



Final Performance Evaluation

Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II (CLEAR II) Project

Final Report

August 2, 2019

Evaluators:

Mario Martinez, Institute for Development Impact

Vasco Veloso, Institute for Development Impact

QED Evaluation Partner: Institute for Development Impact:



Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor under Order number 1605DC-18-F-00417. Points of view or opinions in this evaluation report do 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.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS LIST	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vi
Background	vi
Evaluation Purpose and Methodology	vi
Key Findings and Conclusions	vi
Lessons Learned and Best Practices	ix
Key Recommendations	x
BACKGROUND	1
EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	2
Effectiveness	3
Relevance	3
Efficiency	3
Sustainability	3
Lessons Learned and Replicability	4
Intended Use and Users of Report	4
METHODOLOGY	4
LIMITATIONS	5
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	6
Effectiveness	7
Relevance	32
Efficiency	35
Sustainability	38
Lessons learned and best practices	40
KEY RECOMMENDATIONS	42
Annex I: Terms of Reference	46
Annex II: Documents Reviewed	66

Annex III: List of interviewees69

Annex IV: Data collection instruments71

Annex V: CLEAR II Final Evaluation Stakeholder Workshop Participant List 107

Annex VI: Agenda For Clear Ii Final Evaluation Stakeholder Workshop 108

ACRONYMS LIST

BF	Burkina Faso
BZ	Belize
CL	Child Labor
CLCS	Child Labor Capacity Score
CLEAR II	Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II
CLMS	Child Labor Monitoring System
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
CONEP	Consejo Nacional de la Empresa Privada
CPFSA	Child Protection and Family Services Agency
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EQ	Evaluation Question
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GLP	Global Learning Platform
HCL	Hazardous Child Labor
IAC	International Advisory Council
ILAB	Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILO	International Labor Organization
ILS	International Labor Standards
IO	Intermediate Objective
JM	Jamaica
KII	Key Informant Interview
LB	Liberia
LI	Labor Inspector
LWCL	Light Work Child Labor
LRC	Legislative Reform Committee/Legislative Review Committee
LWOB	Lawyers Without Borders
MoL	Ministry of Labor
NACOMAL	National Commission on Child Labor in Liberia
NAP	National Action Plan

NASTOCL	National Steering Committee on Child Labor
NCFC	National Children and Family Committee
NCLC	National Child Labor Committee
NP	Nepal
OCFT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking
ODPP	Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
OPI	Objective Project Indicator
OTC	Outcome
OTP	Output
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
PN	Panama
PSA	Pre-Situational Analysis
SCA	Solicitation for Cooperative Agreement
SGI	Small Group Interview
TA	Technical Assistance
TDA	Trade of Development Act
TOC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
TPR	Technical Progress Report
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor
WI	Winrock International

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

With funding from the United States Department of Labor, the Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II (CLEAR II) was implemented by Winrock International in partnership with Verité and Lawyers Without Borders (LWOB) from September 2014 through July 2019. The primary objective of the CLEAR II project was to enhance the capacity of host governments in assisted countries to address child labor (CL), including worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

While Burkina Faso and Nepal were initially named as project sites in the Cooperative Agreement, project implementation was scaled-up to five additional countries: Belize, Honduras, Jamaica, Liberia, and Panama. Specific project activities were tailored to the unique needs of each country and organized under four intermediate objectives and eleven outcome indicators¹. The specific intermediate objectives and outcomes targeted in each country varied due to country priorities, host government buy-in, and timing.

Evaluation Purpose and Methodology

The overall purpose of this final performance evaluation was to determine whether the CLEAR II project was implemented as planned and achieved its objectives, and why or why not. Ten specific evaluation questions were grouped along the following criteria: effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability as well as lessons learned and replicability. The main sources of data used to answer the evaluation questions were existing project documentation and qualitative primary data collected in four countries. While the findings presented in Evaluation Question 1 pertain to all countries of implementation (excluding Honduras), the findings presented in Evaluation Questions 2 through 10 are limited to the four countries visited for field work, listed below.

Field work was conducted during the months of April and May 2019 in Belize, Burkina Faso, Jamaica, and Liberia. In these countries, qualitative data were collected in-person using individual key informant interviews, small group discussions, and focus group discussions. Participants included in-country Winrock staff and various collaborators and beneficiaries, such as host governments, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations. Additionally, the evaluation team carried out virtual individual key informant interviews and small group discussions with US-based global stakeholders, including representatives from USDOL, Winrock, LWOB, Verité, and the International Advisory Council.

Key Findings and Conclusions

EFFECTIVENESS

1. ***To what extent has the project achieved its targets, results and activities?*** As of April 2019, the CLEAR II project increased the capacity to address CL in Belize, Burkina Faso, Jamaica, Liberia, Nepal, and Panama through achievement of 100% of objective project

¹ A twelfth outcome indicator, OTC4, relating to strengthening of existing CLMS, was drafted at the beginning of the project prior to country selection. After countries were selected and it was determined which countries would receive CLMS support, OTC4 was dropped because none of those countries had an existing CLMS. This report focuses on the eleven outcome indicators actively used by the project.

indicators (OPIs), 41% outcome (OTC) indicators, and 69% of country-specific output (OTP) indicators as established in the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) and country performance indicators and capacity targets that were revised in 2017-2018 and approved by USDOL in November 2018.

2. ***To what extent has the project contributed to local efforts for child labor reduction?*** A majority of respondents from host government ministries and agencies and the private sector in all evaluated countries credit CLEAR II for substantial contributions to national efforts to combat child labor. Assistance provided by the project contributed to increased local capacity to comply with ILS, enhanced local capacity for CL monitoring and enforcement, and increased capacity for implementation of National Action Plans.
3. ***What project approaches or activities were successful and what contributed to their success? What, if any, approaches or activities were less successful and what contributed to their lack of success?*** There was strong evidence for two highly successful CLEAR II approaches: 1) the creation of committees or ad-hoc working groups to adapt CL local legislation to ILS, and 2) the design and delivery of a set of resources to monitor and enforce CL legislation that proved to be a very effective means to enhance government agencies to address CL and WFCL. The Global Learning Platform and International Advisory Council were less successful, as were the project approaches related to communication and engagement with senior government stakeholders and the selection of activities targeting results outside of project's control. While activities that included the committees and working groups worked well for drafting legislation, gaining approval and endorsement of the legislation was outside of the project's control.
4. ***How did the project coordinate with various entities, including sub-grantees, other donor-funded projects in countries where CLEAR II was implemented, host governments, and USDOL? How did this coordination contribute to the outcomes of the project? What were the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration?*** Coordination between USDOL and the implementing partners was rated as highly satisfactory. Although subgrantees did not have a permanent presence in CLEAR II countries, strong coordination through Winrock field staff was instrumental to subgrantee and project success. Coordination and collaboration with host country governments and other stakeholders was good and was key to success. However, challenges related to levels of commitment among senior government officials and time limitations, both in terms of time needed to obtain government buy-in and time allocated to complete planned activities, among other factors, affected collaboration.
5. ***How effectively did the project draft, implement, and disseminate the resources developed under the project?*** To the extent possible, CLEAR II produced and distributed all planned resources in all countries among beneficiaries and program participants during training, workshops, meetings and awareness activities. While the project effectively reached a range of recipients by inviting diverse audiences to various events, some key host-country stakeholders wished that certain resources had broader dissemination. Host-country stakeholders broadly agreed that the resources were high quality, and there is evidence that stakeholders subsequently used the resources.

6. ***What challenges were encountered during project implementation and how did the project overcome the challenges?*** Lengthy country selection processes, short implementation timelines, tight deadlines and turn-over in local and national governments and resulting changes in political will and access to relevant government officials, as well as resource commitments are some of the key challenges encountered during the implementation. CLEAR II adjusted to these issues by: 1) operating as efficiently as possible on very tight schedule; 2) requesting extension of the performance period; and 3) working with key champions who were technical staff within the government, rather than political appointees.

RELEVANCE

7. ***To what extent did the project address the needs and interests of the target groups?*** CLEAR II carried out extensive participatory assessments in each country context. Stakeholders considered all four Intermediate Objectives to be relevant. However, there were varying perceptions about the extent to which CLEAR II fully addressed each country's needs. For example, many requests related to IO4 ("Improve social programs, policies and/or services to address child labor") were mainly for services that would fall outside the scope of the project, such as direct vocational or education services for families and children.

EFFICIENCY

8. ***How did the following factors contribute to or hinder the achievement of results? Funding, Personnel, Administration, Time, Country selection, Cost increase.*** The According to host government respondents CLEAR II project had sufficient resources to implement most planned activities and has utilized funding efficiently, though some activities such as awareness-raising, and training were limited in scope. Additional funds were added to increase some of these activities. Management was highly adaptive. In-country project staff played a key role in managing local stakeholder relationships and developing resources. During implementation, management was decentralized to address an interim evaluation recommendation. These factors were seen as having positive impacts on project achievements.

SUSTAINABILITY

9. ***What are the project's sustainability goals (i.e., what is intended to be sustained?) To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the threats to sustainability? What are the enablers of sustainability? What is the sustainability of the project's implementation model? If it is sustainable, are there any major risks that can make the model unsustainable?*** CLEAR II is likely to see sustainable results due to the incorporation of project activities in national structures and the creation of resources including labor curriculums, Hazardous and Light Work Lists, rapid reference cards, among others. Knowledge transfer will ensure that these activities and resources will have medium and long term effects in line with the sustainability themes of technical project design and implementation and institutional strengthening identified in the CLEAR II Sustainability Strategy.

Lessons Learned and Best Practices

10. *What are key lessons learned, best practices, success stories and good models that can be applied to current or future global and country-level child labor projects?*

Lessons Learned

1. Late country selection had a significant impact on timelines of project implementation.
2. Sustained support to trained individuals in the form of coaching, mentoring and/or in-service follow up can aid institutionalization of labor inspector capacity building efforts.
3. Host-country approval of legal reforms is out of any USDOL project's control and may take long periods of time despite the reasonableness of the proposed legislation.
4. Deep engagement throughout the life of the project with a wide range of relevant stakeholders from public, private and civil society sectors are beneficial, but require more time for implementation. Future projects should allot more time for implementation of such activities and adjust targets and milestones accordingly.
5. In addition to action plans, which also include regional plans and monitoring systems, awareness-raising is critical to changing perceptions around child labor and allowing for increased common understanding about child labor, as well as on creating effective tools and strategies to address it.
6. Defining workplans involved consultations with different Ministries and Agencies involved in the fight against child labor. However, workplans were agreed with MoL and no agreements for direct activities with other ministries were established except in Jamaica where a signed MOU exists for CPFSA under the Ministry of Education. Agreements on work planning, activities and participation in trainings, workshops and working groups or committees are most effective when they include the Ministry of Labor as well as other Ministries and Agencies involved in the fight against child labor.
7. Online platforms for knowledge sharing require a deeper needs and user requirement analysis at the outset to ensure uptake and sustainability, as well as more focus on curating reference materials on relevant existing knowledge.

Best Practices

1. Joint work on project implementation planning with government helps ensure close coordination and institutionalization of planned actions into government work plans.
2. CLEAR II in-country local staff played a major facilitation and collaboration role for the activities. Prompt deployment and early in-country presence of local staff contributes to increased coordination, collaboration and understanding of the local social and political dynamic, improving local receptivity to the project and overall effectiveness.
3. The creation of dedicated committees or working groups to adapt local CL legislation to ILS offer a platform to enhance stakeholder knowledge and skills related to CL and legislative reform and to advance legislative reform efforts. The LRCs made substantial progress in assessing existing legislation for alignment to ILS and recommending specific modifications to legislation.
4. The Training of Trainers (TOT) approach promotes the scale-up and sustainability of capacity building efforts by building a pool of competent instructors who teach the material to other people, using a training curriculum and supporting TOT guidance.

Key Recommendations

Given that this final performance evaluation report will be finalized after the CLEAR II project ends in July 2019, the below recommendations are intended for consideration for future projects.

Recommendations for USDOL

1. Establish a clear and defined process for country selection early on in project implementation, including selection criteria and establishing a cut off point for adding new countries to allow for longer periods of implementation.
2. Reduce the number of countries to be assisted by one project in similar future projects. Additionally, consider clustering countries in a given region rather than global distribution to facilitate project management and logistics, as well as to take advantage of countries' similarities in priority needs and to foster synergies.
3. Consider revisiting the Theory of Change of similar government capacity building projects to ensure that it is valid and look for ways to strengthen the program logic and improve linkages within the hierarchy in the causal chain, with specific attention on: a) rationalizing the number of outcomes and indicators; b) identifying program assumptions and risks, c) introducing new components based on lessons learned; and d) removing program components and indicators that are outside of project control.
4. Identify and assess assumptions and risks at each level of the results framework prior to implementation. Regularly monitor and report on the status of assumptions and project risks for better coordination and adaptive management.
5. Consider including education or livelihood activities within similar projects to support project implementation and address the root causes of CL.

Recommendations to CLEAR II Partners - Winrock, Verité and LWOB

1. Utilize learning from the CLEAR II project to realistically assess and adequately account for time needed to carry out activities and see measurable results within the amount of time that USDOL has designated for project implementation.
2. Closely monitor government officials' commitment to agreements and develop a strategic plan of engagement for changes in political leadership. Frequent changes in political administration and political will impacts the achievement of results. Develop a plan of engagement of new political leadership and maintain regular communication to ensure optimal collaboration of the officers assigned to project activities.
3. Conduct a technical review of the project's Theory of Change and corresponding Result Framework to update and improve the underlying logic, with a focus on realistic change that can be expected within the timeline and resources.
4. Expand the TOC to include elaboration of key programmatic assumptions and risks at each level of the results framework. Consider monitoring assumptions throughout implementation and including assumption reporting to USDOL for better coordination and adaptive management.
5. Expand general awareness raising efforts among the public focusing on changing the cultural/social dimension and to promote approval of proposed CL legal reforms. Consider leveraging CSO networks, utilizing communication channels through media, social

media, radio, and incorporate community and religious leaders in order to reach more people in rural areas and closed communities.

6. Consider maintaining quarterly meetings with senior host-government authorities involved in project implementation to discuss monitoring reports and agree upon adjustments to project implementation to ensure local ownership and sustainability.
7. Create opportunities for immediate practice with supervision and support beyond replication of trainings and provide mentoring and coaching to trained labor inspectors on their inspection work.

Recommendations for Winrock

1. Expand direct support and broaden the consultative processes to include a larger pool of stakeholders (e.g. line ministries) to increase the likelihood of a concerted response and ownership for improved results. Direct support could include activities specific to the needs of those organizations, such as assistance developing their strategies and plans related to CL issues or tailoring and delivery of training specific to their needs.
2. Devise a strategy for a better utilization of International Advisory Council (IAC), with a mix of demand-driven and pre-defined structured activities and include members with specific expertise in the countries of implementation.

Recommendations for LWOB

1. Allocate more time for advocacy of local legislation reforms to comply with ILS, as the approval of legislation requires a high level of commitment and political will. Consider the formation of an advocacy subcommittee that engages in dedicated advocacy above and beyond the issuing of reports or draft legislation.
2. Utilize local experts to support the needs assessments by validating data and collecting additional information from the field to ensure that contextual nuances and latest developments are captured.

BACKGROUND

The Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II (CLEAR II) Project commenced in September 2014 with an original four-year implementation cycle. Funded by the United States Department of Labor, the project was implemented by Winrock International in combination with two subgrantees: Verité and Lawyers Without Borders (LWOB).

The overall objective of the CLEAR II Project as stated in the Project Document² and project's Results Framework was to enhance the capacity of host governments in assisted countries to address child labor (CL), including worst forms of child labor (WFCL). To achieve this primary objective, the project was organized into four intermediate objectives (IOs), which are the core objectives of the Project's Theory of Change (TOC) developed in the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP). The intermediate objectives include:

- IO1: Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with international labor standards (ILS)
- IO2: Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation and regulations related to CL improved
- IO3: Increased implementation of National Action Plans on Child Labor, including WFCL
- IO4: Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL, including WFCL

According to the CLEAR II Project's Theory of Change and project design, addressing these four systemic issues would assist governments in overcoming the cultural, economic, social, labor and legal factors that lead to child labor and WFCL.

The project identified eleven³ outcome indicators (OTCs) with targets, which are presented in Table 1 below. Under each OTC there are, in turn, output indicators (OTPs) identified and tracked throughout project implementation. Achievement of OTCs are linked to the achievement of their corresponding OTPs as per the PMP of the CMEP.

The CLEAR II Solicitation for Cooperative Agreement Applications (SCA) named Burkina Faso and Nepal as the initial host countries for project activities. USDOL determined that five additional countries would receive support following consultation with Winrock, an assessment to determine host country needs, an analysis of resource requirements for host government support, and an assessment of the potential for achieving a significant and sus-

² A Project Document is a "a more refined, detailed, version of the technical proposal submitted in the grant application and sets the technical parameters and reference points for the project according to the standardized format outlined by OTLA." (source: pg. 8 of the USDOL Management Procedures and Guidelines for Cooperative Agreements, Dec 2017)

³ A twelfth outcome indicator, OTC4, relating to strengthening of existing CLMS, was drafted at the beginning of the project prior to country selection. After countries were selected and it was determined which countries would receive CLMS support, OTC4 was dropped because none of those countries had an existing CLMS. This report focuses on the eleven outcome indicators actively used by the project.

tained decline in child labor. Based on these criteria, the project portfolio subsequently expanded to include Honduras (April 2015), Liberia (November 2016), Belize (December 2016), Panama (March 2017), and Jamaica (May 2017).

USDOL approved final workplans for all countries via project modification in March 2018. Due to timing, country priorities, and host government buy-in, the country workplans were tailored both in terms of IOs covered and the level of implementation within the IOs.

