerable migrant workers are employed and where abuses may be more prevalent.

However, a promising practice was that even though the Project had no direct contact with migrants from abroad, one farm in Brazil hired immigrant/refugee workers from Haiti and Venezuela and provided them with the same services and working conditions they applied to Brazilian migrant workers.

A final lesson learned: it is vital to reflect on how far a project, designed to improve the rights and working conditions for people in the coffee supply chain, can be implemented in areas subject to conflict with armed groups. The pilot project experience in Colombia suggests that it is feasible, up to a point, provided the armed groups or the producers do not see the project as threatening. However, the issue should not be ignored.

4.3. PROMISING PRACTICES

4.3.1. PROACTIVE ADAPTATION OF THE TOOLKIT TO NATIONAL AND LOCAL CONTEXT

The Brazilian pilot project successfully worked with coffee companies, buyers, certifiers, and coffee producers to develop standards, codes of conduct, and training manuals adapted to the reality of Brazil and the priorities of the companies and producers. Verité could potentially replicate the experience in other Latin American countries.

4.3.2. ENGAGEMENT WITH THE PUBLIC SECTOR

The experience gained from the development of the toolkit and subsequent work with members of the National Anti-Trafficking Commission in Mexico could potentially be replicated with public sector agencies in other Latin American Countries. This could involve offering more than short courses on labor rights. For instance, a combination of training on labor rights and workshops could be implemented to identify priorities and develop policies, protocols, guidance, and training materials for key institutions charged with promoting or enforcing national labor legislation, as well as the agricultural extension agencies with a presence in the field. In Brazil, for example, this might include the state-level agricultural extension agencies, such as the Capixaba Institute for Research, Technical Assistance and Rural Extension (INCAPER) in ES and Technical Assistance and Rural Extension Company of the State of Minas Gerais (EMATER).

4.3.3. HIGHER EDUCATION

The initiative of offering online training to agronomy students at the Polytechnic University of Tapachula, Mexico, provides an opportunity to incorporate social and labor issues into the university's curriculum. The agronomy and agricultural engineering students are often working directly in the field. In the medium to long-term, updated curricula could have a significant impact if the agronomists and agricultural engineers are taught a basic understanding of key concepts, such as child labor and forced labor, international labor standards, and the national legal framework and the institutions responsible for its enforcement.

4.3.4. TECHNICAL STUDIES AND PARTICIPATORY WORKSHOPS

The Colombia pilot project's approach should also be considered a promising practice. Verité commissioned the Living Income and Living Wage Report and the Time and Motion study, both of which were complex technical studies but subject to consultations, workshops, and practical experiments with smallholder coffee producers and their workers.

The process offers a model for the development of new initiatives. It involved discussion and experimentation and incorporated ideas and recommendations from the workers. The social safety nets program, sponsored by a major international coffee buyer, was well received, as were the initiatives to provide training to help workers find other sources of income outside the harvest season and improve their food security.

The initiatives to improve harvesting were less successful, but they highlighted other priorities, such as finding alternative ways to carry the harvested coffee cherries, reduce the ergonomic stress on the workers, and, above all, adopt appropriate technologies for transporting the heavy bags of coffee from the field to the roadside weighing stations. The experience of using tarpaulins was mixed since coffee harvesters were unwilling to work in teams, but the experience offers the possibility of increasing women's earnings and reducing the existing gender gap.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1. PROJECT DESIGN

The COFFEE Project's TOC assumes that the eradication of child labor and forced labor and the improvement of the incomes and working conditions of coffee workers and smallholder farmers can be promoted by working with private sector coffee companies and civil society. To be successful, this "change from within" TOC relies on at least three crucial assumptions in the coffee sector:

1. Assumption 1. Voluntary sustainability standards (VSS) and social compliance labor rights protocols become integral to PSS in coffee supply chains.⁹
2. Assumption 2. PSS can demonstrate they monitor social compliance and always contact the authorities if they suspect violations of workers' rights.
3. Assumption 3. PSS that adhere to VSS will publish or commission open access reports investigating cases of suspected labor rights infringements.

Verité underlined the growing importance to the evaluators of Verité's strategy – developed in response to the above three assumptions – to mentor PSS to train their managerial-level personnel in the procurement (coffee-purchasing) departments so that they apply social compliance protocols by default when tendering to purchase coffee.

⁹ Some PSS may have a disproportionately large influence and hence motive to ensure producers and their buyers adhere to sustainability standards, because they head up a group of subscribing farms in a large coffee industry association.

The COFFEE Project won the support of major international coffee companies in this endeavor, which is a testament to the fact that the TOC's approach is not fundamentally flawed, and that certification is important in the coffee industry. However, some assumptions need to be addressed and mitigated in tandem with the activities of the COFFEE Project to publicize, make available, and pilot aspects of the COFFEE Toolkit.

The Verité (2019) PSA¹⁰ includes data on the capacity self-assessment provided by PSS. This data strengthens the argument that closer collaboration with government agencies in specific geographical areas can strengthen social compliance and improve the quality and reliability of certification in coffee supply chains. Table 3 in the PSA (p. 17) presents data that Verité collected in Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil about reported labor violations, with worker informants reporting indicators of forced labor such as recruitment linked to debt, deceptive recruitment, confiscation of identity papers or travel documents, forced overtime (beyond legal limits), limited freedom of movement and communication, degrading living conditions, induced or inflated indebtedness, and physical violence.

5.2. COFFEE TOOLKIT AND TRAINING

The international coffee companies played a role in reviewing and refining the COFFEE toolkit. However, the coffee companies, roasters, buyers, and certifiers face a practical challenge in monitoring their supply chains, especially at the local level, since they do not have enough presence in the field and cannot realistically audit all the producers they buy from.

The key activities needed to maintain the toolkit involve an ongoing process of updating and simplifying, adapting to national and subnational legislation and institutions, and continually adapting it to the needs of specific users.

5.3. PILOT PROJECTS

The pilots in Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil demonstrate interesting initiatives, but the progress achieved is incipient and small-scale. In Mexico and Colombia, the pilots did not always address the issues affecting the most vulnerable migrant workers (Colombia's *andariegos* and the itinerant / migrant workers recruited to medium-size farms in Brazil).

The challenge for the future is to identify ways to develop and expand the initiatives and create more of a demonstration effect. Future initiatives involving significant piloting and practical field-level activities must consider their longer-term sustainability.

5.4. SUSTAINABILITY

The key issues concerning the toolkit's sustainability are, first, to ensure that the documents and training modules are regularly updated. There is a possibility that some international coffee companies would be willing to support further training for their managers and field workers.

¹⁰ Verité, COFFEE Project. PRE-SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS, (PSA). Funded by the USDOL/ILAB. Project duration: April 2019 – March 2022. Date: 2019.

The pilot project's future in Colombia largely depends on continued support from the Manos de Café project. The COFFEE Project's pilot activities closed at the end of June 2023.

5.5. EFFICIENCY

The COFFEE Project mostly applied human and financial resources to designing, evaluating, fine-tuning, and applying the COFFEE Toolkit, which was recently updated on February 12, 2024. Project Outcome 1 and its four outputs took approximately four years, from October 2019 - October 2023, to achieve. The Covid-19 pandemic was partly responsible for the increased time needed to complete this work. Project Outcome 2's outcome and four outputs took approximately two years and six months to achieve. Project Outcome 3's outcome and one output (later increased to three outputs) took approximately four years, from October 2020 to October 2023, to achieve; this includes the overall time for designing and implementing the three pilot projects. Covid-19 restrictions caused this outcome to take nearly two years longer than originally envisaged.

The Project adapted to the challenges placed on implementation caused by Covid-19. Verité requested the Project extension to June 30, 2023 due to delays caused by Covid-19 and the expansion of the Brazilian pilot project. The Project was unable, however, to recoup the lost ground in Mexico because a fourth year was not approved.

5.5.1. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

In general, the M&E systems have been professionally designed and implemented and show a clear move towards being useful MEL systems.

5.5.2. THE MID-TERM EVALUATION

In Mexico and Colombia, the MTE learning process did not lead to improvements in reducing the costs and length and making the toolkit more cost-efficient, time-efficient, and simpler to use for the end-users. The reasons for this are, in Mexico's case, the inability to continue the pilot in Mexico, where the pilot was underfunded, and, in Colombia's case, the ending of Verité's technical input to the Manos de Café project, which only carried out limited piloting of the toolkit.

5.6. IMPACT

5.6.1. OUTCOME 1

Outcome 1 is the "adoption of a robust and sustainable social compliance system by private sector stakeholders in coffee supply chains." The online COFFEE Toolkit is one output, and is available on the COFFEE Project website along with at least one tool created for each of the eight steps of the USDOL Comply Chain framework. The trained Mexican and Brazilian informants assessed the impact of the toolkit by stating they saw a lot of potential in the toolkit, found the training stimulating and interesting, and wished to learn a lot more about social compliance issues. However, they stressed that there was insufficient time for preparation, actual in-class training with a trainer, and practical follow-up in the field to try out the new codes of practice and apply them in their daily work.

5.6.2. OUTCOME 2

Outcome 2, “strengthened capacity of private sector stakeholders to implement a robust and sustainable social compliance system in coffee supply chains”, is an essential project result because the better the capacity of the private sector stakeholders to implement their own social compliance systems, the greater the possibility they will have to reduce violations of labor rights in the coffee supply chains. The impacts that the evaluation can discern on capacity strengthening of coffee supply chain stakeholders include the following data from the CMEP Data Report Annex (as of October 2023):

- Output 2.1. # of curricula developed. The target of 5 has been surpassed at 9.
- Output 2.2 # of individuals trained. 142 individuals had been trained up to October 2023 (target is 200 by end of March 2024).
- Output 2.3. Stakeholders participating in awareness-raising sessions. The target of 200 has been surpassed at 253.

Verité invited trainees introduced to the new curricula to fill in self-assessment reports after the training concluded; these self-assessments are included in the TPR. The M&E reports include self-assessments by other trainees who were introduced to the toolkit. These self-assessments demonstrate a good level of impact on trainees working in the coffee sector of the training and introduction of new ideas on social compliance in coffee chains.

5.6.3. OUTCOME 3

Outcome 3, “new social compliance tools on child labor, forced labor, and acceptable conditions of work piloted in coffee business operations and supply chains,” has been a major focus of the pilot projects. The Project’s impacts on piloting the new toolkit include 31 tools piloted in total: in Mexico (12), Colombia (2), and Brazil (17). The capacity building impact that accrued from stakeholders’ exposure to the tools during toolkit piloting has likely been considerable. In Brazil, piloting of the tools has been extensive; in Colombia and Mexico less so. The reports produced based on findings from the pilot projects include the Time and Motion study for the manual harvesting of coffee in Caicedo and Salgar coffee farms in Antioquia (Colombia). Verité produced three lessons learned reports, one per country. Verité shared their content in SCA events in Portland and Athens. Verité wrote an additional consolidated lessons learned report, which was delivered to USDOL in August 2023.

5.6.4. IMPACTS OF THE PILOT PROJECTS

In Mexico, the impacts of the pilot projects were limited to training. Some interesting initiatives emerged, but little follow-up took place to take them forward. In Colombia, the tools piloted were offered to project stakeholders in a large coffee cooperative and several coffee producers associated with other associations and smaller cooperatives, with the Manos de Café project providing the contacts to individuals and associations identified for training.

The Brazil pilot activities, ongoing to March 2024, made some measurable impacts. The pilots in ES and MG worked with a range of stakeholders and were well received. The positive impacts with permanent workers include:

1. several big and medium coffee farms report that they now use improved, labor-compliant contracts that provide more job security and better benefits for temporary workers; and
2. improved accommodations in two coffee farms, which have the added benefit of providing a best practice example to other coffee farmers who want to improve their compliance with labor and social conditions for their permanent and temporary workers.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The two tables below summarize the most important recommendations arising from this evaluation and are based on the evaluation team’s review and analysis of the project documents, interviews, and focus groups.

The recommendations are divided into two groups: 1) recommendations for Verité, and 2) recommendations for DOL/ILAB. The first two recommendations for Verité refer to actions that Verité should take before the project closes at the end of March 2024. The first – a simple summary document – is easy to implement and, in principle, has been accepted by Verité. The second focuses on ensuring the continuity and updating of the RE-ACT Dashboard and the toolkit; this is an internal issue that needs to be discussed by the management of Verité and should include, if possible, identifying responsibilities for maintaining and upgrading the toolkit once the COFFEE Project comes to an end.

The other three recommendations for Verité are generic and can be applied to future training programs outside the immediate context of the COFFEE Project. They could be applied to training programs related to other countries, regions, and other agricultural commodities. The evaluators have drawn attention concerning how the pandemic constrained the training the COFFEE Project provided. In Mexico, the pandemic hindered a more participatory approach to the training. However, the pilot project experience in Brazil demonstrates the value of adapting the toolkit to the national and regional context, taking a more participatory approach, and focusing the training on field-level managers and extension workers.

Table 3. Recommendations for Verité and Supporting Evidence

Recommendation	Evidence	Page Numbers
Provide a one-page document summarizing the project activities and achievements (from M&E)	Interview with M&E specialist and Project Director	Note 35 and Section 1.8
Agree on the responsibilities and sources of funding to maintain, update, adapt, and improve the RE-ACT Dashboard and COFFEE toolkit	Discussions with coffee companies, buyers, certifiers, and producers.	See Section 3.5
Adapt training programs to the country context (legislation, institutions) and the priorities of the people receiving the training	Interviews with the project director, senior managers, and sustainability managers of companies and cooperatives in Mexico and Brazil	Note 1, 6, 21, 23, 30, 31, 33 and Section 3.2

Recommendation	Evidence	Page Numbers
Offer more practical, participatory training with exercises, workshops, and events	Interviews with senior managers, field workers, and other trainees in Mexico and Brazil	Notes 1, 6, 21, 22, 23
Focus the training on producers, cooperatives, and people who visit farms (extension workers and agronomists)	Interviews with Verité staff and senior managers of coffee company sustainability programs	Note 1, 5, 6

The recommendations for DOL/ILAB are strategic and intended to guide the preparation of future projects in the coffee sector in Latin America. They could be applied to other agricultural sectors in the Latin American region and, indeed, other regions of the world. The first two apply to future projects structured similarly to the COFFEE Project, such as projects that contemplate a core component and pilot projects designed to test a particular approach. The evaluation team believes that pilot projects should always be intended as viable projects and, from the outset, should be designed to ensure some level of sustainability.

The next three recommendations refer to future initiatives supported by USDOL/ILAB. The recommendations to support the incorporation of labor issues into the curriculum for agriculture students is a long-term strategy that would create a greater consciousness among agricultural agronomists and technicians and make it easier to identify child labor and forced labor in the field. Similarly, the recommendation to work with key public sector agencies is a strategy that would complement, not replace, the current TOC focused on working through the private sector.

The recommendation relating to migrant workers reflects the experience of the COFFEE Project and ideas discussed during some interviews. There is no simple answer to address the difficulty of engaging with migrant workers and labor brokers. The topic merits further analysis and discussion and could be explored if USDOL/ILAB were to organize workshops with grantees working on projects that address issues of migrant labor in the coffee sector and in relation to other agricultural commodities.

The final recommendation should apply to all USDOL/ILAB supported projects in areas affected by conflict and/or impacted by organized crime. USDOL/ILAB should ensure grantees carry out a general risk analysis when working in areas of potential conflict and insecurity to ensure the safety and wellbeing of project workers and beneficiaries. They should also adopt simple protocols to reduce the level of risk, develop procedures to address potential situations that might arise, and carry out regular reviews of the security situation in the project area.

Table 4. Recommendations for DOL/ILAB and Supporting Evidence

Recommendation	Evidence	Page Numbers
In future projects, establish a PMU or Coordinator for every country where pilot projects will be implemented to make them viable and more likely to be sustained.	Site visits and discussion with sustainability projects, certifiers, and producer organizations in Colombia.	Note 36 and Sections 3.3, and 3.4

Recommendation	Evidence	Page Numbers
Longer implementation time for pilot projects. This would allow for better planning and engagement with potential beneficiaries.	Interviews with managers and extension workers from coffee company sustainability programs	Note 20
Prioritize agriculture students from polytechnics and universities for future training on labor rights.	Interviews with senior management of coffee companies' sustainability programs. Also, round-up meeting in Brazil	Note 5, 33
Support projects to engage directly with key public sector agencies.	Interviews with Mexico's Anti-Trafficking Commission and the Pilot Project in Brazil	Note 21, 22, 23, 24, 33
Support alternative ways to address the situation of migrant workers.	Project reports and studies. Interviews with the project director, managers of cooperatives and extension workers	Section 3.6 and Note 11, 27, 28
Incorporate risk analysis and security procedures and protocols when working in regions with security risks.	Discussions with coffee workers, smallholder farmers, and extension workers	Note 10 and Section 4.2.1

ANNEX A. EVALUATION DESIGN MATRIX

Issue or Problem Statement

The purpose of this final performance evaluation is to:

- Assess if the project has achieved its objectives and outcomes, identifying the challenges encountered in doing so, and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges, giving particular attention to equity and inclusion in the pilot projects;
- Assess the intended and unintended effects of the project;
- Assess the lessons learned and emerging practices from the project (strategies and models of intervention) and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future projects in the countries covered by the pilot projects and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors; and
- Assess which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable.

It is important to evaluate the COFFEE project to assess the validity of its TOC, its assumptions, its strategy and its outputs that were designed to achieve the expected outcomes or results of the project. It will be useful to the main stakeholders of the project to know if the capacity building and training program, and the introduction of the social compliance toolkit were effective in reducing forced labor and child labor, and were effective in strengthening the ability of private sector and state agencies to more effectively recognize, monitor, and reduce forced labor and child labor in coffee supply chains in Mexico, Colombia and Brazil.

Intended Users

The evaluation will provide ILAB, the grantee, the participants and other project stakeholders or actors who have a concern, interest and/or influence on the labor rights problem the project is intended to address, with an assessment of the project's performance, its effects on project participants, and an understanding of the factors driving the project results.

The results, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation will serve to inform any project adjustments that may need to be made, and to inform stakeholders about the design and implementation of future labor rights projects. The evaluation report will be published on the USDOL website and will be written as a stand-alone document, providing the necessary background information for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

Table: EQ 1. Relevance and Coherence

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ1.1	To what extent is the project's TOC valid (considering threats to internal and external validity), given the implementing environment?	Documents needed include political economy analyses, background studies on the coffee sector in Latin America. The pilot project descriptions for the three countries. Policy documents of the DOL, ILAB, and coffee producer associations, and Chambers of Commerce.	In addition to the desk review the evaluation team will conduct FGD and KII, and a small quantitative survey to private sector and government stakeholders to assess the TOC's validity	No limitations are envisaged for the activities needed to test out the TOC. Data from FGD and KII will be triangulated with documentary sources and survey data. Survey data's reliability will be enhanced by triangulation with the qualitative data from the focus groups and interviews	Whether and to what degree, the TOC and the assumptions on which it is based, are rooted in reality, and in a firm understanding of the political economy of the coffee sector in Latin America
EQ1.2	To what extent were the strategies based on a thorough and current understanding of the context of the coffee sector and coffee supply chains in the three pilot countries?	The grantee-commissioned studies that form the background for the strategies developed in the project will be required reading to test the TOC. Scientific and academic reports on coffee, supply chains and the coffee sector in Latin America	The data from the focus groups, key interviews and survey will complement and triangulate the background studies and desk review data	The evaluation team has built up a good rapport with the grantee. The grantee has a good relationship with the project stakeholders. So, no limitations are envisaged in collecting the data and in the quality of the data to be collected.	Whether and to what degree, the TOC and the assumptions on which it is based, are rooted in reality. A realistic appreciation of the challenges attendant on any attempt to address forced labor and child labor issues in the coffee sector

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ1.3	To what extent were the strategies to achieve project objectives relevant to the priorities of the target groups and local stakeholders?	Grantee-commissioned studies. Special studies of coffee's political economy, especially those including social analysis and ethnographic appreciation of the realities on the ground.	Where it is appropriate, case study summaries, content analysis, and descriptive analysis will be used to analyses TOC validity against political economy realities on the ground.	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Whether and how far the COFFEE project has been appropriately designed to meet the needs of the target groups and local stakeholders
EQ1.4	To what extent has the project adapted to the changing circumstances and needs of the most vulnerable stakeholders?	Grantee-commissioned studies. Special studies of coffee's political economy: i.e.: Colombia Living Wage Study. Brazil: Labor and Recruitment Dynamics in Brazilian coffee sector Study	Review the DOL policies which the grantee has attempted to follow in the COFFEE project. Review the Technical Progress Reports (TPR) Review the Project Document and how and whether it addresses (and is designed to address) the needs of the most vulnerable directly or indirectly. Review the 6-month TPR reports which show variations and adjustments to strategy according to changing realities affecting implementation	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Whether and how far the COFFEE project has met the needs and changing circumstances of the most vulnerable stakeholders

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ1.5	To what extent were the risk analyses and assumptions coherent and relevant to the political economy in the three pilot countries	Grantee-commissioned studies. Special studies of coffee's political economy.	Desk review analyses, triangulated with the findings from focus groups, interviews triangulated during the feedback sessions with Verite and other stakeholders at the presentation of evaluation findings in-country and virtually	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Whether and to what degree, the TOC and the assumptions on which it is based, are rooted in reality.

Table: EQ 2. Effectiveness

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ2.1	To what extent has the project achieved its primary objectives and outcomes?	Project M&E reports Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) report	Review the DOL website and background documents on the COFFEE project. Review the Project Document. Review the 6-month TPR	The available, reviewed studies provide rich information of great use to the evaluation team's assessment of effectiveness	To what degree outcomes have been achieved.
EQ2.2	To what extent has the capacity of the stakeholders been strengthened? What were the achievements of the capacity building activities?	MTE report Technical Progress Reports	Additional to the documentary review, the evaluation team will ask stakeholders in focus groups and interviews and the survey about perceptions of capacity-strengthening and impact.	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	How far and whether stakeholders' capacity to monitor and implement social compliance systems has improved, and insights into things that work for future sustainability

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ2.3	What were the outcomes of the pilot projects in the three countries?	Project M&E reports	The evaluation team will ask stakeholders in focus groups, interviews, and the survey about perceptions of outcomes.	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Degree to which the pilots contributed to the overall achievement of COFFEE project outcomes
EQ2.4	Which interventions, and which components of the project, were most effective for achieving the desired outcomes?"-	MTE report TPR Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	The scope for this question is what activities, and what components, are perceived as the most advantageous and effective for achieving the expected results or outcomes of the project.	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Lessons learned for future similar interventions about what works best to reduce forced labor in similar sector supply chains.
EQ2.5	Has the toolkit strengthened stakeholders' social compliance systems?	MTE report TPR Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Interviews and focus groups will provide data on stakeholders' perceptions of the degrees of strengthening of the social compliance systems which are already operational, or which will be set up in private sector stakeholders companies involved in the project	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses because there is an open dialogue already established between the grantee, private-sector stakeholders and the evaluation team.	Whether and how far the strategy to introduce training and stakeholder capacity--strengthening is the right strategy to reduce forced labor in coffee supply chains.

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ2.6	What factors challenged the desired outcomes and impacts of the Project?	Project M&E reports MTE report Information about the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and other challenges that may have affected project implementation	Not applicable	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Not applicable

Table: EQ 3. Efficiency / Flexibility

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 3.1	Were the project’s human and financial resources applied efficiently in implementing the project strategy? What factors, if any, affected efficiency?	Project budget (The original ProDoc one and revised budgets).	Interviews and focus groups with grantee and stakeholders about the relationship between resources (financial, personnel, and time) vis-à-vis the strategy and the level of ambition of the project	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses. Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about efficiency issues	If and to what degree this type of project with a budget of US\$ 2M originally and US\$2.5M finally has sufficient resources to achieve its stated objectives. Whether the four-year timeline was sufficient to achieve the desired level of ambition

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 3.2	<p>What were the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on project implementation? How did the project adapt?</p>	<p>Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on carrying out training during lockdown and on efficiency of virtual, as opposed to in-person training and mentoring</p> <p>MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey</p>	<p>The strategies for collecting information will be desk review analysis, focus groups, interviews and the survey</p>	<p>No limitations are envisaged for these analyses.</p> <p>Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about efficiency issues.</p> <p>Interviews carried out to date have provided information on the impact of COVID-19</p>	<p>Whether for the lessons learned, future similar projects could include a one-year project extension built in “in case” for similar pandemic shocks.</p> <p>And whether when it is the case that other overarching US Government agreements might be in existence that could include provisions that could threaten an extension if needed of this type of project (or of a component – in this case- the Mexico pilot country).</p>
EQ 3.3	<p>How have the M&E systems been implemented and to what degree were they used as MEL (monitoring evaluation learning systems) to identify trends and patterns, adapt strategies, and make informed decisions?</p>	<p>MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey</p>	<p>The strategies for collecting information will be desk review analysis, focus groups, interviews and the survey- focusing on whether /how MEL was used to make informed decisions</p>	<p>No limitations are envisaged for these analyses.</p> <p>Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about how lessons are learned from special studies and MEL exercises to inform strategic decisions</p>	<p>Whether for the lessons learned, sufficient resources were apportioned to MEL and how far the management of the project was in tuned to making informed decisions based on evidence from monitoring and evaluation systems.</p>

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 3.4	To what degree were the recommendations from the MTE followed up?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Whether the MTE was carried out early enough in the project to make changes if needed in the strategy, or whether the MTE took place too late in the implementation period permit sufficient time to make changes.

Table. EQ 4: Impacts

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ4.1	What are the observed outcomes and impacts of the project? Are they in accordance with the original targets established by the project?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	An analysis of what outputs achieved the most useful outcomes and impacts defined as results reducing forced labor and child labor in coffee supply chains

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 4.2	What were the impacts of the pilot projects?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	An analysis of what outputs achieved the most useful outcomes and impacts defined as results. Whether pilot projects strengthened the capacity and ability of private sector stakeholders in the coffee sector to improve their social compliance monitoring and enforcement systems with the ultimate goal of reducing forced labor and child labor in coffee supply chains.

Table EQ 5: Sustainability

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 5.1	Which activities or initiatives are most likely to be sustained?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Field visits and FGDs and KIIs in pilot countries Survey data	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses.	For future planning purposes, it is very useful to know what activities or initiatives are more likely to be sustained as opposed to others which are more difficult to sustain.

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 5.2	What factors have contributed to or limited this sustainability?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Survey data	Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about how lessons are learned from special studies and MEL exercises to inform strategic decisions	To be able to determine the factors determining sustainability allows improved design of similar future programs.
EQ 5.3	Could the project have made more effort to achieve sustainability?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	It may not be possible to answer these questions with only a four-year timeline for the project, but all efforts will be expended to do so	
EQ 5.4	To what extent were the challenges to sustained implementation of the S3T Toolkit, identified by participants of the Second Advisory Council Dialogue during the 2021 MTE, addressed by the project?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about how lessons are learned from special studies and MEL exercises to inform strategic decisions	Answering this type of question allows the evaluator to draw lessons learned about how flexible the project was, and how able it was (or not), at being able to change strategy if needed to redress an identified problem.