While the project was originally scheduled to conclude in September 2018, USDOL extended the period of performance twice, first in 2017 when the project end date was moved to May 2019 (TPR, October 2017), and again in late 2018, setting the final expiration date to July 2019. In both cases, the purpose of extending was to finalize implementation of activities and allow sufficient time for the delivery of pending expected results, particularly government adoption, endorsement, or institutionalization of project outputs. At the time of this evaluation, the CLEAR II Project was still implementing activities in Belize, Burkina Faso, Jamaica, Liberia, Nepal and Panama. The project also implemented activities on a limited scale in Honduras, but activities in that country ended in 2016⁴.

The evaluation team conducted field work for this final performance evaluation during the months of April and May 2019 in Belize, Burkina Faso, Jamaica, and Liberia. The periods of implementation of the activities in each country visited are as follows (including the extension periods⁵):

- Burkina Faso: June 2017- June 2019
- Liberia: May 2017- May 2019
- Jamaica: June 2018- June 2019
- Belize: April 2018- June 2019

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The overall purpose of this final performance evaluation was to:

- Assess whether the project has achieved its objectives, identifying the challenges encountered in doing so, and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges;
- Assess the intended and unintended effects of the project;
- Assess lessons learned and emerging practices from the project (e.g. strategies and models of intervention) and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future projects in the focus country(ies) and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors;
- Assess which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable.

⁴ In Honduras, assistance consisted of an assessment report on gaps in social programs, policies and/or services delivered in 2015.

⁵ Start dates correspond to month and year of official launch of project. Start and end dates were obtained from TPRs and respondents in the field.

There were ten specific evaluation questions grouped along the following criteria: *effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability as well as lessons learned and replicability*. Prior to fieldwork, the evaluation team developed an Evaluation Question Matrix (Annex I, ToR) that identified specific lines of inquiry within each of the ten evaluation questions and the sources of data for each.

Effectiveness

1. To what extent has the project achieved its targets, results and activities?
2. To what extent has the project contributed to local efforts for child labor reduction?
3. What project approaches or activities were successful and what contributed to their success? What, if any, approaches or activities were less successful and what contributed to their lack of success?
4. How did the project coordinate with various entities, including sub-grantees, other donor-funded projects in countries where CLEAR II was implemented, host governments, and USDOL? How did this coordination contribute to the outcomes of the project? What were the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration?
5. How effectively did the project draft, implement, and disseminate the resources developed under the project?
6. What challenges were encountered during project implementation and how did the project overcome the challenges?

Relevance

7. To what extent did the project address the needs and interests of the target groups?

Efficiency

8. How did the following factors contribute to or hinder the achievement of results?
 - Funding
 - Personnel
 - Administration
 - Time
 - Country selection
 - Cost increase

Sustainability

9. What are the project's sustainability goals (i.e., what is intended to be sustained?) To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the threats to sustainability? What are the enablers of sustainability? What is the sustainability of the project's implementation model? If it is sustainable, are there any major risks that can make the model unsustainable?

Lessons Learned and Replicability

10. What are key lessons learned, best practices, success stories and good models that can be applied to current or future global and country-level child labor projects?

Intended Use and Users of Report

This report is intended to assess CLEAR II program implementation and its effect on project beneficiaries, as detailed above. This learning is of particular interest to program stakeholders including but not limited to funding program managers, implementing partners, and government representatives. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations will serve to inform stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future child labor elimination projects as appropriate.

METHODOLOGY

The final performance evaluation used a mixed-method approach that relied on a combination of document review and qualitative primary data collection including key informant interviews (KII), small group interviews (SGIs), and focus group discussions (FGDs).

Document and Global Learning Platform review: Winrock and USDOL made available a repository of project-related documents for all of the CLEAR II country sites that included, Pre-Situational Analyses, Technical Progress Reports (TPRs) and related correspondence, country-specific Results Frameworks and Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, work plans, in addition to the Cooperative Agreement and related modifications. The evaluation team reviewed the project's Global Learning Platform and documents for both and used a common form to catalog the extracted information. Findings from the documentation review were used in preparation for the fieldwork phase of the evaluation to further refine primary data collection, to triangulate findings from stakeholder interviews and derive conclusions, and to identify target achievements in the six main implementation countries for Evaluation Question 1. A complete list of documents reviewed can be found in Annex II.

Qualitative primary data: Winrock's in-country teams prepared a comprehensive list of stakeholders to be interviewed, and helped coordinate interview scheduling and logistics in Belize, Jamaica, Burkina Faso, and Liberia. Data were collected in-person by a member of the evaluation team through KIIs, small group discussions of two to three people, and focus group discussions of five to eight people. Participants included in-country Winrock project staff and various collaborators and beneficiaries, such as host governments, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations. In-country interviews were scheduled during the following dates:

- Belize: March 31 - April 6
- Liberia: April 10 - April 13
- Jamaica: April 26 and May 3

- Burkina Faso: April 29 - May 3

Additionally, the evaluation team carried out individual key informant interviews and small group discussions with global stakeholders based in the United States. These included representatives from USDOL, the implementing partners, and the International Advisory Council. Both members of the evaluation team conducted all but one of the global stakeholder interviews virtually.

Table 1 displays a summary of the stakeholders interviewed by country and method. A complete list of interviewees is included in Annex III.

Table 1. Qualitative Data Collection by Country

Country	Individual Key Informant Interviews	Small Group Interviews	Focus Group Discussions
Belize	8	3	-
Burkina Faso	10	-	-
Jamaica	9	3	-
Liberia	13	-	3
US-based stakeholders	3	3	-
Total	43	9	3

The evaluation team kept notes during the interviews and group discussions. Key findings from field notes and the desk review were recorded using a *“Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations”* Matrix. Each evaluator independently analyzed their specific country data, using this matrix to triangulate themes by evaluation question and across respondent types. Then, the two evaluators convened to analyze their qualitative data jointly across the sites and in combination with the global stakeholder data as well as findings from the project documentation review to develop project-level findings, conclusions, and recommendations. This evaluation report presents the findings and highlights instances in which the evidence was inconsistent within a country or across countries. While the findings presented in Evaluation Question 1 pertain to all six countries of implementation (excluding Honduras), the findings presented in Evaluation Questions 2 through 10 are limited to the four countries visited for field work.

LIMITATIONS

The principal limitation of this evaluation is that it utilizes primary qualitative data from only four of the seven countries in which the program was implemented. Originally, the other countries were considered for remote data collection and Winrock provided respondent lists for remote interviews. However, the evaluation team and USDOL determined that the scope of work required to complete in country fieldwork in four countries and remote interviews in the three countries was too large and that introducing inconsistency in the application of data collection methods would impact the quality of the data and analysis provided by the evaluation team and ultimately the validity of the findings. DOL and the evaluation team agreed that the evaluators would continue with in country fieldwork and

remote interviews with global stakeholders but would not move forward with remote interviews for the two other countries. DOL encouraged the evaluation team to incorporate lessons learned and best practices from these two countries when possible if they encountered relevant information during their document review. The evaluation team incorporated data from those countries into its response to Evaluation Question 1 (achievement of targets) as well as in text boxes in other sections of the report.

Triangulation across a variety of sources in the four countries visited, as well as among US-based project stakeholders, allowed for conclusions to be drawn about the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and overall lessons learned in those countries. But, the results of this evaluation cannot be well generalized to the other three country sites, where differing contexts and experiences likely shaped the program and its achievements. For this reason, the findings of this evaluation are mainly presented by country, with identification of commonalities and differences that apply among visited countries.

Despite the ability to triangulate across sources, it was impossible to independently validate some of the claims made by interviewees, given the evaluation methodology. For example, claims about changes in general public awareness, would have required data collection among the public. It also was impossible to independently validate the achievement of outcomes that occurred after field work, when efforts toward reaching project targets were still ongoing. The April 2019 Technical Progress Report was used as the source for target achievements, because the evaluation team was able to discuss achievements through March 2019 with key stakeholder respondents in the field. Winrock International provided the evaluation team with numerous updates about progress toward targets and targets achieved after March 2019. This report notes the claims that could not be validated through triangulation or other sources.

The duration and timing of the site visits also presented some challenges for data collection and analysis. At the time of the field visits key activities were still being organized and implemented in each country under study, meaning that this evaluation may not capture the full extent of results achieved. Each site visit was scheduled to last for one week, resulting in some difficulties in rescheduling interviews that were canceled while evaluators were in the field. When circumstances beyond evaluators' control resulted in cancelled interviews, the schedules typically did not allow for accommodating them while in country. In Liberia for instance, a flight cancellation reduced the time available for field work to three and one-half days. The initial field planning was revised to accommodate the necessary changes. In Burkina Faso, security concerns prevented the access of the evaluator to one of the planned sites for face-to-face interviews. In most cases, the evaluators were able to complete missed interviews by phone, although despite multiple efforts to make up for missed opportunities, some planned interviews were not possible to conduct, including ones in Liberia, one in Belize, and two in Jamaica.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Key findings are organized along the five evaluation criteria: effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability, and lessons learned and replicability. Further, the findings are presented per evaluation question and are based on the evidence gathered by applying the

methodology described above.

EFFECTIVENESS

Question 1: To what extent has the project achieved its targets, results and activities?

Summary statement: *As of April 2019, the CLEAR II project increased the capacity to address CL in Belize, Burkina Faso, Jamaica, Liberia, Nepal, and Panama through achievement of 3 of 3 objective project indicators (OPIs), 5 of 12 outcome (OTC) indicators, and 75 of 108 country-specific output (OTP) indicators as established in the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) and country performance indicators and capacity targets that were revised in 2017-2018 and approved by USDOL in November 2018.⁶⁷*

Achievement of Objective Project Indicators (OPIs)

CLEAR II set targets for three objective project indicators (OPIs) and had achieved all three indicator targets by the time of the final performance evaluation (Table 2).

Table 2. CLEAR II Achievement Project Objective Targets

OBJECTIVE PROJECT INDICATORS	Target	Achieved
OPI 1. Number of countries with increased capacity to address CL (C1)	6	6
OPI 2. Number of countries with improved CL Capacity Scores	6	6
OPI 3. Global Learning Platform available for public use	1	1

SOURCE: Winrock International CLEAR II TPR April 2019

Country capacity to address CL issues has improved (OPI 1 and OPI 2). The CLEAR II project's ultimate goal of increasing the capacity to address CL and WFCL in the beneficiary countries was fully met (OPI1), as per the scores of that capacity measured before or early at the start of the project and at the end of the project. The Project measured this capacity in each country by applying the Child Labor Capacity Score (CLCS) methodology in six countries assisted: Nepal, Burkina Faso, Liberia, Panama, Jamaica, and Belize.⁸⁹ The CLCS was calculated before the start, or early at the start, of CLEAR II in each country and again in March-

⁶ Information of targets and actual values are drawn from Annex A of TPRs.

⁷ The original CMEP was approved in December 2015. In 2017-2018, the plan was revised to take into consideration the priority needs and local conditions of the countries that were selected to be assisted by CLEAR project: Nepal, Burkina Faso, Liberia, Honduras, Panama, Jamaica and Belize.

⁸ While Honduras received CLEAR II technical assistance, it was not part of the measurement as the support provided in this country was minimal and consisted of an assessment on existing gaps in social programs, policies and/or services in considering CL issues.

⁹ The methodology produces four scores: foundational, moderate, strong and advanced.

April 2019. In all cases the *final score was higher than the baseline, demonstrating increased capacities of countries to address CL (OPI2)*.

As described in project documentation¹⁰, major achievements made by CLEAR II in the six main implementation countries to increase the capacity to address CL include the following:

- In Burkina Faso, CLEAR II bolstered country capacity in the area of monitoring and enforcement of CL legislation (IO2), by providing and institutionalizing specialized training to labor inspectors to enhance knowledge, skills and abilities to monitor CL issues. Development of plans to coordinate monitoring and enforcement of CL legislation were also part of the assistance delivered under IO2. The project also provided assistance to draft and implement a child labor strategy and development of national and regional plans to fight CL (IO3).
- In Liberia, CLEAR II created a Legislative Reform Committee (LRC) with a wide range of members from government agencies and the private sector (IO1). CLEAR II provided capacity support to the LRC and helped LRC committee members to draft and validate reforms to CL legislation to comply with ILS. Under IO2, the project provided a labor inspector (LI) curriculum, training to enforcement officials, advice and training materials for institutionalization of LI training, and advice and guidelines to build skills and abilities to coordinate with the chamber of commerce. Under IO3, the project supported the development of national and regional action plans.
- In Belize, achievements included the creation of a Legislative Review Committee (LRC), which was instrumental to draft and validate CL legal reforms proposals to adapt local legislation to ILS (IO1). Under IO2, the project delivered a labor inspectorate curriculum, developed and implemented a training of trainers program, provided advice and training materials for institutionalization of training on enforcement of CL legislation, and facilitated working sessions to enhance coordination between government enforcement units and agencies and the private sector. In Belize activities to support the country on national action plan development (IO3) were canceled due to lack of local buy in.
- In Jamaica, under IO1, CLEAR II assisted the National Steering Committee on CL (NAS-TOCL) to draft hazardous and light work lists, which were validated but pending legislative approval and endorsement. Under IO2, the project developed a curriculum on prosecution and investigation of CL geared toward prosecutors and other enforcement officials, advice and training materials for institutionalization of training to enforce CL legislation, and developed and implemented a training of trainers (ToT) program, which has been adopted by the National Police Academy. It should be noted that achievements related to enforcement of CL legislation was not part of the original planning in Jamaica, but CLEAR II provided the assistance to respond to a direct request from the government of Jamaica. CLEAR II also worked with NASTOCL, to advance the development of the national action plan to fight CL, which was drafted after the evaluation field visit to Jamaica (IO3). Additionally, CLEAR II supported a Street Children study that had been initiated by the Child Protection and Family Services Agency (CPFSA).

¹⁰ Winrock International, April 2019. Changes in CLEAR II Child Labor Capacity Scores; and TPR April 2019.

- In Panama, under IO2, CLEAR II's labor inspectorate curriculum was endorsed by the Ministry of Labor by April 2019. CLEAR II also worked to enhance coordination between government enforcement units and the private sector (e.g., between Inspectors and coffee growers on how to support the recently enacted coffee industry code of conduct on CL and between Consejo Nacional de la Empresa Privada {CONEP, the Chamber of Commerce in Panama} and the Labor Inspectorate in addressing risks of child labor in corporate supply chains).
- In Nepal, under IO1, CLEAR II supported CL legislative adaption by formulating recommendations incorporated into the Children Act 2075, which passed in September 2018. Under IO2, the project developed plans to coordinate monitoring and enforcement of CL legislation, including guidelines for a Child Labor Monitoring System and a child labor inspection curriculum, both of which have seen uptake. The labor inspector's training to enhance knowledge, skills, and abilities to monitor CL issues was institutionalized. CLEAR II also worked to improve coordination between the Attorney General's office and the Labor Inspectorate to develop strong child labor cases for prosecution. Under IO3, CLEAR II technical assistance supported the drafting of a National Master Plan to fight CL, which was endorsed in July 2018. The project helped to mainstream child labor and child trafficking into a local disaster management response plan, under IO4.

During endline fieldwork, the evaluation team was able to corroborate that the four visited countries increased their capacities to address CL from project start to endline, as per the perceptions of all interviewees in the field. In effect, all respondents in Belize, Jamaica, Burkina Faso, and Liberia commonly perceived that country capacity to address CL issues increased and also *noted an increase in the general public awareness on CL*, though it was not possible for the evaluation team to validate whether there was an increase in public awareness.

The goal of making Global Learning Platform (GLP) available for public use was met (OPI3). CLEAR II met its objective project indicator related to making available the Global Learning Platform (GLP) aimed at facilitating a wide range of resources to all interested in CL. The GLP was created in early 2015 and has undergone improvements in response to recommendations made by the CLEAR II interim evaluation carried out in February-March 2017. During field work for this endline evaluation, we gathered opinions and perceptions on the use of the GLP. These findings are presented below under the Evaluation Question 3.

Achievement of Outcome Indicators (OTCs)

CLEAR II established eleven targets for OTC indicators distributed into the four IOs of the project.¹¹ Because of the variation in country workplans, there were differences in which countries were targeted for a given OTC. By April 2019, five OTC targets were fully achieved (Chart 1). The text below describes the specific achievements per OTC and the status of OTCs not achieved by April 2019 (additional details on CLEAR II contributions to local efforts for child labor reduction are provided under Question 2).

¹¹ Originally, there were 12 OTC indicators but CLEAR II determined that the OTC 4 related to strengthening of existing CLMS was not needed because countries assisted did not have a CLMS established.

Chart 1. CLEAR II Achievement of Outcome Targets, by Country as of April 2019

IO #	CLEAR II OUTCOME INDICATORS	# of countries with targets	Overall status of OTC targets	Nepal	Burkina Faso	Liberia	Panama	Belize	Jamaica
IO1	OTC 1. Number of countries where legal framework is adapted to meet international labor standards (ILS) (C)	4							
IO1	OTC 2. Number of countries with a functioning LRC	2							
IO2	OTC 3. Number of countries with CLMS established (C)	3							
IO2	OTC 4. Number of countries with a strengthened CLMS	0							
IO2	OTC 5. Number of government agencies institutionalizing training on child labor (C)	5 ^a							
IO2	OTC 6. Number of monitoring/ enforcement coordination plans implemented	6							
IO3	OTC 7. Number of operationalized local action plans for NAP implementation	2 ^b							
IO3	OTC 8. Number of countries where policies, plans or strategies to combat child labor are formulated and adopted (C)	3							
IO3	OTC 9. Number of countries with Research on Child Labor institutionalized (C)	1							
IO3	OTC 10. Number of functional CLU/coordinating bodies	3							
IO4	OTC 11. Number of relevant development, education, anti-poverty and other social programs, policies and/or services including CL (C)	1							
IO4	OTC 12. Number of government agencies that address CL within their social programs, policies and/or services	6 ^c							

SOURCE: CLEAR II, TPR April 2019. Additional OTC targets achieved after this date are not reflected in this chart. Indicators with a C in parenthesis are linked to USDOL's C1 Common Indicators list. Originally, there were 12 OTC indicators but CLEAR II determined that the OTC 4 related to strengthening of existing CLMS was not needed because countries assisted did not have a CLMS established. Therefore, OTC4 did not have targets. At the country-level, all color codes pertain to a target of 1 unless otherwise indicated.