Table EQ 6: Equity and Inclusion

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 6.1	How did the project engage marginalized and underserved populations? Did the design and implementation of the project reflect their needs and priorities? What factors affected these results? Did the Covid-19 pandemic make it more difficult to engage with these populations?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	The limitations of this question as concern this evaluation are determined by the project objectives, which aim to engage private-sector stakeholders, rather than the most marginalized and underserved populations	Even though marginalized and vulnerable populations are target populations, they are arguably only so in an indirect way, and all that that's less present in this evaluation

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 6.2	<p>To what extent did marginalized or underserved populations experience equitable access to and outcomes resulting from the services or interventions supported by the project? What steps are ILAB and the Grantee taking to ensure the technical assistance benefits these populations?</p>	<p>MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey</p>	<p>Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data</p>	<p>Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about marginalized or underserved populations, in the special studies in Colombia and Brazil that were commissioned by the grantee</p>	<p>By assessing these aspects of equity and inclusion will allow the evaluator to draw lessons learned about whether the strategies employed in the COFFEE project could have been broadened to include the so-called lower levels of the most vulnerable and excluded populations.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as stated above the objectives of this project are to indirectly improve the conditions of the most vulnerable -that is people facing forced labor and child labor, by improving social compliance monitoring and enforcement at the level of the coffee buyers and coffee roasters, and also at the level of the policy makers.</p>

Table EQ 7: Lessons Learned

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 7.1	What are the main lessons learned and the replicable practices derived from the COFFEE project?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	Good information is likely to be produced during the working sessions with the grantee and the interviews and focus groups with other stakeholders	By assessing these aspects of replicable practices will allow the evaluator to draw up well-grounded recommendations for future similar interventions in coffee or other agricultural sectors in Latin America.
EQ 7.2	Are there any specific lessons that apply to a particular priority area, such as child labor, forced labor, or human trafficking? If so, which ones?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	Good information is likely to be produced during the working sessions with the grantee and the interviews and focus groups with other stakeholders	Specific information about child labor could allow recommendations to be made for new programs that specifically target child labor, if needed.

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 7.3	Are there any lessons learned from piloting labor rights interventions in regions with significant indigenous populations, and in which producers have communal land holding patterns such as Chiapas? If so, which ones? How can these lessons feed into future program design?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	The limitations to answering EQ 7.3 are that the pilot project in Mexico had to be curtailed due to overarching policy considerations of the US government, and therefore the main stakeholders engaged were higher level government and private sector stakeholders, and not the level of farmers and indigenous populations in Chiapas, and other important coffee growing areas of Mexico like Oaxaca with significant populations	If special studies were commissioned in future to answer this question, they could help improve design for future similar programs in areas of indigenous people and coffee production

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 7.4	Are there any lessons learned concerning the social feasibility of piloting improved social compliance projects in areas that have experienced social unrest focused on access to land and other natural resources, such as Chiapas, and Minas Gerais?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	As with the above EQ 7.3, the limitation in the case of Mexico is that the Mexico pilot project (with its significant indigenous population in Chiapas, the major coffee, producing area of Mexico), had to be curtailed. If indigenous populations are significant in the coffee sector, as for example, laborers in Minas Gerais, Brazil, and in Antioquia in Colombia, (which at this stage, we do not think is the case), then lessons could be learned about this particular area of enquiry.	Answering this question would help hone the future design of similar interventions in areas of social unrest which is focused on conflicts surrounding access to land and other natural resources.

ANNEX B. DOCUMENTATION FOR IN DEPTH REVIEW

BACKGROUND STUDIES CONSULTED, INCLUDING RELEVANT LEGISLATION.

AMECAFE. Data on coffee production in Mexico compiled by Asociación Mexicana de la Cadena Productiva del Café, A.C. (AMECAFE). Website accessed on Oct. 16, 2023. <https://amecafe.org.mx>

AMECAFE. “Directorio de Asociaciones Productivas Amigables con la Biodiversidad”. Website accessed on Oct. 16, 2023 <https://www.amigosdelabiodiversidad.com/directorio/>. (This link on the AMECAFE website provides a list with clickable links to major coffee cooperatives in all the major coffee producing states of Mexico).

Conservation International, Hivos, Oxfam Wereldwinkels, Solidaridad, 2020.

Dohrn, Charlotte. “A case study of small-scale coffee production: coffee farming as a potential tool for environmental conservation and community development in rural Minas Gerais, Brazil”. *Interdisc. Environ. Rev.*, 14 (1). 2013.

Federal Government of Brazil. PACTO NACIONAL PELA ERRADICAÇÃO DO TRABALHO ESCRAVO NO BRASIL, Brasília. 19 May 2005.

Folch, Albert and Planas, Jordi. “Cooperation, Fair Trade, and the Development of Organic Coffee Growing in Chiapas (1980–2015).” *Sustainability* 2019, 11, 357. 11 January 2019.

Freitas, H, & Poliana, D., “Íntegra dos posicionamentos de Starbucks, Rainforest Alliance, Fazenda Pedreira, COOXUPÉ e Fazenda Cedro-Chapadão. Respostas enviadas para a reportagem ‘Starbucks: fazendas de café certificadas são flagradas com trabalho escravo e infantil em Minas Gerais.’” <https://reporterbrasil.org.br/2023/11/integra-dos-posicionamentos-de-starbucks-rainforest-alliance-fazenda-pedreira-cooxupe-e-fazenda-cedro-chapadao/>

Freitas, H, & Poliana, D., “Starbucks: fazendas de café certificadas são flagradas com trabalho escravo e infantil em Minas Gerais.” 14 November, 2023.

Macdonald, K. “Globalising Justice within Coffee Supply Chains? Fair Trade, Starbucks and the transformation of supply chain governance”. *Third World Quarterly*, 28:4, 793-812. 2007.

Maguire-Rajpaul, V., et al., “Coffee certification in Brazil: compliance with social standards and its implications for social equity.” *Environment, Development and Sustainability* (2020) 22:2015–2044.

Martinez, Maria Elena. Desarrollo Alternativo, A.C. Poverty Alleviation Through Participation in Fair Trade Coffee Networks: The Case of the Tzotzilotic Tzobolotic Coffee Coop Chiapas, Mexico. September, 2002. Research funded by the Ford Foundation.

Panhuisen, S. and Pierrot, J., *Coffee Barometer*, 2020. Published by the Coffee Collective 2020:

Newitt, K. / Ergon Associates Limited. “BACKGROUND PAPER FOR THE WORLD DEVELOPMENT REPORT 2013. Private Sector Voluntary Initiatives on Labor Standards. 2013.

Valkila, J., Nygren, A. “Impacts of Fair-Trade certification on coffee farmers, cooperatives, and laborers in Nicaragua.” *Agric Hum Values* 27, 321–333. 2010.

Walmart. “Organic and Fair-Trade Coffee from Chiapas.” <https://www.walmart.com/ip/Organic-Fair-Trade-Mexican-Chiapas-Whole-Bean-Coffee-12-ounce/135982974> Website accessed on Oct. 16, 2023. Walmart.com website.

Watson, K. and Achinelli, M. “Context and Contingency: The Coffee Crisis for Conventional Small-Scale Coffee Farmers in Brazil.” *Geographical Journal* 174 (3):223-234. Sept. 2008.

PROJECT DOCUMENTATION, AND STUDIES PRODUCED BY THE PROJECT.

Andersen, L. and Andersen, N. Living Income and Living Wage Report. Rural Areas and Small Towns of Coffee-Growing Regions in Central Colombia. Dec. 2021.

Salamanca Ortiz, María Claudia. ESTUDIO DE TIEMPOS Y MOVIMIENTOS PARA LA COSECHA MANUAL DE CAFÉ EN FINCAS CAFETERAS DE CAICEDO Y SALGAR, ANTIOQUIA. June 2022.

Verité, Technical Progress Report (TPR): Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala. 04/30/2018.

Verité. TPR. Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala. 11/30/2018.

Verité. TPR: Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala. 04/30/2019.

Verité. TPR. COFFEE Project. 10/30/2019.

Verité. TPR. COFFEE Project. 30 Oct 2020.

Verité. TPR. COFFEE Project. Oct. 29, 2021.

Verité. Mid-term Evaluation Report on the Socially Sustainable Sourcing Toolkit Review and Validation Process. 19 April 2021.

Verité. TPR. COFFEE Project. April 30, 2021.

Verité. Data Reporting Form. Copy of Annex A – Data Reporting Form. Excell spread sheet showing progress for performance indicators. Oct 2020, Final. Oct 2020.

Verité. Copy of Annex A - Data Reporting Form. Oct 2021.

Verité. Copy of Annex A - Data Reporting Form April 2021 with CMEP rev.xls

Verité. Copy of Annex A - Data Reporting Form (April 2022) Final.xlsx April 2022.

Verité. Copy of Annex A - Data Reporting April 2023 (Comments).xlsx Apr. 2023:

Verité. M&E Report. Lessons Learned from COFFEE Pilot Projects in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico. Draft Report for USDOL. No date.

Verité. Selected Screenshots from the Verité Risk Map Web Interface. No date (produced for the Guatemala Project. Includes mock-ups on Prevalence of Types of Risk Based on Data from Workers Throughout Guatemala’s Coffee Sector).

Verité. Verité-COFFEE Project Document. Final draft, April 17, 2019.

Verité. Modification request to change the COFFEE Project, 05/15/2019.

Verité. Annex 2 Work Plan for the COFFEE Project. Verité Excell Document. Nd. Shows the project start in 2019 with finalization by end-2022

Verité. COFFEE Project. COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING & EVALUATION PLAN (CMEP). Nd.

USDOL, Grant Award Document for the Verité Submission for FOA-ILAB-17-07:

Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala, 11/30/2017.

USDOL, The COFFEE project. <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/cooperation-fair-free-equitable-employment-coffee-project> Accessed 3 Oct. 2023.

USDOL Annex I: Project Revision Form. Project Title: Cooperation On Fair, Free, Equitable Employment (COFFEE) Project. Recipient: Verité. Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-31476-17-75-K-. FY 2017.

VERITE PRE PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Annex 5 - Brazil Stakeholder & Initiatives Mapping Report.docx

Annex 7 - Colombia & Mexico Initiatives Mapping Report.docx

Appendix 1. COFFEE Pre-Situational Analysis (PSA).pdf

Appendix 2. Brazil Kick-off Meeting Agenda.pdf

Appendix 3. Colombia Kick-off Meeting Agenda.pdf

Appendix 4. Mexico Kick-off Meeting Agenda.pdf

Appendix 9. Pilot Project - Brazil.pdf

Appendix 10. Pilot Project - Mexico.pdf

Appendix 11. Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) COFFEE. Concept Note.pdf

Appendix 12. Mexico Research Findings virtual meetings report.pdf

COL & MEX Initiatives Mapping Report, FINAL 24Jan2020 C.Wunderlich.pdf

Tool 4 - Sample Code of Conduct Provisions-FINAL.pdf

Tool 5 - Sample Social Responsibility Agreements-FINAL.pdf

Tool 6 - Guidance on Identifying Risks Related to Recruitment and Hiring_FINAL.pdf

Tool 10 - Framework on preventing and remediating labor violations_FINAL.pdf

Verite-Piece Rate 2-Pager-FOR CLIENT REVIEW.pdf

Verite-Piece Rate White Paper-FOR CLIENT REVIEW.pdf

Verite-Recruitment 2-Pager-FOR CLIENT REVIEW.pdf

Verite-Recruitment White Paper-FOR CLIENT REVIEW.pdf

BUDGET AND AUDIT DOCUMENTS FOR COFFEE

USDOL. NICRA-Negotiated Negotiated indirect cost rate agreement; establishes what can be spent on what project budget item. Jan 28, 2019.

Verité. Copy of Verite DOL Coffee Rev Budget 2.19.19.xlsx. COFFEE Project Budget. 02/19/2019

Verité. Verité Revision Submission for FOA-ILAB-17-07. COFFEE Project. Verité Revised Budget Narrative COFFEE Project. February 19, 2019.

Whittlessey Forward Advising. VERITÉ, INC. Independent Auditors' Report (IAR). Financial Statements and Supplementary Information (FS&SI). Dec. 31, 2017 and 2016. x

Whittlessey Forward Advising. VERITÉ, INC. IAR. FS&SI. Dec. 31, 2018 and 2017. September 5, 2018.

Whittlessey Forward Advising. VERITÉ, INC. FS&SI. Dec. 31, 2019 and 2018. October 21, 2020.

ANNEX C. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

This introduction and the consent form to be included at the beginning of the questionnaire.

Evaluation of the US Department of Labor financed COFFEE Project implemented by Verité

Please take the time to complete this questionnaire. It should take no more than 20 to 30 minutes. Your responses will provide important information to help us evaluate the COFFEE Project and will provide useful inputs for the future planning of interventions to tackle infringements of labor rights in the coffee sector.

The questionnaire and all your answers will be confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Consent Form

I hereby consent to WI-HER and United States Department of Labor using any data that are captured in this survey questionnaire.

I understand that no personally identifiable information will be included in any published report on the data from this survey questionnaire.

Please write your name here:

Signed:

Date:

QUESTION 1: Have you received any training from Verité since 2019?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know / NA

In which year did you participate in the training?

.....

If you answered No, then skip to Q4 (If not, why?)

QUESTION 2: What are the training titles of the modules?

If you responded 'yes' to the previous question, then please provide the name of the training module (s) you were instructed in.

Title (s) of the training module (s) you were instructed in?

- A. Write the title (s) below:

.....

9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 3: How many people in your institution received the training?

Write number of others trained here:

Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 4: If you have not received any training from Verité or the COFFEE project in the past 4 years, why not?

1. Training was not offered to me / to my department.
2. My limited education meant that I elected not to participate.
3. I had no desire to be trained.
4. No time to be trained.
5. Transport or logistical problems.
6. Internet access problems
9. Don't know / not applicable.

QUESTION 5: If you replied to the previous Question 4 (not having received training from Verité), would you in future like to receive training from Verité?

1. Yes.
2. No.
9. Don't know /Not applicable.

Question 6: If you answered "yes" to the previous question, what skills are you interested in acquiring?

What skill do you want to learn? (***INSTRUCTIONS: You may tick more than one category if you wish***)

1. Farm management that meets acceptable standards of social and labor relations.
2. Social compliance in labor relations and best practices for contracting of workers.
3. Acceptable standards of housing and service provision.
4. Proper health and safety regulations for coffee workers.
5. Sexual harassment prevention training.
6. Gender violence prevention training.
9. Don't know / not applicable.

Question 7: Have you observed any institutional or budgetary changes in your institution due to the Verité training?

- A. Yes B. No 9. Do not know / Not applicable

"INSTRUCTIONS: If you answered "NO" to this Question 7, please skip to Question 10.

Question 8: What are the institutional and/or budgetary changes you observed in your institution due to the Verité training.

Instructions: You may tick more than one if appropriate:

1. Our company / institution has approved a policy or standards to eliminate forced labor, child labor and other abuses in the supply chain.
2. There is now an annually renewed **budget line** for ensuring that our company / institution undertakes regular social compliance audits.

3. There is now **at least one** full-time member of staff in our company / institution responsible for monitoring and auditing the welfare of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.
4. There is now a process in our company / institution for annual / regular review and strategic planning to address the labor rights of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.
5. Other. If you selected other, please explain here, in the box below.

Describe any other institutional and policy changes made in the box below as a result of Verité training:

Institutional and policy changes made a result of Verité training:

.....

Don't know /not applicable.

Question 9 To what degree has the institution where you work absorbed into its management systems the social compliance toolkit provided by Verité?"

INSTRUCTIONS for Question 9: Please consider the following statement, and click on only one box:

"The institution where I work has absorbed into its management systems the social compliance toolkit provided by Verité":

1. Strongly agree with the above statement (High)
2. Agree with the above statement (Above-moderate)
3. Neither agree nor disagree with the above statement (Moderate)
4. Disagree with the above statement (Low)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

INSTRUCTIONS: Please skip Question 10 if it is irrelevant to you and go to Question 12.

QUESTION 10: Was the design of the Verité training modules for social compliance relevant to your institution in improving social compliance in the coffee supply chains?

Please indicate for Question 10 **your level of agreement** concerning the following statement (**only tick one box**):

Degree of relevance of the design of the training modules provided by Verité in the COFFEE Project:

"The design of the training modules was relevant to my institution in improving social compliance in the coffee sector."

1. Strongly agree (High)
2. Agree (Above-moderate)
3. Neither agree nor disagree (Moderate)
4. Disagree (Low)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 11: How far was Verité’s strategy to reduce labor violations in the coffee sector based on a sound strategy?

The training modules **used by Verité** were based on a thorough, up to date understanding of the context of the coffee sector in my country.

Please indicate **your level of agreement** concerning the above statement (*only tick one box*):

1. Strongly agree (High)
2. Agree (Above-moderate)
3. Neither agree nor disagree (Moderate)
4. Disagree (Low)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 12: To what extent did the COFFEE project address the needs of the most vulnerable?

The COFFEE project addressed the needs of the most vulnerable such as itinerant workers (*andariegos*) and child laborers.

Please indicate your level of agreement (only click on *one box*):

1. Strongly agree (High)
2. Agree (Above-moderate)
3. Neither agree nor disagree (Moderate)
4. Disagree (Low)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 13: Has the capacity of your organization been strengthened to monitor and prevent occurrences of forced labor and or child labor in the coffee supply chain?

Please indicate your level of agreement concerning the following statement (*only tick one box*).

“The capacity of my organization to monitor and prevent occurrences of forced labor and or child labor in the coffee supply chain has been strengthened due to the COFFEE project.”

1. Strongly agree (High)
2. Agree (Above-moderate)
3. Neither agree nor disagree (Moderate)
4. Disagree (Low)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 14: Can you provide an example of how your institution has improved its ability to monitor and control labor violations in your supply chains, as a result of the COFFEE project?

Write your example here and **specify the type of labor violation**. To help you, here are some examples of types of labor violation targeted by the COFFEE project:

- child labor
- forced labor
- sexual harassment

- gender based violence,
- inadequate wages
- lack of protective equipment (masks, gloves, uniforms)
- no proper contract provided
- no health or insurance cover for workers
- Substandard accommodation
- No/insufficient nutritious and clean food/meals and drinking water
- No rest periods
- No adequate toilets and / or showers

Instructions: If you can provide an example, please describe it here:

1. Yes, I can provide an example •

My example is

.....

2. No, I can't provide an example

9. Don't know / Not applicable

Question 15: How far were you involved in giving feedback to Verité on the draft proposal for a social compliance system, including guidance materials?

1. Highly involved (several requests for feedback from Verité) (high)
2. Well involved (one or two requests for feedback from Verité) (above-moderate)
3. I was asked for my feedback once (moderate)
4. I wasn't consulted or asked for feedback by Verité (low)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 16: How would you describe the impact of the pilot project in your country (Brazil, Colombia, or Mexico)?

1. Very positive (High)
2. Good (Above-moderate)
3. Moderate
4. Poor (Low)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 17: Which activities or initiatives are most likely to be sustained?

Instructions: you may click on more than one option, unless you select "Don't know / Not applicable".

1. Online training for our staff
2. Online training for staff from relevant government agencies, extension workers and/or universities and training institutions
3. Face to face training and workshops for our staff and supply chain workers

4. Meals, classes, and other activities for the children of temporary migrant workers in our supply chains
5. Health insurance, pension provision and other social benefits for smallholders and temporary workers
6. Improvement of accommodation and service provision for temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain
7. New harvesting techniques and equipment to improve the income and welfare of coffee workers.
8. Initiatives to support coffee workers outside the harvest season (e.g., handicrafts, maintenance of equipment, kitchen gardens)
9. Needs-based research and development initiatives (e.g. time and motion studies, harvesting techniques, improved pest control to avoid/reduce use of agrochemicals)
99. Do not know / Not applicable •

QUESTION 18: What factors have contributed to this sustainability?

“Instructions: you may click on more than one option, unless you select Don’t know / Not applicable”.

1. Our company / institution has approved a policy or standards to eliminate forced labor, child labor and other abuses in the supply chain.
2. There is now an annually renewed **budget line** for ensuring that our company / institution undertakes regular social compliance audits.
3. There is now **at least one** full-time member of staff in our company / institution responsible for monitoring and auditing the welfare of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.
4. There is now a process in our company / institution for annual / regular review and strategic planning to address the labor rights of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.
9. Don’t know / Not applicable

QUESTION 19: What are the major challenges faced by your company/institution to eradicate forced labor and child labor in the coffee supply chain?

“Instructions: you may click on more than one option, unless you select “Don’t know / Not applicable”.

1. Our company / institution does not have a policy or standards to address forced labor, child labor and other abuses in the supply chain.
2. Our company / institution does not have a budget line to undertake regular social compliance audits.
3. No full-time manager in our company / institution has been assigned the responsibility to monitor and audit the welfare of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.
4. Our company / institution has no process of review or strategic planning to address the labor rights of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.
5. Uncertain market / low coffee prices on world market
6. Increased costs of inputs and equipment (machinery, fuel, fertilizers)
7. Threats to security (e.g., organized crime and political instability)
8. Climatic factors / climate change

9. Coffee pests and diseases

10. Other (specify): Instructions: If you selected "other", please explain here", below.

.....

99. Don't know / Not applicable

QUESTION 20: What two recommendations would you make to improve the implementation of social compliance systems in the coffee sector?

Instructions: If you provide recommendations, please specify WHO should carry out the recommendation, and for which institution your recommendation is aimed at :

1.Recommendation 1:.....

1)WHO should carry out your Recommendation 1.....

2) Which institution your Recommendation 1 is aimed at.....

2.Recommendation 2:.....

1)WHO should carry out your Recommendation 2.....

2) Which institution your Recommendation 2 is aimed at.....

99. Do not know / Not applicable

INSTRUCTIONS: This section is about the respondent.

This section is about the respondent.

1. What is your position (the title of your job) in the organization that you work in?
2. Name of your organization

Note: *The name of your organization will not be used in any way and will be kept anonymous.*

3. What is your principal country of residence?

Mexico

Colombia

Brazil

Other (please write below)

.....

1. Your education

What did you study as a major subject at university, or technical college, or polytechnic?

Agronomy

Environmental science

Engineering

Management

Financial administration / accounting

Other (specify)

Major subject: 1-.....

Level obtained:

Diploma or Technical College Qualification

University degree

Master's degree.

Highest level of education?

Diploma or Technical College Qualification

University degree

Master's degree

Your specific job

Please specify your specific job activities in the institution where you work:

Instructions: *Fill in **only one**, and the one that applies to you. Tick "other" and then specify your job, if none of the following categories is applicable to you:*

1. I am an independent coffee producer on a coffee farm that I own / co-own; I am **not** a member of a coffee cooperative)
2. I am an independent coffee producer on a coffee farm that I own / co-own and I **am** a member of a coffee cooperative)
3. I work on a coffee farm in the capacity of a technical supervisor.
4. I work for a coffee company that buys and sells raw coffee (wholesaler and/or exporter).
5. I work in a coffee company that buys and sells roasted coffee in its own brand.
6. I work in a coffee company that buys and sells roasted coffee in our own coffee outlets.
7. I work in a coffee company that buys and sells roasted coffee via other coffee retail outlets.
8. Other
9. Don't know / N/A

Your specific job

Please specify your specific job activities in the institution where you work:

Instructions: *Fill in **only one**, and the one that applies to you. Tick "other" and then specify your job, if none of the following categories is applicable to you:*

1. I am an independent coffee producer on a coffee farm that I own / co-own; I am **not** a member of a coffee cooperative)
2. I am an independent coffee producer on a coffee farm that I own / co-own and I **am** a member of a coffee cooperative)
3. I work on a coffee farm in the capacity of a technical supervisor.
4. I work for a coffee company that buys and sells raw coffee (wholesaler and/or exporter).
5. I work in a coffee company that buys and sells roasted coffee in its own brand
6. I work in a coffee company that buys and sells roasted coffee in our own coffee outlets
7. I work in a coffee company that buys and sells roasted coffee via other coffee retail outlets
8. Other
9. Don't know / N/A

ANNEX D. OUTLINES FOR KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

The evaluation will use key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (FGDs). This section outlines a generic format for these, according to the main stakeholder groups:

- Civil society organizations
- Government agencies
- Private-sector stakeholders, including coffee producers, cooperatives, recruitment agencies, coffee buyers, roasters, and coffee associations.

It is important that the evaluators base their evaluation findings on an empirical set of qualitative opinions from the KIIs and FGDs. The aim is to measure the perceived impact of the project using a set of agreed evaluation questions, based on OECD DAC evaluation criteria.

The KIIs and FGDs are designed to record the informants' responses to the evaluation and will provide insights into the social compliance issues in the coffee production and supply chain.

A standard format will be used to summarize the findings of the KIIs and FGDs. This will facilitate comparison and reference across stakeholder groups. These formats will follow the OECD / DAC evaluation criteria, as expressed in the seven key EQs.

Key Informant Interview and Focus Group Discussion guide

The interview outline comprises a list of open-ended questions (the agreed EQs). The evaluators will start by explaining the background and objectives of the evaluation and will ask the participants for a brief explanation with their names and roles.

It will then focus on factual questions and background information on the topics being discussed, and will follow with questions intended to elicit the participants' opinions and beliefs. The evaluators will end by asking for general recommendations, as appropriate, and will try to summarize them. The evaluators will follow the lines of enquiry opened during the interviews and discussions to clarify the information and informants' perceptions.

Format for writing up field notes

Date:

Time: from.....to

Time the interview / Focus Group took:.....

Interviewer:.....: Note-taker:.....

Place of interview/Residence of the person (s) interviewed:.....

Region/State/Department/District/Province.....

Organization name (s) of informant (s).....

Aim of this meeting:

For Mixed Gender Focus Group Discussions:

Person (s) interviewed: ...

Person 1 Gender, Role or occupation

Person 2 Gender, Role or occupation

Person 3 Gender, Role or occupation

For Key Informant Interviews

Role or occupation:

Gender (where not obvious from the name)

Procedure for the KIIs and FGDs

- i) **Introduction:** We would like to talk about social and labor conditions in the coffee industry. We are evaluating a project funded by US Government Department of Labor, which is intended to improve working and living conditions in the coffee industry.
- ii) The COFFEE project has been working here to improve the conditions of workers and other people involved in the coffee supply chain. We are conducting interviews with coffee farmers, buyers and with companies that roast coffee in Mexico, Colombia and Brazil, and we would like to know your opinions about the project. We are also interested in hearing from the government agencies and other organizations that work to ensure acceptable working conditions for people employed in the coffee sector.
- iii) **Confidentiality:** All information will be kept confidential, and we will not cite anyone by name. The information will be used to develop recommendations for future projects.
- iv) **Closing question:** We will ask key informants and FGD participants if they want to ask any questions or have any additional information or comments.
- v) **Recommendations or solutions:** We will try to summarize the recommendations from the interviews and meetings

The pilot projects focus on specific issues in each country:

- In Mexico, the project aims to improve key actors' understanding of international standards and Mexican labor law, aiding the identification and elimination of forced labor, child labor, and other abuses, and identifying and remediating the root causes of labor exploitation.
- In Colombia, the project is piloting innovative models to improve payment for people engaged in the coffee harvest, including vulnerable women and Venezuelan migrants.
- In Brazil, the project addresses issues related to labor recruitment, including deception, charging workers recruitment fees or commissions and retaining personal documents. The pilot project is working with producers, traders and roasters to identify and reduce these risks.

Key evaluation questions for KIIs and FGDs

Stakeholder Group 1 includes:

- Grantee and Implementing Partners

Stakeholder Group 2 includes:

- Coffee growers and coffee growers' organizations
- Workers' Organizations
- NGOs & other relevant local or national organizations

Stakeholder Group 3 includes:

- Government agencies responsible for labor, agriculture and marketing
- Universities (Mexico)

Stakeholder Group 4 includes:

- National or regional level coffee producers' organizations, chambers of commerce, etc.
- Private Sector International Brand Representatives

The main emphasis in all of the EQs below for the four stakeholder groups is on the perceived impact, relevance, and sustainability of the capacity building, mentoring, and training.

Additionally, the evaluation will consider the impact of the S3T social compliance toolkit.

The following seven sets of EQs follow the agreed EQs. They have been edited and framed in general terms that can be applied to a KII or an FGD, and stimulate an open-ended, semi-structured KII with 1-3 people or a more structured FGD with 8-10 people.

EQ 1 Relevance and Coherence.

- Were the project activities you have been involved in / aware of appropriate to the needs of the women, men, and families working in the coffee supply chain?
- Were the project activities you have been involved in / aware of appropriate to the needs of your organization?
- Is there some other activity or strategy to improve social compliance that could have been used?

EQ 2 Effectiveness

- Has the project strengthened the capacity of the stakeholders?
- What were the most important achievements of the capacity building activities?
- Have the social compliance systems been strengthened?
- Factors and challenges to perceived progress?

EQ 3 Efficiency/Flexibility

- Impacts of COVID-19 on project implementation. How did the project adapt?

- Were the project's human and financial resources applied efficiently in implementing the project strategy? Factors affecting efficiency.
- Utilization of the M&E systems and how far they were used as monitoring evaluation learning systems to make informed decisions.

EQ 4 Impacts

- What do you see as the principal achievements and impacts of the project?

EQ 5 Sustainability

- Which activities and initiatives are most likely to be sustained?
- What has contributed to or limited their sustainability?

EQ 6 Equity and inclusion

- Which marginalized or underserved populations are involved in the coffee supply chain?
- What specific efforts were made to engage with them? Were they effective?
- Factors that can facilitate or make it more difficult to engage with them?

EQ 7 Lessons learned

- What are the main lessons learned from the pilot projects?
- Will you continue to use the S3T toolkit in your work and in your organization.
- Any lessons concerning piloting labor rights interventions as concerns, child, labor, or forced labor or human trafficking in your experience or the experience of your organization.

ANNEX E. FULL LIST OF THE INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES TO BE SURVEYED BY THE ELECTRONIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Table 1: Institutions and their Representatives to be Surveyed

Organization	Questionnaire language	Role in the project
Catholic Relief Services	English	Private sector & industry association partner (PSIAP)
Catholic Relief Services	English	PSIAP
Catholic Relief Services	English	PSIAP
Allegro Coffee (USA)	English	PSIAP
Starbucks (USA)	English	PSIAP
Starbucks (USA)	English	PSIAP
Counter Culture Coffee (USA)	English	PSIAP
Intelligentsia (USA)	English	PSIAP
National Coffee Association of USA	English	PSIAP
National Coffee Association of USA	English	PSIAP
Specialty Coffee Association (USA)	English	PSIAP
Global Coffee Platform	English	PSIAP
International Coffee Organization	English	PSIAP
Rainforest Alliance (USA)	English	PSIAP
Rainforest Alliance (USA)	English	PSIAP
Sustainable Coffee Challenge	English	PSIAP
Labor Collective Action Network	English	PSIAP
Nestle Mexico	Spanish	Training participant
Rainforest Alliance (Mexico)	Spanish	Training participant
Nestle´s providers (Mexico)	Spanish	Training participant

Organization	Questionnaire language	Role in the project
Nestle´s providers (Mexico)	Spanish	Training participant
Nestle´s providers	Spanish	Training participant
Nestle´s providers	Spanish	Training participant
Grupo Merino (Mexico)	Spanish	Training participant
Grupo Merino (Mexico)	Spanish	Training participant
Olam Food Ingredients (Mexico)	Spanish	Training participant
Olam Food Ingredients (Mexico)	Spanish	Training participant
Tapachula Polytechnic (Mexico)	Spanish	Training participant
Nestle Mexico	Spanish	PSIAP
NESPRESSO (Central America)	Spanish	PSIAP
Rainforest Alliance (Mexico)	Spanish	PSIAP
Nescafe (Plan Nescafe): Nestlé Coffee Sustainable Agric. Dept., Marysville, Ohio	Spanish	PSIAP
Mexican Government: Dept. of the General Directorate of Strategies Focused on Human Rights. (Anti-Trafficking Commission)	Spanish	Training recipient
Gov. of Mexico: Dept. of the General Directorate of Strategies Focused on Human Rights. (Anti-Trafficking Commission)	Spanish	Training recipient
FEVIMTRA ¹¹ (Anti-Trafficking Commission)	Spanish	Training recipient

¹¹ FEVIMTRA = The Special Prosecutor's Office for Crimes of Violence Against Women and Human Trafficking).

Organization	Questionnaire language	Role in the project
ECOM Agroindustrial Corp. Limited (Mexico)	Spanish	PSIAP
Government of Mexico: Anti Trafficking Coalition	Spanish	Training recipient
Government of Mexico: Anti Trafficking Coalition	Spanish	Training recipient
Government of Mexico: Anti Trafficking Coalition	Spanish	Training recipient
Government of Mexico: Anti Trafficking Coalition		Training recipient
JDE Peet's (JDE)	Portuguese	Private Sector and International Brand Representatives
Mercon	Portuguese	Private Sector and International Brand Representatives
Global Fund to End Modern Slavery (GFEMS)	Portuguese	Partner organization with Verite
National Pact Institute for the Eradication of Slave Labor (InPACTO)	Portuguese	Partner organization with Verite
InPACTO	Portuguese	Partner organization with Verite
The Lat Am. & Carib. Netw. of Fairtrade Small Producers and Workers (CLAC)	Portuguese	Partner organization with Verite
CLAC	Portuguese	Partner organization with Verite
FAZENDA VENEZA	Portuguese	Training participant
FAZENDA VENEZA	Portuguese	Training participant
Santana da Vargem Small Farmers Cooperative (COOPASV)	Portuguese	Training participant
COOPASV	Portuguese	Training participant

Organization	Questionnaire language	Role in the project
COOPASV	Portuguese	Training participant
COOPASV	Portuguese	Training participant
Giovani Miari's Farm Ltd.Três Pontas – Minas Gerais)	Portuguese	PSIAP
FAZENDAS GIOVANI MIARI	Portuguese	PSIAP
Três Pontas, MG	Portuguese	PSIAP
FAZENDAS GIOVANI MIARI	Portuguese	PSIAP
FAZENDAS GIOVANI MIARI	Portuguese	PSIAP
FAZENDAS GIOVANI MIARI	Portuguese	PSIAP
FAZENDAS GIOVANI MIARI	Portuguese	PSIAP
EXPORTADORA GUAXUPÉ	Portuguese	Private Sector and International Brand Representatives
Asociación Colombiana Para la Excelencia del Café	Spanish	PSIAP
COOCAFISA (Cooperative): “Cooperativa de Caficultores de Salgar”	Spanish	PSIAP
COOCAFISA	Spanish	PSIAP
COOCAFISA	Spanish	PSIAP
COOCAFISA	Spanish	PSIAP
RGC-Manos de café	Spanish	PSIAP
RGC-Manos de café	Spanish	PSIAP
RGC coffee company.	Spanish	PSIAP
RGC coffee company	Spanish	PSIAP
RGC-Manos de café	Spanish	PSIAP

ANNEX F. APPROVED SURVEY SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

Sample for the survey questionnaire and sample size for the key informant interviews and focus group discussions.

Type of survey instrument:

The survey questionnaire will be self-administered and will be sent to all the stakeholders whose contact details have been provided by the grantee.

Limitations:

Limitations may include cases of technicians and other stakeholders who were included in the Mexico pilot project – and possibly other similar stakeholders in Colombia and Brazil- not being able to respond to the survey, possibly due to internet connectivity problems, or other reasons. Benefits of self-administered surveys include the possibility to check a record, or look up some information, if a respondent is initially unsure how to answer a question. If programmed, the questionnaire can allow respondents to answer it partially, stop and then return to it later.¹²

Consent form:

Each survey respondent will be asked to read and sign a consent form that will precede the survey questionnaire. The consent form will explain that the personally identifiable information (PII) will not be included. For this report, PII is considered village names, individuals' names and titles. PII is often found in an annex of the report listing who had been interviewed as part of the evaluation. This is useful/important information for USDOL to have, which is why WI HER will produce two versions of the final report: one with PII, another version without. USDOL publishes and disseminates the version without PII.

The Form

I hereby consent to WI-HER and United States Department of Labor using any data that are captured in this survey questionnaire.

I understand that no personally identifiable information will be included in any published report on the data from this survey questionnaire.

[Please write your name here:

Signed:

Date:

Introduction to the Questionnaire

This introduction will be included at the beginning of the questionnaire.

Please take some time (approximately 20-30 minutes) to complete this questionnaire. Your responses will provide important information that will help independently evaluate the performance of the COFFEE Project. Your data will provide important information useful for future

¹² M. Callegaro et al., *Web Survey Methodology*. Sage, 2015, 23-24.

planning for interventions to tackle the problem of infringements of labor rights in the coffee sector.

The survey questionnaire data are confidential.

All of your responses to this questionnaire will be confidential.

What this survey is for?

This survey provides you the opportunity to tell the evaluation team your opinion about the performance of the COFFEE project and your opinions about the technical assistance such as training or information that were provided by Verité.

You are not obliged to complete this survey.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Survey Sample

For the purpose of accurately defining the stakeholders to be surveyed, the sample is divided into three levels: first (high), second (middle level), and third (lower) level stakeholders. This is because, to take one example, in Mexico the first level (e.g., Nestle Mexico) and second level (e.g., agronomists at the Polytechnic of Tapachula) stakeholders were engaged in virtual training, but the third level stakeholders (producers, municipal level and field level technicians) could not receive the planned training courses, due to the connectivity and logistical challenges they faced.

The first level also includes international level stakeholders.

International level stakeholders consist of actors that were consulted and that assisted Verité in the formulation, project design and implementation phases; they are:

- Catholic Relief Services
- Global Coffee Platform
- Starbucks (USA)
- Allegro Coffee (USA)
- Counter Culture Coffee (USA)
- Intelligentsia (USA)
- National Coffee Association of USA
- Specialty Coffee Association
- International Coffee Organization
- Rainforest Alliance (USA)
- Sustainable Coffee Challenge
- The Sustainable Coffee Challenge – Labor Collective Action Network
- Centre for Regional Coffee and Business Studies

International level stakeholders: Indicative subtotal of respondents: 15.

The sample will consist of a representative sample of direct and some indirect stakeholders that have received training by Verité staff in the objectives and use of the Socially Sustainable Sourcing Toolkit (S3T).

The direct stakeholders that were trained by Verité were responsible for furthering the application and monitoring of the S3T social compliance toolkit among the agronomists and field technicians who have the face-to-face contact with producers and workers in the coffee sector.

Mexico

In Mexico, the first level stakeholders are Government agencies and civil society association in the Anti-Trafficking Coalition (80 members in total), Private sector coffee exporters, buyers, roasters, and social compliance organizations:

- Government of Mexico (Central Government level)-Ministerio Publico and Attorney General's Office
- Nestle (Nespresso and Nescafé)
- Rainforest Alliance
- Nestle's providers
- ECOM Agroindustrial Corp. Limited
- Grupo Merino
- Olam Food Ingredients
- The Mexican Association of the Productive Coffee Chain

Second level stakeholders are:

- Tapachula Polytechnic- no one invited yet, no stakeholders at Tapachula Polytechnic identified yet.

Mexico- Indicative subtotal of respondents: 20

Colombia

- COOCAFISA (Cooperative)-managers and agronomists
- RGC-Manos de café – Manager, field staff, and technicians
- Asociación Colombiana Para la Excelencia del Café
- National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia (Federación Nacional de Productores de Café de Colombia)
- Centre for Regional Coffee and Business Studies / (CRECE)

Colombia: Indicative subtotal of respondents: 15

Brazil

In Brazil, the first and second level stakeholders include international NGOs, national NGOs, coffee exporters (private sector), private sector and international brand representatives, Employers' Associations (Cooperatives):

- Global Fund to End Modern Slavery (GFEMS): Institutional partner of the project. Verité developed some activities with GFEMS, and participated in advocacy spaces simultaneously. GFEMS were invited by Verité to interview on Dec 14 2023, together with InPacto. InPacto attended, but GFEMS did not attend the interview.
- National Pact Institute for the Eradication of Slave Labor (InPacto): Organization that leads GT Café, in which the COFFEE Project participates, and aims to develop a Sector Pact for coffee and mobilize actors in the chain for social sustainability.
- Guaxupé Exporter (training was delivered to the exporter's sustainability team, booklets were distributed to producers, as part of a project between the company and JDE)
- JDE Peet's (The sustainability manager at JDE is a project partner participating, together with his team, in training with the project in Mexico (Latin America) and initiatives in Brazil with its suppliers)
- Mercon
- Conselho dos Exportadores de Café do Brasil
- Centre for Regional Coffee and Business Studies
- The Latin American and Caribbean Network of Fair-Trade Small Producers and Workers (CLAC)
- Santana da Vargem Small Farmers Cooperative (COOPASV)
- Giovani Miari's Farm Ltd.(Fazendas Giovani Miari Administracao E Participacoes Ltda., Sociedade Empresária Limitada) located at Três Pontas – Minas Gerais)
- Veneza's Farm (Fazenda Veneza)

Brazil- Indicative subtotal of respondents: 20

Table 1: Number of survey questionnaires to be distributed by stakeholder category and by country.

Stakeholder level	Mexico	Colombia	Brazil	Total survey questionnaires sample
High level	14	3	7	24
Middle level	1	12	7	20
Lower level	0	0	6	6
Totals	15	15	20	65*

* 15 international stakeholders included

Table 2: KII / FGD Qualitative Data Collection Strategy

Stakeholder Type	Method	Sample Size	Potential Respondents
Grantee and Implementing Partners	KII/FGD	5	Project manager and representatives from in-country offices of Verité. Team responsible for S3T. Background, history and stakeholder mapping for the project
Government agencies responsible for labor, agriculture and marketing	KII, FGD	4	Where possible, the evaluation will prioritize government staff working at local level (including State Government and municipal agencies) who are directly involved with coffee production and are responsible for compliance with labor law, certification and agricultural extension
Coffee growers and coffee growers' organizations	KII, FGD	4	Depending on the local agrarian structure, this will be stratified and could include smallholders, representatives of cooperatives and similar organizations, medium-scale producers, and the owners or managers of large coffee plantations
National or regional level coffee producers' organizations, chambers of commerce, etc.	KII, FGD	5	Representatives that can offers insights into the activities, policies and priorities of these organizations. Also, to understand how coffee marketing operates in each country
Workers' Organizations	KII, FGD	2	If there are any associations that represent coffee workers, including migrant laborers
NGOs & other relevant local or national organizations	KII, FGD	4	NGOs and others engaged in the field of workers' rights, support for smallholder producers, certification, marketing and environmental sustainability
Private Sector International Brand Representatives	KII, FGD	8	Representatives working on social corporate responsibility, buying, quality-control and marketing

The purpose of the survey is to collect quantitative data to help triangulate the qualitative data collected from key informant interviews and focus group discussions in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico. The survey is intended to provide a database that can quickly verify evaluation findings that are collected during the key informant interviews and the focus group discussions.

The evaluation questions must provide data to help answer the major questions of the evaluation, which follow the DOL/ILAB evaluation criteria and, additionally, a question on equity and inclusion which is a cross cutting issue that is also reflected in some of the evaluation questions.

The overall objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Assess if the project has achieved its objectives and outcomes, identifying the challenges encountered in doing so, and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges, giving particular attention to equity and inclusion in the pilot projects;

- Assess the intended and unintended effects of the project;
- Assess the lessons learned and emerging practices from the project (strategies and models of intervention) and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future projects in the countries covered by the pilot projects and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors; and
- Assess which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable.

The overall objective of the survey is:

- To provide a statistically robust and representative survey of the opinions about the impact, successes, and challenges of the COFFEE Project among the main high-level and medium-level stakeholders who have been involved in the COFFEE Project.

The main outputs of the survey will be:

- Precise answers to the principal evaluation questions that can help future planners.
- Opinions about the impact of the COFFEE Project on the respondent's institution's own practices related to social compliance in the coffee sector.
- Opinions about the successes and identified best practices of the COFFEE Project.
- Opinions about the challenges and any perceived shortcomings of the COFFEE project.
- To find out whether interviewed coffee companies' and other industry partners' staff have increased their knowledge and adoption of preventive measures addressing forced labor and child labor in the coffee supply chain.
- To highlight the respondents' opinions about the major challenges in their company / institution to stop forced labor and child labor in the coffee supply chain.
- To provide specific details about possible training received from the COFFEE project.
- To provide lessons learned and recommendations for future similar projects or possible new phases of the COFFEE project aiming to tackle forced labor and child labor in the coffee supply chains.

The scope of the survey and the need for informant anonymity:

The survey's scope is delimited by the TOR and the agreed evaluation questions (which are based on the DOL/ILAB criteria. Survey best practice suggests web-based or emailed survey questionnaires should be limited to 20 questions at most. Experience with surveys shows that busy people faced with a survey questionnaire of more than 10 -20 questions that takes more than 10 minutes to complete can result in survey fatigue and rushed answers. The ideal survey length suggested by a key study is a median of 10 minutes and a maximum survey length of 20 minutes.¹³ Importantly, respondents are known to be willing to answer survey questions when

¹³ Revilla, M., & Ochoa, C., "Ideal and maximum length for a web survey." International Journal of Market Research 59 (5), 557-565, 2017.

they trust that their data will be treated anonymously.¹⁴

The people and institutions to be included by this survey:

The institutions to be included in this survey are those that have been directly engaged as partners and stakeholders by Verité during the implementation of the project in Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil. The full list of the institutions and their representatives to be surveyed, is still being compiled and will be annexed to this document as soon as it is ready.

The level of the institutions to be engaged in the survey questionnaire:

Interviews that the evaluation team have completed in Mexico, and with Verité staff, confirm that internet connectivity and reliability of internet services were a major obstacle to the desired level of participation of target groups during implementation of the online training modules during the Covid pandemic. Furthermore, in the three countries, technicians such as rurally based agronomists and other field level technicians, and coffee producers, coffee harvesters, and other COFFEE stakeholders in rural areas will quite likely still face difficulties in accessing electronic media.

We have included in the survey those stakeholders whose contact details we have been provided with by the grantee. However not all stakeholders invited to fill in the questionnaire will wish to respond or be able to answer a survey by e-mail or online directly.

The potential for survey questionnaire non-responses to negatively affect the quality of the evaluation data to be produced by the survey questionnaire is mitigated by the additional qualitative data the evaluation team has collected in the three project countries. Except for Mexico which has not been visited for field work interviews at the level of the farms and field technicians, the evaluation team has conducted in Colombia and Brazil key informant interviews and focus groups at the level of the coffee farms and the coffee producers and included for interview people working in the coffee sector in the rural areas. Furthermore, the evaluation team was able to conduct several important high and medium level online interviews with Mexican stakeholders which have provided significant evaluation data.

Overall, this strategy will permit the evaluation team to provide data to triangulate the evaluation findings that will be provided from this survey which will not be able to include the lower levels (level of field technicians and coffee workers) of the coffee supply chains but only the high to medium ones.

The evaluation survey questions were designed to reflect the most important areas of concern of the evaluation. They were designed to permit busy respondents to answer the questions quite quickly and to provide maximum utility to the evaluation. We have designed this survey to include questions using multiple choice answers where possible given the time constraints of the people we will be surveying.

¹⁴ Revilla, M., & Ochoa, C., op. cit..

ANNEX H. DETAILS OF THE METHODOLOGY

APPROACH:

The overall approach permitted a mixed methods assessment for data triangulation and analysis and developing evaluation findings and conclusions that are empirically grounded and triangulated, which in turn informed substantive and accurate recommendations. Wherever possible, the evaluation team took a participatory and inclusive approach. This means informants, women and men, were invited to speak on their own terms. The participatory and inclusive approach ensured that data was collected from a diverse range of counterparts, partners, and stakeholders and are, to the extent possible, inclusive of the most vulnerable and marginalized participants.

DOCUMENT REVIEW:

Background and project documents: Annex B (Documentation for In-Depth Documentation Review) presents the documents studied for the in-depth desk review of all project documents relevant to Verité's COFFEE project. Additionally, consulted background studies, including relevant legislation, are presented in Annex B.

SURVEY: SCOPE, QUESTIONS, AND SAMPLING:

The attached (Annex C) survey questionnaire was designed to provide data for the Final Performance Evaluation of the COFFEE project. Each email request to fill in the survey was accompanied by an introductory email interview request in English, Spanish, or Portuguese. The survey questions were drafted, beginning in mid-December 2023; earlier iterations were commented on by USDOL and the grantee in early January 2024, revised, and finalized in mid-January 2024.

ONLINE INTERVIEWS WITH VERITÉ AND INTERNATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS:

ANNEX D (outlines for KIIs and FGDs) presents the KII interview guides with the evaluation questions. Annex D outlines a generic format for these, according to the main stakeholder groups:

- Civil society organizations;
- Government agencies; and,
- Private-sector stakeholders, including coffee producers, cooperatives, recruitment agencies, coffee buyers, roasters, and coffee associations.

A total of eight online KIIs were held with Mexican beneficiaries and stakeholders involved in the COFFEE project (one based in Costa Rica and another in the US). Repeated attempts to contact Tapachula Polytechnic failed despite the efforts of the grantee. Nevertheless, the data from these interviews was useful in formulating findings and recommendations for the overall COFFEE project and for the pilot in Mexico in particular. As a result of the logistical constraints in Colombia, the evaluation team carried out three online interviews and a workshop/round-up meeting while in Colombia. These interviews complemented the site visits and face-to-face interviews and focus groups in Colombia. One Brazilian coffee farm was visited in person. There were virtual focus groups with other stakeholders.

ANNEX I. RESULTS OF THE ONLINE SURVEY

The survey questionnaire, comprising 20 questions, was emailed to 50 people in January 2024. Five email responses came back with the message that the respondent had left his position, leaving 45 potential survey respondents. After the initial receipt of only six responses, the survey questionnaire and the introductory email were again emailed to the people on the list of respondents. A further five responses have since been registered. By February 13, 2024, 11 responses in total had been received.

The analyses below are based on a response rate of 11 out of 45, or 24.4 percent, i.e., just under a quarter of the respondents. This low response rate arguably does not permit the evaluation team to make reliable conclusions based on it. We have nevertheless presented below the main survey results which are relevant to the analysis of the evaluation results (which are presented in Section 3), and useful for the forward-looking recommendations.

Several of the survey findings broadly agree with data results from the qualitative interviews, workshops, and focus groups. This would suggest that the disadvantage of the low response rate is partially mitigated by triangulation with the qualitative data that are available from the interviews and focus groups.

PROFILE OF THE 11 RESPONDENTS:

- There were *two respondents from Mexico*, one of whom works in a large Mexican agro-industrial company, while the other works in the Federal Government, in an organization that is a member of the Mexican Anti-Trafficking Coalition.
- There were *three respondents from Colombia*, who all work in a coffee Cooperative. One respondent is a social worker; the other two are *técnicos de campo* (agronomy technicians) working in coffee production at the level of the farms.
- There were *five respondents from Brazil*, who occupy medium to high level positions in a large Brazilian coffee farm, a large Brazilian agro-industrial coffee company, a Brazilian Cooperative that groups together small and medium sized coffee producers, and a large Brazilian coffee exporter.
- There was *one respondent from the USA*, who works in the coffee sector, in a specialty coffee association which is a coffee sector trade association/non-profit.

SURVEY RESULTS ACROSS THE SPECIFIC SURVEY QUESTIONS:

As regards **Q1 (Have you received any training from Verité since 2019?)** and **Q2 (What are the training titles of the modules?)**, the US respondent received no training, possibly because he advised Verité on the design on the COFFEE project. 4 out of 5 Brazilian respondents did receive training from Verité. One Colombian and two Mexican respondents did receive training from Verité.

As regards **Q4 (If you have not received any training from Verité or the COFFEE project in the past 4 years, why not?)**, by **Q5 (Would you in future like to receive training from Verité?)**, four Brazilian respondents replied, “Don’t know/ N/A”, to Q4, and 1 answered “Yes” to wanting training from Verité in future.

The two Mexican respondents replied, “Don’t know/ N/A / No time available”, to Q4, and the two Mexican respondents answered “Yes” to wanting training from Verité in future.

The three Colombian respondents replied, “Don’t know/ N/A”, to Q4, and one of them answered “Yes” to wanting training from Verité in future.

The US-based respondent replied, “Don’t know/ N/A”, to Q4, and answered “Yes” to wanting training from Verité in future.

In conclusion, on Q5, five out of 11, or just under half of the respondents want training from Verité in future.

Regarding **Q6 (What skills are you interested in acquiring?)**, the US, Colombian, Mexican, and Brazilian respondents would like training in future from Verité. The training they want is as follows:

The responses to Q6 (what skills are you interested in acquiring?) are (number of responses in brackets after the option):

- Farm management that meets acceptable standards of social and labor relations (6)
- Social compliance in labor relations and best practices for contracting of workers (3)
- Sexual harassment prevention training (2)

The **Mexican** respondents wanted training in:

- Compliance with social and labor standards in labor relations and good practices for hiring workers.
- Training in prevention of sexual harassment.
- Training in prevention of gender violence

The **Colombian** respondents wanted training in:

- Compliance with social and labor standards in labor relations and good practices for hiring workers.
- Social management of farms and agricultural companies that comply with good practices.

As regards **Q7 (Have you observed any institutional or budgetary changes in your institution due to the Verité training?)**, the following results are surmised from the survey:

- Four Brazilian respondents stated they had observed institutional / budgetary changes in their institution due to the Verité training.
- The two Mexican respondents replied “don’t know.”
- One Colombian respondents replied “don’t know.”
- The US respondent replied “don’t know.”

As regards **Q8 (What are the institutional and/or budgetary changes you observed in your institution due to the Verité training?)** the following responses are noted:

The Brazilian respondents replied that the changes they observed in their institutions were as follow (number of responses appears in brackets after the option):

1. Our company / institution has approved a policy or standards to eliminate forced labor, child labor and other abuses in the supply chain. (2)
2. There is now an annually renewed budget line for ensuring that our company / institution undertakes regular social compliance audits. (2)

The **Mexican** respondents provided no reply to what changes they observed in their institutions.

One **Colombian** respondent replied “Don’t know / N/A”, whilst the two Colombian technical agronomists that work in a coffee Cooperative stated that they had observed the following changes in their institution (number of responses appears in brackets after the option):

1. Our company / institution has approved a policy or standards to eliminate forced labor, child labor and other abuses in the supply chain (3)
2. There is now an annually renewed budget line for ensuring that our company / institution undertakes regular social compliance audits (1)

The **US respondent** replied “Don’t know / N/A” to what changes they observed in their institutions.

QUESTION 11: How far was Verité’s strategy to reduce labor violations in the coffee sector based on a sound strategy?

This question concerning opinions about Verité’s strategy to reduce labor violations in the coffee sector, produced the following responses:

The US respondent replied that he strongly agreed (High).

The Colombian respondents replied that

1. Strongly agree (High) (2)
2. Agree (Above-moderate) (1)
3. Neither agree nor disagree (Moderate)
4. Disagree (Low) (0)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

The Mexican respondents replied that:

1. Strongly agree (High) ()
2. Agree (Above-moderate) (2)
3. Neither agree nor disagree (Moderate)
4. Disagree (Low) ()
9. Do not know / Not applicable

Four out of five of the Brazilian respondents replied that they agreed; one strongly agreeing, and three agreeing to an above-moderate degree. One person disagreed:

1. Strongly agree (High) (1)
2. Agree (Above-moderate) (3)
3. Neither agree nor disagree (Moderate)
4. Disagree (Low) (1)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

Conclusion on QUESTION 11:

Most (10 out of 11) respondents either agreed strongly or to an above moderate degree that Verité’s strategy to reduce labor violations in the coffee sector is based on a sound strategy.

QUESTION 12: To what extent did the COFFEE project address the needs of the most vulnerable?