Green = Fully achieved.

Yellow = Partially achieved.

Red = Not achieved.

^a Nepal had a target of 2. Jamaica did not have a target set against this indicator but has achieved the same result as other countries with targets.

^b Burkina Faso had a target of 4 and Liberia had a target of 3.

^c Nepal had a target of 2.

OTC 1. Number of countries where legal framework is adapted to meet international labor standards (ILS). *Linked to USDOL common indicator C1*

The countries with OTC1 targets were Nepal, Liberia, Jamaica, and Belize. In all four countries, CLEAR II completed a comprehensive legal analysis of CL local legislation and prepared, along with host government and private sector representatives, a set of validated recommendations to adapt the local laws and regulation to ILS. In Nepal, the Children's Act was approved and endorsed by the government in 2018, the Child Labour Act is pending endorsement. In Liberia, Jamaica and Belize, the legal recommendations were formulated, validated and submitted to government labor authorities for endorsement and subsequent submission to legislative bodies for final approval. Thus, this indicator was achieved in 1 of 4 countries (25%) at the time of fieldwork.

OTC2. Number of countries with functioning LRC.

The countries with OTC2 targets were Liberia and Belize. The Legislative Reform Committee (LRC) was launched in Liberia in late 2017, while the LRC in Belize was launched in June 2018. Since that time, both committees have been active, meeting to review and draft legislation. Thus, this indicator was achieved in 2 of 2 countries (100%) at the time of fieldwork.

OTC3. Number of countries with CLMS established. *Linked to USDOL common indicator C1*

The countries with OTC3 targets were Nepal, Burkina Faso, and Liberia. In Nepal, CLEAR II worked with the Panauti Municipality to develop and test CLMS guidelines and tools, and these were endorsed by the municipality. The project was in the process of developing a national CLMS framework document, a manual of procedures, and data collection tools in Burkina Faso. In Liberia, the project had developed guidelines encompassing a general plan and tools to establish a CLMS. In Liberia and Burkina Faso, these instruments were pending validation, in the form of an agreement of stakeholders to support the plan as well as its implementation, to be considered as fully achieved. Thus, this indicator was achieved in 1 of 3 countries (33%) at the time of fieldwork.¹²

OTC4. Number of countries with a strengthened CLMS.

CLEAR II did not set target for this indicator due to the fact that countries interested in related assistance on CLMS did not have an established CLMS unit to be strengthened. Instead the project focused on the establishment of CLMS in these countries under OTC3

OTC5. Number of government agencies institutionalizing training. *Linked to USDOL common indicator C1*

The countries with OTC5 targets were Nepal, Burkina Faso, Liberia, Panama and Belize. Nepal had a target of two government agencies, while the other countries each had one agency targeted. In these countries, CLEAR II provided assistance on institutionalization of training in CL enforcement geared primarily towards labor inspectors. In Nepal, the Pa-

¹² After evaluation field work, the CLMS-related instruments were validated and approved by the government, and the CLMS was established in Burkina Faso in June 2019, according to follow-up information from CLEAR II.

nauti Municipality adopted the labor inspectorate curriculum, as did the Department of Labor and Occupational Safety, which posted the curriculum on its website. In Panama, the curriculum was endorsed by the Ministry of Labor in April 2019 and, since the ToT, inspectors have used the curriculum to provide training to CONEP and to organize several other trainings. In Burkina Faso, Regional Directorates were conducting trainings using CLEAR II Training of Trainers (ToT) materials. The government of Liberia issued a letter accepting the labor inspectorate training. In Belize, the training has not been formally institutionalized.¹³ However, the Ministry of Labor has utilized the training for members of the Chamber of Commerce and plans additional trainings. While Jamaica did not initially have a target because similar labor inspectorate training had been provided by the ILO-funded TACKLE project, the project developed a TOT geared towards prosecution. The Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (ODPP) and CPFSA have adopted the TOT, and the National Police Academy has accepted for inclusion in their online training program. Thus, this indicator was achieved in 6 of 6 agencies (100%), in addition to one agency in Jamaica that was not included in the original target.

OTC6. Number of monitoring/enforcement coordination plans implemented.

The countries with OTC6 targets included Nepal, Burkina Faso, Liberia, Panama, Jamaica, and Belize. Assistance under this outcome includes helping these countries to formulate a regional implementation plan to share information on CL regulations, reporting systems, and monitoring procedures. At the time of the evaluation, only Nepal had implemented a standalone coordination plan. In Burkina Faso and Liberia, all training of trainers plans and regional NAP implementation plans included a coordination component. Preliminary work, discussions with Ministry of Labor (MoL) or verbal commitment had occurred in Jamaica, Belize, and Panama towards development of coordination plans. In Liberia, CLEAR II reported that work with a private company to formulate a coordination plan was delayed due to changes in the company's organizational leadership. Thus, this indicator was achieved in 1 of 6 countries (17%) at the time of fieldwork¹⁴.

OTC7. Number of operationalized local action plans for NAP implementation.

The countries with OTC7 targets were Burkina Faso and Liberia. CLEAR II set a target of four local actions plans to implement its NAP in Burkina Faso and three local plans in Liberia. In Burkina Faso, at the time of the evaluation field visits, three local plans had been developed and implemented in Cascades, Boucle du Mouhoun, and Nord. In Liberia, three local plans had been developed but not implemented at the time of the evaluation field work. Thus, this indicator was achieved in 3 of 7 plans to implemented (43%) at the time of fieldwork¹⁵.

¹³ After evaluation field work, CLEAR II informed the evaluation team that Belize has institutionalized the training curriculum.

¹⁴ After evaluation field work, CLEAR II informed the evaluation team that Liberia and Jamaica have both drafted coordination plans. However, it should be noted, that given that the project adapted its coordination strategies at the wishes of governments who preferred to incorporate coordination in other ways, or build it in to other existing plans such as local NAP action plans, tracking completion of standalone coordination plans is not an effective means of measuring progress towards coordination in CLEAR II countries.

¹⁵ The fourth plan in Burkina Faso was implemented by June 2019, according to follow-up information from CLEAR II.

OTC8. Number of countries where policies, plans or strategies to combat child labor are formulated and adopted. *Linked to USDOL common indicator C1*

The countries with OTC8 targets were Nepal, Burkina Faso, and Liberia. In Nepal, the project supported the development of the National Master Plan, which was endorsed by Cabinet in July 2018. In Burkina Faso, the project supported the government and other stakeholders to draft the National Child Labor Strategy and National Child Labor Strategy Operational Plan. Both were adopted by the Ministry of Labor in June 2017, and the operational plan is being implemented.¹⁶ In Liberia, the project supported the development and validation of the National Action Plan and the Multi-Year Workplan (2018 to 2020) for the strategy. The Multi-Year Workplan was adopted by the Ministry of Labor in April 2018. Thus, this indicator was achieved in 3 of 3 countries (100%)¹⁷.

OTC9. Number of countries with Research on Child labor institutionalized. *Linked to USDOL common indicator C1*

Jamaica was the only country with an OTC9 target. CLEAR II supported a Street Children study that had been initiated by the Child Protection and Family Services Agency, a local government agency. CLEAR II supported study planning and documentation, such as developing inputs for the sampling plan and the methodology. Thus, this indicator was achieved in 1 of 1 countries (100%).

OTC 10. Number of functional CLU/coordinating bodies.

The countries with OTC10 targets were Liberia, Belize, and Jamaica. In Liberia, the National Steering Committee was launched by the government and is in charge of working on NAP implementation. In Jamaica, the National Steering Committee on Child Labor (NASTOCL) was launched by the government and is the coordinating body responsible for the design and implementation of activities or regulations to reduce CL in the context of the NAPs. Both committees meet regularly, and CLEAR II supported them with logistical and other technical assistance. In Belize, the National Child Labour Committee (NCLC) is responsible for NAP development and has been meeting. However, it has not involved CLEAR II in the meetings and therefore no assistance under this outcome can be attributed towards achievement of this target. Thus, this indicator was achieved in 2 of 3 countries (66%) at the time of fieldwork.

OTC11. Number of relevant development education, anti-poverty and other social programs, policies and/or services including CL. *Linked to USDOL common indicator C1*

Nepal was the only country with an OTC11 target. In workshops and consultation meetings, CLEAR II provided assistance to Nepal in order to mainstream child labor and child trafficking within a local disaster management response plan, which was endorsed by the municipality. Thus, this indicator was achieved in 1 of 1 countries (100%).

¹⁶ The National Child Labor Strategy was endorsed by Cabinet in May 2019, according to follow-up information from CLEAR II.

¹⁷ After evaluation field work, CLEAR II informed the evaluation team that a draft of the NAP was developed in Jamaica in May 2019.

OTC 12. Number of government agencies that address CL within their social programs, policies and/or services.

According to a global summary of performance indicators and capacity targets, the countries with OTC12 targets (under IO4) include Nepal, Burkina Faso, Belize, Jamaica, Liberia, and Panama. Nepal had a target of two government agencies, while the other countries each had one agency targeted. In contrast, many of the country-specific results frameworks did not include content related to IO4 (ie, there was no listing of outcomes or outputs under this intermediate objective), making it difficult to identify what the project aimed to do and to achieve.

The evaluation team found inconclusive evidence about the achievement of this target. In the field, most respondents from the host government agencies and the private sector could not identify work by CLEAR II on OTC12. A global target achievement summary in CLEAR II reports¹⁸ shows that five out of seven government agencies met the target by April 2019, an execution of 71%. The country-specific target achievement summaries indicate that the results for Liberia, Jamaica, and Belize were expected to be achieved under other intermediate objectives, although the project documentation does not detail the specific results achieved in Liberia and Jamaica where the target is shown as being met. The Panama summary does not contain any narrative about how this target was achieved. The summary for Burkina Faso indicates that this target is being achieved through IO2, while the reports for Nepal indicate that the Panauti Municipality has allocated funds for child labor inspection training and child labor monitoring by October 2018 and was in the process of allocating funds for CLMS in April 2019¹⁹.

Achievement of Output Indicators (OTPs)

The number of targets at the output indicator (OTP) level differed across countries evaluated, and there was wide variation in the achievement of OTP indicators by country (Chart 2). As of April 2019, at the country level, Nepal was the only country to achieve all of its CLEAR II OTP targets, which is not surprising given that the project's 2016 launch there allowed for a substantially longer implementation than the other countries. On the other hand, implementation in Jamaica started last, and the project had achieved 6 of 14 targets (43% achievement). Within IOs, the achievement of output targets was somewhat consistent - within each IO, about 70% of the output targets had been met or exceeded.

¹⁸ Source: Annex A of the CLEAR II October 2018 TPR and April 2019 TPR

¹⁹ After evaluation field work, CLEAR II informed the evaluation team that Nepal Panauti municipality allocated budget for CL monitoring and Belize adopted CL training into MOL training program. As such, 7 out of 7 government agencies have met the target.

Table 3. CLEAR II Achievement of Output Targets by Country as of April 2019

Intermediate objective	Jamaica		Liberia		Burkina Faso		Nepal		Belize		Panama		Global - all countries			
	# of targets and status	# targets/ % achieved	# of targets and status	# targets/ % achieved	# of targets and status	# targets/ % achieved	# of targets and status	# targets/ % achieved	# of targets and status	# targets/ % achieved	# of targets and status	# targets/ % achieved	# of targets and status	Achievement summary		
IO 1 Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with ILS	 6	1=147%	 9	6=100%	 2	2=100%	 6	6=100%	 7	1=214%	 0	no targets set	 30	21 fully achieved 3 partially achieved 6 not achieved		
		2=100%		1=86%						1=150%					1=57%	
		3=0%		2=0%						2=100%					1=25%	
										1=0%						
IO 2 Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation and regulations related to CL improved	 4	1=100%	 12	1=120%	 10	1=500%	 11	1=197%	 6	1=200%	 8	1=800%	 51	35 fully achieved 1 partially achieved 15 not achieved		
		1=83%		1=116%		1=280%				1=136%						
		2=0%		6=100%		1=108%				3=100%					3=100%	2=100%
				4=0%		3=100%				4=0%					1=120%	1=0%
IO 3 Increased implementation of National Action Plans on Child Labor, including WFCL	 4	1=150%	 6	1=150%	 7	4=100%	 3	3=100%	 0	no targets set	 0	no targets set	 20	15 fully achieved 5 not achieved		
		1=100%		1=107%		3=0%										
		2=0%		4=100%												
IO 4 Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address child labor, including WFCL	 0	no targets set	 0	no targets set	 0	no targets set	 4	4=100%	 0	no targets set	 3	3=0%	 7	4 fully achieved 3 not achieved		

SOURCE: CLEAR II, TPR April 2019. Additional OTP targets achieved after this date are not reflected in this chart.

Dark Green = 100% of targets achieved.

Light Green = At least 60% of targets achieved. Yellow = More than 0% of targets achieved, but less than 60%. Red = 0% of targets achieved.

Blue = No targets set.

Question 2: To what extent has the project contributed to local efforts for child labor reduction?

Summary statement: *A majority of respondents from host government ministries and agencies and the private sector, in all evaluated countries, credit CLEAR II for substantial contributions to national efforts to combat child labor. Assistance provided by the project contributed to increased local capacity to comply with ILS, enhanced local capacity for CL monitoring and enforcement, and increased capacity for implementation of National Action Plans.*

Increased capacity to comply with ILS

Of the countries visited for this evaluation, CLEAR II supported Liberia, Jamaica and Belize to comply with ILS. One area of contribution was the legal expertise and experience transferred to stakeholders to adapt local CL legislation to ILS. A second area of assistance was around organizational capacity to collaborate effectively with a wide range of CL stakeholders from civil society, the private sector, and the government, including line ministries and other agencies.

Support to adapt CL legislation to ILS

CLEAR II made significant contributions towards committee member knowledge about alignment to ILS and how to draft CL legislation and regulations. A challenge in these countries is the formal adoption of the legislation and regulations.

- Most respondents from government, private sector and civil society in all three countries recognized their deficits in knowledge and skills to adapt local legislation toward ILS at the beginning of the project. In fact, all government and civil society respondents in Belize and Jamaica recognized that before the project, they had important weaknesses in combating CL issues because of their limited knowledge of ILS. Examples quoted by respondents include lacking (1) a clear definition of child and hazardous work, (2) effective updated penalties to discourage for CL legislation violations, (3) labor inspectors trained to effectively identify and report CL cases.
- Respondents from LRCs cited the expertise and experience of the LWOB as a principal factor contributing to their increased skills and knowledge around adaptation of CL legislation towards ILS. That expertise and experience was imparted in trainings and workshops and in tools and resources that could be adapted to each national context. As one example, in Liberia, LWOB shared Hazardous and Work Lists from other countries so as to facilitate comparison.
- Some respondents in Belize and Jamaica indicated that the legislative analysis itself informed LRC members about the potential focus areas for ILS alignment, and rapid reference cards also helped local authorities and stakeholders understand the legislative gaps in alignment to ILS.
- According to a majority of US-based stakeholders, host government representatives, and field-based project staff, the project has succeeded in supporting countries to conduct a comprehensive legal analysis in the adaptation of child labor legislation. This included Hazardous and Light Work Lists developed in all three countries. In Belize and Liberia, other laws also were reviewed and recommendations for amendments were drafted by the LRCs with support from CLEAR II.

- At the time of the evaluation field work, while the project had increased capacities of all assisted countries in adapting CL local legislation to ILS, evaluation field work observed that CL legal reforms developed by CLEAR II have not been approved by corresponding bodies to make them mandatory in Liberia, Jamaica and Belize -- an action that is ultimately outside of the project's control.²⁰

Support to coordinate interagency development of CL legislation

The creation of legislative review committees (LRC) in Belize and Liberia increased the organizational capacity of the MoL, other participant government agencies, and private sector representatives to collaborate and coordinate interagency and multi-sectoral work for development of comprehensive and sound CL laws and regulations in compliance with ILS. In Jamaica, CLEAR II worked with the National Steering Committee on Child Labor (NASTOCL) and created working groups to adapt CL legislation to ILS. In Belize, most respondents consider this approach as successful and some of them even as a best practice as it allowed to produce legal reforms in a short period of time and with consensus from a wide range of stakeholders host government, private sector and civil society.

- All respondents from the government and private sector in Jamaica, Belize and Liberia credit CLEAR II with providing key advice, training and resources to coordinate and organize various stakeholders working on CL to develop legislative reforms that would be consistent across all sectoral legislation on key topics (e.g., definition of a child, compulsory education age, hazards for specific sectors, penalties, work permitted to children, and mitigation measures to hazardous work)
- Most interviewees in Liberia, Jamaica and Belize, including LRC working group members as well as external observers, considered the assistance provided to enhance coordination and organization of stakeholders within the LRC to be of high quality and motivating to coordinate interagency efforts to effectively reduce CL. Some interviewees mentioned the deep commitment to project results held by most technical members of the committees or working groups.