- The US respondent agreed the project addressed the vulnerable people's needs (above-moderate) (1).
- The Colombian respondents agreed the project addressed the vulnerable people's needs (2 completely, 1 moderately).
- The Mexican respondents agreed the project addressed the vulnerable people's needs (2 moderately)
- The Brazilian respondents agreed the project addressed the vulnerable people's needs (3 fully), but 2 did not agree.

Conclusion on QUESTION 12:

Most (nine out of 11) respondents either agreed strongly or to a moderate degree that the COFFEE project addressed the needs of the most vulnerable.

As regards **Q13 ("Has the capacity of your organization been strengthened to monitor and prevent occurrences of forced labor and or child labor in the coffee supply chain?")**, the following survey results are given:

- The US respondent replied "don't know/ N/A" (0).
- Two Colombian respondents were fully in agreement, one agreed "above moderate" (1)
- One Mexican respondent agreed "above moderate" (1), one replied "neither /nor" (0)
- The Brazilian respondents agreed fully (4), and one Brazilian agreed above moderately.

In conclusion, for Q13, almost all (nine out of 11) were fully in agreement, one agreed "above moderate" that the capacity of their organizations were strengthened to monitor and prevent occurrences of forced labor and or child labor in the coffee supply chain.

As regards **Q14 ("Can you provide an example of how your institution has improved its ability to monitor and control labor violations in your supply chains, as a result of the COFFEE project?")** the following results emerged:

- Mexico (2 responses):
 - Committees have been formed on the following topics: registration of complaints, gender equality, and assess-address child labor, forced labor, workplace abuse and harassment. The committees have been set up in locations in our supply chain with the goal of preventing and monitoring AAA farms.
 - Verification visits are made to check that fair payments are made to workers.
- Colombia (2 responses):
 - Thanks to the training received, work began in the communities on everything related to child protection through recreational activities with coffee farmers, their families and also involving children, which would allow a more complete message to be conveyed.

Despite the fact only four examples were registered, they show very promising initiatives focused on pro-labor rights and pro-early child education and child welfare, as a direct result of the training from Verité.

As regards **Q15 (“How far were you involved in giving feedback to Verité on the draft proposal for a social compliance system, including guidance materials”)**, it is noteworthy that all five respondents from Brazil were “highly involved / extensively involved” in providing feedback to Verité on the proposal for a social compliance system, including guidance materials for the pilot project in Brazil; whereas in Colombia all three respondents were well consulted, but the 2 Mexican ones said “Verite did not consult me” and “don’t know/ N/A”.

As regards **Q16 (“How would you describe the impact of the pilot project in your country (Brazil, Colombia, or Mexico?)”)**, the following survey results are given:

- The US respondent replied “1.Very High ” (1).
- Two Colombian respondents were fully in agreement (2), one agreed “above moderate” (1)
- One Mexican respondent agreed “above moderate” (1), one replied “neither /nor” (0)
- The Brazilian respondents agreed fully (4), and one Brazilian (1) agreed above moderately.

As regards **Q17 “Which activities or initiatives are most likely to be sustained?”**, the results are:

The US respondent replied:

- 2. Online training for staff from relevant government agencies, extension workers and/or universities and training institutions, 4. Meals, classes, and other activities for the children of temporary migrant workers in our supply chains, 5.Health insurance, pension provision (1 respondent).

The Colombian respondents replied:

- 8. Initiatives to support coffee workers outside the harvest season (e.g., handicrafts, maintenance of equipment, kitchen gardens); 9. Needs-based research and development initiatives (e.g. time and motion studies, harvesting techniques, improved pest control to avoid/reduce use of agrochemicals) (1 respondent);
- 1. Online training for our staff; 2. Online training for staff from relevant government agencies, extension workers and/or universities and training institutions; 3. Face to face training and workshops for our staff and supply chain workers; 6.Improvement of accommodation and service provision for temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain; 7. New harvesting techniques and equipment to improve the income and welfare of coffee workers; 9.Needs-based research and development initiatives (e.g. time and motion studies, harvesting techniques, improved pest control to avoid/reduce use of agrochemicals) (1 respondent);
- 8. Initiatives to support coffee workers outside the harvest season (e.g., handicrafts, maintenance of equipment, kitchen gardens) (1 respondent);

The Mexican respondents replied:

- 2. Online training for staff from relevant government agencies, extension workers and/or universities and training institutions; 3.Face to face training and workshops for our staff and supply chain workers. 5.Health insurance, pension provision and other social benefits for smallholders and temporary workers (1 respondent).

- 3. Face to face training and workshops for our staff and supply chain workers. 5. Health insurance, pension provision and other social benefits for smallholders and temporary workers; 7. New harvesting techniques and equipment to improve the income and welfare of coffee workers; 8. Initiatives to support coffee workers outside the harvest season (e.g., handicrafts, maintenance of equipment, kitchen gardens) (1 respondent).

The Brazilian respondents replied as below:

- Online training for our staff (5 Brazilian respondents)
- Face to face training and workshops for our staff and supply chain workers (4 Brazilian respondents)
- 6. Improvement of accommodation and service provision for temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain (1 Brazilian respondent)
- 7. New harvesting techniques and equipment to improve the income and welfare of coffee workers (1 Brazilian respondent)

As regards **Q18: What factors have contributed to this sustainability?** The following results were recorded.

Table 1: Q18 Results – Sustainability Factors

Factors	Total # of responses	Brazil	Colombia	Mexico	USA
Our company / institution has a policy or standards to confront forced labor, child labor and other abuses in our supply chain.	6	2	2	2	0
There is now a presumptive line that is renewed annually that guarantees that our company/institution carries out periodic audits to ensure compliance with its social policies.	6	3	2	1	0
There is at least one member of our company/institution of permanent personnel responsible for monitoring and auditing the well-being of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.	5	2	2	1	0
There is now in our company/institution an annual/regular review and strategic planning process to address the labor rights of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.	5	3	1	1	0
Don't know / Not applicable	0	0	0	0	1

As regards **Q19: What are the major challenges faced by your company / institution to eradicate forced labor and child labor in the coffee supply chain?** The following results were recorded.

Table 2: Q19 Results – Major Challenges Faced

Major Challenges	Total # of responses	Brazil	Colombia	Mexico	USA
Our company / institution does not have a policy or standards to address forced labor, child labor and other abuses in the supply chain.	1	0	1	0	0
Our company / institution does not have a budget line to undertake regular social compliance audits	0	0	0	0	0
No full-time manager in our company / institution has been assigned the responsibility to monitor and audit the welfare of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.	0	0	0	0	0
Our company / institution has no process of review or strategic planning to address the labor rights of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain	1	1	0	0	0
Uncertain market / low coffee prices on world market	3	1	1	0	1
Increased costs of inputs and equipment (machinery, fuel, fertilizers)	3	1	2	0	0
Threats to security (e.g., organized crime and political instability)	2	0	2	0	0
Climatic factors / climate change	3	1	1	0	1
Coffee pests and diseases	1	1	0	0	0
Other (specify):	0	0	0	0	0
Don't know / Not applicable	5	3	0	2	0

As regards to **Q20: What two recommendations would you make to improve the implementation of social compliance systems in the coffee sector?** The following instructions were shared and results were recorded.

Instructions: If you provide recommendations, please specify WHO should carry out the recommendation, and for which institution your recommendation is aimed at.

The 2 Mexican and 3 Colombian respondents made no responses, and no recommendations. The US and the Brazilian informants made recommendations.

Table 3: Recommendations from 1 USA Respondent

Recommendation Number	Who should carry out the recommendations?	For which institution (s) is the recommendation aimed at?
R.1 Market volatility should be addressed through integrated approaches that benefit farmers and farmworkers, mitigating price fluctuations (price risk management) and aligning price discovery mechanisms that prevent poverty cycles (e.g. living wage or living income strategies).	Companies (roasters & traders) and government in producing and consuming countries (shared responsibility).	Verité through advocacy efforts for informing companies and governments (at the national level) efforts on addressing labor violations and social compliance issues in the coffee sector.
R. 2 Companies should be open to these social innovations, but governments (in consuming and producing countries) should create enabling environments for guarantee these provisions (through social policy) when markets fails or it's unable to compensate through price.	Facilitate access to information and education on social compliance. The lower the value the wider the impact. If people, companies, and organization are aware about the issues / challenges and the tools for addressing them, the possibility for mitigating negative impacts are higher.	Verité through advocacy efforts.

Table 4: Recommendations from 4 Brazil Respondents

Recommendation Number	Who should carry out the recommendations?	For which institution (s) is the recommendation aimed at?
R.1 Producers must contract workers with the help of an accountant and must constantly inspect the working environment and health and safety conditions.	Producers and technicians from the main coffee traders	Coffee farms in general
R. 2 Extension technicians must remain attentive to reporting channels	Response blank	Response blank
R1. More information and practical actions.	Cooperatives accompanied by trained consultants	Producers, workers, and those involved
R.2 Assess (monitor) working conditions and hiring	Traders' technicians who are responsible for social compliance/sustainability	Response blank
R.1. Public - private partnership to increase awareness on the topic.	Public authorities in conjunction with companies (exporters, cooperatives, etc.)	Public Ministry of Labor, (Inspection Department), companies and cooperatives.
R.2. Disclose (i.e., make public) examples of suitability (best practices)	All the concerned stakeholders	Cooperatives and producers

ANNEX J. THE COFFEE TOOLKIT

COFFEE Toolkit (February 2024)

Users: Retailers, Roasters, & Traders (RRT); Cooperatives, Medium & Large Farms (CML); Small Farmers and Small Cooperatives (SFC); Auditors and Monitors (A&M); Civil Society and Government (CSG)

DEFINITIONS AND BACKGROUND TOOLS

Tool Number 1. Definitions and Concepts

Intended Users: RRT, CML, A&M, CSG

Tool Number 2. Primer on Labor and Recruitment Risks in the Latin American Coffee Sector

Intended Users: RRT, CML, A&M, CSG

Tool Number 3. Video – What is Child Labor?

Intended Users: SFC

Tool Number 4. Video – What is Forced Labor?

Intended Users: SFC

Tool Number 5. Video – Forced Labor Indicators

Intended Users: SFC

Tool Number 6. Video – Mario: Case Study on Recruitment Practices & Forced Labor

Intended Users: SFC

Tool Number 7. Video – Discrimination against Women in the Coffee Sector

Intended Users: SFC

Tool Number 8. Booklet – Worker Recruitment and Hiring in the Coffee Sector

Intended Users: SFC

STEP 1. ENGAGE STAKEHOLDERS

Tool Number 9: Guidance on Stakeholder Engagement

Intended Users: RRT, CML, SFC, CSG

STEP 2. ASSESS RISKS AND IMPACTS

Tool Number 10: Risk Evaluation for Action in the Coffee Trade (RE-ACT dashboard)

Intended Users: RRT, A&M, CSG

Tool Number 11: Video – Child Labor Risks

Intended Users: SFC

Tool Number 12: Video – Recruitment Related Risks

Intended Users: SFC

Tool Number 13: Self-Assessment Questionnaire (SAQ) for Coffee Traders

Intended Users: RRT

Tool Number 14: SAQ for Coffee Producers

Intended Users: SFC

Tool Number 15: Booklet - SAQ for Coffee Producers*

Intended Users: CML

Tool Number 16: SAQ for Labor Brokers

Intended Users: CML

Tool Number 17: Booklet - SAQ for Labor Brokers*

Intended Users: SFC

STEP 3. DEVELOP A CODE OF CONDUCT

Tool Number 18: Sample Code of Conduct Provisions

Intended Users: RRT, CML

Tool Number 19: Sample Social Responsibility Agreements

Intended Users: RRT

STEP 4. COMMUNICATE AND TRAIN

Tool Number 20: Guidance on Communication and Training across the Supply Chain

Intended Users: RRT

STEP 5. MONITOR COMPLIANCE

Tool Number 21: Guidance on Monitoring of Labor Brokers

Intended Users: CML

Tool Number 22: Booklet – Monitoring of Labor Brokers

Intended Users: SFC

STEP 6. REMEDIATE VIOLATIONS

Tool Number 23: Root Cause Analysis of Labor Violations in the Coffee Sector

Intended Users: RRT, CML, CSG

Tool Number 24: Guidance on Response and Remedy

Intended Users: RRT, CML

STEP 7. INDEPENDENT REVIEW

Tool Number 25: Guidance on Independent Monitoring of Coffee Farms

Intended Users: A&M

Tool Number 26: Worker Interview Questions

Intended Users: CML, A&M, CSG

Tool Number 27: Labor Broker Interview Questions

Intended Users: A&M, CSG

STEP 8. REPORT ON PERFORMANCE

Tool Number 28: Guidance on Public Reporting

Intended Users: RRT, CSG

Source: [COFFEE Project on Verité website](#)

ANNEX K. TERMS OF REFERENCE

3 November 2023

FINAL EVALUATION COOPERATION ON FAIR, FREE, EQUITABLE EMPLOYMENT (COFFEE)

SUBMITTED TO

United States Department of Labor
Bureau of International Labor Affairs
200 Constitution Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20210
www.dol.gov/ilab

PREPARED BY

WI-HER, LLC
8212 Old Courthouse Rd.
Suite A
Vienna, VA 22182
www.wi-her.org

Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor under contract number 1605C2-23-F-00050. This material does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AMECAFE	The Mexican Association of the Productive Coffee Chain
ASECC	Asociación Colombiana Para la Excelencia del Café
Cecafé	Conselho dos Exportadores de Café do Brasil
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
COFFEE	Cooperation on Fair, Free, Equitable Employment
CRECE	Center for Regional Coffee and Business Studies
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (DAC)
DOL	U.S. Department of Labor
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FNC	National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia
FOA	Funding Opportunity Announcement
GESI	Gender Equity and Social Inclusion
Ha	Hectare
ILAB	Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILO	International Labor Organization
InPACTO	Institute for the National Pact to Eradicate Slave Labor
KII	Key Informant Interview
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NGOs	Non-governmental Organizations
NICRA	Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement
OCFT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development ()
OECD/DAC	OECD / DAC Network
OTLA	Office of Trade and Labor Affairs
PII	Personally Identifiable Information
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
S3T	Socially Sustainable Sourcing Toolkit (S3T)
SCC	Sustainable Coffee Challenge

SCC LCAN	The Sustainable Coffee Challenge – Labor Collective Action Network
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPR	Technical Progress Report
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USDOL	U.S. Department of Labor

1. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The Office of Trade and Labor Affairs (OTLA) and the Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) are offices within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) that provides a wide range of technical assistance around the world. ILAB's mission is to promote a fair global playing field for workers in the United States and around the world by enforcing trade commitments among trading partners, strengthening global labor standards, promoting racial and gender equity, and combating international child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

OCFT works to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking around the world through international research, policy engagement, technical cooperation, and awareness-raising. OCFT supports technical cooperation projects in more than 90 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by OCFT support sustained efforts that address child labor and forced labor's underlying causes, including poverty and lack of access to education.

This evaluation approach will be in accordance with DOL's Evaluation Policy¹⁵. ILAB is committed to using the most rigorous methods applicable for this performance evaluation and learning from the evaluation results. The evaluation will be conducted by an independent third party and ethically while safeguarding the dignity, rights, safety, and privacy of participants. The evaluation criteria generally guiding evaluations of ILAB technical assistance programming include: Relevance, Coherence/Alignment (to the extent possible), Effectiveness, Efficiency/Resource Use, Impact (to the extent possible), Sustainability, and Equity and Inclusion.¹⁶ A broader set of evaluative criteria or domains may also be considered depending on the learning objectives for this evaluation, including themes of design, equity, replicability, consequence, and unintended effects, among others.¹⁷ In conducting this evaluation, the evaluator will strive to uphold the American Evaluation Association's Guiding Principles for Evaluators.¹⁸ ILAB will make the evaluation report available and accessible on its website.

ILAB has contracted with WI-HER under order number 1605C2-23-F-00050 to conduct performance evaluations of technical assistance projects. The present terms of reference (TOR) pertain to the final performance evaluation of the Verité Cooperation on Fair, Free, Equitable Employment (COFFEE) Project in Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil. This document serves as the framework and guidelines for the evaluation. It is organized into the following sections:

1. Background and Justification
2. Purpose & Scope of Evaluation
3. Evaluation Questions
4. Evaluation Methodology & Timeframe

¹⁵ [U.S. Department of Labor Evaluation Policy](#).

¹⁶ These criteria stem from [Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use by the Organization for Economic Development's Development Assistance Committee \(OECD-DAC\) Network on Development Evaluation](#). DOL determined these criteria are in accordance with the OMB Guidance M-20-12.

¹⁷ Evaluative Criteria: An Integrated Model of Domains and Sources, American Journal of Evaluation, Rebecca M. Teasdale, 2021, Vol. 42(3) 354-376.

¹⁸ [American Evaluation Association's Guiding Principles](#).

5. Roles & Responsibilities
6. Expected Outputs/Deliverables
7. Evaluation Report
8. Annexes

1.1 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1.1. BRAZIL

Brazil is the world's largest coffee producer, supplying about a third of the world's coffee, while Colombia is the world's third producer, supplying around nine percent. The coffee sector employs about eight million people in Brazil, and involves over half of the economically active population in Southern Mexico.¹⁹ Over 80 percent of coffee sector workers worldwide are employed in coffee harvesting, largely because the coffee harvest is labor-intensive and cannot be mechanized for harvesting high-quality coffee, especially on smallholder farms and in mountainous terrain.

Much of the work is temporary and informal in nature and involves the employment of whole families who migrate to pick coffee during the harvest season; however, the male head of household is often treated as the only registered worker even when his wife and/or children contribute to his production.²⁰

Most people working in the harvest are paid piece-rates according to the amount of coffee harvested, and this contributes to sub-minimum wages, compulsory overtime, and the incentivization of child labor.²¹ USDOL has listed 17 countries in which coffee is produced with child labor, the third highest number out of all commodities listed.²² These countries included Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, and Guatemala.²³

1.1.2. COLOMBIA

Research commissioned by Verité in Colombia concludes that a coffee workers' average annual wage is well below the estimated living wage.²⁴ The informality of the coffee sector is a major problem that contributes to child labor in Colombia.

According to a 2010 Colombian Coffee Federation Report²⁵, which uses the results of the 2006 *Survey on Coffee Growing Labor Market and Access to Credit for Colombian Coffee Growing Producers*, produced by the Centre for Regional Coffee and Business Studies (CRECE) and the

¹⁹ Verité-COFFEE Project-Draft Project Document-FOA-ILAB-17-07

²⁰ Verité-COFFEE Project-Draft Project Document op. cit.

²¹ Verité-COFFEE Project-Draft Project Document op. cit.

²² United States Department of Labor. 2018 List of Goods Produced with Child Labor and Forced Labor. <https://www.dol.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ilab/ListofGoods.pdf>

²³ Verité-COFFEE Project-Draft Project Document-FOA-ILAB-17-07 op. cit.

²⁴ Andersen, L. and Andersen, N., Living Income and Living Wage Report. Rural Areas and Small Towns of Coffee-Growing Regions in Central Colombia. Dec. 2021.

²⁵ "Status of Minors of Colombian Coffee Growing Families with Regard to Child Labor, March, 2010. Document accompanying the Letter from J. Orduz, President of the Colombian Coffee Federation, to S. Polaski, Deputy Undersecretary for International Affairs, DOL, Washington DC. April 1 2010. <https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/ILAB/submissions/20100406.pdf>

National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia (FNC), there are 527,000 small-scale coffee growers in 16 coffee growing departments in Colombia. Coffee plantations are “for the most part a family enterprise where 95 percent of coffee plantations have less than 5 hectares (ha). The average size of these plantations is 1.2 hectares. There are only 17,950 coffee growers with coffee fields of 5- 10 ha (3.4 percent) and just 7,540 producers with over 10 ha farmed with coffee (1.4 percent).”

Colombian coffee activities are carried out in family agricultural units, with many smallholdings. This status is confirmed by the recurring fact that the household residence of the producer is his/her own farm. Thus, 77 percent of small coffee grower households live on their own farms. According to the market labor survey, labor is provided mostly by the family (83 percent) on the farms of small coffee growers, which is characteristic of the family agricultural enterprise. There is little child labor involved in the production of Colombian coffee: activities performed by minors stem from the fact that coffee plantations in Colombia are primarily a family-run activity comparable to producing farms in developed countries, including the United States.

Labor is mainly hired for tasks such as picking or renovation of coffee farming, activities that are basically performed in one or two short periods of the year. Coffee farms are not only dedicated to coffee production, with only 28 percent of the area dedicated to coffee. On the remainder of the land, common crops grown are corn, beans, plantains, cacao, and sugar cane, as well as pasture lands that allow the family to have cattle.²⁶

1.1.3 BRAZIL

Verité-commissioned research in Brazil²⁷ shows that the Brazilian coffee sector has had close ties to slavery and migration since its inception. Minas Gerais is the largest coffee-producing state. Migrant workers – mostly temporary and informally employed – make up a significant proportion of workers in the Minas Gerais coffee sector.²⁸ Migrant workers are vulnerable to labor exploitation, in large part because labor brokers often recruit them, and migrant workers are informally employed, working without contracts, and often subject to precarious working conditions. The Covid-19 pandemic also increased workers’ vulnerability to labor exploitation in Brazil. Labor brokers are used widely to recruit workers for Brazilian coffee farms, especially temporary migrant coffee harvesters. Most labor brokers are unregistered, operate informally, and fail to comply with labor law and customer codes of conduct. Recruitment practices related to forced labor include deceit, charging recruitment fees, and document retention.²⁹ In many cases, the work is not registered or recorded in their *carteira de trabalho*, which restricts migrant workers from securing future jobs and accessing social security benefits.³⁰

In Brazil, women are especially vulnerable to recruitment and hiring abuses, as well as labor exploitation. Women are often not considered coffee farm employees but are instead treated as

²⁶ “Status of Minors of Colombian Coffee Growing Families”. Op.cit.

²⁷ Verité, Labor Migration and Recruitment Dynamics in the Coffee Sector of Minas Gerais, Brazil. May 31, 2021.

²⁸ Verité, Labor Migration and Recruitment Dynamics op.cit.

²⁹ Verité, Labor Migration and Recruitment Dynamics op.cit.

³⁰ Verité, Labor Migration and Recruitment Dynamics op.cit.

unpaid “helpers” to their partners or other male family members.³¹ Gender-based discrimination is common in the hiring, registration, and payment of workers on coffee farms in Minas Gerais.³²

Coffee is one of the most important crops in the Mexican agricultural sector and employs 285,000 coffee producers and approximately 400,000 temporary workers, known as *jornaleros*, during the harvest season. In many cases, the *jornaleros* migrate with their families, leading to a high risk of child labor and interruption of the education of their children.

Mexico’s coffee sector relies heavily on Guatemalan and other Central American migrants, many of whom are undocumented and therefore at greater risk of exploitation. Approximately 90-95 percent of the coffee sector workforce in the State of Chiapas is comprised of Guatemalan workers. In 2017, Verité conducted research in five major coffee-producing states in Mexico and Guatemala, and identified issues related to unscrupulous recruitment practices, forced labor, child labor, and unacceptable working conditions.³³

Research funded in 2002 by the Ford Foundation on a coffee cooperative in Chiapas suggests that cooperatives can benefit smallholder coffee producers and workers. The cooperative provides services to 800 members, including harvest collection, a coffee mill, credit, technical assistance, and support with negotiating contracts to sell coffee on national and international markets that offer better prices than local middlemen.³⁴

Data from the Asociación Mexicana de la Cadena Productiva del Café, A.C. (AMECAFE) shows there are 178,928 producers in Chiapas (35 percent of all producers in Mexico) who cultivate 253,986 hectares (36 percent of the land under coffee in Mexico).³⁵ A significant part of this production is organic coffee.³⁶ A collective organization of small coffee producers in cooperatives has facilitated the expansion of organic coffee growing in Chiapas.³⁷

1.2 THE VERITÉ COFFEE PROJECT

The COFFEE Project draws on the policy framework of the USDOL. Its major objective is to promote collaboration between government, civil society, and business to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

It follows ILAB’s stated policy of empowering civil society organizations to monitor and respond to cases of child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking. Through its technical cooperation and pilot projects, the COFFEE Project seeks to strengthen the capacity of civil society to carry out practical actions to address abusive labor practices.

³¹ Verité, Labor Migration and Recruitment Dynamics op.cit.

³² Verité, Labor Migration and Recruitment Dynamics op.cit.

³³ Verité-COFFEE Project-Draft Project Document-FOA-ILAB-17-07

³⁴ Martínez, M. Desarrollo Alternativo, A.C., Poverty Alleviation Through Participation in Fair Trade Coffee Networks: The Case of the Tzotzilotic Tzobolotic Coffee Coop, Chiapas, Mexico, Sept., 2002.

³⁵ Website accessed on Oct. 16, 2023. <https://www.amigosdelabiodiversidad.com/directorio/>

³⁶ Folch, A. and Planas, J., “Cooperation, Fair Trade, and the Development of Organic Coffee Growing in Chiapas (1980–2015).” *Sustainability* 2019, 11, 357. 11 Jan. 2019.

³⁷ Folch and Planas, 2019, op.cit.

Table 1: Overview of the Verite COFFEE Project

Country	Project name	Project Budget	Grantee	Project period of performance	Fieldwork dates for this evaluation
Brazil, Colombia, Mexico	Cooperation on Fair, Free, Equitable Employment (COFFEE) Project	2,500,000 USD	Verité	April 2019 to March 2024	17 November – 15 December 2023

1.2.1. THE THEORY OF CHANGE OF THE COFFEE PROJECT

The Theory of Change assumes that if (1) civil society organizations, (2) government agencies, and (3) concerned private sector stakeholders (including coffee producers or farmers, labor-recruitment agencies, coffee buyers, coffee roasters, and professional coffee associations)³⁸ abide by increasingly by ethical, fairtrade principles, there will be a knock-on effect down to the level of coffee farms and coffee producers, with tangible and sustainable results in reducing forced labor, child labor, and other unacceptable labor practices.

The Theory of Change assumes that if the above-mentioned three key stakeholder groups in the pilot COFFEE countries carry out applied research and monitor the situation of forced labor in the coffee sector, this will improve stakeholders' understanding of the causes of labor exploitation and could facilitate the commitment of private and government actors to tackle labor malpractices more effectively in the coffee supply chain.

The Theory of Change assumes that by involving the three key stakeholder groups in a learning and mentoring process centered on the introduction, sustained, and sustainable use of the social compliance system and toolkit (S3T), the COFFEE project will achieve its primary objective of *improving the implementation of social compliance systems that promote acceptable conditions of work and the elimination of child labor and forced labor in coffee supply chains.*

The Theory of Change also incorporates ILAB's stated policy to partner with the private sector. It assumes that sustained, ongoing private sector engagement will be effective in addressing the structural challenges that continue to allow child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking in coffee supply chains. Research³⁹ shows that this policy positively impacts the well-being and livelihoods of farming families and other types of workers in the coffee supply chains.⁴⁰ Other research is more reticent about the positive impacts on the livelihoods of coffee farmers and laborers because of the introduced Fair Trade codes of practice. One example of this is a case study from Nicaragua, which shows that Fair Trade agreements do not always guarantee improved

³⁸ Examples of professional associations include ASECC, CecaFé, FNC, Asociación Mexicana de la Cadena del Café, A.C. (AMECAFE), and SCC LCAN.

³⁹ Macdonald, K. "Globalising Justice within Coffee Supply Chains? Fair Trade, Starbucks and the transformation of supply chain governance", *Third World Quarterly*, 28:4, 793-812, 2007.

⁴⁰ Newitt, K., BACKGROUND PAPER FOR THE WORLD DEVELOPMENT REPORT 2013. Private Sector Voluntary Initiatives on Labor Standards. Ergon Associates Limited, 2013.

livelihoods. This is “mainly because Fair Trade’s opportunities to provide a significant price premium for participating farmers largely depend on world coffee prices in mainstream markets.”⁴¹

Verité is actively partnering with companies whose corporate policies increasingly seek technical assistance for pursuing risk-mitigation strategies to promote fair trade and a non-exploitative, equitable, and just global coffee sector.