Enhanced local capacity for CL monitoring and enforcement

CLEAR II contributions towards monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation and regulations were organized around two main areas of activities. In all four countries visited by evaluators, one set of activities related to the capacity of labor inspectors and labor inspectorates. In Burkina Faso and Liberia, another set of activities pertained to the establishment of Child Labor Monitoring Systems (CLMS).

Support to labor inspectorates

Overall, the project provided significant support to government authorities to increase the capacity of labor inspectorates according to a majority of interviewees.

²⁰ Since the evaluation field work, CLEAR II has received a formal communication from the Ministry of Labor in Belize and in Jamaica, committing them to the passage of legislation.

- **Country-focused support** - The CLEAR II approach was to provide support tailored to the needs of each of the four countries. To that extent, labor inspectorates' assessments were carried out in each of the countries to assess organizational capacity, followed by the development of different training curricula for the particular countries. In Belize, Burkina Faso, and Liberia the project surveyed inspectors on their training needs to ensure focus of support in areas of expressed needs.
- **Training of Trainers (ToT)**- In the four countries visited by evaluators, support to labor inspectorates and government agencies also was provided through delivery of ToT, an approach selected to increase the likelihood of the initial training's outreach to wider audiences through a training cascade. There are multiple examples of how the TOT contributed to an increased CL monitoring and enforcement capacity in the countries. In Burkina Faso, after having initially trained labor inspectors from the 13 regions, CLEAR II supported the replication of trainings to inspectors (or controllers) and other stakeholders in different regions. The trainees of the initial ToT facilitated sessions that trained over 300 stakeholders (including 137 inspectors and controllers) across the different regions. In Belize and Liberia, CLEAR II facilitated trained inspectors to train external stakeholders such as Chamber of Commerce.

CLEAR II Training of Trainers in Nepal

A major focus for CLEAR II in Nepal has been integrating child labor issues into labor inspectorate training in collaboration with the Ministry of Labor, Employment and Social Security (MoLESS). Winrock designed a series of workshops using a Training of Trainers (ToT) model to equip representatives from government, the private sector, nonprofit and unions with the knowledge to effectively identify and respond to child labor in Nepal. The training resulted in participants taking ownership of the further development and delivery of curriculum. The new trainers have developed plans for disseminating their knowledge and skills, targeting policy makers and inspectors. They have delivered an independent workshop targeting Social Mobilizers, who are on the frontlines in fighting child labor in Nepal, cutting across the education and health sectors. The CLEAR II ToT activities have also led to the signing of a Letter of Intent for the government to play a leadership role in coordinating future trainings, indicating a long-term commitment to sustainability.

- The contribution of the project is further confirmed by the **endorsement of the training curriculum** in host countries, such as in Liberia where the MoL included an introductory letter in the training curriculum. There are also **examples of institutionalization** of training. In Jamaica, the National Police Academy has committed to using CLEAR II resources in its online platform, and the ODPP also has committed to using the materials. The Jamaican Child Protection and Family Services Agency also has trained its staff, primarily social workers, using the TOT curriculum and the guidelines to train others.
- While interviewees in all four countries praised the important contributions of CLEAR II to increase the capacities of labor inspectorates, limitations to the full enforcement of labor legislation persist. Namely, respondents in Burkina Faso and Liberia pointed to

the lack of stable funding to regularly conduct inspections, and respondents in Jamaica and Liberia cited challenges in enforcement in the informal sector.

Support to establish CLMS

The project made major contributions to support government authorities in Burkina Faso and Liberia for the establishment of CLMS, according to a majority of respondents.

- In Burkina Faso, the approach envisioned was to build on experience from a previous pilot project on CLMS²¹. As such, it was foreseen that knowledge deriving from that project would support the development of CLMS documents (CLMS Framework Document, Manual of Procedures, Data Collection Tools). The CLEAR II activity was delayed due to the need to reach an agreement with MoL on the objectives and expectations of the consultancy to carry out this work. After the consultancy company was retained and prepared the documents, they were presented to a Monitoring Committee for feedback and suggestions. At the time of the final evaluation fieldwork, the process was not finalized. After fieldwork, CLEAR II helped to organize a workshop to validate the various documents. Further to the validation, the MoL has drafted a National Operational Plan on CLMS, corroborating MoL and in-country project staff responses about the local interest in having a CLMS. However, roll-out of the CLMS was beyond the scope of the project and has not yet occurred.
- In Liberia, the participatory process for developing CLMS guidelines and resources was to organize a series of workshops that involved members of a National Working Group on CLMS (created from an NSC committee on monitoring and evaluation) and assessments in target communities. Community assessments were done involving members of local child labor systems that are to benefit from CLMS tools, such as Children Welfare Committees (led by the Ministry of Gender, Children, and Social Protection) and former community advocates from a previous Winrock-implemented project in Liberia.²² The process further involved field-testing of tools. Then, the CLMS Guidelines were drafted and shared with the MoL, though the necessary approvals have not been obtained from the MoL. Local stakeholders reported that delays in obtaining approvals are linked with limited political will of the new government elected during CLEAR II implementation. According to one respondent from the MoL and one from the Ministry of Gender, the CLMS is to be coordinated in the future by the Ministry of Gender, Children, and Social Protection, although a Ministry official highlighted financial challenges to operationalize the system.

Increased capacity for implementation of National Action Plans

CLEAR II made significant contributions around the development and implementation of National (and local) Action Plans to fight child labor in Burkina Faso, Jamaica and Liberia,

²¹ USDOL-funded Reducing Child Labor through Education and Services (RCLES) project, implemented by Counterpart International in 2017

²² Actions to Reduce Child Labor (ARCH) Project, Implemented by Winrock International

according to the majority of respondents from government and local collaborators. However, this activity was cancelled in Belize due to lack of local buy in and lack of a fully functional CL unit that could lead the process.

- In Burkina Faso, CLEAR II undertook three main activities towards the development and implementation of national and local action plans (for NAP implementation).
 - In 2017 CLEAR II provided support to the development of the National Child Labor Strategy 2018-2020 and its operational plan. The endorsement of the strategy occurred in June 2019. Respondents from the MoL indicated that the main reasons for the long period for approval related to lack of clarity concerning which procedures to follow for endorsement, an internal factor to MoL.
 - CLEAR II support has also allowed for the development of local action plans for NAP implementation in four regions in Burkina Faso (Boucle du Mouhoun, Cascades, Haut Bassins and Nord). Regional representatives from different line ministries and civil society organizations praised the support provided by CLEAR II towards the development of the regional plans. They thought well of the processes used, as they included different types of stakeholders for formulation together with training on elements essential to addressing child labor, and the plans were validated between different public authorities. One respondent from the MoL at regional level noted that the plans are important tools for clarifying activities to implement and for fundraising among development partners.
 - Further to the development of the local action plans, CLEAR II was able to provide targeted implementation support in all four regions to organize two sensitization workshops per region. Respondents from the regions praised this support, as it allowed them to conduct awareness raising on child labor issues -- an activity typically challenged by the gaps in operating budgets of the Regional Directorates for Labor.
- In Jamaica, CLEAR II undertook two main activities toward the development of national policies to combat child labor.
 - CLEAR II supported development of the NAP, although a first draft of the plan was produced after the final evaluation fieldwork.
 - CLEAR II assisted in the institutionalization of research on CL through the provision of technical assistance to conduct a study on street children, which is being carried out by the Child Protection and Family Services Agency. The assistance provided included a workshop to define the terms of the study, which included review of inception report and drafting of a questionnaire to gather primary data on the phenomena of street children. Findings from the study will inform policy decision-making to address main factors leading to the prevalence of street children.
- In Liberia, CLEAR II undertook activities in support of the National Steering Committee (NSC) towards the development of an implementation plan for the NAP and regular support to coordination efforts.

- The Liberia National Action Plan was drafted and validated by the NSC in 2016 and 2017 but not endorsed until after the evaluation field work in June 2019. During that time, CLEAR II supported the NSC towards the development of a National Multiyear Workplan (2018-2020). This plan was the first country effort towards the roll-out of the NAP and an important feature in the fight against child labor, according to MoL respondents.
- In addition, CLEAR II supported NACOMAL to organize regional workshops in Bomi County, Bong County and Grand Bassa County for presentation of the NAP and Multi-year Workplan. Attended by stakeholders from different ministries, civil society representatives, Liberia National Police and others, these fora allowed for the development of three local action plans, which have not yet been operationalized.
- CLEAR II also provided the NSC with coordination training workshops for the development of a Child Labor Coordination Plan and technical support for NSC quarterly meetings.
- Respondents from the National Steering Committee confirmed CLEAR II's important contributions toward the development of tools and increased local knowledge around CL. However, they noted a lack of political will to support endorsements and provide the necessary funding for effective roll-out.

Question 3: What project approaches or activities were successful and what contributed to their success? What, if any, approaches or activities were less successful and what contributed to their lack of success?

Summary statement: *Strong evidence was found that CLEAR II implemented two approaches with high success: 1. the creation of committees or ad-hoc working groups to adapt CL local legislation to ILS; work done in specific themes under this approach made substantial progress in project implementation; and 2. the design and delivery of a set of resources to monitor and enforce CL legislation, which proved to be a very effective means to enhance government agencies to address CL and WFCL. The Global Learning Platform and International Advisory Council were less successful, as were the project approaches related to communication and engagement with senior government stakeholders and selection of activities targeting results outside of project's control.*

Successful activities/approaches

1. LRC approach to draft CL reforms (under IO1)

CLEAR II developed legislative review committees/legislative reform committees (LRC in Belize and Liberia and sub-committee of the National Steering Committee on Child Labor in Jamaica) to propose detailed legal reforms to adapt local legislation to ILS. A majority of legislative working group members interviewed reported that CLEAR II support allowed for their increased knowledge around child labor and for the drafting of high-quality pieces of legislation and regulations in line with ILS.

The project's support to the LRC, mainly channeled through the subgrantee LWOB, used different tools to foster knowledge and ownership by LRC members. These included workshops and trainings (on legislative analysis and drafting, for example). In all countries, respondents identified the high quality training on drafting laws to be important to improving efficiency and effectiveness of government agencies to reduce CL.

The LRC were also platforms to share knowledge, experience, international best practices, and standards on CL. Informants recognized this information sharing as an important contribution to improve local capacity to combat CL and to raise awareness on CL issues. For example, in Jamaica in a NASTOCL meeting, the sharing of a PowerPoint lecture by LWOB discussing working age limits, hazardous and light work, was considered instrumental in raising awareness and increasing motivation to work against CL²³. In Liberia, members of the LRC highlighted that they now sensitize others about CL in their professional settings and communities.

According to government counterparts in Belize, one LRC success factor was the careful selection of committee members (based on their high interest in contributing to the work against CL). In general, members of the committees showed motivation and commitment to achieving results. This was complemented by the approach to work with government technical officers responsible for CL matters, instead of senior authorities, because it helped to overcome the challenge of reaching quorum and consistent attendance at meetings. Belize used this strategy with success as the recommendations to adapt CL legislation were completed within schedule.

While the CL legal reforms were validated by the working groups in Liberia, Belize and Jamaica, there were some delays in endorsement or approval of the proposed texts by the requisite national authorities, a factor outside the control of the project.

2. Toolkits to strengthen enforcement of CL legislation (under IO2)

CLEAR II provided two separate toolkits: (1) a tailored Labor Inspector toolkit in Burkina Faso, Liberia, Belize, Panama, and Nepal and (2) a Prosecution and Investigation toolkit in Jamaica. The toolkits were comprised of a core curriculum, training the trainer program, and other supporting documentation (e.g., guidelines to conduct investigations and coordinate enforcement work among different government agencies). The toolkits are considered a major success for most respondents. Broadly, respondents in Liberia, Belize and Jamaica said resources provided through their respective toolkits improved their knowledge, skills and abilities, and thus, the effectiveness of labor inspectors and prosecutors; the evaluation team was unable to objectively validate these claims. The context-specific adaptations of the toolkits also contributed to the success of this activity, giving users detailed examples relevant to their country rather than generalized guidance, according to respondents in Liberia, Jamaica, and Belize. Respondents from implementing partners and government staff also believed that the toolkits were likely to promote sustainability in the area of legislation enforcement.

²³ After field work, the evaluation team confirmed that the video was shared by LWOB.

Less successful activities/approaches

1. Global Learning Platform

The evaluation found limited evidence of utilization of ***Global Learning Platform*** (GLP)²⁴, which was initially conceived as an interactive and multilingual portal that would complement in-country capacity building efforts through the provision of training modules and other tools. The Interim Evaluation Report identified shortcomings in the GLP and recommended refocusing the GLP to produce and post more original content and disseminate content to relevant users. Following this feedback, the focus of the platform was shifted toward idea sharing between field staff, with a discussion board and blog. Several efforts to redesign the platform were reported by CLEAR II in its TPRs, the latest of which in the CLEAR II April 2019 TPR, that highlights the redesign of the platform “to emphasize tools, resources, and materials developed by the project”.

The GLP provides electronic access to resources and tools on addressing child labor in the countries of CLEAR II implementation. According to the CLEAR II April 2019 TPR, the project expects that these resources will support the continued work of country partners, particularly due to the available of capacity building resources. Nevertheless, interviews with in-country staff and partners in the four countries revealed low usage of the platform, with various reasons given for the low usage. The majority of respondents in all evaluated countries, ranging from government officials to local collaborators, told the evaluation team that they had never heard of this resource, while some interviewees such as project staff in the different countries reported little or no use of the platform. Others who were aware of the GLP in Jamaica indicated that it was not adequate given that its content does not provide relevant information on the country. However, although utilization of the platform may have been low, open access to experiences and resources over the internet was of interest to many respondents.

2. International Advisory Council

As a global innovation introduced by the project, the ***International Advisory Council*** (IAC), created in early 2015, was to be a council of experts available to provide on-demand expertise to US-based and field-based project staff. As indicated in the Project Document, this council would offer pro-bono support to the CLEAR II project team and other stakeholders, upon request from the project. Nevertheless, the IAC was not fully utilized through the project period.

According to one US-based stakeholder, IAC members were ready and able to respond, but the utilization of the IAC was fully demand driven and only limited requests were made throughout 2016-2018. The evaluation team was unable to determine the reasons for the limited utilization. During that period support provided included:

- Webinars on topics such as monitoring and enforcement of CL legislation, social protection, development of NAPs, and general policy issues.

²⁴ <https://www.winrock.org/ms/clear-ii-glp/>

- Feedback and guidance during a September 2018 virtual discussion on experiences with CLMS, held among CLEAR II home and field staff, and Winrock child labor project representatives.
- Assistance with CMEP revisions

As the project approaches its end date, IAC members have prepared to engage in ‘country-pairings’ -- activities focused on pairing in-country teams with IAC members to brainstorm solutions for specific issues. While one discussion took place in Jamaica in April 2019 to the benefit of the country team, interviews with field staff in other countries revealed little knowledge about this possibility.

There also were some approaches underlying activities that appear less successful:

1. *The majority of interviewees agreed that the approval of legal reforms by corresponding bodies is beyond the control of CLEAR II.* Even though the technical work was very effective in preparing recommendations to amend CL local laws and regulations, their approval ultimately depends on a variety of factors including political will and changes in country priorities. Several respondents indicated that this activity should have included advocacy work to promote approval of proposed CL legal reforms. Others suggested that endorsement or approval of changes in country legislation should not have been part of the project expected results.
2. *While CLEAR II fostered communication at all levels of government (from technical staff to appointed positions), respondents noted that relationship management and communication with senior government authorities (appointed positions) was not always enough* when it came to discussing implementation progress and identifying corrective measures to ensure expected results and sustained commitment of high-level government authorities. Technical work within CLEAR II committees and working groups proved effective as many deadlines were met as planned (for example, draft of recommendations of legal reforms; trainings on legal analysis and law enforcement; elaboration of manuals, labor inspectorate curriculums, and coordination with government agencies). However, when technical work needed approval from authorities to move forward, the project sometimes found that senior authorities were not maintaining an awareness of project progress. Time was then spent briefing these authorities and, in some cases, convincing them about the relevancy of the work being carried out. For this reason, some activities, products and results were not delivered according to deadlines.

Question 4: How did the project coordinate with various entities, including sub-grantees, other donor-funded projects in countries where CLEAR II was implemented, host governments, and USDOL? How did this coordination contribute to the outcomes of the project? What were the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration?

Summary statement: *Coordination between USDOL and the implementing partners was rated as highly satisfactory. Coordination and collaboration with host country governments*

and other stakeholders was good and was key to success. However, challenges related to levels of commitment among senior government officials and time limitations, among other factors, affected collaboration.

All respondents felt that the **implementing partners and USDOL** coordinated and collaborated well. CLEAR II staff and USDOL have had close communication to develop workplans and to identify deviations and necessary adjustment to ensure achievement of planned activities and expected outputs and outcomes. Such adjustments include: the extension of period of performance on two occasions, the revision of the CMEP to align it to assist countries' needs, coordination to support the interim mid-term evaluation (carried out in February-March 2017) and the final evaluation, and implementation of recommendations made in the mid-term evaluation report. The idea was always "solve issues as fast as possible" to ensure success. Respondents described the processes as highly thorough, useful and participatory, allowing for a common definition and understanding on goals, objectives, targets, and timelines through joint analyses of what activities/objectives remained realistic, which required revision, and whether assumptions still held.

There was consensus among respondents from Winrock, LWOB, and Verité that there was a very good interaction **between CLEAR II implementing partners** at all times. This was especially important because subgrantees did not have permanent presence in CLEAR II countries. Some respondents expressed that lack of permanent presence and enough personnel in country was a critical factor to effective coordination of project activities. Thus, activities under the responsibility of subgrantees depended on the support of Winrock country teams for organization. For example, Winrock coordinated logistics (e.g., distributed invitations, arranged the location, etc.) for meetings and trainings delivered by Verité under IO2. There also was effective collaboration between LWOB and Verité, including sharing of information and co-conducting workshops and other activities together in a few circumstances. For example, in Liberia, the two subgrantees conducted a coordination workshop that strengthened collaboration among stakeholders in advocating for passage and implementation of the NAP legislation enforcement; this was considered a success and an example of a best practice.

Collaboration **between Winrock headquarters and country project staff** was also very effective, resulting in smooth coordination of logistics and other administrative planning and execution of activities. For example, in Liberia, CLEAR II country staff highlighted how open communication lines with Winrock in the US allowed for clarity around roles and responsibilities. In Liberia, staff indicated that when they consulted headquarters for major decisions, headquarters staff were responsive and proactive in supporting them. The CLEAR II country teams exhibited a high level of commitment to achieving the outputs and outcomes under IPs responsibility in all countries, which the evaluation team sees as a contributing factor to success, particularly given that the subgrantees do not have permanent presence in countries.

Coordination and collaboration **with the host-country governments** is seen as critical for success. However, there was variation in the extent to which coordination with host-country governments was deemed sufficient by respondents. Respondents from Winrock, LWOB, and Verité generally reported that coordination with the host-country governments

was good. Nearly all host government stakeholders reported that coordination and collaboration with lower- and mid-level government staff for technical activities was good. Nevertheless, about one-half of the host government respondents in Belize, Jamaica, and Burkina Faso reported that communication with senior host-government authorities to discuss project progress towards results was limited and needed improving, as discussed above in EQ3.

Respondents noted several factors that helped promote good collaboration with host-country governments. One was the commitment of host government technical staff to the achievement of outputs and outcomes (a fact noted by implementers, collaborators and beneficiaries). Another key approach to close coordination and collaboration was to include CLEAR II work plans as part of the government agencies' work plan, toward "institutionalization of the project". In the four visited countries, jointly designing workplans with host country counterparts facilitated project work plans to be embedded in government work plans -such as within line ministries, decentralized agencies, steering committees, and even municipalities- and to improve coordination with host governments. Examples of successful collaboration with host-country governments includes:

- In Liberia, the in-country project team built on relations established from a prior Winrock project in Liberia (ARCH), and the CLEAR II country office was located at the premises of the Liberia MoL for one year. The co-location allowed the project immediate access to MoL stakeholders.
- In Belize, at least half of the respondents noted that the joint, careful selection of members of the LRC by CLEAR II and senior government representatives was a success factor; this could be considered a good practice.
- In Burkina Faso, where collaboration with the central government was not optimal, CLEAR II successfully engaged with regional authorities in four regions. As a result, local plans supporting the NAP were developed and implementation support was provided.

The extent of coordination *with other donor-funded projects* varied by country. In each country, CLEAR II attempted to identify stakeholders including other donor-funded projects working in the field. When identified, those working on CL issues were contacted/approached to seek synergies, complementarities, avoid duplications or share information. We found, according to respondents, that in Liberia and Burkina Faso there was little presence of other stakeholders working on CL. In Jamaica there were collaboration-seeking interactions with ILO and the Child Protection Partnership (CPP). In Belize there was communication with Fair Trade International and the European Union, which did a study in the sugar cane industry related to CL issues.

Successes and challenges

A major success noted by most respondents relates to how CLEAR II succeeded in fostering intense coordination and ample collaboration in the working groups. Through LWOB, the project has supported drafting of several amendments to align legal framework to ILS in the CLEAR II implementation countries. Examples of this are the drafting of recommenda-

tions for amendments to the Decent Work Act penalties and Labor Act in Liberia; recommendations for the Labor Act, Shops Act, and Education Act in Belize; and the drafting of the lists of hazardous and light work in Belize, Jamaica, and Liberia. Coordinated and collaborative development of NAP is also listed as a success by respondents including government officials and CSO representatives.

One of the keys for the success appears to derive from a careful selection of motivated and interested government and private sector counterparts for membership to the working groups. The majority of respondents agreed that political buy-in of senior authorities in target countries obtained before and after the project award, and sustained throughout the life of the project, was key to ensure optimal collaboration of the officers assigned to project activities. The solid combination of engaging employees, employers and government representatives with local staff expertise and logistics coordination facilitated agreements on CL issues. As a result, this approach promoted thorough revision of CL legislation in a short period of time. In Belize, respondents noted that the direct involvement and close communication with senior government authorities contributed to the project's success in preparing recommendations to adapt CL local legislation to ILS. Also, in Belize, an agreement among LRC members to adopt a model where parents provide signed permit to let their children work under good labor conditions and well-coordinated workshops, have been identified as great successes.

Despite coordination and collaboration among IPs, government agencies and representatives from the private sector and civil society in all countries, there were important challenges that resulted in delays in implementation of some activities and submission of project deliverables. For instance, despite intensive coordination and logistics support for LRC's working meetings, committee member attendance proved a notable challenge leading to cancellation of meetings due to lack of quorum. This resulted in delays in moving forward with activities.

As mentioned previously, some government respondents in Jamaica and Belize stated that the project activities were too ambitious and unrealistic for the project period, meaning the more time could have been allocated to complete planned activities. This was compounded by challenges around obtaining buy-in from higher levels of governments, such as in Burkina Faso. In Liberia, MoL staff revealed that senior MoL staff requested the project budget for activities such as workshops before allowing the participation of technical staff, delaying certain activities.

Question 5: How effectively did the project draft, implement, and disseminate the resources developed under the project?

Summary statement: *All planned resources under the CLEAR II project were produced in all countries and distributed, to the extent possible, among all beneficiaries and program participants during training, workshops, meetings and awareness activities. While the project effectively reached a range of recipients by inviting diverse audiences to various events, some key host-country stakeholders wished that certain resources had broader dissemination. Host-country stakeholders broadly agreed that the resources were high quality, and there is evidence that stakeholders subsequently used the resources.*

The CLEAR II project produced all planned resources, including labor inspectorate and prosecutor curricula; ToT; legal analysis of legislation; manuals on writing legal documents; rapid reference cards on CL issues and definitions; labor inspectorate assessments; and pamphlets and brochures.

- LWOB worked under IO1 to increase host-country capacity to develop CL legislation, regulations, directives and guidelines that are compliant with ILS. In this regard, resources in each country were developed considering the different realities in the targeted countries and, more importantly, the particular capacity building needs. Resources disseminated include legislative assessments; the legislative manuals, which address how to propose and draft legal/policy documents; the Jamaica Training of Trainers manual and video recordings of the TOT lectures; and rapid reference cards that convey basic knowledge on CL such as definitions, regulations, etc. In Liberia, to encourage ratification of ILO convention 138, the NACOMAL coordinator (who also was the LRC Chairperson) was provided with copies of the Convention and Rapid Reference Cards to distribute to members of the Liberian Legislative branch (House of Representatives and Senate).
- Verité produced resources to improve country capacity on monitoring and enforcement of policy, and legislation and regulations related to CL. Resources developed and disseminated included the ToT for labor inspectors, which was translated in four languages; and an organizational improvement kit, aimed at focusing management on systemic issues that may prevent effectively addressing CL in the countries. Training and coordination plans were shared with relevant counterparts and beneficiaries. This included training materials for the private sector and chambers of commerce, where templates of contracts to be signed by children and employers, which address CL issues, were also provided.

Resources developed by CLEAR II were distributed, to the extent possible, among all beneficiaries and program participants in electronic and hard copies as appropriate during training, workshops, meetings and awareness activities in all countries with almost no differences in the use of distribution channels. The main strategy to improve public outreach was to invite not only the targeted audiences (mainly labor inspectors), but also other stakeholders from the government and private sector, such as line ministries (education, health, police, and migration) and chamber of commerce and business associations.

- In Liberia, LWOB produced materials for community outreach that present the proposed amendments to hazardous and light work lists and Decent Work Act, which were presented for review to the LRC Chairperson. The intention is that such materials will be distributed to civil society.²⁵
- In Belize, LWOB produced pamphlets in collaboration with the LRC that were distributed at industry consultations.

²⁵ After evaluation field work, CLEAR II informed the evaluation team that 500 copies of the materials have been distributed.

- In addition to dissemination in CLEAR II countries, some resources around Intermediate Objectives 1 and 2 were also disseminated through the GLP, such as Child Labor Manuals and Rapid Reference Cards for Belize, Jamaica and Liberia, and the Training Curriculum for Belize, Burkina Faso and Liberia.

CLEAR II has also engaged in the production of awareness raising and education resources to the benefit of the general public.

- In 2018, CLEAR II supported the celebration event of the World Day Against Child Labor, in Monrovia, Liberia. For that event, CLEAR II provided planning support, purchased and printed t-shirts, printed and distributed awareness-raising materials such as stickers, and provided transportation for children to attend the event.
- In Jamaica MoL carried out roadshows and distributed awareness material facilitated by the project—such as on hazardous and light work, child definition and children rights, schooling age—to reach the general public in Kingston and some parishes.

In Jamaica, dissemination was not as broad as desired by key stakeholders.

- In Jamaica, some respondents indicated that the number of copies distributed of the labor inspector manual were not sufficient -the size of documents required some additional funds and government agencies did not have enough resources.²⁶
- Materials prepared by LWOB on the legal framework and enforcement was appropriately distributed among training participants according to majority of respondents. Although, in Jamaica more than half of the respondents wished these resources might have been distributed to a wider audience, including government officers from lines ministries, decentralized agencies, and private sector representatives.
- Host government agencies being assisted wanted to carry out the awareness activities nationwide in Jamaica to have higher impact and better results in reducing child labor.

All respondents agreed that all material delivered by CLEAR II project were of high quality and useful, particularly the resources developed by Verité and LWOB under intermediate objectives 1 and 2. The evaluation found evidence that in-country stakeholders have used various resources produced. For example, MoL inspectors in Belize, Burkina Faso, and Liberia have used the country-specific training curricula to train other inspectors and external stakeholders (such as Chambers of Commerce).

²⁶ After evaluation field work, CLEAR II informed the evaluation team that an additional 150 hard copies of the TOT manual have been distributed to address this.

Question 6: What challenges were encountered during project implementation and how did the project overcome the challenges?

Summary statement: *Lengthy country selection processes, short implementation timelines, tight deadlines and turnover in local and national governments and resulting changes in political will and resource commitments are some of the key challenges encountered during the implementation*

One of the major challenges faced by CLEAR II was the **selection and approval of countries** where implementation would take place. Beyond the two identified by USDOL during solicitation (Burkina Faso and Nepal), USDOL's selection and approval of additional countries to be added to CLEAR II proved to be a lengthy process. As a result, time left for implementation in countries was reduced to a maximum of 2-years, after the first extension of CLEAR II's expiration date from September 2018 to May 2019.

CLEAR II had to set tight deadlines to achieve targets in a short period of time in all four IOs: legal reforms, enforcement of laws, national plans and policies, and social programs and policies. A majority of respondents from all four countries evaluated, including host government agencies and the private sector, noted that **limited implementation time** to achieve targets and meet deadlines was an important challenge for all activities. The strategy since the start of a country project was to select participants highly committed to CL reduction. This was a factor of success as all members worked extra time (beyond the normal work day) to advance the project in a timely manner as much as possible. In Belize and Jamaica some respondents from the private sector and host-country government authorities and collaborators conceded that deadlines were not realistic, and that working overtime would not be sustainable. One respondent said that the "outputs were being rushed" by project staff. In Belize, to overcome the challenge of limited time, the LRC sped up the process by meeting more frequently. Initially the meetings were held once a month for four months and then the frequency of meetings was shifted to once a week during the last two months of work so that the proposed legal reforms were finalized as planned. Further, interviews with host government and private sector collaborators and beneficiaries as well as CLEAR II staff revealed that, during the revision of the CMEP and work plans, some activities were canceled due to time limitations (e.g. Belize canceled development of action plan and related work; in Jamaica assistance to work under social programs and policies were eliminated).

CLEAR II staff informed USDOL on several occasions that time was an important limitation to achieve targets and requested a hastened engagement of countries and a project extension. As a result, the Project was extended twice, in 2017 and 2018. Respondents recognized the project extension to be beneficial but probably still not enough to achieve all pending results. Respondents from Belize, Liberia and Jamaica, for example, expressed doubts in getting approval for CL legal reforms during the extension.

Lack of political will or change in priorities, often related to **changes in national and local governments**, affected project implementation across the IOs in all four host countries. CLEAR II was able to obtain political will or buy-in from high level government authorities during project planning stages to work towards achieving project's results. How-

ever, when there were changes to government administrations, this affected the implementation because it was necessary to present the project to new key stakeholders and await endorsements as necessary. According to respondents, when high-level authorities demonstrated a lack of commitment to the project, this was reflected in the lack of or delayed approval of key project deliverables or inputs such as proposed National Action Plans, proposals of CL legal reforms, approving government funds to procure goods and services such as office space, short-term consultants, or full time personnel necessary to implement or complement project activities. The key strategy to mitigate subsequent delays or change in priorities was to work with technical staff in host countries governments, rather than appointees. More specifically, to minimize delays and loss of knowledge deriving from shifts in senior government officials, the project approach was to identify and work with key champions or very renowned officers within government structures (e.g., technical staff who had strong experience and long service in the institutions and serving in various key roles).

Additionally, even though CLEAR II had sufficient resources to implement all activities planned, approximately one-half of the host government and private sector respondents in Jamaica and Belize perceived limited project funding to be a key challenge. In many cases, this was because the needs that they wanted addressed were beyond the scope of activities and results included in work plans. For example, in accordance with project funds, activities were planned for a specific scope and size per country (e.g., a defined number of trainees or geographic coverage of awareness activities). This was the case for awareness activities, trainings on enforcement, workshops on legislation analysis, distribution of resources developed, NAP implementation at local level and collection of updated data on CL. Respondents in Belize and Jamaica expressed the need to extend the geographic coverage of awareness campaigns, provide training to a broader audience and sectors, and support host-government data collection projects to inform design of CL policies and national action plans. Although general awareness raising among the public was not directly in the project scope of work, host government respondents cited insufficiencies in the scope and size of public awareness efforts carried out by CLEAR II project. They cited the potential increase in CL reporting if public awareness increased. Many respondents claimed that the distribution of resources developed was not sufficient (for example, the labor inspectorate curriculum and training of trainers program) and that training should have included more participants.

Among the challenges listed above are a variety that were outside the control of influence of CLEAR II. Typically, factors outside a project's control should be considered as critical assumptions that must hold during project implementation so the expected results are achieved. Given the risks associated with each assumption regarding its probability to remain true during project implementation, a project should envision and identify measures to handle situations where assumptions fail in order to ensure expected results. The evaluation team was not able to identify in the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP November 2018) an analysis of the risks of the critical assumptions identified by the project or an identification of mitigation measures. The Critical Assumptions laid out by the project in the CMEP were the following²⁷:

²⁷ CLEAR II, CMEP November 2018, page 41.

- Turnover of government individuals affecting both capacity and engagement /level of interest
- Lack of financial resources to address labor law enforcement/prevention of CL or implement policies
- Political, social, economic and ecological changes in the country, which affect project implementation.

RELEVANCE

Question 7: To what extent did the project address the needs and interests of the target groups?

Summary statement: *CLEAR II actively sought to establish relevance of its activities by carrying out extensive participatory assessments in each country context. All four Intermediate Objectives of the project were considered relevant by stakeholders. However, across and within countries there were varying perceptions about the extent to which CLEAR II fully addressed each country's needs.*

The main phases of planning and needs assessments conducted included the following:

- *Results Framework* - The CLEAR II Global Results Framework was the initial tool for program planning and definition of country-specific results frameworks and work plans in each of the CLEAR II countries. It presented the four intermediate objectives and the priority areas where CLEAR II was to provide support, in response to gaps identified in the USDOL annual report Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor²⁸. After this initial phase of identifying general needs and actions that informed the broad design of the program, a second stage was planned to develop country-specific results frameworks. It entailed the identification of the concrete needs of each CLEAR II country and the determination of which needs to address and what actions to implement. To do so, the project considered the Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor report and consulted with host-government line ministries (especially MoL) on their priority needs, which also promoted buy-in and ownership during implementation.
- *Pre-Situational Analyses* - These exercises were assessments (internal to CLEAR II and USDOL) of the existing situation and country efforts to combat child labor prior to CLEAR II activities in all CLEAR II countries. They were essentially project baseline assessments, under the responsibility of Winrock, conducted via desk research and discussions with key informants in the countries, and involved CLEAR II M&E officers and local experts. Although the pre-situational analyses presented a comprehensive description of the situation in each country, as well as identifying possible priority areas of intervention for CLEAR II, they were delivered or conducted in each country after workplan approval and the initiation of technical support. As such, PSAs might have influenced initial planning but evaluation fieldwork did not find verifiable evidence of

²⁸ USDOL's Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor, prepared by Bureau of International Labor Affairs in accordance with the Trade and Development Act of 2000 (TDA).

their usage for planning purposes. The field visits found little or no evidence of their usage by CLEAR II country staff. In Jamaica, one respondent mentioned that the country work plan implemented some recommendations of the PSA without indicating which specific suggestions were carried out.

- Labor inspectorate assessments- The purpose of these assessments was to obtain knowledge on the inspectorate's mandate, resources, management structure, and overall enforcement ability in each CLEAR II country. Conducted by Verité, information from these assessments supported the development of training curricula and a training program on eliminating child labor for labor inspectors and other related positions, such as Labor Controllers in Burkina Faso or Commissioners in Liberia, supervisors, and trainers. In order to assess inspectors' needs and capacities prior to training, the project conducted training needs self assessments among inspectors in each country.
- Legislative analyses- These assessments were intended to provide an overview of the status of each CLEAR II country in relation to the applicable international conventions, country laws and practices related to child labor. They further contained suggested amendments to statutory provisions in laws relating to child labor.
- Child Labor Capacity Score (CLCS) - The CLCS was an internal project tool designed to measure the host-governments' progress in addressing child labor in the four areas of the intermediate objectives. They were conducted at early and late stages of implementation to measure changes in governments' capacities. They are further detailed in the Effectiveness section of the report, under Evaluation Question 1.