The Theory of Change assumes that if Verité provides private sector firms with the tools needed to understand and align with international and national labor standards and legislation, private sector companies will better design effective strategies to monitor and remediate identified issues. For example, Comply Chain provides companies with eight steps for developing a robust social compliance system for monitoring global supply chains.

The Theory of Change assumes that once private sector stakeholders adopt the new social compliance systems, they will strengthen their capacity to monitor compliance and implement sustainable social compliance systems in their supply chains.

It also assumes that piloting the new social compliance tools on child labor, forced labor, and working conditions will lead to improved compliance with international and national standards and legislation and, ultimately, reduce child labor and forced labor in coffee supply chains, and improve working conditions.

The principal assumptions may be summarized as follows:

- Private sector stakeholders are willing and able to implement social compliance systems.
- Increased capacity of the private sector leads to sustained implementation of social compliance systems.
- New social compliance tools are adopted, updated, communicated and enforced by relevant government and non-government agencies.
- More owner-worker cooperative schemes introduced to reduce informality, increased formal registration of coffee workers, and increased profit sharing for vulnerable coffee sector workers.

It is envisaged that the key informant interviews, focus groups, site visits, and discussions with coffee producers and coffee workers in Colombia and Brazil will offer further insights into the key assumptions of the Theory of Change.

1.3 PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE COFFEE PROJECT

The USDOL website presents the problem to be addressed by the COFFEE Project:⁴² Most coffee harvesters are paid piece-rates according to the amount of coffee harvested, contributing to sub-minimum wages, compulsory overtime, and child labor. Many coffee workers are indigenous men,

⁴¹ Valkila, J., Nygren, A. “Impacts of Fair Trade certification on coffee farmers, cooperatives, and laborers in Nicaragua”. *Agric Hum Values* 27, 321–333, 2010.

⁴² <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/cooperation-fair-free-equitable-employment-coffee-project>

women, and children with low levels of education who come from marginalized populations vulnerable to labor violations. There have been reports of several practices that may indicate forced labor in coffee production, such as widespread use of recruitment fees, document retention, indebtedness to company stores, restrictions on freedom of movement, child labor, and overtime and minimum wage violations. In some cases, even children and pregnant women are exposed to pesticides without personal protective equipment. Weak government enforcement of labor laws and an uncoordinated, fragmented, ineffective response from the private sector enable systemic labor violations that continue unabated in the coffee sector.

The pilot projects will focus on specific issues in the coffee sector in each country.

In Mexico, the project aims to improve key actors' understanding of international standards and Mexican labor law, aiding in the identification of forced labor, child labor, and other abuses and identifying and remediating the root causes of labor exploitation.

In Colombia, the project is piloting innovative models to improve working conditions for people engaged in the coffee harvest, including vulnerable women and Venezuelan migrants.

In Brazil, the project addresses issues related to labor recruitment, especially the use of informal intermediaries who may be guilty of deception, charging workers recruitment fees or commissions, or retaining personal documents. The pilot project works with producers, traders, and roasters to identify and reduce these risks.

1.4 PROJECT STRATEGY

The project aims to facilitate sustained, sector-wide changes in labor practices through an integrated strategy. The project centers on the creation of a sustainable social compliance system and toolkit (S3T), along with guidance materials and trainings for stakeholders that will enable industry actors to implement the compliance systems.

1.4.1. PROJECT OBJECTIVE:

To improve the implementation of social compliance systems amongst coffee sector stakeholders that promote acceptable conditions of work and the elimination of child labor and forced labor in coffee supply chains.

To achieve this, the project piloted a subset of tools with private sector and industry association partners in three key coffee-producing countries (Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico). The pilots aim to generate significant impact and provide opportunities for expansion and replication. The lessons learned from these pilots will be used to refine the project's global compliance system and toolkit.

The COFFEE Project works with a coalition of major international coffee brands, coffee traders and producers, industry associations, certifiers, and other key stakeholders in the US and pilot countries. This coalition plays a critical role in helping the project establish a global social compliance system and toolkit to eradicate forced and child labor and wage, hour, and health and safety violations from their supply chains.

The project's logical framework proposes three outcomes that will lead to increased, sustainable adoption of the social compliance systems by the private sector, government, and civil society stakeholders.

Outcome 1: The adoption of a robust and sustainable social compliance system by private sector stakeholders in coffee supply chains.

- Output 1.1: Engage stakeholders and solicit feedback on major needs and best practices.
- Output 1.2: Develop a compliance system and supporting tools in alignment with the eight steps of *Comply Chain*.
- Output 1.3: Dissemination of a global compliance system and toolkit.
- Output 1.4: Secure commitments for adoption and implementation of social compliance.

Outcome 2: Strengthened capacity of private-sector stakeholders to implement a robust and sustainable social compliance system in coffee supply chains.

- Output 2.1: Hold in-person trainings for stakeholders on the use of the compliance system and tools.
- Output 2.2: Create online trainings for stakeholders on the use of the compliance system and tools.

Outcome 3: New social compliance tools on child labor, forced labor, and acceptable work conditions piloted in the coffee supply chain.

- Output 3.1: Implement pilot projects in the Brazilian, Colombia, and Mexican coffee sectors.

2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

2.1 EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of this final performance evaluation is to:

- Assess if the project achieved its objectives and outcomes, identifying the challenges encountered in doing so, and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges, giving particular attention to equity and inclusion in the pilot projects;
- Assess the intended and unintended effects of the project;
- Assess the lessons learned and emerging practices from the project (strategies and models of intervention) and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future projects in the countries covered by the pilot projects and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors; and
- Assess which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable.

2.2. INTENDED USERS

The evaluation will provide ILAB, the grantee, the participants, and other project stakeholders or actors who have a concern, interest, and/or influence on the labor rights problem the project addresses with an assessment of the project's performance, its effects on project participants, and an understanding of the factors driving the project results.

The results, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation will inform any project adjustments that may need to be made and inform stakeholders about the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future labor rights projects as appropriate. The evaluation report will be published on the USDOL website and be written as a stand-alone document, providing the necessary background information for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

The participatory workshops planned by the evaluation team will include government, non-government and private sector stakeholders involved in coffee supply chains in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico as well as Verité technical staff, and USDOL and ILAB personnel.

2.3. SCOPE

The evaluation will consider the pilot projects implemented between April 2019 and December 2023 in Colombia and Mexico and March 2024 in Brazil. The evaluation will take into account the specific issues that affected the COFFEE project during the period of project implementation, particularly the Covid-19 pandemic and the protests in Colombia.

The evaluation will not cover the original project in Guatemala, which was canceled due to security issues.⁴³

⁴³ Grant Award Document for the Verité Submission for FOA-ILAB-17-07: Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala, 11/30/2017.

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will review the performance monitoring data with the grantee. Where relevant, the evaluation will rate the level of achievement of each of the project's major outcomes using the four-point scale described in Annex D (low, moderate, above-moderate, and high).

The following is based on the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria⁴⁴ and includes questions designed to advance ILAB's institutional learning relative to equity and inclusion. These questions have been discussed internally within ILAB and reviewed with the consultants.

3.1. RELEVANCE AND COHERENCE

- To what extent is the project's Theory of Change valid (considering threats to internal and external validity), given the implementing environment?
- To what extent were the strategies based on a thorough and current understanding of the context of the coffee sector and coffee supply chains in the three pilot countries?
- To what extent were the strategies to achieve project objectives relevant to the priorities of the target groups and local stakeholders?
- To what extent has the project adapted to the changing circumstances and needs of the most vulnerable stakeholders?
- To what extent were the risk analyses and assumptions coherent and relevant to the political economy in the three pilot countries?

3.2. EFFECTIVENESS

- To what extent has the project achieved its primary objectives and outcomes?
- To what extent has the capacity of the stakeholders been strengthened? What were the achievements of the capacity building activities?
- What were the outcomes of the pilot projects in the three countries?
- Which interventions, and components of the project, were most effective for achieving the desired outcomes?"
- Has the toolkit strengthened stakeholders' social compliance systems?
- What factors challenged the desired outcomes and impacts of the project?

⁴⁴ The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Network (OECD/DAC) on Development Evaluation (EvalNet) has defined six evaluation criteria – relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability – and two principles for their use. These criteria provide a normative framework used to determine the merit or worth of an intervention (policy, strategy, programme, project or activity). They serve as the basis upon which evaluative judgements are made.

3.3. EFFICIENCY/FLEXIBILITY

- Were the project's human and financial resources applied efficiently in implementing the project strategy? What factors, if any, affected efficiency?
- What were the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on project implementation? How did the project adapt?
- How have the monitoring & evaluation (M&E) systems been implemented, and to what degree were they used as monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) systems to identify trends and patterns, adapt strategies, and make informed decisions?
- To what degree were the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) recommendations followed up on? ⁴⁵
 - i. Did the MTE recommendations lead to any demonstrable gains?
 - ii. Were the M&E findings and recommendations made in time for the project to implement the recommendations?

3.4. IMPACTS

- What are the observed outcomes and impacts of the project? Are they in accordance with the original targets established by the project?
- What were the impacts of the pilot projects?

3.5. SUSTAINABILITY

- Which activities or initiatives are most likely to be sustained?
- What factors have contributed to or limited this sustainability?
- Could the project have made more effort to achieve sustainability?
- To what extent were the challenges to sustained implementation of the S3T toolkit, identified by participants of the second Advisory Council Dialogue during the 2021 MTE, ⁴⁶ addressed by the project?

3.6. EQUITY AND INCLUSION

- How did the project engage marginalized and underserved populations? Did the design and implementation of the project reflect their needs and priorities? What factors affected these results? Did the Covid-19 pandemic make it more difficult to engage with these populations?
- To what extent did marginalized or underserved populations experience equitable access to and outcomes resulting from the services or interventions supported by the project? What

⁴⁵ The Cooperation On Fair, Free, Equitable Employment (COFFEE) Project. Midterm Evaluation Report on the Socially Sustainable Sourcing Toolkit Review and Validation Process. 19 April 2021.

⁴⁶ COFFEE Project: Mid Term Evaluation Report on the Socially Sustainable Sourcing Toolkit Review and Validation Process. Apr. 2021. Among the challenges identified were: cost of implementing the S3T toolkit; tools and practices too technical and not adapted to business operations; limited leverage and engagement capacity with supply chain business partners; supply chain complexity; and size of operations (p.19).

steps are ILAB and the Grantee taking to ensure the technical assistance benefits these populations?

3.7. LESSONS LEARNED

- What are the main lessons learned and the replicable practices derived from the COFFEE project?
- Are there any specific lessons that apply to a particular priority area, such as child labor, forced labor, or human trafficking? If so, which ones?
- Are there any lessons learned from piloting labor rights interventions in regions with significant indigenous populations and in which producers have communal land-holding patterns, such as Chiapas? If so, which ones? How can these lessons feed into future program design?
- Are there any lessons learned concerning the social feasibility of piloting improved social compliance projects in areas that have experienced social unrest focused on access to land and other natural resources, such as Chiapas and Minas Gerais?

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

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

4.1. APPROACH

The evaluation approach will involve a mix of methods and, where possible, be participatory. It will also rely on project documents, including performance monitoring data, to provide quantitative information. Qualitative information will be obtained through field visits, interviews, and focus groups as appropriate. The opinions and observations of stakeholders and project participants will be used to improve, triangulate, and clarify the quantitative analysis. The participatory nature of the evaluation should generate a sense of ownership among stakeholders and project participants.

To the extent that they are available, quantitative data will be drawn from the project's performance data reporting and project reports, incorporated into the analysis and triangulated with the quantitative and qualitative data collected during fieldwork. Where possible, the level of achievement of each of the project's major outcomes will be rated on a four-point scale (low, moderate, above-moderate, and high).

Project staff and partners will provide introductions at meetings but will not be allowed to dominate the proceedings. The following additional principles will be applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives will be triangulated wherever possible.
2. Any interviews relating to child labor will, wherever possible, include parents' and children's voices using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following ILO-

IPEC's guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor ⁴⁷ and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children. ⁴⁸ WI-HER attaches the utmost importance to including the voices of participants from different backgrounds and groups in the sample for any project evaluation conducted. Any research work undertaken with minors is guided by WI-HER's child safeguarding policy, which details WI-HER's commitment to protecting children and ensuring that appropriate safeguarding measures are implemented when undertaking research work involving their participation.

3. As much as possible, efforts will be made to include workers and producers from diverse backgrounds, including workers from underserved groups and/or historically marginalized populations and communities, when necessary safeguarding their identity and information, preserving their dignity, and protecting them from possible retaliation or other harm.
4. Gender and cultural sensitivity and 'Do No Harm' approaches will be integrated into the evaluation approach. Women's voices will be afforded equal priority during fieldwork sessions, and WI-HER will ensure women's voices are heard throughout the evaluation.
5. Consultations will allow a degree of flexibility to incorporate unexpected issues and maintain a sense of ownership on the part of the coffee producers, coffee workers, and other stakeholders, allowing additional issues to be discussed that may not have been included in the TOR.
6. To the extent possible, a consistent approach will be followed for each project site, with adjustments made for the different actors involved, activities conducted, and the progress of implementation in each locality or institution. It is important to recognize that the evaluation of the pilot project in Mexico will be conducted online and will not engage with the same range of actors and stakeholders as is envisaged for the site visits in Colombia and Brazil.

4.2. EVALUATION TEAM

The proposed key personnel are experts in conducting performance evaluations of international development projects in a variety of sectors, including but not limited to women's empowerment, decent work and labor conditions, economic growth, agriculture, education, rule of law, and health. The evaluation team will consist of:

4.2.1. CONTRACT MANAGER: DR. TAROUB FARAMAND

Dr. Taroub Faramand is an international development innovator and leader with over 35 years of management and technical experience in evaluations, strategic planning and analysis, program design and data for decision-making, capacity development, and gender equity and social inclusion (GESI) in a variety of sectors including counter human trafficking and harassment, health, civic engagement, good governance, anti-corruption and transparency, and education.

⁴⁷ Ethical Considerations When Conducting Research on Children in the Worst Forms of Child Labour (TBP MAP Paper III-02). ISBN 92-2-115165-4. Geneva: December 1, 2003.

⁴⁸ [UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children](#).

Dr. Faramand and WI-HER's home office support staff will be in permanent contact with the evaluation team and the client and provide real-time support to the evaluation team at all critical junctures of the evaluation. She will perform quality assurance and technical backstopping and participate in the weekly management meetings between WI-HER, ILAB, Verité, and the evaluation team.

4.2.2. LEAD EVALUATOR: DR. DAVID MOORE

Dr. David Moore has over 30 years of experience conducting assessments, evaluations, and other monitoring assignments for projects related to social inclusion, poverty reduction and analysis, children's rights, indigenous peoples' rights, gender and women's rights, environmental and social impact, health, social safety nets and alternative development (anti-drug interventions), livelihood restoration and resettlement. He has 12 years of experience working in 22 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, where he has expertly designed and implemented qualitative and quantitative mixed methods of data collection/analysis for M&E assignments. Dr. Moore has a Ph.D. in Anthropology from Oxford University and speaks fluent English and Spanish, and proficient Portuguese. He has conducted evaluations and other assignments for MCC and World Bank in Cabo Verde and Mozambique.

4.2.3. LEAD EVALUATOR: DR. JONATHAN RENSHAW

Dr. Jonathan Renshaw is a social anthropologist with a Ph.D. from the University of London (LSE) and was formerly the Lead Social Specialist at the Environmental Safeguards Unit of the Inter-American Development Bank in Washington, DC. He has over 30 years of experience working on social issues, participation, and governance in Latin America and the Caribbean. This experience has covered policy development, strategic and country-level studies, preparation of training programs and guidance notes, and the development, management, supervision, and evaluation of projects with indigenous peoples, conservation and environmental resilience, urban upgrading, involuntary resettlement, public health, and census and population studies. He recently worked on resilience and adaptation to climate change in Panama, Nicaragua, and Sri Lanka, recovery and restoration following major disasters – including the rupture of the Fundão tailings dam in Minas Gerais, Brazil, as well as hurricanes in Dominica and St. Maarten, and conflict resolution in Nicaragua and Argentina. He is fluent in Spanish and Portuguese.

4.3. DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team will use the following data collection methods during the assessment:

- a. A review of all project documents, including the results of the mid-term evaluation and frameworks related to COFFEE pilot projects in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico.
- b. Development of a matrix to identify potential sources of data.
- c. Interviews with key stakeholders, including people who have used the toolkit and/or have been engaged in the implementation of the pilot projects.
- d. Focus group discussions with key stakeholders. This will help the triangulation of information and the analysis and development of recommendations.
- e. A simple survey sent to a sample of selected stakeholders who have been trained to use the tools in the Socially Sustainable toolkit.

4.3.1. DOCUMENT REVIEW

The evaluation will review the documentation provided by DOL and Verité, including background research studies, project documents, quarterly and annual progress reports, and the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, and will carry out secondary research using online resources and on-site inquiries to identify relevant documents. It will also include the review and analysis of relevant M&E data from key implementing partners.

4.3.2. QUESTION MATRIX

Before beginning fieldwork, the evaluator will develop a matrix outlining potential sources of data that will allow the evaluation to collect information on each evaluation question. This will help with time allocation in the field and will ensure that they are exploring all possible avenues for data triangulation. The Contractor will share and discuss the final version of the TOR and question matrix with USDOL and the grantee (Verité).

4.3.3. INTERVIEWS WITH STAKEHOLDERS

The evaluation team will conduct 20-25 interviews and 10-12 focus group discussions over approximately 42 working days with project stakeholders in the US, Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil. The interviews and focus groups in the US and Mexico will be conducted remotely by video link (Zoom). The interviews and focus groups in Colombia and Brazil will be conducted, whenever possible, in-person. The evaluation will conduct an average of seven to eight key informant interviews for each pilot project. Additional interviews will be organized online with global industry leaders, partners, and other relevant stakeholders in the US and elsewhere.

The evaluation team will attempt to interview an equal distribution of male and female respondents and will keep a record of the number of males and females as the interviews are conducted, and may make specific requests for more gender equality of numbers in fieldwork sessions, as needed. If necessary, some focus groups may be conducted exclusively with women coffee workers to achieve a balanced gender perspective. This is particularly important if the meetings with producers and workers are largely comprised of men. At this stage, the evaluation does not envisage carrying out focus groups with specific age groups (e.g. young people, elderly).

The evaluation team will interview and/or conduct focus group discussions with the ILAB Project Managers and MEL specialists (former and current) and with representatives of the following organizations. The number of interviews and participants from each organization will depend on availability.

Table 2: Key Informant Interview (KII) / Focus Group Discussion (FGD) Data Collection Strategy

Stakeholder Type	Method	Sample Size	Potential Respondents
Grantee and Implementing Partners	KII/FGD	5	Project manager and representatives from in-country offices of Verité. The team responsible for S3T. Background, history, and stakeholder mapping for the project.
Government agencies responsible for labor, agriculture, and marketing	KII, FGD	4	Where possible, the evaluation will prioritize government staff working at the local level (including State Government and municipal agencies) who are directly involved with coffee production and are responsible for compliance with labor law, certification, and agricultural extension.
Coffee growers and coffee growers' organizations	KII, FGD	4	Depending on the local agrarian structure, this will be stratified and could include smallholders, representatives of cooperatives and similar organizations, medium-scale producers, and the owners or managers of large coffee plantations.
National or regional level coffee producers' organizations, chambers of commerce, etc.	KII, FGD	5	Representatives that can offer insights into the activities, policies, and priorities of these organizations. Also, to understand how coffee marketing operates in each country.
Workers' Organizations	KII, FGD	2	If there are any associations that represent coffee workers, including migrant laborers
NGOs & other relevant local or national organizations	KII, FGD	4	NGOs and others engaged in the field of workers' rights, support for smallholder producers, certification, marketing, and environmental sustainability
Private Sector International Brand Representatives	KII, FGD	8	Representatives working on social corporate responsibility, buying, quality control, and marketing

The participants will be identified with assistance from ILAB, Verité, and other partners. They are likely to include Verité staff and grantees, private sector representatives, relevant industry experts, and representatives of the producers and workers in the countries where the pilot projects have been implemented.

The evaluation will use a semi-structured interview format that is comprehensive and specific to the type of respondent. It will address the evaluation questions, allowing for predetermined and emergent themes. The interviews are meant to generate in-depth insights from people with special knowledge rather than generalized findings.

4.3.4. FOCUS GROUPS

Focus groups will be conducted with the following categories of beneficiaries in each country:

- Mexico – users of the toolkit, including representatives of coffee buyers and/or roasters, organized producers (cooperatives), extension workers and agronomists, and government agencies responsible for the oversight of working practices and conditions. Since the focus groups will be conducted online, it seems unlikely the evaluation will be able to organize focus groups with the most vulnerable migrant coffee workers.
- Colombia – users of the toolkit, including coffee buyers and roasters, organized coffee farmers (cooperatives), extension workers and/or civil society organizations working in the sector, and where possible, migrant and non-migrant workers and their families (including one group for women workers).
- Brazil – users of the toolkit, including coffee buyers and roasters, coffee producers, including organized smallholders in Minas Gerais (MG) and larger plantation owners in Espírito Santo (ES), migrant and locally-based coffee workers and their families (including one group for women workers).

Verité and its local partners will be asked to organize the focus groups. They will be conducted using a comprehensive semi-structured interview tool that is specific to the type of respondent and addresses the evaluation questions, allowing for both predetermined and emergent themes.

The aim is to conduct 5-6 focus groups in both Colombia and Brazil where the project has been piloted, and 1-2 focus group discussions online in Mexico. Ideally, the groups will comprise 8-10 participants.

To render the methodologies more participatory, the evaluation will provide easel boards, sticky note pads, flipcharts, and markers to allow the participants to write, draw, or participate in gallery walk/sharing circles about how they feel and what they think. This approach may not always be appropriate or possible; still, the basic method of all evaluation data collection should be participatory and include asking open-ended evaluation questions to triangulate and utilize multiple sources of information and informants to generate the most reliable responses.

4.3.5. SURVEY

A short online survey (no more than 10 questions) will capture the perceptions of participants in each country where the pilot projects have been implemented, and be used to validate other existing data collection methods. The survey will be shared with OCFT and Verité and if necessary, adjusted, before it is applied.

The survey will focus on the medium and higher-level stakeholders involved in the project, including national-level organizations of producers and exporters, certifiers, national and international advocacy NGOs focused on workers' rights, and the coffee companies/brands that have worked with the project.

The sample size will be determined in accordance with the number of agencies and organizations and the level of their participation in the trainings and pilot projects. The survey will be administered to the required participants to reach the desired sample. This will provide a solid balance between a high-level and in-depth view of project implementation. Annex 3 provides a work-in-progress draft of the survey instrument.

4.3.6. 6. SITE VISITS

The fieldwork for the final evaluation covering the COFFEE Project implemented by Verité is projected to take place over four weeks from 18 November to 10 December 2023.

The fieldwork for Mexico will be conducted remotely. Fieldwork will be conducted in-person for Colombia in the Antioquia Department and for Brazil in the States of Espírito Santo and Minas Gerais. The evaluators will make the final selection of stakeholders to be interviewed in collaboration with USDOL and Verité. The evaluation team will make all necessary efforts to interview a representative sample of stakeholders during the four-week time period to permit a rounded assessment and thorough understanding of the successes and challenges of the project.

The list of stakeholders per country to be interviewed, presented in the table below, is a tentative proposal to be agreed upon. The list is not complete. *Please note that the stakeholder table below is still being updated in the first and second weeks of November 2023. A new and finalized version will be made available to the grantee and DOL, and included in the Final Evaluation Report.*

The table below records some of this information gleaned from the available reports. All interviews will be conducted virtually via Zoom. Verité staff will not participate.

Table 3: List of stakeholders per country to be interviewed

Country	Stakeholder	Justification
Mexico	Allegro Coffee company & specialty coffee roaster	Coffee company
Mexico	Counter Culture	Coffee company & ultra-premium roaster- Stated Commitment on Counter Culture website to improve working conditions in its coffee supply chains
Mexico	JDE (Jacobs Douwe Egberts)	Mainstream coffee company & brand
Mexico	Keurig Dr Pepper	KDP fund Verité and other nonprofits to introduce sustainable social compliance systems to improve the labor conditions and livelihoods of vulnerable coffee workers
Mexico	NCA (National Coffee Association)	Multistakeholder Initiative
Mexico	Nespresso	Premium coffee company: Nespresso's Sustainable Quality Program focuses on helping farmers be more productive and includes a module on "fair treatment and good working conditions for workers"
Mexico	Nestlé	Coffee company. Nestlé co-funded Verité research on labor risks in Mexico's five largest coffee-producing states
Mexico	Smucker	Coffee company / brand

Country	Stakeholder	Justification
Mexico	Starbucks	Partner organization. Starbucks is a founding member of the Sustainable Coffee Challenge. Starbucks has committed to using 100% coffee from C.A.F.E compliant farms
HQ in California, USA	SCA (Specialty Coffee Association)-	Multistakeholder Initiative
Chicago, USA	SCC (Sustainable Coffee Challenge ⁴⁹)	Multistakeholder Initiative
USA	SCC LCAN (Sustainable Coffee Challenge-Labor Collective Action Network)	
USA	Intelligentsia	Coffee company / ultra-premium roaster
Quebec based Offices in Colombia (Bogota)	Canadian coffee trader, RGC Coffee	Partner organization. Sent staff to COFFEE trainings on S3T. RGC is implementing a pilot project in Caldas, Colombia, in cooperation with Solidaridad, Rainforest Alliance, and a major Coffee Cooperative to improve working conditions on 5,000 family-owned small holder farms. RCG finances Las Manos de Café which constitutes a major part of the Colombia pilot project
Offices in Colombia, Brazil, Mexico	Rainforest Alliance	Multistakeholder Initiative that works against forced labor
Brazil	Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	Implementing Partner
Brazil	Institute for the National Pact to Eradicate Slave Labor (InPACTO)	Implementing Partner
Brazil	GCP (National Pact to Eradicate Slave Labor)	Multistakeholder Initiative

⁴⁹ The Sustainable Coffee Challenge is a collaborative effort of companies, governments, NGOs, research institutions, and others to transition the coffee sector to be fully sustainable. Challenge partners are urgently working together to increase transparency, align around a common vision for sustainability, and collaborate to accelerate progress toward those goals. Conceived by Conservation International and Starbucks and launched during the 2015 Paris climate meetings with 18 founding partners dedicated to coffee sustainability, the Challenge aims to stimulate greater demand for sustainable coffee. <https://www.sustaincoffee.org/about/>

Country	Stakeholder	Justification
Colombia	ASECC	The Specialty Coffee Association of Colombia (ASECC) assisted Verité with the stakeholder mapping of coffee producers; provided input on the toolkit and pilot projects; supported outreach to other Colombian stakeholders; and hosted stakeholder meetings in the country.
Colombia	Manos del Café Project- coffee producers, coffee workers (harvesters)	This project was included in the COFFEE project by Verité for documentation of the effects of introducing the S3T tool kit; Verité also piloted the use of simple assisted coffee harvesting tools to increase workers’ production and earnings while working for the same number of hours and decreasing ergonomic risks. Manos del Café Project also established microenterprises in coffee, benefitting 52 workers (some microenterprises closed, some continue)
Colombia	Salgar Coffee Growers’ Cooperative	Verité evaluated a model focused on the provision of services to improve workers’ well-being. The Manos de café program provided workers and their families with medical and dental services, assistance in participation in savings and retirement services, and recreation services. Currently, this program benefits 388 coffee pickers in Antioquia. With the help of Ulula and the Salgar Coffee Growers’ Cooperative, Verité developed and implemented a survey with 118 workers via WhatsApp.
	Ulula https://ulula.com/contact/	Phone-based worker needs and preferences survey (with Ulula) carried out as part of the KDP funded Living Income & Living Wage Study (Colombia) Ulula’s main focus is on better labor conditions in the workplace and improved livelihoods in the communities where coffee is sourced.