Generally, these various assessments underwent validation processes. Assessments of labor inspectorates (including training needs assessments) were validated by the MoL. Legislative analyses were validated by the respective Legislative Review Committees. The different assessments then informed reports that presented the main findings on a particular topic, as well as recommendations and proposals on how CLEAR II could address country challenges pertaining to child labor. For the project's sub-grantees, conducting these assessments (legislative assessments or labor inspectorate assessments) marked the starting point for program execution.

CLEAR II also consulted with in-country stakeholders to plan country-specific workplans. Among those consulted there were MoL (at national and regional/local levels), other line ministries, and other stakeholders with a role in addressing CL, such as the police, trade unions, chamber of commerce, business associations or civil society organizations. The nature of these consultations varied by country.

- The evaluation field work found that in Burkina Faso, although there were initial letters of intention and support²⁹ from various ministries, national stakeholder engagement in project planning was mainly conducted with the MoL.
- In Belize, respondents noted the consultations with senior decision-makers, but shortcomings as to consultation of other stakeholders. Also in Belize, most respondents were not aware of how needs were assessed or validated.

²⁹ Winrock Country Presence and Host Government Support, Project Document Annex D

- In Jamaica, discussions on country needs occurred primarily between the MoL and the US Embassy.
- In Liberia, the project conducted consultations with the main stakeholders in the Ministry of Labor (including NACOMAL).

Further to the consultations in the planning phase, CLEAR II agreed on workplans with the MoL in each CLEAR II country. Consultation continued to be sought from MoL counterparts throughout project implementation. Given the differing mandates of MoL in each country and the local social and political dynamics, there was not one single approach to seeking their feedback. Means of engaging and obtaining feedback then were adapted from country to country taking into consideration responsiveness of actors, access of country coordinators, or liaison through working groups.

Additionally, in each host-country, the project engaged officials from other ministries, as well as other stakeholders such as CSOs, and their representatives participated in project activities (namely LRCs or NAP development). However, the project did not establish agreements for direct activities to the benefit of these other ministries. The Washington DC-based project staff reported that it would have been useful to implement activities directly with other ministries, given that their work often compliments the CL efforts of the MoL. It was noted that the time available for implementation did not allow for such activities. The project's solution to this challenge was to engage other ministries and stakeholders through working groups and project activities such as training. This proved possible in countries where coordination structures are in place, such as in Belize, Liberia or Jamaica, but more limited at the central level in Burkina Faso, where coordination between ministries is limited. As a note, although the Project indicated in its April 2018 TPR that it had joined a Ministry of Gender-led working group on Children Protection (*GTPE, or Groupe de Travail en Protection de l'Enfant*) in Burkina Faso, interviews in the field were not able to corroborate this.

Across and within countries there were varying perceptions about the extent to which CLEAR II fully addressed each country's needs. The baseline child labor situation in each country was uniquely challenging, and stakeholder needs and interests reflected the complexities of the local situation. The four Intermediate Objectives of CLEAR II were considered relevant by stakeholders. Nevertheless, as per US Winrock staff, governments' requests for support under IO4 were mainly for services that would fall outside the scope of the project, such as direct services for families and children. At the time of the evaluation, targets under IO4 were reported to be achieved or were in the process of being achieved through activities carried out under the other IOs.

In all CLEAR II countries, stakeholders highlighted that there are basic needs that could not be addressed by the project. In some countries, lack of resources challenged the basic conduct of ministerial activities, which subsequently could decrease the level of political priority for efforts to fight child labor. In the initial stages of planning, needs noted in this regard in Liberia and Belize ranged from equipment such as laptops or printers to vehicles, motor-bikes or fuel. The main reasons advanced for not addressing such needs were that they would fall outside CLEAR II scope. Later, some equipment such as laptops loaded with project reference materials were distributed to carry out activities in Belize. In Burkina Faso,

the MoL highlighted that its interest in the establishment of a Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS) would be linked with the need to purchase management software, which was not considered for support by CLEAR II.

While stakeholders in Burkina Faso praised the increased awareness at the regional level and the development of regional action plans for the National Action Plan (NAP), they noted that support from the project would need to be complemented by actual support services to children in the form of shelters, support to education, professional training or others. It was noted in interviews with project staff that although important, this would fall outside CLEAR II scope. Additionally, there was an expectation among some respondents such as Regional Directorates of Labor that the project could support largely (if not fully) the implementation of regional action plans in Burkina Faso. The regional action plans were organized around three main areas of prevention, protection and coordination. While CLEAR II supported organization of two prevention-focused sensitization activities in each of the four regions, there have been no implementation activities related to protection and coordination. Regional government respondents indicated that financial gaps in the regional departments prevent regular implementation of activities identified in plans.

EFFICIENCY

Question 8: How did the following factors contribute to or hinder the achievement of results? Funding, Personnel, Administration, Time, Country selection, Cost increase

Summary statement: *All factors under review (Funding, Personnel, Administration, Time, Country selection, Cost increase) had a direct effect on the efficiency of CLEAR II project implementation. The degree of their effect varied, with country selection having the highest impact on efficiency of project implementation.*

Funding and cost increase. Evidence gathered through the review of project reporting and stakeholder interviews confirm that CLEAR II project had sufficient resources to implement most planned activities and has utilized funding efficiently. In addition to original budget allocation, CLEAR II received a cost increase of \$595,000 USD in December 2018. The purpose of the cost increase was to support programmatic activities in Intermediate Objectives 1, 2 and 3:

- In IO1 additional funds were allocated to: awareness-raising activities in Jamaica, the organization of a three-day workshop for media to develop awareness materials for distribution in Liberia, and the organization of a follow-up legislative analysis workshop in Belize.
- In IO2, additional funding was devoted to draft the CLMS plan, CLMS tools and workshop on enforcement of coordination systems in Burkina Faso; a workshop for enforcement agencies in Jamaica; and additional activities in Nepal.

- In IO3, funds were added to support implementation of local strategic plans in Burkina Faso and technical assistance for NAP development and the Street Children Study in Jamaica.

The funding increase allowed Verité and LWOB to expand their work. For Verité, additional funding was devoted to work with the Belize chamber of commerce and for production of materials in CLEAR II countries. LWOB had funds allocated to further work with LRC in Belize and Liberia and technical assistance to the MoL to ensure endorsement of Child Labor Regulations.

According to host government respondents, while funding resources were mostly adequate, there are some instances where activities were limited in scope such as awareness raising, training, and provision of training material. Stakeholders also noted that additional funding would have been desired to expand existing activities or implement additional ones to allow the program to be more responsive to government requests for related activities that were not in the originally planned scope. Additional funding may not have changed whether these were addressed -- they would have needed to be considered within project scope.

Personnel and administration. Initiation of activities in the countries allowed for the recruitment of in-country project staff, who played a key role engaging with local stakeholders and managing local operations. These in-country staff were knowledgeable of the local dynamics and institutions, allowing for close contact with national counterparts and promoting ownership among staff in career positions (as opposed to appointed positions). In some instances, in-country staff contributed directly to the development of project resources, such as for example in Burkina Faso where in-country staff provided important inputs to the Legislative Assessment initially presented. In the four countries visited for this evaluation, turnover of project staff was not perceived as an issue affecting program implementation. Nevertheless, project staff and host government respondents indicated that additional staff would have been helpful given that the project engaged with so many different stakeholders in each country.

The CLEAR II management structure was heavily centralized during program planning at the beginning of the project, but the project made efforts to decentralize its management structure, in line with the recommendation of the Interim Evaluation Report. Efforts towards decentralization involved shifting decision-making processes such that in-country teams would be considered the project lead in each country, with Winrock's headquarters team providing technical direction and management oversight. Country teams became responsible for implementing country workplans, coordinating with LWOB and Verité to ensure appropriateness of activities to the country context, and coordinating with host-government stakeholders. During the endline evaluation field work, most field-based project staff did not indicate that decision-making as an issue. Nevertheless, one example emerged from field work on how centralized decision-making persisted in causing a delay: in Burkina Faso respondents such as the MoL noted that after they and the Winrock in-country team had made decisions about the work of a consultant to undertake CLMS activities, Winrock headquarters subsequently requested to revisit the ToR for the development of the CLMS tools and documents, thereby causing a delay.

There is evidence that the management of the project (by both Winrock and USDOL) was adaptive. For example, CLEAR II addressed the recommendations presented in the interim evaluation, as documented in subsequent TPRs. As an example:

- The number of countries to be supported was reduced from eight to seven.
- Following country selections, the results frameworks were adapted to the specifics of each country.
- The project duration was extended twice: from September 2018 to May 2019, and then to July 2019.
- The decentralization of project management from headquarters to country teams was addressed.

Country Selection and Time. The Solicitation for Cooperative Agreement identified two of the eight countries initially planned to receive project support: Nepal and Burkina Faso. It further indicated that a final decision on adding countries to CLEAR II had to be taken by USDOL. Either Winrock or USDOL could initiate the process of adding countries to the CLEAR II portfolio by suggesting other inclusions. Further to discussions and a principle agreement by both entities, a formal submission of a “Request for Country Approval” would be submitted by Winrock for official review and approval by USDOL. A grant modification would occur. CLEAR II would then submit a “new country activities and budget” memo within 90 days of receipt of the grant modification, including a list of proposed activities and budget. After approval, a country-specific results indicator table and activity work plans would be created³⁰.

While this is USDOL’s current policy for handling modifications of this nature, reality showed that country selection was one of the main factors affecting program efficiency, with a direct impact on project implementation time. The excerpt below from one of CLEAR II TPRs further illustrates the difficulties in selecting countries to receive CLEAR II support.

“The process of adding new countries to the CLEAR II project is political and can take time. While we understand and support USDOL’s interest in countries that may not ordinarily win government funds, the project has suffered several delays that have resulted from awaiting responses from governments.” -- Winrock, October 2016 TPR

The CLEAR II project had an initial planned implementation period of four years (from September 30, 2014 to September 29, 2018). In the original planning, it was foreseen that implementation would start in Nepal and Burkina Faso in the first year, allowing up to three years of implementation. The additional six countries would be identified and enter the project on a rolling basis in years two and three of CLEAR II, allowing for approximately 20 months of implementation. While in Nepal activities started as planned, no other country activities had substantially commenced by the time of the Independent Interim Evaluation in March 2017. At that time, only Liberia had been formally approved to be added to the project. Jamaica and Belize were still in negotiations to be added.

³⁰ Adapted from CLEAR II CMEP 2018.

Although Burkina Faso was one of the two countries identified before program start, implementation suffered substantial delays, and the project was only launched in June 2017. The political and social unrest in the country were the main factors advanced for delaying implementation, together with low level of buy-in by government authorities. While the government in Burkina Faso demonstrated interest in CLEAR II during the early scoping and planning phases, representatives from the MoL claimed that the slow start has reduced their expectations for the program, especially as key stakeholders were, in their opinion, not given appropriate reasons for delaying activities.

Given the implementation delays, project staff foresaw that the time available to implement activities and obtain outputs and results would be insufficient. Thus, Winrock submitted a grant modification request, approved in late-March 2018 (Grant Modification number eight). This modification allowed for (1) a revision of the project end date (from September 29, 2018 to May 31, 2019), (2) a reduction in the number of project countries (from eight to seven), and (3) a budget revision to accommodate the extended project schedule, redistribution of contingency funds and additional activities. The implementation period was further extended until the end of July 2019 at the time of request of cost increase (see above). The reduction of the number of countries, recommended in the CLEAR II Independent Interim Evaluation, was highlighted in one interview with US-based stakeholders as a feature to be considered for future projects.

Despite the additional time for implementation, the ambitious project work plans continued to face challenges that affected the achievement of results. The relatively tight timeline forced the concentration of activities, prompting activity sequencing issues. For example, in all four countries (Belize, Burkina Faso, Jamaica and Liberia) the pre-situational analyses were delivered after approval of the Work Plans in 2018. Additionally, the nature of some of the project objectives made their achievement difficult during the project period. For example, while the project sought to address gaps in host-country legal and regulatory frameworks through adaptation of laws and policies, the inherent political nature of the legislative process (including, ultimately, the adoption of such reforms) was largely out of the control of the project.

SUSTAINABILITY

Question 9: What are the project's sustainability goals (i.e., what is intended to be sustained?) To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the threats to sustainability? What are the enablers of sustainability? What is the sustainability of the project's implementation model? If it is sustainable, are there any major risks that can make the model unsustainable?

Summary statement: *CLEAR II is likely to see sustainable results in some areas due to the incorporation of project activities in national structures and the creation of resources (e.g., labor curriculums, Hazardous and Light Work Lists, rapid reference cards, among others) that will continue to have effects over the medium and long term by means of knowledge transfer*

to users, in line with the sustainability themes of technical project design and implementation and institutional strengthening identified in the CLEAR II Sustainability Strategy.

Sustainability goals. In the four countries and among US-based respondents, there was a desire to maintain benefits in all areas of project intervention. However, different stakeholders highlighted different sustainability goals for benefits introduced by the project, that range from interests in maintaining support to existing national structures to continue to adapt national legislation to ILS, to support to the implementation of national and regional action plans, awareness or increased training and assistance to child labor monitoring and enforcement.

Approach to sustainability. CLEAR II used a participatory approach to plan for and facilitate the sustainability of project activities and benefits. In the last quarter of 2018, CLEAR II fostered discussions between implementing partners and Country Coordinators on to best engage local stakeholders in sustaining project results. Further to that, at the time of the final evaluation field work, CLEAR II was undergoing efforts to identify which outcomes can be maintained with support from local authorities. Activities to that end are the handover sessions with national governments in CLEAR II countries. Such sessions started after the final evaluation fieldwork and are expected to run through June 2019. These meetings, where CLEAR II officially hands over the project, will aim also at working with local authorities to identify strategies to continue the fight against child labor.

Activities/benefits likely to be sustained. Two project activities show particular likelihood for sustainability under certain conditions:

- In Belize, Jamaica, and Liberia, where LRCs were created to support legislative compliance with ILS, countries now have tools to utilize for legislative drafting and LRC working group members in these countries report an increased confidence in their skills. While the project has largely created LRCs within pre-existing national structures, the post-CLEAR II continuation of work on adapting local legislation to international standards will depend on government commitment to such structures. Moreover, while the LRCs successfully drafted many documents that have been accepted by the technical working groups, some document approvals are still pending; failure to approve/endorse them would mean that lack of compliance with ILS might still remain.
- CLEAR II made concerted efforts towards institutionalizing training to labor inspectors on child labor by creating labor inspectorate training curriculums and by utilizing a training of trainers approach. In the four countries, the evaluation identified examples of trainings being carried out by trainers that have benefited from ToT and host-government commitment to use training tools. Nevertheless, challenges persist in maintaining the benefits derived from the trainings. The 2017 TDA report confirms limited resources to conduct labor inspections in Belize, Burkina Faso, Jamaica and Liberia, as well as other limitations such as the inability to conduct inspections in the informal sector in Jamaica and Liberia. Interviews during fieldwork noted that labor inspections have not taken place in Burkina Faso or Liberia since CLEAR II support. Without carrying out the inspections, the opportunity to apply skills learned in the training is reduced, and thus the benefits of the training are not fully realized.

Threats to sustainability. Interviews with host-government stakeholders highlighted that while CLEAR II increased knowledge and tools to address child labor, host government operating conditions will pose challenges for sustainability. Many of the government structures in charge of coordination and enforcement of efforts to fight child labor lack adequate resources in the four countries.

- In Liberia, the structures responsible to coordinate the fight against child labor within MoL (NACOMAL) lacks a dedicated budget and operates with few staff. According to one key stakeholder, the immediate future of the National Steering Committee on Child Labor, which CLEAR II supported through the organization of regular meetings, is a challenge. This stakeholder anticipated that, while different organizations and individuals will continue to participate in meetings, it will be difficult to maintain the same number of meetings and level of work. It is not clear the extent to which the government will be able to commit funding to implement activities.
- In Burkina Faso, national and regional authorities highlighted that other priorities, such as the deteriorating security conditions, may challenge the financial commitments to agencies tasked with fighting child labor.
- In all four countries visited by evaluators, lack of staff and equipment was highlighted as a general challenge to the continued implementation of activities using skills and tools developed by CLEAR II.

LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

Question 10: What are key lessons learned, best practices, success stories and good models that can be applied to current or future global and country-level child labor projects?

Lessons Learned

1. ***Because country selection came late, it had a significant impact on timelines of project implementation.*** Learning from CLEAR II shows that limiting the number of countries and selecting them early in the project may allow for more efficient implementation and deeper engagement.
2. ***Sustained support to TOT trained individuals in the form of coaching, mentoring and/or in-service follow up can aid institutionalization of labor inspector capacity building efforts.*** CLEAR II provided mentoring and monitoring to ToT trained participants who co-facilitated trainings with other government agencies and the private sector on child labor post ToT. However structured follow-up mentoring or coaching did not happen with regard to their actual inspection work, making it difficult to assess the

level of institutionalization. Research shows that peer and supervisory support and follow-up activities results in improved transfer of skills and knowledge in the work-space³¹.