Table 4: Fieldwork plan

Date	Activity
November 17	Arrival In Medellin, Colombia
November 18	Meeting with Verité staff & consultant who will join the evaluation team
November 20-24	Data collection in Colombia

Date	Activity
November 27	Round up meeting with stakeholders to present findings
November 28	Travel to São Paulo
November 29	Meet with Verité COP and project staff
November 30	Travel to Vitória and data collection
December 3	Travel to São Paulo
December 4-7	Data collection in Minas Gerais
December 8	Round up meeting with stakeholders in Brazil (Varginha, MG) to share preliminary findings

4.3.7. QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF SECONDARY DATA

Secondary data will consist of available monitoring data and, where relevant, the country reports and analyses prepared by Verité⁵⁰. The key documents that the evaluation requires are included in Annex 2. The evaluation team will work with ILAB to secure prompt access to secondary data from ILO, relevant government bodies, and external sources. After gaining access to the data, the evaluation team will assess their quality and relevance in answering the research questions and develop a list of relevant indicators. The evaluation team's analysis of this data will inform the correlation and validation of findings from the evaluation fieldwork/data collection.

The evaluation team will analyze project monitoring data to assess the performance of activities relative to expected results, and equity considerations. The evaluation team's analysis, which will rely on descriptive statistics such as counts, tabulated proportions, and means, will identify common trends, patterns, and any changes in stakeholders' motivation, behavior, capacity, practices, policies, programs, relationships, or resource allocation as a result of project activities. The evaluation team will use project monitoring data and quantitative data collected during evaluation fieldwork (please see Appendix D for rapid scorecard template), triangulated with relevant qualitative data collected during interviews and FGDs, to develop summary achievement and sustainability ratings, as well as an assessment of equity in relation to access to project interventions as well as outcomes for target beneficiaries (if requested), with particular attention to underserved populations or historically marginalized groups or communities.

4.4. OUTCOME ACHIEVEMENT, EQUITY AND SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS

The evaluator will objectively rate each of the project's outcomes according to three factors, including: 1) level of achievement, 2) level of equity with respect to access to project interventions

⁵⁰ Information can be provided in general statistical terms, not individual, following report models that the system can provide, especially according to the availability of the data collected and processed by each entity.

and/or targets achieved, and 3) potential for sustainability on a four-point scale (low, moderate, above-moderate, and high). Outcome equity ratings should be provided only for the equity-related outcomes designated by ILAB (if required).

4.4.1. ACHIEVEMENT

“**Achievement**” measures the extent to which a development intervention or project attains its objectives/outcomes, as described in its performance monitoring plan (PMP).

For assessing the achievement of program or project outcomes, the evaluation team should consider the extent to which the objectives/outcomes were achieved and identify the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes. The evaluation team should consider to what extent the project is likely to meet or exceed its targets by project end.

Project achievement ratings should be determined through triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data. The evaluation team should collect **qualitative data** from key informant interviews and focus group discussions through a structured data collection process, such as a survey or rapid scorecard.

Interviews and focus groups can also provide context for the results reflected in the Data Reporting Form submitted with the Technical Progress Report (TPR). The evaluation team should also analyze **quantitative data** collected by the project on key performance indicators defined in the PMP and reported on in the TPR Data Reporting Form.

The evaluation team should consider the reliability and validity of the performance indicators and the completeness and accuracy of the data collected. The assessment of quantitative data should consider the extent to which the project achieved its targets and whether these targets were sufficiently ambitious and achievable within the period evaluated.

The evaluation team should assess each of the project’s outcome(s) according to the following scale:

- **High:** met or exceeded most targets for the period evaluated, with mostly positive feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Above-moderate:** met or exceeded most targets for the period evaluated **but** with neutral or mixed feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Moderate:** missed most targets for the period evaluated, **but** with mostly positive feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Low:** missed most targets for the period evaluated, with mostly neutral or negative feedback from key stakeholders and participants.

4.4.2. EQUITY

“**Equity**” assesses the extent to which a development intervention or project provides for equitable access to project interventions or services, as well as the extent to which the project contributes to equitable outcomes for all individuals, including individuals who belong to underserved

communities⁵¹ that have been denied such treatment.

For assessing the equity of program or project outcomes, the evaluation team will consider who has/has not been reached, served, engaged, or affected by the project's interventions in positive, negative, or undetermined ways. The evaluation team will review the project's overall output and outcome data and its disaggregated data for specific groups to identify trends and patterns with respect to equitable access and outcomes. **For final evaluations**, the evaluation team will consider to what extent the project is likely to achieve targets for specific underserved target groups and those populations that are hardest to reach by project end.

Project equity ratings will be determined through triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data. The evaluation team will collect **qualitative data** from KIISs and FGDs through a structured data collection process, such as a survey or rapid scorecard. Interviews and focus groups can also provide context for the results reflected in the Data Reporting Form submitted with the TPRs. The evaluation team will also analyze aggregated and disaggregated **quantitative data** collected by the project on key performance indicators defined in the Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) and reported on in the TPR Data Reporting Form. The evaluation team will consider the reliability and validity of the performance indicators and the completeness, representativeness, and accuracy of the data collected. The assessment of quantitative data will consider the extent to which the project achieved targets in an equitable manner and whether the targets for specific underserved groups were appropriate and sufficiently ambitious and achievable within the period evaluated.

The evaluation team will assess each of the project's outcome(s) according to the following scale:

- **High:** reported outcome data reflects tangible benefits for most or all underserved groups during the period evaluated, with mostly positive feedback from representatives of each of the relevant underserved groups.
- **Above-moderate:** reported outcome data reflect tangible benefits for most or some of the underserved groups during the period evaluated, **but** with mixed or neutral feedback from representatives of one or more of the relevant underserved groups.
- **Moderate:** reported outcome data reflect limited or no tangible benefits for underserved groups during the period evaluated, **but** with mostly positive feedback from representatives of those groups.
- **Low:** reported outcome data does not reflect tangible benefits for underserved groups during the period evaluated (or the project lacks disaggregated data to demonstrate), with mostly neutral or negative feedback from representatives of those groups.

⁵¹ "Underserved communities" refers to populations who have been historically underserved, marginalized, or denied equitable treatment on the basis of disability, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, religion, migration status, and persons or groups otherwise adversely affected by persistent poverty or inequality. In accordance with Executive Order 13985 of January 20, 2021, Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government, the term "underserved communities" refers to populations sharing a particular characteristic, as well as geographic communities, that have been systematically denied a full opportunity to participate in aspects of economic, social, and civic life.

4.4.3. SUSTAINABILITY

“**Sustainability**” is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. When evaluating the sustainability of a project, it is useful to consider the likelihood that the benefits or effects of a particular output or outcome will continue after donor funding ends. It is also important to consider the extent to which the project takes into account the actors, factors, and institutions that are likely to have the strongest influence over, capacity, and willingness to sustain the desired outcomes and impacts. Indicators of sustainability could include agreements/linkages with local partners, stakeholder engagement in project sustainability planning, and successful handover of project activities or key outputs to local partners before project end, among others.

The project’s Sustainability Plan (including the associated indicators) and TPRs (including the attachments) are key (but not the only) sources for determining its rating. **The evaluation team will assess each of the project’s objective(s) and outcome(s) according to the following scale:**

- **High:** strong likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources⁵² are in place to ensure sustainability;
- **Above-moderate:** above average likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources are identified but not yet committed;
- **Moderate:** some likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and some of the necessary resources are identified;
- **Low:** weak likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources are not identified.

In determining the rating above, the evaluation team will also consider the extent to which sustainability risks were adequately identified and mitigated through the project’s risk management and stakeholder engagement activities. **For final evaluations**, the evaluation team will assess the risk environment and its expected effects on the project outcomes after the project exits and the capacity/motivation/resources/linkages of the local actors/stakeholders to sustain the outcomes produced by the project.

4.5. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CONFIDENTIALITY

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners, stakeholders, communities, and project participants, implementing partner staff will generally not be present during interviews. However, implementing partner staff may accompany the evaluator to make introductions whenever necessary to facilitate the evaluation process, make respondents

⁵² Resources can include financial resources (i.e. non-donor replacement resources), as well as organization capacity, institutional linkages, motivation and ownership, and political will, among others.

feel comfortable, and allow the evaluator to observe the interaction between the implementing partner staff and the interviewees.

The evaluation team will respect the rights and safety of participants in this evaluation. During this study, the evaluation team will take several precautions to ensure the protection of respondents' rights:

- No interview will begin without receipt of informed consent from each respondent.
- The evaluation team will conduct KIIs and FGDs in a confidential setting so no one else can hear the respondent's answers.
- Covid-19 precautions and social distancing will be implemented during face-to-face interviews and FGDs.
- The evaluation team will be always in control of its written notes.
- The evaluation team will transmit data electronically using secure measures.

The evaluation team will talk with respondents to assess their ability to make autonomous decisions and their understanding of informed consent. Participants will understand that they have the right to skip any question with which they are not comfortable or to stop at any time.

4.6. STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

The evaluation will include a Stakeholder Validation Workshop with Verité and other key stakeholders at the conclusion of each field visit. The dates agreed upon with the DOL and Verité are November 27 in Medellín, for Colombia, and December 8, in Varginha, MG, for Brazil. The meetings will allow the evaluators to present their preliminary findings and recommendations to Verité and the other stakeholders. The list of participants will be agreed upon with Verité during the site-visit fieldwork in Colombia and Brazil. The evaluation team will prepare PowerPoints in both English and Spanish, and English and Portuguese ahead of the meetings. The evaluation team will draft a short summary or minutes of the meetings in Spanish or Portuguese after the meetings have concluded and share them via email.

A virtual round-up meeting will be held with Verité and key stakeholders on November 15 after the virtual interviews in Mexico (November 9-16) have been completed as agreed upon with Verité.

The meetings will be used to present the major preliminary results and emerging issues, discuss recommendations, including issues related to project sustainability, and obtain clarification or additional information. The evaluators of the meeting, in consultation with project staff, will determine the meeting agenda. Some specific questions for stakeholders may be prepared to guide the discussion along with, possibly, a brief written feedback form.

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

- Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main results;
- Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the results;
- Opportunity for implementing partners not met or not previously interviewed to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality; and,

- 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 key conclusions of the round-up meetings will be summarized in a short note (one to two pages), in Spanish or Portuguese, which will be shared with Verité and the other stakeholders who participated in the meeting.

4.7. LIMITATIONS

Fieldwork for the evaluation will last three weeks, and the evaluation team will not have enough time to visit all project sites. As a result, the evaluator will not be able to take all sites into consideration when formulating their results. The evaluation team will make all efforts possible, through their detailed field site visits to Brazil and Colombia, to ensure that the evaluation team visits a representative sample of sites, including some that have performed well and some that have experienced challenges.

Another significant limitation is that the evaluation will not occur during the coffee harvest. This timing will make it difficult to engage with coffee workers, especially migrant workers who follow the coffee harvests in Colombia and Brazil.

This is not a formal impact assessment, which is reflected by the fact that there are fewer impact evaluation questions (EQs) (two) and more EQs regarding effectiveness (six) that can be more accurately assessed. Moreover, since most project activities involved training and introducing new tools for use by many stakeholders in the coffee supply chains, registering impact in a four-year period is very difficult. The organizational and institutional changes required to sustainably introduce and continue using and applying in coffee chain working practices and the new social compliance tools are ongoing; variations in success rate of uptake to be expected according to pilot country, economic, cost, political economy, human rights situation, and legal dimensions. Measurable impacts require a long-term commitment from the stakeholder institutions. Concrete, objectively verifiable impacts are not to be expected in the COFFEE project’s relatively short four-year time frame, especially given the fact that the first year of the project involved designing and fine-tuning S3T as well as training and mentoring stakeholders on the S3T toolkit in the three pilot countries.

Additionally, as acknowledged in COFFEE project monitoring reports, the Covid-19 pandemic negatively affected project progress for more than a year.

Results for the evaluation will be based on information collected from background documents and in interviews with stakeholders, project staff, and project participants. The accuracy of the evaluation results will be determined by the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources.

Furthermore, the ability of the evaluator to determine efficiency will be limited by the amount of financial data available. A cost-efficiency analysis is not included because it would require impact data, which is not available.

5. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Contractor is responsible for accomplishing the following items:

- Providing all evaluation management and logistical support for evaluation deliverables within the timelines specified in the contract and TOR;
- Providing all logistical support for travel associated with the evaluation;
- Providing quality control over all deliverables submitted to ILAB; and
- Ensuring the Evaluation Team conducts the evaluation according to the TOR.

The Evaluation Team will conduct the evaluation according to the TOR. The Evaluation Team is responsible for accomplishing the following items:

- Receiving and responding to or incorporating input from the grantees and ILAB on the initial TOR draft;
- Finalizing and submitting the TOR and sharing concurrently with the grantees and ILAB;
- Reviewing project background documents;
- Reviewing the evaluation questions and refining them as necessary;
- Developing and implementing an evaluation methodology, including document review, KIIs and FGDs, and secondary data analysis, to answer the evaluation questions;
- Conducting planning meetings or calls, including developing a field itinerary, as necessary, with ILAB and grantees;
- Deciding the composition of field visit KII and FGD participants to ensure the objectivity of the evaluation;
- Developing an evaluation question matrix for ILAB;
- Presenting preliminary results verbally to project field staff and other stakeholders as determined in consultation with ILAB and grantees;
- Preparing an initial draft of the evaluation report for ILAB and grantee review;
- Incorporating comments from ILAB and the grantee/other stakeholders into the final report, as appropriate.
- Developing a comment matrix addressing the disposition of all of the comments provided; and
- Preparing and submitting the final report.

ILAB is responsible for the following items:

- Launching the contract;
- Reviewing the TOR, providing input to the evaluation team as necessary, and agreeing on the final draft;
- Providing project background documents to the evaluation team in collaboration with the grantees;

- Obtaining country clearance from the U.S. Embassy in fieldwork country;
- Briefing grantees on the upcoming field visit and working with them to coordinate and prepare for the visit;
- Reviewing and providing comments on the draft evaluation report;
- Approving the final draft of the evaluation report;
- Participating in the pre- and post-trip debriefing and interviews; and,
- Including the ILAB evaluation contracting officer’s representative on all communication with the evaluation team.

The grantee is responsible for the following items:

- Reviewing the TOR, providing input to the evaluation team as necessary, and agreeing on the final draft;
- Providing project background materials to the evaluation team in collaboration with ILAB;
- Preparing a list of recommended interviewees with feedback on the draft TOR;
- Participating in planning meetings or calls, including developing a field itinerary, as necessary, with ILAB and evaluator;
- Scheduling meetings during the field visit and coordinating all logistical arrangements;
- Helping the evaluation team to identify and arrange for interpreters as needed to facilitate worker interviews;
- Reviewing and providing comments on the draft evaluation reports;
- Organizing, financing, and participating in the stakeholder debriefing meeting;
- Providing in-country ground transportation to meetings and interviews;
- Providing materials such as a flip chart, sticky notes, markers, and other office supplies necessary to engage interviewees; and,
- Including the ILAB program office on all written communication with the evaluation team.

5.1. TIMETABLE

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

Table 5: Tentative Timetable

Task	Responsible Party	Date
Evaluation launch call	DOL/ILAB	September 29, 2023
Background project documents sent to Contractor	DOL/ILAB	September 29, 2023
TOR Template submitted to Contractor	DOL/ILAB	September 28, 2023

Task	Responsible Party	Date
Contractor and Grantee work to develop a draft itinerary and stakeholder list	Contractor and Grantee	November 3, 2023
Logistics call - Discuss logistics and field itinerary	Contractor and Grantee (DOL/ILAB as needed)	November 13, 2023
Contractor sends minutes from the logistics call	Contractor	November 13, 2023
Draft TOR sent to DOL/ILAB and Grantee	Contractor	October 23, 2023
DOL/ILAB and Grantee provide comments on draft TOR	DOL/ILAB and Grantee	October 31, 2023
Fieldwork budget submitted to DOL/ILAB	Contractor	November 4, 2023
Fieldwork budget approved by DOL/ILAB	DOL/ILAB	November 5, 2023
Revise and finalize field itinerary, TOR, and stakeholder list based on comments	DOL/ILAB, Contractor, and Grantee	November 6, 2023
Cable clearance information submitted to DOL/ILAB, if required	Contractor	November 8, 2023
Final TOR submitted to DOL/ILAB for approval	Contractor	November 6, 2023
Question matrix submitted to DOL/ILAB for review	Contractor	October 23, 2023
Final approval of TOR by DOL/ILAB	DOL/ILAB	November 9, 2023
Submit finalized TOR to Grantee	Contractor	November 10, 2023
Interview call with DOL/ILAB	Contractor	Ongoing
Interview call with Grantee HQ staff	Contractor	Ongoing
Fieldwork / Data collection	Contractor	November 13, 2023 - December 8, 2023
Stakeholder Validation Workshop	Contractor	November 27 (Columbia) and December 8, 2023 (Brazil)
Post-fieldwork debrief call	Contractor	December 18, 2023
Initial draft report for review submitted to ILAB and Grantee	Contractor	January 15, 2024
1 st round of review comments due to Contractor	ILAB and Grantee	January 29, 2024
Revised report submitted to DOL/ILAB and Grantee	Contractor	February 9, 2024

Task	Responsible Party	Date
DOL/ILAB and Grantee/key stakeholder comments due to contractor after 2 nd round of review	DOL/ILAB and Grantee	TBD
Revised report in redline submitted to DOL/ILAB and Grantee demonstrating how all comments were addressed either via a comment matrix or other format	Contractor	TBD
DOL/ILAB and Grantee provide concurrence that comments were addressed	DOL/ILAB and Grantee	TBD
Final report submitted to DOL/ILAB and Grantee	Contractor	TBD
Final approval of the report by DOL/ILAB	DOL/ILAB	TBD
Draft infographic/brief document submitted to DOL/ILAB	Contractor	TBD
DOL/ILAB comments on draft infographic/brief	DOL/ILAB	TBD
Editing and Section 508 compliance by contractor	Contractor	TBD
Final infographic/brief submitted to DOL/ILAB (508 compliant)	Contractor	TBD
Final approval of infographic/brief by DOL/ILAB (508 compliant)	DOL/ILAB	TBD
Final edited report submitted to COR (508 compliant)	Contractor	TBD
Final edited approved report and infographic/brief shared with Grantee (508 compliant)	Contractor	TBD
Learning Event for ILAB staff, Grantees, and other stakeholders as requested (usually virtual)	Contractor	TBD

6. EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

Four weeks after the completion of data collection in the respective country, the Contractor will submit a first draft evaluation report. The report will 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 results/lessons learned/emerging good practices, and key recommendations)
4. Evaluation Objectives
5. Project Description
6. Listing of Evaluation Questions
7. Results
 - a. The results section includes the facts, analysis, and supporting evidence. The results section of the evaluation report should address the evaluation questions. It does not have to be in a question-response format but should be responsive to each evaluation question.
8. Conclusions and Recommendations
 - a. Conclusions – interpretation of the facts, including criteria for judgments
 - b. Lessons Learned and Emerging Good Practices ⁵³
 - c. Key Recommendations – critical for successfully meeting project objectives and/or judgments on what changes need to be made for sustainability or future programming
9. Annexes
 - a. List of documents reviewed
 - b. Interviews (including list of stakeholder groups; without PII in web version)/meetings/site visits
 - c. Stakeholder workshop agenda and participants
 - d. TOR, Evaluation Methodology and Limitations
 - e. Summary of Recommendations (citing page numbers for evidence in the body of the report, listing out the supporting evidence for each recommendation, and identifying the party that the recommendation is directed toward.)

The key recommendations must be **action-oriented and implementable**. The recommendations should be clearly linked to results and directed to a specific party to be implemented. It is preferable for the report to contain no more than 10 recommendations but other suggestions may be incorporated into the report in other ways.

The total length of the report should be approximately 30 pages for single project/country evaluations and 45 pages for multi-project/multi-country evaluations for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

⁵³ An emerging good practice is a process, practice, or system highlighted in the evaluation reports as having improved the performance and efficiency of the program in specific areas. They are activities or systems that are recommended to others for use in similar situations. A lesson learned documents the experience gained during a program. They may identify a process, practice, or systems to avoid in specific situations

The first draft of the report will be circulated to ILAB and the grantee individually for their review. The evaluator will demonstrate how they incorporate or address comments from ILAB and the grantee/other key stakeholders into the final reports as appropriate, and the evaluator will show what changes have been made and provide a response as to why any comments might not have been incorporated or addressed.

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

The electronic submissions of any deliverables intended for publication, including the evaluation report and infographics, or other communication products, will include two versions: one version, including personally identifiable information (PII) that is not Section-508 compliant, and a second version for publication that is Section-508 compliant and does not include PII such as names and/or titles of individuals interviewed.

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION DESIGN MATRIX

ISSUE OR PROBLEM STATEMENT

The purpose of this final performance evaluation is to:

- Assess if the project has achieved its objectives and outcomes, identifying the challenges encountered in doing so, and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges, giving particular attention to equity and inclusion in the pilot projects;
- Assess the intended and unintended effects of the project;
- Assess the lessons learned and emerging practices from the project (strategies and models of intervention) and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future projects in the countries covered by the pilot projects and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors; and
- Assess which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable.

It is important to evaluate the COFFEE project to assess the validity of its TOC, its assumptions, its strategy and its outputs that were designed to achieve the expected outcomes or results of the project. It will be useful to the main stakeholders of the project to know if the capacity building and training program, and the introduction of the social compliance toolkit were effective in reducing forced labor and child labor, and were effective in strengthening the ability of private sector and state agencies to more effectively recognize, monitor, and reduce forced labor and child labor in coffee supply chains in Mexico, Colombia and Brazil.

INTENDED USERS

The evaluation will provide ILAB, the grantee, the participants and other project stakeholders or actors who have a concern, interest and/or influence on the labor rights problem the project is intended to address, with an assessment of the project's performance, its effects on project participants, and an understanding of the factors driving the project results.

The results, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation will serve to inform any project adjustments that may need to be made, and to inform stakeholders about the design and implementation of future labor rights projects. The evaluation report will be published on the USDOL website and will be written as a stand-alone document, providing the necessary background information for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

Table: EQ 1. Relevance and Coherence

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ1.1	To what extent is the project's TOC valid (considering threats to internal and external validity), given the implementing environment?	Documents needed include political economy analyses, background studies on the coffee sector in Latin America. The pilot project descriptions for the three countries. Policy documents of the DOL, ILAB, and coffee producer associations, and Chambers of Commerce.	In addition to the desk review the evaluation team will conduct FGD and KII, and a small quantitative survey to private sector and government stakeholders to assess the TOC's validity	No limitations are envisaged for the activities needed to test out the TOC. Data from FGD and KII will be triangulated with documentary sources and survey data. Survey data's reliability will be enhanced by triangulation with the qualitative data from the focus groups and interviews	Whether and to what degree, the TOC and the assumptions on which it is based, are rooted in reality, and in a firm understanding of the political economy of the coffee sector in Latin America
EQ1.2	To what extent were the strategies based on a thorough and current understanding of the context of the coffee sector and coffee supply chains in the three pilot countries?	The grantee-commissioned studies that form the background for the strategies developed in the project will be required reading to test the TOC. Scientific and academic reports on coffee, supply chains and the coffee sector in Latin America	The data from the focus groups, key interviews and survey will complement and triangulate the background studies and desk review data	The evaluation team has built up a good rapport with the grantee. The grantee has a good relationship with the project stakeholders. So, no limitations are envisaged in collecting the data and in the quality of the data to be collected.	Whether and to what degree, the TOC and the assumptions on which it is based, are rooted in reality. A realistic appreciation of the challenges attendant on any attempt to address forced labor and child labor issues in the coffee sector

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ1.3	To what extent were the strategies to achieve project objectives relevant to the priorities of the target groups and local stakeholders?	Grantee-commissioned studies. Special studies of coffee's political economy, especially those including social analysis and ethnographic appreciation of the realities on the ground.	Where it is appropriate, case study summaries, content analysis, and descriptive analysis will be used to analyses TOC validity against political economy realities on the ground.	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Whether and how far the COFFEEE project has been appropriately designed to meet the needs of the target groups and local stakeholders
EQ1.4	To what extent has the project adapted to the changing circumstances and needs of the most vulnerable stakeholders?	Grantee-commissioned studies. Special studies of coffee's political economy: i.e.: Colombia Living Wage Study. Brazil: Labor and Recruitment Dynamics in Brazilian coffee sector Study	Review the DOL policies which the grantee has attempted to follow in the COFFEE project. Review the Technical Progress Reports (TPR) Review the Project Document and how and whether it addresses (and is designed to address) the needs of the most vulnerable directly or indirectly. Review the 6-month TPR reports which show variations and adjustments to strategy according to changing realities affecting implementation	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Whether and how far the COFFEEE project has met the needs and changing circumstances of the most vulnerable stakeholders

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ1.5	To what extent were the risk analyses and assumptions coherent and relevant to the political economy in the three pilot countries	Grantee-commissioned studies. Special studies of coffee's political economy.	Desk review analyses, triangulated with the findings from focus groups, interviews triangulated during the feedback sessions with Verite and other stakeholders at the presentation of evaluation findings in-country and virtually	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Whether and to what degree, the TOC and the assumptions on which it is based, are rooted in reality.

Table: EQ 2. Effectiveness

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ2.1	To what extent has the project achieved its primary objectives and outcomes?	Project M&E reports Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) report	Review the DOL website and background documents on the COFFEE project. Review the Project Document. Review the 6-month TPR	The available, reviewed studies provide rich information of great use to the evaluation team's assessment of effectiveness	To what degree outcomes have been achieved.
EQ2.2	To what extent has the capacity of the stakeholders been strengthened? What were the achievements of the capacity building activities?	MTE report Technical Progress Reports	Additional to the documentary review, the evaluation team will ask stakeholders in focus groups and interviews and the survey about perceptions of capacity-strengthening and impact.	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	How far and whether stakeholders' capacity to monitor and implement social compliance systems has improved, and insights into things that work for future sustainability

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ2.3	What were the outcomes of the pilot projects in the three countries?	Project M&E reports	The evaluation team will ask stakeholders in focus groups, interviews, and the survey about perceptions of outcomes.	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Degree to which the pilots contributed to the overall achievement of COFFEEE project outcomes
EQ2.4	Which interventions, and which components of the project, were most effective for achieving the desired outcomes?"-	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	The scope for this question is what activities, and what components, are perceived as the most advantageous and effective for achieving the expected results or outcomes of the project.	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Lessons learned for future similar interventions about what works best to reduce forced labor in similar sector supply chains.
EQ2.5	Has the toolkit strengthened stakeholders' social compliance systems?	MTE report TPR Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Interviews and focus groups will provide data on stakeholders' perceptions of the degrees of strengthening of the social compliance systems which are already operational or which will be set up in private sector stakeholders companies involved in the project	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses because there is an open dialogue already established between the grantee, private-sector stakeholders and the evaluation team	Whether and how far the strategy to introduce training and stakeholder capacity--strengthening is the right strategy to reduce forced labor in coffee supply chains.

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ2.6	What factors challenged the desired outcomes and impacts of the Project?	Project M&E reports MTE report Information about the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and other challenges that may have affected project implementation	Interviews with pilot project beneficiaries, with private sector stakeholders, and survey data will provide data on stakeholders' perceptions on challenges and risks	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	It will permit the drawing up of lessons learned, and provide input to recommendations for future similar interventions to be financed by USDOL/ILAB

Table: EQ3. Efficiency / Flexibility

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 3.1	Were the project's human and financial resources applied efficiently in implementing the project strategy? What factors, if any, affected efficiency?	Project budget (The original ProDoc one and revised budgets).	Interviews and focus groups with grantee and stakeholders about the relationship between resources (financial, personnel, and time) vis-à-vis the strategy and the level of ambition of the project	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses. Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about efficiency issues	If and to what degree this type of project with a budget of US\$ 2M originally and US\$2.5M finally has sufficient resources to achieve its stated objectives. Whether the four-year timeline was sufficient to achieve the desired level of ambition

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 3.2	What were the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on project implementation? How did the project adapt?	Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on carrying out training during lockdown and on efficiency of virtual, as opposed to in-person training and mentoring MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	The strategies for collecting information will be desk review analysis, focus groups, interviews and the survey	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses. Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about efficiency issues. Interviews carried out to date have provided information on the impact of COVID-19	Whether for the lessons learned, future similar projects could include a one-year project extension built in “in case” for similar pandemic shocks. And whether when it is the case that other overarching US Government agreements might be in existence that could include provisions that could threaten an extension if needed of this type of project (or of a component – in this case- the Mexico pilot country).
EQ 3.3	How have the M&E systems been implemented and to what degree were they used as MEL (monitoring evaluation learning systems) to identify trends and patterns, adapt strategies, and make informed decisions?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	The strategies for collecting information will be desk review analysis, focus groups, interviews and the survey- focusing on whether /how MEL was used to make informed decisions	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses. Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about how lessons are learned from special studies and MEL exercises to inform strategic decisions	Whether for the lessons learned, sufficient resources were apportioned to MEL and how far the management of the project was in tuned to making informed decisions based on evidence from monitoring and evaluation systems.
EQ 3.4	To what degree were the recommendations from the MTE followed up?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	Whether the MTE was carried out early enough in the project to make changes if needed in the strategy, or whether the MTE took place too late in the implementation period permit sufficient time to make changes.

Table. EQ4: Impacts

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ4.1	What are the observed outcomes and impacts of the project? Are they in accordance with the original targets established by the project?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	An analysis of what outputs achieved the most useful outcomes and impacts defined as results reducing forced labor and child labor in coffee supply chains
EQ 4.2	What were the impacts of the pilot projects?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses	An analysis of what outputs achieved the most useful outcomes and impacts defined as results. Whether pilot projects strengthened the capacity and ability of private sector stakeholders in the coffee sector to improve their social compliance monitoring and enforcement systems with the ultimate goal of reducing forced labor and child labor in coffee supply chains.

Table EQ 5: Sustainability

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 5.1	Which activities or initiatives are most likely to be sustained?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Field visits and FGDs and KIs in pilot countries Survey data	No limitations are envisaged for these analyses.	For future planning purposes, it is very useful to know what activities or initiatives are more likely to be sustained as opposed to others which are more difficult to sustain.
EQ 5.2	What factors have contributed to or limited this sustainability?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Survey data	Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about how lessons are learned from special studies and MEL exercises to inform strategic decisions	To be able to determine the factors determining sustainability allows improved design of similar future programs.
EQ 5.3	Could the project have made more effort to achieve sustainability?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	It may not be possible to answer these questions with only a four-year timeline for the project, but all efforts will be expended to do so	An enhanced appreciation of sustainability successes or challenges, permits assessment of the degree of coherence and relevance (or otherwise) of the overall strategy, and the degree of realism of the objectives vis a vis the absorption capacity, managerial buy-in for new ideas, and technical capacity of private companies and institutions which, post training, are expected to sustain any improvements in their degree of social compliance in coffee supply chains

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 5.4	To what extent were the challenges to sustained implementation of the S3T Toolkit, identified by participants of the Second Advisory Council Dialogue during the 2021 MTE, addressed by the project?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about how lessons are learned from special studies and MEL exercises to inform strategic decisions	Answering this type of question allows the evaluator to draw lessons learned about how flexible the project was, and how able it was (or not), at being able to change strategy if needed to redress an identified problem.

Table EQ 6: Equity and Inclusion

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 6.1	How did the project engage marginalized and underserved populations? Did the design and implementation of the project reflect their needs and priorities? What factors affected these results? Did the Covid-19 pandemic make it more difficult to engage with these populations?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	The limitations of this question as concern this evaluation are determined by the project objectives, which aim to engage private-sector stakeholders, rather than the most marginalized and underserved populations	Even though marginalized and vulnerable populations are target populations, they are arguably only so in an indirect way, and all that that's less present in this evaluation

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 6.2	To what extent did marginalized or underserved populations experience equitable access to and outcomes resulting from the services or interventions supported by the project? What steps are ILAB and the Grantee taking to ensure the technical assistance benefits these populations?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	Good information exists in the TPR and other monitoring reports about marginalized or underserved populations, in the special studies in Colombia and Brazil that were commissioned by the grantee	By assessing these aspects of equity and inclusion will allow the evaluator to draw lessons learned about whether the strategies employed in the COFFEE project could have been broadened to include the so-called lower levels of the most vulnerable and excluded populations. Nevertheless, as stated above the objectives of this project are to indirectly improve the conditions of the most vulnerable -that is people facing forced labor and child labor, by improving social compliance monitoring and enforcement at the level of the coffee buyers and coffee roasters, and also at the level of the policy makers.

Table EQ 7: Lessons Learned

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 7.1	What are the main lessons learned and the replicable practices derived from the COFFEE project?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	Good information is likely to be produced during the working sessions with the grantee and the interviews and focus groups with other stakeholders	By assessing these aspects of replicable practices will allow the evaluator to draw up well-grounded recommendations for future similar interventions in coffee or other agricultural sectors in Latin America.
EQ 7.2	Are there any specific lessons that apply to a particular priority area, such as child labor, forced labor, or human trafficking? If so, which ones?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	Good information is likely to be produced during the working sessions with the grantee and the interviews and focus groups with other stakeholders	Specific information about child labor could allow recommendations to be made for new programs that specifically target child labor, if needed.

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 7.3	Are there any lessons learned from piloting labor rights interventions in regions with significant indigenous populations, and in which producers have communal land holding patterns such as Chiapas? If so, which ones? How can these lessons feed into future program design?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	The limitations to answering EQ 7.3 are that the pilot project in Mexico had to be curtailed due to overarching policy considerations of the US government, and therefore the main stakeholders engaged were higher level government and private sector stakeholders, and not the level of farmers and indigenous populations in Chiapas, and other important coffee growing areas of Mexico like Oaxaca with significant populations	If special studies were commissioned in future to answer this question, they could help improve design for future similar programs in areas of indigenous people and coffee production

EQ	Evaluation Questions (EQ)	Information Required and Sources	Scope and Methodology	Limitations	What will this analysis likely allow us to say?
EQ 7.4	Are there any lessons learned concerning the social feasibility of piloting improved social compliance projects in areas that have experienced social unrest focused on access to land and other natural resources, such as Chiapas, and Minas Gerais?	MTE report. TPR. Interviews, focus groups, and the survey	Desk review analysis, and interviews with Verite staff. Survey data	As with the above EQ 7.3, the limitation in the case of Mexico is that the Mexico pilot project (with its significant indigenous population in Chiapas, the major coffee, producing area of Mexico), had to be curtailed. If indigenous populations are significant in the coffee sector, as for example, laborers in Minas Gerais, Brazil, and in Antioquia in Colombia, (which at this stage, we do not think is the case), then lessons could be learned about this particular area of enquiry.	Answering this question would help hone the future design of similar interventions in areas of social unrest which is focused on conflicts surrounding access to land and other natural resources.

ANNEX 2: INFORMED CONSENT AGREEMENT – KII/FGD

Evaluators must review this form in detail with all informants before the interview and be sure that they understand it clearly before obtaining their signature. If the informant is illiterate or expresses discomfort signing the form but verbally consents to proceeding with the interview, the evaluator may sign the form to indicate that they received verbal consent.

PURPOSE:

Thank you for taking the time to meet with us today. My name is [NAME]. I am a researcher from an organization called [insert contractor name], a company that provides monitoring and evaluation services. I am here to conduct a study about the USDOL financed project [insert project title] implemented by the [insert Grantee name].

You have been asked to participate today so that we can learn more about the support you (or your organization) may have received from [insert the Grantee or Partner name]. We would like your honest impressions, opinions and thoughts about various issues related to (the implementation of activities of) this program. I am independent consultant and have no affiliation with those who provided you with assistance. In addition, I do not represent the government, employers, employers' organizations, or workers' organizations.

PROCEDURES:

If you agree to participate, we ask you to discuss your experience and opinion of the activities and services implemented under this program. The interview will take about (xx minutes, hour) of your time. Although we will publish our results in a public report, all of your answers will be kept confidential. Nothing you tell us will be attributed to any individual person. Rather the report will include only a composite of all of the answers received by all of the individuals we interview. Although we may use quotes, none of the individuals interviewed will be named in the report.

RISKS/BENEFITS:

There is no risk or personal gain involved in your participation in this interview. You will not receive any direct benefit or compensation for participating in this evaluation. Although this study will not benefit you personally, we hope that our results will help improve support provided to [insert project purpose].

Voluntary Participation:

Participation in this interview/FGD is completely voluntary. You do not have to agree to be in this study. You are free to end the interview/leave the FGD at any time or to decline to answer any question which you do not wish to answer. If you decline to participate in the interview, no one will be informed about this.

Do you have any questions at this time? [Interviewer should answer any questions]

Do I have your permission to proceed?

ANNEX 3: RIGHT TO USE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Right to Use

I, _____, grant to the United States Department of Labor (including any of its officers, employees, and contractors), the right to use and publish photographic likenesses or pictures of me (or my child), as well as any attached document and any information contained within the document. I (or my child) may be included in the photographic likenesses or pictures in whole or in part, in conjunction with my own name (or my child's name), or reproductions thereof, made through any medium, including Internet, for the purpose of use, dissemination of, and related to USDOL publications.

I waive any right that I may have to inspect or approve the finished product or the advertising or other copy, or the above-referenced use of the portraits or photographic likenesses of pictures of me (or my child) and attached document and any information contained within the document.

Dated _____, 20__

Signature or

Parent/guardian if under 18

Name Printed

Address and phone number

Identifier (color of shirt, etc.): _____




ANNEX 4: PERFORMANCE SUMMARY AND RAPID SCORECARD TEMPLATES

Table 1: Performance summary template

Performance Summary	Rating
LTO 1 (insert Long-Term Outcome (LTO) wording)	
Summary of overall assessment given	<div style="text-align: center; margin-bottom: 5px;"> Low Moderate Above- Moderate High </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 15%;">Achievement</div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center; margin-top: 5px;"> <div style="width: 15%;">Sustainability</div> </div>
LTO 2 (insert LTO wording)	
Summary of overall assessment given	<div style="text-align: center; margin-bottom: 5px;"> Low Moderate Above- Moderate High </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 15%;">Achievement</div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center; margin-top: 5px;"> <div style="width: 15%;">Sustainability</div> </div>
LTO 3 (insert LTO wording)	
Summary of overall assessment given	<div style="text-align: center; margin-bottom: 5px;"> Low Moderate Above- Moderate High </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="width: 15%;">Achievement</div> </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center; margin-top: 5px;"> <div style="width: 15%;">Sustainability</div> </div>




Table 2: Rapid scorecard templates

From your perspective ⁵⁴, rate how effectively (e.g., moving project toward its intended results) the project has been regarding each of its specific outcomes:

Project Outcome: (circle 1-5 for each element)	Comments
<p>Outcome 1:</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p>  <p>Low Moderate Above-moderate High</p>	
<p>Outcome 2:</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p>  <p>Low Moderate Above-moderate High</p>	
<p>Outcome 3:</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p>  <p>Low Moderate Above-moderate High</p>	

⁵⁴ Based on the triangulation of information from the project database and other sources and the data collected through interviews and FGD during the evaluation process.

What outcomes, components or/and practices implemented by the project do you consider as being those more critical for the project to become sustainable in the long term? Currently, what is the likelihood that those outcomes/ components/ practices remain sustainable?

Outcome/ Component/ Practice	Likelihood that it becomes sustainable
1.	1. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100%;"> 1 2 3 4 </div>  <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> Low Moderate Above-moderate High </div>
2.	2. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100%;"> 1 2 3 4 </div>  <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> Low Moderate Above-moderate High </div>
3.	3. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100%;"> 1 2 3 4 </div>  <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> Low Moderate Above-moderate High </div>

ANNEX 5: DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED TO DATE ON THE COFFEE PROJECT AND THE COFFEE SECTOR

Table 1: Documentation Reviewed to Date

Document Type	Document Title	Year/mon. of publication	Author	Main evaluation issues to be investigated / Follow up
Project Documentation	Verité-COFFEE Project Document. Final draft	April 17, 2019	Verité	Complete familiarization with the project document permits a realistic understanding of the Project strategy, the expected outcomes, and expected impacts, regarding the balance between financial and staff resources on the one hand, and actual project activities on the ground on the other. The field work and interviews with Verité and beneficiary stakeholders will permit analysis of the degree of coherence of the TOC, project strategy and activities described in the project document
Project Documentation	The COFFEE Project https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/cooperation-fair-free-equitable-employment-coffee-project	Accessed 3 Oct. 2023	DOL	Familiarization with the COFFEE Project website permits easy access to the essential objectives of the Project and provides the reader access to the USDOL / ILAB online resources pertaining to labor rights
Project Documentation	Grant Award Document for the Verité Submission for FOA-ILAB-17-07: Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala	11/30/2017	DOL	This document awards 2,000,000 USD for a Guatemala project. This appears to have been halted due to violence and attacks on Verite staff, and the budget transferred to COFFEE Project (tbd); pages 1-48 are the Project Document for the Guatemala Project, followed by all the annexes and budgets.
Project Documentation	Modification request to change the COFFEE Project	05/15/2019	Verité	Modification request for FY17 Verite project, #IL-31476-17-75-K, to address child & forced labor in coffee. Revisions include budget, geographical areas, end date, key personnel.

Document Type	Document Title	Year/mon. of publication	Author	Main evaluation issues to be investigated / Follow up
Project Documentation	<p>Annex I: Project Revision Form</p> <p>Project Title: Cooperation On Fair, Free, Equitable Employment (COFFEE) Project</p> <p>Recipient: Verité</p> <p>Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-31476-17-75-K-</p>	Accessed 3 Oct. 2023	DOL	<p>This document is the Annex showing the changes needed to transform the cancelled Guatemala Project (“Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala”) into the COFFEE Project. I.e., to expand the focus from child labor in the coffee supply in Guatemala to a Latin America program in three countries to focus on free fair, equitable employment in the coffee sector.</p> <p>Specific changes are listed below:</p> <p>Adjustment of the geographical focus of the project from Guatemala to Latin America.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of a globally relevant compliance system and toolkit rather than a compliance system and toolkit focused on the Guatemalan coffee sector. • Addition of pilot projects in three important Latin American coffee producing countries (Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico) and the elimination of a national-level Grievance Reporting and Information Dissemination (GRID) system. • Transitioning the previous Project Director to the Social Compliance Specialist role, where he will focus on building relationships with private sector partners, amplifying project impact by seeking external funding to expand and extend the pilot projects, and ensuring that the project benefits from learnings and contacts obtained through Verité work in other agricultural commodities. • Recruiting and hiring a new Project Director that meets the requirements set out in the FOA. • Revision of the budget to reflect spend-down, changes in partners, new activities, and a change in the regional focus of the project. • Adjustment of project duration from 12/01/2017-12/31/2020 to 12/01/2017 03/31/2022.
Project Documentation	<p>COFFEE Project</p> <p>COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING & EVALUATION PLAN (CMEP)</p>	Accessed 3 Oct. 2023	Verité	<p>Describes the full Results Framework. Describes the Performance Monitoring Plan and Indicators. Includes an “Annex 1: Project-level Forced Labor Definitions. Forced Labor & Child Labor Definitions for the Brazilian, Colombian, and Mexican Contexts”</p>

Document Type	Document Title	Year/mon. of publication	Author	Main evaluation issues to be investigated / Follow up
Project Documentation	Annex 2 Work Plan for the COFFEE Project	Accessed 3 Oct. 2023	Verité Excell Docume nt.	Shows the project start in 2019 with finalization by end-2022
Project Documentation	Selected Screenshots from the Verité Risk Map Web Interface	Accessed 3 Oct. 2023	Verité	Document was produced for the Guatemala Project. Includes mock-ups on Prevalence of Types of Risk Based on Data from Workers Throughout Guatemala's Coffee Sector
Project Documentation	COFFEE Tool	Accessed 3 Oct. 2023	Verité	Describes the tool design process during July 2019-Sept. 2021
Semi-annual project report	Technical Progress Report (TPR): Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala	04/30/2018	Verité	Describes project staffing for the original Guatemala project.
Semi-annual project report	TPR: Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala	11/30/2018	Verité	This report monitors the Project on Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala and has useful data for the COFFEE Project
Semi-annual project report	TPR: Addressing Child and Forced Labor in Coffee Supply Chains in Guatemala	04/30/2019	Verité	Describes security issues against Verite project staff in Guatemala
Semi-annual project report	TPR: COFFEE Project	10/30/2019	Verité	This is an early report. Details are provided of the upcoming activities, including stakeholder mappings, situational analyses in the 3 pilot countries for the next 6-month period).
Semi-annual project report	Technical Progress Report: COFFEE Project	30 Oct 2020	Verité	The report describes the process for doing the Mid Term Evaluation. This report focuses on guidance for stakeholder engagement; and updates progress in the 3 countries

Document Type	Document Title	Year/mon. of publication	Author	Main evaluation issues to be investigated / Follow up
Semi-annual project report	Technical Progress Report: COFFEE Project	Oct. 29, 2021	Verité	Describes how the COVID-19 pandemic caused significant economic impacts on Verite's private sector partners, necessitating modification of the sustainability plan The report's 17 Appendices are not provided on Google Drive
Semi-annual project report	Technical Progress Report: COFFEE Project	April 30, 2021	Verité	Technical Progress Reports provide data, indicators, and qualitative information about each 6-month implementation period, vital for in depth analysis of the Project and understanding Project progress
Evaluation report	Mid-term Evaluation Report on the Socially Sustainable Sourcing Toolkit Review and Validation Process. 19 April 2021	19 April 2021	Verité	The useful report provides further analysis of the TOC of COFFEE. These data provided by this method of self-assessment need to be triangulated with other sources, given the low response rate. The workers' perspectives are not presented verbatim in this report.
Data Reporting Form	Copy of Annex A – Data Reporting Form. Oct 2020, Final.	Oct 2020	Verité	Excell spread sheet showing progress for performance indicators
Data Reporting Form	Copy of Annex A - Data Reporting Form Oct 2021.		Verité	Excell spread sheet showing progress for performance indicators
Data Reporting Form	Copy of Annex A - Data Reporting Form April 2021 with CMEP rev.xls	April 2021	Verité	Excell spread sheet showing progress for performance indicators
Data Reporting Form	Copy of Annex A - Data Reporting Form October 2022 (Comments).xlsx	October 2022	Verité	Excell spread sheet showing progress for performance indicators
Data Reporting Form	Copy of Annex A - Data Reporting Form (April 2022) Final.xlsx	April 2022	Verité	Excell spread sheet showing progress for performance indicators

Document Type	Document Title	Year/mon. of publication	Author	Main evaluation issues to be investigated / Follow up
Data Reporting Form	Copy of Annex A - Data Reporting April 2023 (Comments).xlsx	Apr. 2023:	Verité	Excell spread sheet showing progress for performance indicators
M&E Report	Lessons Learned from COFFEE Pilot Projects in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico. Draft Report for USDOL.	No date is shown in the report	Verité	The lessons learned from COFFEE Pilot Projects are useful for the evaluation team to triangulate its findings after the desk phase and field work phases are completed
Budget and Audit Documents for COFFEE	NICRA-Negotiated Negotiated indirect cost rate agreement	Jan 28, 2019	US DOL	Establishes what can be spent on what project budget item
Budget and Audit Documents for COFFEE	Copy of Verite DOL Coffee Rev Budget 2.19.19.xlsx	02/19/2019	Verité	COFFEE Project Budget
Budget and Audit Documents for COFFEE	Verité Revision Submission for FOA-ILAB-17-07. COFFEE Project. Verité Revised Budget Narrative COFFEE Project.	February 19, 2019	Verité	Provides financial data permitting analysis of expenditures on salaries, travel, overheads versus project expenditures
Budget and Audit Documents for COFFEE	VERITÉ, INC. Independent Auditors' Report (IAR). Financial Statements and Supplementary Information (FS&SI). Dec. 31, 2017 and 2016	Dec. 31, 2017, and 2016	Whittles sey Forward Advising	Auditors' Report, budget information, and financial statements permit validation of evaluation findings pertaining to the financing and budgeting or individual components

Document Type	Document Title	Year/mon. of publication	Author	Main evaluation issues to be investigated / Follow up
Budget and Audit Documents for COFFEE	VERITÉ, INC. IAR. FS&SI. Dec. 31, 2018 and 2017	September 5, 2018	Whittles sey Forward Advising	Financial statements permit validation of evaluation findings pertaining to the financing and budgeting or individual components
Budget and Audit Documents for COFFEE	VERITÉ, INC. FS&SI. Dec. 31, 2019 and 2018	October 21, 2020	Whittles sey Forward Advising	Financial statements permit validation of evaluation findings pertaining to the financing and budgeting or individual components
Special Studies	Living Income and Living Wage Report. Rural Areas and Small Towns of Coffee-Growing Regions in Central Colombia.	Dec. 2021	L. Andersen and N. Andersen	Keywords: Living costs, living wages, living income, coffee, Colombia, Anker methodology.
Special Studies	Labor migration and recruitment dynamics in the coffee sector of Minas Gerais, Brazil	May 31, 2021	Verité	The study shows that shortages of qualified local workers created demand for temporary workers during labor intensive periods, especially during the harvest season. This creates a need for a significant contingent of labor brokers to recruit workers from distant communities. These labor brokers are often unregistered, operate informally, and engage in unscrupulous practices that greatly increase the risk of forced labor, such as deception, document retention, and charging of recruitment fees. This study reinforces the relevance of the Theory of Change of the COFFEE Project
Special Studies	“Context and Contingency: The Coffee Crisis for Conventional Small-Scale Coffee Farmers in Brazil.” Geographical Journal 174 (3):223-234.	Sept. 2008.	Watson, K. and Achinelli, M.	Analysis of causes of the increased marginalisation of small-scale farmers, the degradation of soils, and overall rural decline in areas of Brazil

Document Type	Document Title	Year/mon. of publication	Author	Main evaluation issues to be investigated / Follow up
Special Studies	“A case study of small-scale coffee production: coffee farming as a potential tool for environmental conservation and community development in rural Minas Gerais, Brazil”. Interdisc. Environ. Rev., 14 (1).	2013.	Charlotte Dohrn	The paper considers the transition to a sustainable coffee production system as a potential tool for environmental conservation and community development.
Special Studies	“Cooperation, Fair Trade, and the Development of Organic Coffee Growing in Chiapas (1980–2015).” Sustainability 2019, 11, 357.	11 January 2019	Albert Folch and Jordi Planas	Chiapas is the state that produces the greatest amount of coffee, with both the highest number of producers and the largest cultivated area. A significant part of this production is organic coffee. This article analyzes the expansion of organic coffee growing in Chiapas and its connection with the process of the collective organization of small coffee producers in cooperatives.
Special Studies	Data on coffee production in Mexico compiled by Asociación Mexicana de la Cadena Productiva del Café, A.C. (AMECAFE)	Website accessed on Oct. 16, 2023	AMECAFE	There are 178,928 producers in Chiapas, or 35.4% of producers in Mexico, cultivating 253,986 hectares (36.4% of all land under coffee in Mexico)
Special Studies	“Directorio de Asociaciones Productivas Amigables con la Biodiversidad”	Website accessed on Oct. 16, 2023	Amigos de la Biodiversidad	This link on the AMECAFE website provides a list with clickable links to major coffee cooperatives in all the major coffee producing states of Mexico (Chiapas, Oaxaca, Veracruz, Puebla, Guerrero in descending order of production importance)

Document Type	Document Title	Year/mon. of publication	Author	Main evaluation issues to be investigated / Follow up
Special Studies	Poverty Alleviation Through Participation in Fair Trade Coffee Networks: The Case of the Tzotzilotic Tzobolotic Coffee Coop Chiapas, Mexico	Sept., 2002	Maria Elena Martinez Desarrollo Alternativo, A.C.	Research funded by the Ford Foundation. The Sociedad Cooperativa Tzotzilotic Tzobolotic (Tzotziles unidos para producir) is a coffee cooperative that provides a variety of services to 800 members. These services include harvest collection, a coffee mill, credit services, technical training, and negotiating contracts (to sell coffee on the national and international markets) with better prices than those offered by local middlemen. It was officially registered in 1992 by families from fifteen communities of the municipality of El Bosque in the Highlands of Chiapas, Mexico.
Special Studies	“Organic and Fair-Trade Coffee from Chiapas”	Website accessed on Oct. 16, 2023	Walmart.com website	“These big, tasty Mexican beans come from the Mut Vitz ('Hill of Birds') Coffee Cooperative in the Northern Highlands of Chiapas.The Tzotzil farmers of Mut Vitz are under intense pressure from the government and the international corporate world to give up their identities and their lands. The pressures are as indirect as the international market price and the destruction of traditional landholding laws in Mexico, and as direct as armed incursions into the villages and the theft of their coffee harvest by paramilitaries.”

ANNEX 6: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REQUIRED FOR REVIEW

- Verité. PSA Pre-Situational Analysis Report submitted in Dec 2019
- A list of the companies and government agencies with their contact emails and telephone numbers that took part in the online training for Mexico
- Verité document. Initiatives Mapping for Mexico. 2019 (?)
- Verité document. White Papers (the Draft Pilot Projects) in Portuguese, Spanish for the 3 countries.
- Final Stakeholder Mapping Reports for Mexico, Brazil, Colombia.
- Verité / Nestlé Report. Co-funded Research on labor risks in Mexico's five largest coffee producing states. Date ?
- The Performance Work Statement (PWS)
- Appendix 1. COFFEE Pre-Situational Analysis (PSA) for Mexico, Colombia and Brazil
- Appendix 2. Brazil Kick-off Meeting Agenda
- Appendix 3. Colombia Kick-off Meeting Agenda
- Appendix 4. Mexico Kick-off Meeting Agenda
- Appendix 5. S3T – Tool 4. Sample code of conduct provisions
- Appendix 6. S3T – Tool 5. Sample social responsibility agreements
- Appendix 7. S3T – Tool 6. Guidelines on identifying risks related to recruitment and hiring
- Appendix 8. S3T – Tool 10. Framework on preventing and remediating labor violations
- Appendix 9. Pilot Project – Brazil
- Appendix 10. Pilot Project – Mexico
- Appendix 11. Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) COFFEE. Concept Note.
- Appendix 12. Mexico Research Findings virtual meetings report

ANNEX 7: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

TYPE OF SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The survey questionnaire will be self-administered and will be sent to all the stakeholders whose contact details have been provided by the grantee.