3. ***Host-country approval of legal reforms ultimately is out of any USDOL project's control*** and may take long periods of time despite the reasonableness of the proposed legislation. Implementation frameworks, timing and target setting should account for this in future projects.
4. ***Broad consultations throughout the life of the project with a wide range of relevant stakeholders from public, private and civil society sectors are beneficial, but require more time for implementation.*** Future projects should allot more time for implementation of such activities and adjust targets and milestones accordingly.
5. While supporting development of action plans (including regional plans) and monitoring systems are important to provide policy framework and tools for stakeholders, such measures alone do not allow for effective holistic implementation of defined actions to the benefit of final beneficiaries. Other activities such as ***awareness-raising are critical to change perceptions around child labor and program activities*** and allow for increased common understanding about child labor, as well as on tools and strategies to address it.
6. The process for defining workplans in CLEAR II countries involved consultations with different Ministries and Agencies involved in the fight against child labor. However, workplans were agreed with MoL and no agreements for direct activities with other ministries were established except in Jamaica where a signed MOU exists for CPFSA under the Ministry of Education. Although participation of officials from other ministries in trainings, workshops or membership in project-established bodies such as the LRCs, enhanced planning, ***limiting agreements to MOL alone reduces the effectiveness of capacity building efforts, ultimately limiting the host government's potential for a comprehensive response to concrete cases of child labor*** that future projects should avoid.
7. ***Online platforms for knowledge sharing require in-depth needs and user requirement analysis at the outset to ensure uptake and sustainability,*** with reference materials curated for relevant existing knowledge (e.g. hazardous work lists and other useful reference materials).

Best Practices

1. ***Joint work on project implementation planning with government helps ensure close coordination and institutionalization of planned actions into government work plans.***

³¹ Harry J. Martin, Improving training impact through effective follow-up: techniques and their application, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio, USA, 2015

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2c1c/febd07e1f761310e7aa221df495021712981.pdf>

2. CLEAR II had in-country local staff that played a major facilitation and collaboration role for the activities. ***Prompt deployment and early in-country presence of local project staff contributes to increased coordination, collaboration and understanding of the local social and political dynamic, ultimately improving local receptivity to the project and overall effectiveness.***
3. ***The creation of dedicated committees or working groups to adapt local CL legislation to ILS offer a platform to enhance stakeholder knowledge and skills related to CL and legislative reform and to advance legislative reform efforts.*** The LRCs made substantial progress in assessing existing legislation for alignment to ILS and recommending specific modifications to legislation.
4. ***The Training of Trainers (TOT) approach promotes the scale-up and sustainability of capacity building efforts*** by building a pool of competent instructors who then could teach the material to other people, using a training curriculum and supporting TOT guidance.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

Given that this final performance evaluation report will be finalized after the CLEAR II project ends in July 2019, the below recommendations are intended for consideration for future projects.

Recommendations for USDOL

1. ***Establish a clear and defined process for country selection, including selection criteria and establishing a cut off point for adding new countries to allow for longer periods of implementation.*** Well defined selection criteria might reduce time of engaging countries and allow longer time for implementation. DOL should consider selecting countries and assessing the feasibility of implementation prior to issuing any request for applications or request for proposals for similar projects in the future. Ideally, USDOL would “recruit” all participating countries ahead of awarding the project for implementation. This would give implementing partners more time and resources to dedicate exclusively to project implementation. This is particularly important given that legal reform takes time as it requires broad consultations, stakeholder validation, advocacy, and finally, official approval. Moreover, projects require more time to ensure that knowledge and tools, such as the labor inspection tools produced under CLEAR II, are effectively applied in the field. ***(Based on EQ3, EQ6, EQ8, and EQ10)***
2. ***Reduce the number of countries to be assisted by one project in similar future projects.*** Additionally, ***consider clustering countries in a given region rather than global distribution*** to facilitate project management and logistics, to take advantage of countries’ similarities in priority needs and to foster synergies. ***(Based on the overall findings and conclusions from this evaluation)***
3. ***Consider revisiting the Theory of Change of similar government capacity building projects to ensure that it is valid by looking for ways to strengthen the program***

logic and improve linkages between the levels in the causal chain and that it is realistic to be implemented in the project period. There are opportunities to utilize lessons learned from CLEAR II implementation to: (a) rationalize the number of outcomes expected within the timeframe of the project and corresponding indicators, (b) reexamine program assumptions to identify those that risk program implementation, (c) introduce new components based on lessons learned from this program and (d) remove program components and corresponding indicators that are outside of its circle of control, such as approval of legal reforms on CL, adoption of CL policies and national action plans (NAPs). **(Based on the overall findings of this evaluation)**

4. **Elaborate on key programmatic assumptions in the CMEP and Project Document to ensure that assumptions and risks at each level of the results framework are identified and assessed prior to implementation. Consider also including a requirement for regular monitoring and reporting on the status of assumptions and project risks for better coordination and adaptive management.** Theories of Change for projects such as CLEAR II include implicit assumptions that underlie the success of their implementation (such as political will within leadership, stability within counterpart ministries within government, willingness of professionals to participate in training and apply new knowledge, and time needed between for official enactment of legislation). When conditions change and these assumptions no longer hold true, they have a direct and significant impact on project implementation and achievement of outcomes (e.g., see Evaluation Question 6). Since DOL is currently not requiring this in its CMEP and Project Documents, it could consider replicating practices of other USG agencies which require explicit identification of key assumptions and risks and their tracking throughout implementation. USAID for example refers to this as “Assumptions Monitoring” or “Context Monitoring” and there is ample evidence of the importance of this practice and useful guidance is available on how to best integrate them in M&E plans and reporting³². **(Based on the overall findings of this evaluation)**
5. **Consider including activities that address education or livelihood components** at a smaller scale within similar projects to support project implementation and address the root causes of CL. CLEAR II received frequent requests by host country governments (i.e. under IO4) for direct services to families and children, which were outside the scope of the project. Having a reserve funding to support special initiatives directly targeting children and communities could aid implementation and strengthen the relationships on the ground. **(Based on EQ7)**

Recommendations to CLEAR II Implementing Partners - Winrock, Verité and LWOB

6. In future similar projects, **utilize learning from the CLEAR II project to realistically assess and adequately account for time needed to carry out activities and see meas-**

³² See: <https://www.usaid.gov/project-starter/program-cycle/pmp/monitoring-assumptions> and https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1861/DRAFT_Activity_MEL_Plan_Guide-line_Nov_17_2017.pdf

urable results within the amount of time that USDOL has designated for project implementation. This should be reflected in project implementation plans and target setting. **(Based on EQ1)**

7. **Ensure close monitoring of commitment to agreements by host government officials and develop a strategic plan of engagement for changes in political leadership.** Frequent changes in political administration and political will impacts the achievement of results. Developing a plan of engagement of new political leadership and maintaining regular communication to ensure optimal collaboration of the officers assigned to project activities will increase effectiveness and help secure political buy-in of senior authorities in target countries. **(Based on EQ1, Main causes of deviations from targets)**
8. **Conduct a technical review of the project's Theory of Change and corresponding Result Framework to update and improve the underlying logic, with a focus on realistic change that can be expected within the timeline and resources.** Ensure that the project TOC is realistic and includes a clear logic of change that can be achieved within the timeframe of project implementation. This will help ensure that there are no overlaps between levels of results and leaps in logic. **(Based on EQ1)**
9. Further to the point above, even if not required by a funder, consider **expanding the TOC to include elaboration of key programmatic assumptions and risks at each level of the results framework. Consider monitoring assumptions throughout implementation and including assumption reporting to USDOL for better coordination and adaptive management.** This is particularly important given some of the lessons learned from CLEAR II implementation, which show the effect of critical assumptions (such as changes to political will, changes in the government, time between drafting of legislation to official enactment etc.) on project implementation and the achievement of outcomes. **(Based on the overall findings of this evaluation)**
10. **Expand general awareness raising efforts among the public** focusing on changing the cultural/social dimension and promoting approval of proposed CL legal reforms. CLEAR II did some awareness raising with public, but more could have been done in this area. Consider leveraging CSO networks, utilizing communication channels through media, social media, radio, and incorporate community and religious leaders in order to reach more people in rural areas and closed communities. **(Based on EQ8)**
11. **Consider maintaining frequent (quarterly) meetings with senior host-government authorities involved in project implementation to discuss monitoring reports and agree upon adjustments to project implementation as appropriate.** Lessons from CLEAR II implementation have shown that adaptive management can support achievement of expected results. Keeping high-level host government authorities well informed is seen as key to obtain local ownership. **(Based on EQ3)**
12. Future programs should **create opportunities for immediate practice with supervision and support beyond replication of trainings and provide mentoring and coaching to trained labor inspectors on their inspection work.** This may enhance the overall effectiveness of these efforts and ensure that skills gained through training aren't being lost due to the lack of practice. Additionally, close follow up of labor inspectors may unveil other issues/gaps that would be useful to address. **(Based on EQ2).**

Recommendations for Winrock

13. ***In addition to MoL, expand the direct support to and broaden consultative processes to include a larger pool of stakeholders including other line ministries*** to increase the likelihood of a concerted response and ownership for improved results. Direct support could include activities specific to the needs of those organizations, such as assistance developing their strategies and plans related to CL issues or tailoring and delivery of training specific to their needs. ***(Based on EQ3 and EQ7)***
14. ***Devise a strategy for a better utilization of the International Advisory Council (IAC), with a mix of demand-driven and pre-defined structured activities and include members with specific expertise in the countries of implementation.*** The IAC created by CLEAR II was structured as a demand-based mechanism which was not fully utilized due to a low number of requests. However, evidence from this evaluation points to the high value of a mechanism to provide additional knowledge resources to the field. Future programs should work to actively generate more demand and structure IACs engagement differently to fully leverage the readiness of experts on an IAC to provide input to projects based on past experiences, best practices and country-specific context. ***(Based on EQ3 - Less successful activities/approaches)***

Recommendations for LWOB

15. In future legislation reform projects similar to CLEAR II, ***plan to allocate more time for advocacy of local legislation reforms to comply with ILS***, as the approval of legislation requires a high level of commitment and political will. Consider the formation of an advocacy subcommittee that engages in dedicated advocacy above and beyond the issuing of reports or draft legislation. While there is no guarantee that advocacy will lead to the desired legislative outcome, it could influence the political process. ***(Based on EQ3)***
16. In future projects of similar nature, ***in addition to a desk review, consider utilizing local experts to support the assessments by validating data and collecting additional information from the field*** to ensure that contextual nuances and latest developments are captured. This investment will pay off through shorter review rounds and better stakeholder receptivity to assessment results, ultimately ensuring good planning and effective implementation. ***(Based on EQ8)***

ANNEX I: TERMS OF REFERENCE

I. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). 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, strengthening labor standards, 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. Since OCFT's technical cooperation program began in 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over \$900 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects in more than 90 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL support sustained efforts that address child labor and forced labor's underlying causes, including poverty and lack of access to education.

Project Context³³

Despite a decline in the worldwide prevalence of child labor due to enhanced public awareness and efforts by governments, non-profit organizations, and others, there are an estimated 168 million children engaged in child labor, of which approximately one-half perform hazardous child labor (HCL). In Asia, there are 77 million children engaged in child labor, including 33 million in HCL. In sub-Saharan Africa, there are 59 million children laborers, with 28 million of them in HCL. Among 12 million child laborers in Latin America and the Caribbean, 9.6 million are in HCL. There are 9.2 million child laborers in the Middle East and North Africa, including 5.2 million in HCL.³⁴

The myriad factors contributing to child labor include poverty; limited access to education; insufficient awareness of the negative consequences of child labor; limited private sector and government stakeholder engagement in prevention and response activities; and a lack of awareness and implementation of international best practices for addressing child labor. The focus of the CLEAR II project is to address insufficient awareness of consequences, limited capacity and engagement, and lack of awareness and implementation of international best practices.

Insufficient awareness: Communities, relevant industry leaders, key government stakeholders and local stakeholders such as police and judges are often insufficiently aware of the negative consequences of child labor. Often there is a lack of understanding of the impact of child labor on a country's international reputation and standing, economic growth and

³³ Adapted from the CLEAR II CMEP

³⁴ Source: ILO-IPEC, "Marking progress against child labor, Global estimates and trends 2000-2012."

development, and social issues including health and education. As a result, they may continue to tolerate or even encourage child labor. In addition, insufficient awareness about the root causes of child labor may limit capacity for stakeholders to advocate for, or propose, appropriate solutions.

Limited capacity: Various stakeholders are positioned to prevent and combat child labor in communities and industries around the world. However, their actions may be limited due to the absence of capacity, strategies and policies; the lack of coordination and resources; and industry shortcomings. Often government stakeholders lack resources, training and knowledge, and they do not coordinate with other stakeholders with similar goals. In addition, countries often lack strategic plans and effective and current action plans to combat child labor. Labor inspections and monitoring by civil servants can be compromised by a lack of resources and skills to enforce existing laws. The roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders may be undefined or uncoordinated, leading to disorganized prevention and response activities. Further, private sector stakeholders frequently lack awareness of, resources and training for, and interest in addressing child labor.

Lack of awareness and implementation of international best practices: It is common for government stakeholders to mistakenly believe that laws, regulations and policies are compliant with international standards on child labor when they are not, or to believe that non-compliant laws effectively address the issue. Laws and regulations often have gaps such as the inclusion of minimum age exceptions, modified or ignored definitions such as “light work” or “worst forms”, and failure to include informal sectors. Countries tend to focus resources for enforcement on particular groups of children, geographic areas or sectors. This often leaves gaps in enforcement for other children not covered by those resources.

Project Specific Information³⁵

From September 2014 through May 2019, the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) funded Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II (CLEAR II), a project that aimed to support a global reduction in child labor through technical assistance and cooperation with the host governments of seven countries³⁶. Implemented by Winrock International, with sub-partners Lawyers Without Borders and Verité, program activities were intended to (1) strengthen the legal framework by making local or national legislation, regulations, and directives/guidelines compliant with International Labor Standards regarding child labor; (2) improve the monitoring and enforcement of child labor-related policies, legislation, and regulations; (3) increase the implementation of National Action Plans on child labor, including the worst forms of child labor; and (4) improve social programs, policies, and/or services to address child labor.

While Burkina Faso and Nepal were initially named as project sites in the Cooperative Agreement, the additional countries to receive support were determined after an assessment of

³⁵ Adapted from the CLEAR II Cooperative Agreement and CMEP

³⁶ Eight countries were initially planned, but this was later descope to seven countries, including Honduras.

host country need, amount of host government support, and potential for achieving a significant and sustained decline in child labor. Based on these criteria, the project portfolio subsequently expanded to include Jamaica (May 2017), Belize (December 2016), Panama (March 2017), Liberia (November 2016), and Honduras (April 2015). Final workplans for all countries were approved via project modification in March 2018.

Specific project activities were tailored in each country following the initial needs assessment. At a macro-level, additional project activities included establishing an International Advisory Council of international experts that provide pro bono technical assistance to the project through sharing information, knowledge, and best practices on issues related to child labor based on their skills and expertise.

The project's results framework is provided below:

CLEAR II RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: CLEAR II countries with enhanced capacity to address CL, including WFCL

IO 1 Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with ILS

Supporting Results:

SO 1.1 Draft laws in compliance with ILS on Child Labor approved by relevant body

- Output 1.1.1 New/ improved legislation drafted and submitted by LRC
- Output 1.1.2 Recommendations on legislation validated
- Output 1.1.3 Assessment report on compliance with ILS completed

SO 1.2 Coordinating mechanism to adapt legislation to ILS functional

- Output 1.2.1 LRC established
- Output 1.2.2 LRC members trained to review/draft legislation/policies
- Output 1.2.3 Materials disseminated to civil society/NGO representatives
- Output 1.2.4 Tools and guidelines on legal analysis of CL laws developed

IO 2 Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation and regulations related to CL improved

Supporting Results:

SO 2.1 CLMS structures established and/or strengthened at national and/or sub-national levels

- Output 2.1.1 Community level CLMS plans developed
- Output 2.1.2 Guidelines for community-based monitoring developed for GLP
- Output 2.1.3 National and local structures identified by government for CLMS and/or CL data management

SO 2.2 CL concerns integrated into labor inspection process

- Output 2.2.1 Lead trainers trained to deliver LI curriculum
- Output 2.2.2 LI trained in organizational improvement
- Output 2.2.3 Checklists, tools, resources and/or manual for LI developed for GLP
- Output 2.2.4 Training plan developed for district/local level government authorities in charge of labor inspection
- Output 2.2.5 Gaps and recommendations identified regarding LI and enforcement of CL law

SO 2.3 Coordination plan between public and private sector developed

- Output 2.3.1 Enforcement agencies, private sector and other relevant stakeholders sensitized on their role and responsibilities to

IO 3 Increased implementation of National Action Plans on Child Labor, including WFCL

Supporting Results:

SO 3.1 Local level strategic plans on WFCL operationalized

- Output 3.1.1 Local level authorities trained in local resource mobilization and management skills
- Output 3.1.2 Local strategic plans developed
- Output 3.1.3 Strategies for NAP roll-out disseminated to local level authorities

SO 3.2 National policies, plans or programs to combat CL, including WFCL, formulated and/or improved

- Output 3.2.1 NAP revised/updated

SO 3.3 Institutional framework to carry out research on WFCL in place

- Output 3.3.1 Global Best Practices documented
- Output 3.3.2 Research on CL conducted
- Output 3.3.3 Research component included in NAP
- Output 3.3.4 Coordinating body members trained in use of CLMS / CL research data
- Output 3.3.5 Technical training and sample tools provided to data collectors on GLP

SO 3.4 Coordinating body to enforce/ implement NAP established/ strengthened

- Output 3.4.1 Coordinating body members identified and trained
- Output 3.4.2 Roles and responsibilities of relevant stakeholders clarified and documented
- Output 3.4.3 Institutional coordination plan developed

IO 4 Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL, including WFCL

Supporting Results:

SO 4.1 Relevant government stakeholders dedicate assets/resources to appropriate social programs, policies and/or services to reduce CL

- Output 4.1.1 Relevant government officials and other stakeholders trained on resource mobilization and management skills to implement social programs, policies and/or services

SO 4.2 Recommendations to fill gaps in social programs, policies and/or services related to CL operationalized by relevant body

- Output 4.2.1 Recommendations drafted to address gaps in social programs, policies and/or services related to CL issues
- Output 4.2.2 Materials available on scaling up/integration of CL into social programs, policies and/or services
- Output 4.2.3 Line ministry representatives informed on the impact of CL
- Output 4.2.4 Assessment report completed identifying gaps in social programs, policies and/or services related to CL issues

Purpose and Scope of Evaluation

The purpose of the final performance evaluation is to:

- Assess whether the project has achieved its objectives, identifying the challenges encountered in doing so, and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges;
- Assess the intended and unintended effects of the project;
- Assess lessons learned and emerging practices from the project (e.g. strategies and models of intervention) and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future projects in the focus country(ies) and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors;
- Assess which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable.