LIMITATIONS

Limitations may include cases of technicians and other stakeholders who were included in the Mexico pilot project – and possibly other similar stakeholders in Colombia and Brazil- not being able to respond to the survey, possibly due to internet connectivity problems, or other reasons. Benefits of self-administered surveys include the possibility to check a record, or look up some information, if a respondent is initially unsure how to answer a question. If programmed, the questionnaire can allow respondents to answer it partially, stop and then return to it later.⁵⁵

CONSENT FORM

Each survey respondent will be asked to read and sign a consent form that will precede the survey questionnaire. The consent form will explain that the personally identifiable information (PII) will not be included. For this report, PII is considered village names, individuals' names and titles. PII is often found in an annex of the report listing who had been interviewed as part of the evaluation. This is useful/important information for USDOL to have, which is why WI HER will produce two versions of the final report: one with PII, another version without. USDOL publishes and disseminates the version without PII.

CONSENT FORM

I hereby consent to WI-HER and United States Department of Labor using any data that are captured in this survey questionnaire.

I understand that no personally identifiable information will be included in any published report on the data from this survey questionnaire.

[Please write your name here:

Signed:

Date:

55 M. Callegaro et al., Web Survey Methodology. Sage, 2015, 23-24.

INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

This introduction will be included at the beginning of the questionnaire.

EVALUATION OF THE US DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FINANCED COFFEE PROJECT IMPLEMENTED BY VERITÉ

Please take some time (approximately 20-30 minutes to complete this questionnaire. Your responses will provide important information that will help independently evaluate the performance of the COFFEE Project. Your data will provide important information useful for future planning for interventions to tackle the problem of infringements of labor rights in the coffee sector.

The survey questionnaire data are confidential

All of your responses to this questionnaire will be confidential.

What this survey is for

This survey provides you the opportunity to tell the evaluation team your opinion about the performance of the COFFEE project and your opinions about the technical assistance such as training or information that were provided by Verité.

You are not obliged to complete this survey.

Thank you for your cooperation.

SURVEY SAMPLE

For the purpose of accurately defining the stakeholders to be surveyed, the sample is divided into three levels: first (high), second (middle level), and third (lower) level stakeholders. This is because, to take one example, in Mexico the first level (e.g., Nestle Mexico) and second level (e.g., agronomists at the Polytechnic of Tapachula) stakeholders were engaged in virtual training, but the third level stakeholders (producers, municipal level and field level technicians) could not receive the planned training courses, due to the connectivity and logistical challenges they faced

The first level also includes international level stakeholders.

International level stakeholders consist of actors that were consulted and that assisted Verité in the formulation, project design and implementation phases; they are:

- Catholic Relief Services
- Global Coffee Platform
- Starbucks (USA)
- Allegro Coffee (USA)
- Counter Culture Coffee (USA)
- Intelligentsia (USA)
- National Coffee Association of USA
- Specialty Coffee Association
- International Coffee Organization

- Rainforest Alliance (USA)
- Sustainable Coffee Challenge
- The Sustainable Coffee Challenge – Labor Collective Action Network
- Centre for Regional Coffee and Business Studies

International level stakeholders: Indicative subtotal of respondents: 15.

The sample will consist of a representative sample of direct and some indirect stakeholders that have received training by Verité staff in the objectives and use of the Socially Sustainable Sourcing Toolkit (S3T). The direct stakeholders that were trained by Verité were responsible for furthering the application and monitoring of the S3T social compliance toolkit among the agronomists and field technicians who have the face-to-face contact with producers and workers in the coffee sector.

Mexico In Mexico, the first level stakeholders are Government agencies and civil society association in the Anti-Trafficking Coalition (80 members in total), Private sector coffee exporters, buyers, roasters, and social compliance organizations:

- Government of Mexico (Central Government level)-Ministerio Publico and Attorney General's Office
- Nestle (Nespresso and Nescafé)
- Rainforest Alliance
- Nestle's providers
- ECOM Agroindustrial Corp. Limited
- Grupo Merino
- Olam Food Ingredients
- The Mexican Association of the Productive Coffee Chain

Second level stakeholders are:

- Tapachula Polytechnic- no one invited yet, no stakeholders at Tapachula Polytechnic identified yet

Mexico- Indicative subtotal of respondents: 20

Colombia

- COOCAFISA (Cooperative)-managers and agronomists
- RGC-Manos de café – Manager, field staff, and technicians
- Asociación Colombiana Para la Excelencia del Café
- National Federation of Coffee Growers of Colombia (Federación Nacional de Productores de Café de Colombia)
- Centre for Regional Coffee and Business Studies / (CRECE)

Colombia: Indicative subtotal of respondents: 15

Brazil In Brazil, the first and second level stakeholders include international NGOs, national NGOs, coffee exporters (private sector), private sector and international brand representatives, Employers' Associations (Cooperatives):

- Global Fund to End Modern Slavery (GFEMS): Institutional partner of the project. Verité developed some activities with GFEMS, and participated in advocacy spaces simultaneously. GFEMS were invited by Verité to interview on Dec 14 2023, together with InPacto. InPacto attended, but GFEMS did not attend the interview.
- National Pact Institute for the Eradication of Slave Labor (InPacto): Organization that leads GT Café, in which the COFFEE Project participates, and aims to develop a Sector Pact for coffee and mobilize actors in the chain for social sustainability.
- Guaxupé Exporter (training was delivered to the exporter's sustainability team, booklets were distributed to producers, as part of a project between the company and JDE)
- JDE Peet's (The sustainability manager at JDE is a project partner participating, together with his team, in training with the project in Mexico (Latin America) and initiatives in Brazil with its suppliers)
- Mercon
- Conselho dos Exportadores de Café do Brasil
- Centre for Regional Coffee and Business Studies
- The Latin American and Caribbean Network of Fair-Trade Small Producers and Workers (CLAC)
- Santana da Vargem Small Farmers Cooperative (COOPASV)
- Giovani Miari's Farm Ltd.(Fazendas Giovani Miari Administracao E Participacoes Ltda., Sociedade Empresária Limitada) located at Três Pontas – Minas Gerais)
- Veneza's Farm (*Fazenda Veneza*)

Brazil- Indicative subtotal of respondents: 20

Table 1: Number of survey questionnaires to be distributed by stakeholder category and by country.

Stakeholder level	Mexico	Colombia	Brazil	Total survey questionnaires sample
High level	14	3	7	24
Middle level	1	12	7	20
Lower level	0	0	6	6
Totals	15	15	20	65*

* 15 international stakeholders included

THE PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY

The purpose of the survey is to collect quantitative data to help triangulate the qualitative data collected from key informant interviews and focus group discussions in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico. The survey is intended to provide a database that can quickly verify evaluation findings that are collected during the key informant interviews and the focus group discussions.

The evaluation questions must provide data to help answer the major questions of the evaluation, which follow the DOL/ILAB evaluation criteria and, additionally, a question on equity and inclusion which is a cross cutting issue that is also reflected in some of the evaluation questions.

The overall objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Assess if the project has achieved its objectives and outcomes, identifying the challenges encountered in doing so, and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges, giving particular attention to equity and inclusion in the pilot projects;
- Assess the intended and unintended effects of the project;
- Assess the lessons learned and emerging practices from the project (strategies and models of intervention) and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future projects in the countries covered by the pilot projects and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors; and
- Assess which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable.

The overall objective of the survey is:

- To provide a statistically robust and representative survey of the opinions about the impact, successes, and challenges of the COFFEE Project among the main high-level and medium-level stakeholders who have been involved in the COFFEE Project.

The main outputs of the survey will be:

- Precise answers to the principal evaluation questions that can help future planners.
- Opinions about the impact of the COFFEE Project on the respondent's institution's own practices related to social compliance in the coffee sector.
- Opinions about the successes and identified best practices of the COFFEE Project.
- Opinions about the challenges and any perceived shortcomings of the COFFEE project.
- To find out whether interviewed coffee companies' and other industry partners' staff have increased their knowledge and adoption of preventive measures addressing forced labor and child labor in the coffee supply chain.
- To highlight the respondents' opinions about the major challenges in their company / institution to stop forced labor and child labor in the coffee supply chain.
- To provide specific details about possible training received from the COFFEE project.
- To provide lessons learned and recommendations for future similar projects or possible new phases of the COFFEE project aiming to tackle forced labor and child labor in the coffee supply chains.

THE SCOPE OF THE SURVEY AND THE NEED FOR INFORMANT ANONYMITY

The survey's scope is delimited by the TOR and the agreed evaluation questions (which are based on the DOL/ILAB criteria). Survey best practice suggests web-based or emailed survey questionnaires should be limited to 20 questions at most. Experience of surveys shows that busy people faced with a survey questionnaire of more than 10 -20 questions, and that takes more than 10 minutes to complete, can result in survey fatigue and rushed answers. The ideal survey length suggested by a key study is a median of 10 minutes and a maximum survey length of 20 minutes.⁵⁶ Importantly, respondents are known to be willing to answer survey questions when they trust that their data will be treated anonymously.⁵⁷

THE PEOPLE AND INSTITUTIONS TO BE INCLUDED BY THIS SURVEY.

The institutions to be included in this survey are those that have been directly engaged as partners and stakeholders by Verité during the implementation of the project in Mexico, Colombia, and Brazil. The full list of the institutions and their representatives to be surveyed, is still being compiled and will be annexed to this document as soon as it is ready.

THE LEVEL OF THE INSTITUTIONS TO BE ENGAGED IN THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE.

Interviews that the evaluation team have completed in Mexico, and with Verité staff, confirm that internet connectivity and reliability of internet services were a major obstacle to the desired level of participation of target groups during implementation of the online training modules during the Covid pandemic. Furthermore, in the three countries, technicians such as rurally-based agronomists and other field level technicians, and coffee producers, coffee harvesters, and other COFFEE stakeholders in rural areas will quite likely *still* face difficulties in accessing electronic media.

We have included in the survey those stakeholders whose contact details we have been provided with by the grantee. However not all stakeholders invited to fill in the questionnaire will wish to respond, or be able to answer a survey by e-mail or online directly.

The potential for survey questionnaire non-responses to negatively affect the quality of the evaluation data to be produced by the survey questionnaire is mitigated by the additional qualitative data the evaluation team has collected in the three project countries. Except for Mexico which has not been visited for field work interviews at the level of the farms and field technicians, the evaluation team has conducted in Colombia and Brazil key informant interviews and focus groups at the level of the coffee farms and the coffee producers and included for interview people working in the coffee sector in the rural areas. Furthermore, the evaluation team was able to conduct several important high and medium level online interviews with Mexican stakeholders which have provided significant evaluation data.

Overall, this strategy will permit the evaluation team to provide data to triangulate the evaluation findings that will be provided from this survey which will not be able to include the lower levels

⁵⁶ Revilla, M., & Ochoa, C., "Ideal and maximum length for a web survey." **International Journal of Market Research** 59 (5), 557-565, 2017.

⁵⁷ Revilla, M., & Ochoa, C., op. cit..

(level of field technicians and coffee workers) of the coffee supply chains but only the high to medium ones.

THE EVALUATION SURVEY QUESTIONS.

The following survey questions have been designed to reflect the most important areas of concern of the evaluation. They have been designed to permit busy respondents to answer the questions quite quickly and to provide maximum utility to the evaluation. We have designed this survey to include questions using multiple choice answers where possible given the time constraints of the people we will be surveying.

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE:

This introduction and the consent form to be included at the beginning of the questionnaire.

INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Evaluation of the US Department of Labor financed COFFEE Project implemented by Verité

Please take the time to complete this questionnaire. It should take no more than 20 to 30 minutes. Your responses will provide important information to help us evaluate the COFFEE Project and will provide useful inputs for the future planning of interventions to tackle infringements of labor rights in the coffee sector.

The questionnaire and all your answers will be confidential.

Thank you for your cooperation.

CONSENT FORM

I hereby consent to WI-HER and United States Department of Labor using any data that are captured in this survey questionnaire.

I understand that no personally identifiable information will be included in any published report on the data from this survey questionnaire.

[Please write your name here:

Signed:

Date:

QUESTION 1: Have you received any training from Verité since 2019?

- 2. Yes
- 3. No
- 4. Don't know / N/A

In which year did you participate in the training?

.....

If you answered No, then skip to Q4 (If not, why?)

QUESTION 2: What are the training titles of the modules?

If you responded 'yes' to the previous question, then please provide the name of the training module (s) you were instructed in.

Title (s) of the training module (s) you were instructed in?

A. Write the title (s) below:

.....

9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 3: How many people in your institution received the training?

Write number of others trained here:

A. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 4: If you have not received any training from Verité or the COFFEE project in the past 4 years, why not?

1. Training was not offered to me / to my department
2. My limited education meant that I elected not to participate
3. I had no desire to be trained
4. No time to be trained
5. Transport or logistical problems
6. Internet access problems
9. Don't know / not applicable

QUESTION 5: If you replied to the previous Question 4 (not having received training from Verité), would you in future like to receive training from Verité?

1. Yes 2. No 9. Don't know /Not applicable

QUESTION 6: If you answered "yes" to the previous question, what skills are you interested in acquiring?

What skill do you want to learn? (*INSTRUCTIONS: You may tick more than one category if you wish*)

1. Farm management that meets acceptable standards of social and labor relations
2. Social compliance in labor relations and best practices for contracting of workers
3. Acceptable standards of housing and service provision
4. Proper health and safety regulations for coffee workers
5. Sexual harassment prevention training
6. Gender violence prevention training
99. Don't know / not applicable

QUESTION 7: Have you observed any institutional or budgetary changes in your institution due to the Verité training?

A. Yes B. No 9. Do not know / Not applicable

INSTRUCTIONS: *If you answered “NO” to this Question 7, please skip to Question 10.*

QUESTION 8: What are the institutional and/or budgetary changes you observed in your institution due to the Verité training.

Instructions: You may tick more than one if appropriate:

1. Our company / institution has approved a policy or standards to eliminate forced labor, child labor and other abuses in the supply chain.
2. There is now an annually renewed **budget line** for ensuring that our company / institution undertakes regular social compliance audits
3. There is now **at least one** full-time member of staff in our company / institution responsible for monitoring and auditing the welfare of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.
4. There is now a process in our company / institution for annual / regular review and strategic planning to address the labor rights of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain
5. Other. If you selected other, please explain here, in the box below.

Describe any other institutional and policy changes made in the box below as a result of Verité training:

Institutional and policy changes made a result of Verité training:

.....

9. Don't know /not applicable

QUESTION 9: To what degree has the institution where you work absorbed into its management systems the social compliance toolkit provided by Verité?”

INSTRUCTIONS for Question 9: *Please consider the following statement, and click on only one box:*

“The institution where I work has absorbed into its management systems the social compliance toolkit provided by Verité”:

1. Strongly agree with the above statement (High)
2. Agree with the above statement (Above-moderate)
3. Neither agree nor disagree with the above statement (Moderate)
4. Disagree with the above statement (Low)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

INSTRUCTIONS: *Please skip Question 10 if it is irrelevant to you and go to Question 12.*

QUESTION 10: Was the design of the Verité training modules for social compliance relevant to your institution in improving social compliance in the coffee supply chains?

Please indicate for Question 10 **your level of agreement** concerning the following statement (**only tick one box**):

Degree of relevance of the design of the training modules provided by Verité in the COFFEE Project:

“The design of the training modules was relevant to my institution in improving social compliance in the coffee sector.”

1. Strongly agree (**High**)
2. Agree (**Above-moderate**)
3. Neither agree nor disagree (**Moderate**)
4. Disagree (**Low**)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 11: How far was Verité’s strategy to reduce labor violations in the coffee sector based on a sound strategy?

The training modules **used by Verité** were based on a thorough, up to date understanding of the context of the coffee sector in my country.

Please indicate **your level of agreement** concerning the above statement (***only tick one box***):

1. Strongly agree (**High**)
2. Agree (**Above-moderate**)
3. Neither agree nor disagree (**Moderate**)
4. Disagree (**Low**)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 12: To what extent did the COFFEE project address the needs of the most vulnerable?

The COFFEE project addressed the needs of the most vulnerable such as itinerant workers (*andariegos*) and child laborers

Please indicate your level of agreement (only click on ***one box***):

1. Strongly agree (**High**)
2. Agree (**Above-moderate**)
3. Neither agree nor disagree (**Moderate**)
4. Disagree (**Low**)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 13: Has the capacity of your organization been strengthened to monitor and prevent occurrences of forced labor and or child labor in the coffee supply chain?

Please indicate your level of agreement concerning the following statement (***only tick one box***).

“The capacity of my organization to monitor and prevent occurrences of forced labor and or child labor in the coffee supply chain has been strengthened due to the COFFEE project.”

1. Strongly agree (**High**)
2. Agree (**Above-moderate**)
3. Neither agree nor disagree (**Moderate**)
4. Disagree (**Low**)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 14: Can you provide an example of how your institution has improved its ability to monitor and control labor violations in your supply chains, as a result of the COFFEE project?

Write your example here and specify the type of labor violation. To help you, here are some examples of types of labor violation targeted by the COFFEE project:

- child labor
- forced labor
- sexual harassment
- gender based violence,
- inadequate wages
- lack of protective equipment (masks, gloves, uniforms)
- no proper contract provided
- no health or insurance cover for workers,
- Substandard accommodation
- No/insufficient nutritious and clean food/meals and drinking water
- No rest periods
- No adequate toilets and / or showers

Instructions: If you can provide an example, please describe it here:

1. Yes, I can provide an example

My example is

2. No, I can't provide an example
99. Don't know / Not applicable

Question 15: How far were you involved in giving feedback to Verité on the draft proposal for a social compliance system, including guidance materials?

1. Highly involved (several requests for feedback from Verité) (high)
2. Well involved (one or two requests for feedback from Verité) (above-moderate)
3. I was asked for my feedback once (moderate)
4. I wasn't consulted or asked for feedback by Verité (low)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 16: How would you describe the impact of the pilot project in your country (Brazil, Colombia, or Mexico)?

1. Very positive (High)
2. Good (Above-moderate)
3. Moderate
4. Poor (Low)
9. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 17: Which activities or initiatives are most likely to be sustained?

Instructions: you may click on more than one option, unless you select "Don't know / Not applicable".

1. Online training for our staff

2. Online training for staff from relevant government agencies, extension workers and/or universities and training institutions
3. Face to face training and workshops for our staff and supply chain workers
4. Meals, classes, and other activities for the children of temporary migrant workers in our supply chains
5. Health insurance, pension provision and other social benefits for smallholders and temporary workers
6. Improvement of accommodation and service provision for temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain
7. New harvesting techniques and equipment to improve the income and welfare of coffee workers
8. Initiatives to support coffee workers outside the harvest season (e.g., handicrafts, maintenance of equipment, kitchen gardens)
9. Needs-based research and development initiatives (e.g. time and motion studies, harvesting techniques, improved pest control to avoid/reduce use of agrochemicals)
99. Do not know / Not applicable

QUESTION 18: What factors have contributed to this sustainability?

“Instructions: you may click on more than one option, unless you select Don’t know / Not applicable”.

1. Our company / institution has approved a policy or standards to eliminate forced labor, child labor and other abuses in the supply chain.
2. There is now an annually renewed **budget line** for ensuring that our company / institution undertakes regular social compliance audits.
3. There is now **at least one** full-time member of staff in our company / institution responsible for monitoring and auditing the welfare of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.
4. There is now a process in our company / institution for annual / regular review and strategic planning to address the labor rights of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.
99. Don’t know / Not applicable

QUESTION 19: What are the major challenges faced by your company/institution to eradicate forced labor and child labor in the coffee supply chain?

“Instructions: you may click on more than one option, unless you select “Don’t know / Not applicable”.

1. Our company / institution does not have a policy or standards to address forced labor, child labor and other abuses in the supply chain.
2. Our company / institution does not have a budget line to undertake regular social compliance audits.
3. No full-time manager in our company / institution has been assigned the responsibility to monitor and audit the welfare of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.
4. Our company / institution has no process of review or strategic planning to address the labor rights of temporary and permanent workers in our supply chain.
5. Uncertain market / low coffee prices on world market

- 6. Increased costs of inputs and equipment (machinery, fuel, fertilizers)
- 7. Threats to security (e.g., organized crime and political instability)
- 8. Climatic factors / climate change
- 9. Coffee pests and diseases
- 10. Other (specify): Instructions: If you selected "other", please explain here" below.

.....

99. Don't know / Not applicable

QUESTION 20: What two recommendations would you make to improve the implementation of social compliance systems in the coffee sector?

Instructions: If you provide recommendations, please specify WHO should carry out the recommendation, and for which institution your recommendation is aimed at:

1.Recommendation 1:.....

1)WHO should carry out your Recommendation 1.....

2) Which institution your Recommendation 1 is aimed at.....

2.Recommendation 2:.....

1) WHO should carry out your Recommendation 2.....

2) Which institution your Recommendation 2 is aimed at.....

99. Do not know / Not applicable

This section is about the respondent.

- 4. What is your position (the title of your job) in the organization that you work in?
- 5. Name of your organization

Note: *The name of your organization will not be used in any way and will be kept anonymous.*

- 6. What is your principal country of residence?

Mexico

Colombia

Brazil

Other (please write below)

.....
5. Your education

What did you study as a major subject at university, or technical college, or polytechnic?

Agronomy

Environmental science

Engineering

Management

Financial administration / accounting

Other (specify)

Major subject: 1-.....

Level obtained:

Diploma or Technical College Qualification

University degree

Master's degree.

Highest level of education?

Diploma or Technical College Qualification

University degree

Master's degree

Your specific job

Please specify your specific job activities in the institution where you work:

Instructions: *Fill in **only one**, and the one that applies to you. Tick "other" and then specify your job, if none of the following categories is applicable to you:*

1. I am an independent coffee producer on a coffee farm that I own / co-own; I am **not** a member of a coffee cooperative)
2. I am an independent coffee producer on a coffee farm that I own / co-own and I **am** a member of a coffee cooperative)
3. I work on a coffee farm in the capacity of a technical supervisor.
4. I work for a coffee company that buys and sells raw coffee (wholesaler and/or exporter).
5. I work in a coffee company that buys and sells roasted coffee in its own brand.
6. I work in a coffee company that buys and sells roasted coffee in our own coffee outlets.
7. I work in a coffee company that buys and sells roasted coffee via other coffee retail outlets.
8. Other
9. Don't know / N/A

ANNEX 4 OUTLINES FOR KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

The evaluation will use key informant interviews (KII) and focus group discussions (FGDs). This section outlines a generic format for these, according to the main stakeholder groups:

- Civil society organizations
- Government agencies
- Private-sector stakeholders, including coffee producers, cooperatives, recruitment agencies, coffee buyers, roasters, and coffee associations.

It is important that the evaluators base their evaluation findings on an empirical set of qualitative opinions from the KIIs and FGDs. The aim is to measure the perceived impact of the project using a set of agreed evaluation questions, based on OECD DAC evaluation criteria.

The KIIs and FGDs are designed to record the informants' responses to the evaluation and will provide insights into the social compliance issues in the coffee production and supply chain.

A standard format will be used to summarize the findings of the KIIs and FGDs. This will facilitate comparison and reference across stakeholder groups. These formats will follow the OECD / DAC evaluation criteria, as expressed in the seven key EQs.

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

The interview outline comprises a list of open-ended questions (the agreed EQs). The evaluators will start by explaining the background and objectives of the evaluation and will ask the participants for a brief explanation with their names and roles.

It will then focus on factual questions and background information on the topics being discussed, and will follow with questions intended to elicit the participants' opinions and beliefs. The evaluators will end by asking for general recommendations, as appropriate, and will try to summarize them. The evaluators will follow the lines of enquiry opened during the interviews and discussions to clarify the information and informants' perceptions.

Format for writing up field notes.

Date: Time: from.....to

Time the interview / Focus Group took:.....

Interviewer:.....: Note-taker:.....

Place of interview/Residence of the person (s) interviewed:.....

Region/State/Department/District/Province.....

Organization name (s) of informant (s).....

Aim of this meeting:

For Mixed Gender Focus Group Discussions:

Person (s) interviewed: ...

Person 1 Gender, Role or occupation

Person 2 Gender, Role or occupation

Person 3 Gender, Role or occupation

For Key Informant Interviews

Role or occupation:

Gender (where not obvious from the name)

Procedure for the KIIs and FGDs

- i) **Introduction:** We would like to talk about social and labor conditions in the coffee industry. We are evaluating a project funded by US Government Department of Labor, which is intended to improve working and living conditions in the coffee industry.
- ii) The COFFEE project has been working here to improve the conditions of workers and other people involved in the coffee supply chain. We are conducting interviews with coffee farmers, buyers and with companies that roast coffee in Mexico, Colombia and Brazil, and we would like to know your opinions about the project. We are also interested in hearing from the government agencies and other organizations that work to ensure acceptable working conditions for people employed in the coffee sector.
- iii) **Confidentiality:** All information will be kept confidential, and we will not cite anyone by name. The information will be used to develop recommendations for future projects.
- iv) **Closing question:** We will ask key informants and FGD participants if they want to ask any questions or have any additional information or comments.
- v) **Recommendations or solutions** We will try to summarize the recommendations from the interviews and meetings

The pilot projects focus on specific issues in each country:

- In Mexico, the project aims to improve key actors' understanding of international standards and Mexican labor law, aiding the identification and elimination of forced labor, child labor, and other abuses, and identifying and remediating the root causes of labor exploitation.
- In Colombia, the project is piloting innovative models to improve payment for people engaged in the coffee harvest, including vulnerable women and Venezuelan migrants.
- In Brazil, the project addresses issues related to labor recruitment, including deception, charging workers recruitment fees or commissions and retaining personal documents. The pilot project is working with producers, traders and roasters to identify and reduce these risks.

KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS FOR KIIS AND FGDS

Stakeholder Group 1 includes:

- Grantee and Implementing Partners

Stakeholder Group 2 includes:

- Coffee growers and coffee growers' organizations

- Workers' Organizations
- NGOs & other relevant local or national organizations

Stakeholder Group 3 includes:

- Government agencies responsible for labor, agriculture and marketing
- Universities (Mexico)

Stakeholder Group 4 includes:

- National or regional level coffee producers' organizations, chambers of commerce, etc.
- Private Sector International Brand Representatives

The main emphasis in all of the EQs below for the four stakeholder groups is on the perceived impact, relevance, and sustainability of the capacity building, mentoring, and training.

Additionally, the evaluation will consider the impact of the S3T social compliance toolkit.

The following seven sets of EQs follow the agreed EQs. They have been edited and framed in general terms that can be applied to a KII or an FGD, and stimulate an open-ended, semi-structured KII with 1-3 people or a more structured FGD with 8-10 people.

EQ 1 Relevance and Coherence.

- Were the project activities you have been involved in / aware of appropriate to the needs of the women, men, and families working in the coffee supply chain?
- Were the project activities you have been involved in / aware of appropriate to the needs of your organization?
- Is there some other activity or strategy to improve social compliance that could have been used?

EQ 2 Effectiveness

- Has the project strengthened the capacity of the stakeholders?
- What were the most important achievements of the capacity building activities?
- Have the social compliance systems been strengthened?
- Factors and challenges to perceived progress?

EQ 3 Efficiency/Flexibility

- Impacts of COVID-19 on project implementation. How did the project adapt?
- Were the project's human and financial resources applied efficiently in implementing the project strategy? Factors affecting efficiency.
- Utilization of the M&E systems and how far they were used as monitoring evaluation learning systems to make informed decisions.

EQ 4 Impacts

- What do you see as the principal achievements and impacts of the project?

EQ 5 Sustainability

- Which activities and initiatives are most likely to be sustained?
- What has contributed to or limited their sustainability?

EQ 6 Equity and inclusion

- Which marginalized or underserved populations are involved in the coffee supply chain?
- What specific efforts were made to engage with them? Were they effective?
- Factors that can facilitate or make it more difficult to engage with them?

EQ 7 Lessons learned

- What are the main lessons learned from the pilot projects?
- Will you continue to use the S3T toolkit in your work and in your organization.
- Any lessons concerning piloting labor rights interventions as concerns, child, labor, or forced labor or human trafficking in your experience or the experience of your organization.