The final evaluation will assess whether the project has been implemented as planned and identify promising practices and lessons learned. The scope of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with Winrock. All activities that have been implemented from project launch through the time of evaluation fieldwork will be considered.

Intended Users

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

Evaluation Questions

The evaluation team prepared a list of 10 evaluation questions that was submitted to and approved by USDOL. The questions are grouped per evaluation criteria: effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and lessons learned and replicability.

Effectiveness

1. To what extent has the project achieved its targets, results and activities?
2. To what extent has the project contributed to local efforts for child labor reduction?
3. What project approaches or activities were successful and what contributed to their success? What, if any, approaches or activities were less successful and what contributed to their lack of success?
4. How did the project coordinate with various entities, including sub-grantees, other donor-funded projects in countries where CLEAR II was implemented, host governments, and USDOL? How did this coordination contribute to the outcomes of the project? What were the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration?

5. How effectively did the project draft, implement, and disseminate the resources developed under the project?
6. What challenges were encountered during project implementation and how did the project overcome the challenges?

Relevance

7. To what extent did the project address the needs and interests of the target groups?

Efficiency

8. How did the following factors contribute to or hinder the achievement of results?
 - a. Funding
 - b. Personnel
 - c. Administration
 - d. Time
 - e. Country selection
 - f. Cost increase

Sustainability

9. What are the project's sustainability goals (i.e., what is intended to be sustained?) To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the threats to sustainability? What are the enablers of sustainability? What is the sustainability of the project's implementation model? If it is sustainable, are there any major risks that can make the model unsustainable?

Lessons Learned and Replicability

10. What are key lessons learned, best practices, success stories and good models that can be applied to current or future global and country-level child labor projects?

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

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

A. Approach

The evaluation approach will be qualitative and participatory in nature and use project documents including CMEP data to provide quantitative information, particularly as related to effectiveness in achieving targets of performance indicators during the life of the project. Qualitative information will be obtained through field visits, interviews and focus groups as appropriate. Opinions coming from beneficiaries (such as government offices, business associations, legal offices, and labor unions) will improve and clarify the use of quantitative analysis of secondary data derived from project documents, as well as the opportunity to triangulate answers from different stakeholders. The participatory nature of the evaluation

will contribute to the sense of ownership among beneficiaries.

Quantitative data will be drawn from the CMEP and technical progress reports to the extent that it is available and incorporated in the analysis. The evaluation approach will be independent in terms of the membership of the evaluation team. Project staff and implementing partners will generally only be present in meetings to provide introductions. The following additional principles will be applied during the evaluation process:

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

B. Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will consist of:

1. The lead evaluator Mario Martinez, and assistant evaluator Vasco Veloso, will carry-out evaluations in Belize/Jamaica and Burkina Faso/Liberia, respectively. Both evaluators will use the Evaluation Questions Matrix to produce evidence to answer the set of evaluation questions (see Annex 1).
2. As appropriate, an interpreter fluent in necessary languages will travel with and/or support the evaluators virtually. The responsibility of the interpreter is to ensure that the evaluation team is understood by the stakeholders as far as possible, and that the information gathered is relayed accurately to the evaluator.

One member of the CLEAR II project staff in each country may travel with the evaluators to make introductions. This person is not involved in the evaluation process.

The international evaluators will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with QED and I4DI, USDOL, and the project staff; assigning the tasks of the national consultant and interpreter for the field work; directly conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; analysis of the evaluation material gathered; presenting findings and stakeholder feedback at a stakeholder meeting in Washington, D.C.; and preparing the evaluation report. A variety of actions will be taken to ensure consistency of data collection approach and analysis, as described below in section **G. Evaluation Quality Control**.

C. Data Collection Methodology

1. Document Review

- Pre-field visit preparation includes extensive review of relevant documents
- During fieldwork, documentation will be verified, and additional documents may be collected
- Documents may include:
 - CMEP documents (dated November 2018),
 - Pre-situational analyses,
 - Project document and revisions,
 - Cooperative Agreement,
 - Technical Progress and Status Reports,
 - Project Results Frameworks and Monitoring Plans,
 - Work plans,
 - Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports,
 - Management Procedures and Guidelines,
 - Research or other reports undertaken (baseline studies, etc.), and
 - Project files (including school records) as appropriate.

2. Evaluation Matrix

Before beginning fieldwork, the evaluation team will create an evaluation matrix, which outlines the source of data from where the evaluator plans to collect information for each evaluation question. This will help the evaluators make decisions as to how they are going to allocate their time in the field. It will also help the evaluators to ensure that they are exploring all possible avenues for data triangulation and to clearly note where their evaluation findings are coming from.

3. Interviews and Focus Group Discussions with Stakeholders

Informational interviews will be held with up to 60 project stakeholders, across the four project sites. Winrock will develop a proposed list of key informants, and final selection of the interviewees will be made by the evaluation team in accordance with the information needs of the evaluation. Additionally, up to eight focus group discussions may be convened with informants. Depending on the information needs of the evaluation team, these focus groups may be adapted to small group interviews; final coordination will occur in conjunction with in-country CLEAR II staff, once the evaluation team is on site.

The evaluation team will solicit opinions of relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries in areas where awareness-raising activities occurred (such as government representatives, legal authorities, union and NGO officials, the action program implementers, program staff, among others) regarding the project's accomplishments, program design, sustainability, and the working relationship between project staff and their partners, where appropriate.

Depending on the circumstances, these meetings will be one-on-one, or group interviews and they may be conducted in-person or virtually. Technically, stakeholders are all those who have an interest in a project, for example, as implementers, direct and indirect beneficiaries, community leaders, donors, and government officials. Thus, it is anticipated that meetings may be held with:

- OCFT staff responsible for this evaluation and project prior to the commencement of the field work
- Implementers at all levels
- Headquarters, Country Director, Project Managers, and Field Staff of Grantee and Partner Organizations
- Government Ministry Officials and Local Government Officials who have been involved in or are knowledgeable about the project
- Community leaders, members, and volunteers
- Other project beneficiaries
- International NGOs and multilateral agencies working in the area
- Other child protection and/or education organizations, committees and experts in the area
- U.S. Embassy staff member

4. Field Visits

Each evaluator will visit a selection of project sites. The final selection of field sites to be visited will be made by the evaluator. Every effort should be made to include some sites where the project experienced successes and others that encountered challenges, as well as a good cross section of sites across targeted child labor sectors. During the visits, the evaluators will observe the activities and outputs developed by the project. Focus group discussions and interviews may be conducted with stakeholders during these field visits.

D. Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. Prospective respondents will be informed of their right to decline participation in the evaluation without penalty. All respondents will be made aware at the outset that they are free to terminate the interview at any point, and to skip any questions that they do not wish to respond to, or to withdraw from the evaluation, without penalty. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure a maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners, stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries, 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 feel comfortable, and to allow the evaluator to observe the interaction between the implementing partner staff and the interviewees.

E. Stakeholder Meeting

Following the field visits, one Global Stakeholders Meeting will be conducted by the evaluation team. The meeting, to be held in Washington, DC, will be attended by USDOL, Winrock CLEAR II Staff (HQ team and CLEAR II Country Coordinators) CLEAR II Partners and the Evaluators. The meeting will be used to present the major preliminary findings and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders, including those not interviewed earlier. The agenda of the meeting will be determined by the evaluation team in consultation with project staff. Some specific questions for stakeholders may be prepared to guide the discussion and possibly a brief written feedback form.

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

1. Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main findings
2. Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the findings
3. Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality
4. If appropriate, Possible Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) exercise on the project's performance
5. 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.

A debrief call will be held with the evaluation team and USDOL after the Global Stakeholders Meeting to provide USDOL with a plan for addressing feedback received during the stakeholder meeting and reconfirming the timeline for report drafting and finalization.

F. Limitations

The evaluation team will not be able to take all project sites into consideration when formulating the findings. All efforts will be made to ensure that the evaluator is visiting a representative sample of sites, including some that have performed well and some that have experienced challenges. Four sites will be visited in person, with fieldwork lasting one week in each of these sites.

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

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.

G. Evaluation Quality Control

Throughout the evaluation, the team will employ a variety of quality control measures. Because each of the two evaluators will focus on separate countries for data collection and analysis, inter-rater reliability is a consideration. After the instruments have been created, the evaluation team will meet virtually to practice and align data collection styles. The team will create common document data extraction and interview debrief forms and will jointly review how to use them. In the case of the document data extraction, upon commencing the review, several documents will be reviewed by both of the evaluators and their extraction compared for similarity. Any differences will be discussed and resolved. Similarly, there will be opportunity for both evaluators to jointly participate in several virtual interviews, whereby their debrief forms can be compared and resolved. The team will communicate regularly throughout the data collection and analysis to maintain alignment in approaches. Finally, during the report-writing phase, each evaluator will be responsible for drafting their

respective conclusions at the country level, and together will collaborate on the project-level synthesis. Triangulation will be used to identify key learnings across stakeholder types and/or sites.

H. Timetable

The timetable is as follows. Evaluators will travel to Burkina Faso, Liberia, Belize and Jamaica.

Task	Date	Status
DOL sends email intro and next steps	February 8	Complete
DOL shares CLEAR II documents with QED/I4DI	February 8	Complete
Evaluation launch call with Winrock	February 13	Complete
Evaluation launch call with QED/I4DI	Week of February 19	Complete
DOL sends draft evaluation questions to Winrock for review	By Tuesday, February 19	Completed 2/21
Winrock provides feedback on evaluation questions to DOL and QED/I4DI	By Tuesday, February 26	Complete
QED/I4DI consolidates feedback and circulates additional drafts of evaluation questions as needed before finalizing questions	By Monday, March 4	Complete
DOL sends QED/I4DI TOR inputs	By Tuesday, February 26	Complete
Winrock submits draft itinerary and stakeholder list	By Tuesday, March 5	Complete
USDOL organizes logistics call for QED/I4DI, DOL, and Winrock	Sometime during March 11-13	Complete
QED/I4DI submits draft TOR to DOL and Winrock for review	By Wednesday, March 20	Complete
QED/I4DI submits travel and hotel information for evaluators to DOL	By Thursday, March 14	Belize Complete
DOL submits country clearances for evaluators	By Friday, March 15	Belize complete

DOL and Winrock submit comments on TOR to QED/I4DI	By Monday, March 25	■
QED/I4DI submits updated TOR to DOL for approval	By Wednesday, March 27	■
DOL approves final TOR	By Thursday, March 28	■
Fieldwork (lead evaluator: LE, and assistant evaluator (AE)).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · March 31-April 6, Belize (LE) · April 7-13, Liberia (AE) · April 28-May 4 Burkina Faso (AE) and Jamaica (LE). 	
Post-fieldwork debrief call	Week of May 13	
Draft report submitted to DOL/OCFT and Grantee for 48-hour review	May 27	
DOL/OCFT and Grantee comments for 48-hour draft due to Contractor	May 30	
Revised report (2-week review draft) submitted to DOL/OCFT and Grantee	June 6	
DOL/OCFT and stakeholder comments due to contractor after full 2-week review	June 20	
Final report submitted to DOL/OCFT and Grantee	June 27	
Final approval of report by DOL/OCFT	July 11	
Draft infographic document submitted to DOL/OCFT	July 25	
DOL/OCFT comments on draft infographic	August 8	
Final infographic submitted to DOL/OCFT	August 15	
Final approval of infographic by DOL/OCFT	August 22	
Final edited report submitted to COR	August 22	
Final edited approved report and infographic shared with to grantee	August 29	

III. EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

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

- I. Table of Contents
- II. List of Acronyms
- III. Executive Summary (providing an overview of the evaluation, summary of main findings/lessons learned/good practices, and key recommendations)
- IV. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology
- V. Project Description
- VI. Evaluation Questions
 - A. Answers to each of the evaluation questions, with supporting evidence included
- VII. Findings, Recommendations and Conclusions
 - A. Findings – the facts, with supporting evidence
 - B. Conclusions – interpretation of the facts, including criteria for judgments
 - C. Key Recommendations - critical for successfully meeting project objectives – judgments on what changes need to be made for future programming
 - D. Other Recommendations – as needed
 - E. Lessons Learned and Best Practices
- VIII. Annexes - including list of documents reviewed; interviews/meetings/site visits; stakeholder workshop agenda and participants; TOR; etc.

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

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

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

IV. EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

The Contractor will be responsible for Evaluation Management and Support.

ANNEX 1. EVALUATION QUESTIONS MATRIX

CORE Evaluation questions	Dimensions for inquiry	Data Source ^a	Methods for data collection. e.g., Document Review (DR), Site Observation (SO), Key Informant Interviews (KII), Small Group Interviews (SGI), Focus Groups (FG)
I. EFFECTIVENESS			
1. To what extent has the project achieved its targets, results and activities?	1.1. Did the program meet its output and outcome targets (as specified in the CMEP) ? If not, where were the deviations (by output/outcome)? Why did these deviations occur? 1.2. Did the project achieve other results that were not articulated -intended- in the CMEP? 1.3. Did the project implement any major non-planned activities to ensure achievements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project documents: Cooperative agreement, modifications, CMEP, TPRs, NAPs Stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In country stakeholders (see footnote): CLEAR II staff, Verite and LWOB staff, host governments, private sector, labor unions, NGOs, etc. - Global stakeholders (not in-country): IP headquarter staff, DOL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Document review - Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), individual/one-on-one and small groups - Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and/or Small Group Discussions (SGIs) – depending on group size <p>Belize: 10 KIIs and 3 SGIs (includes CLEAR II Staff) Jamaica: 14 KIIs and 4 SGIs of 2 to 3 people. Burkina Faso: 14 KIIs and 1 SGI Liberia: 18 KIIs, 3 FGDs/SGIs and 3 telephone interviews</p>

<p>2. To what extent has the project contributed to local efforts for child labor reduction?</p>	<p>2.1. What are the project’s major contributions to reduce child labor in (country)? Probe: What would be some best examples of those contributions?</p> <p>2.2. Since 2015, what efforts/programs/projects have been undertaken in (country) to address child labor? Probe: Who are the main implementing partners for these efforts? To which of these did CLEAR II contribute? How?</p>	<p>- Project documents: Cooperative agreement, modifications, CMEP, TPRs, NAPs</p> <p>- Stakeholders: - Implementing partners and beneficiaries - Implementing partners of CL projects not funded by DOL in (country) as available</p>	<p>- Document review</p> <p>Belize: 10 KIIs and 3 SGIs (includes CLEAR II Staff) Jamaica: 14 KIIs and 4 SGIs of 2 to 3 people. Burkina Faso: 14 KIIs and 1 SGI Liberia: 18 KIIs, 3 FGDs/SGIs and 3 telephone interviews</p>
<p>3. What project approaches or activities were successful and what contributed to their success? What, if any, approaches or activities were less successful and what contributed to their lack of success?</p>	<p>3.1. What activities or approaches were especially successful in achieving (intermediate objective 1, 2, 3, or 4 as appropriate) Why?</p> <p>3.2. Were there activities or approaches that didn’t work well in regards to (intermediate objective)? Why?</p> <p>Project intermediate objectives: 1. Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with international labor standards 2. Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation, and regulations related to CL improved 3. Increased implementation of national action plans on Child Labor including WFCL 4. Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL including WFCL</p>	<p>- Stakeholders: - Implementing partners and beneficiaries</p> <p>- Project documents as above</p>	<p>- KIIs and FGDs/SDGs as above - Telephone interviews as above - Document review</p>

<p>4. How did the project coordinate with various entities, including sub-grantees, other donor funded projects in countries where CLEAR II was implemented, host governments, and DOL? How did this coordination contribute to the outcomes of the project? What were the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration?</p>	<p>4.1. How did the project coordinate with implementing partners, other donor-funded projects, host government and DOL? 4.2. How did this coordination contribute to the success or lack of success of the project? 4.3. What were, if any, the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration? 4.4. How did the willingness/commitment/engagement of government authorities contribute to project success or lack of success?</p>	<p>- Stakeholders:- Implementing partners and beneficiaries- Implementing partners of CL projects not funded by DOL in (country) - DOL officers engaged in CL international cooperation (e.g. OCFT)- other Host Government entities</p>	<p>- KIIs and FGDs/SGIs as above- Telephone interviews as above</p>
<p>5. How effectively did the project draft, implement, and disseminate the resources developed under the project?</p>	<p>5.1. Did the project develop and disseminate all resources³⁷ planned? If not, why? 5.2. How did resources developed contribute to the four project intermediate objectives? 5.3. What are the stakeholders' perceptions of the resources developed? 5.4. How were resources disseminated? Did you use a webportal? 5.5. What dissemination strategy, if any, has worked the best? Why?</p>	<p>- Stakeholders: - Implementing partners and beneficiaries</p> <p>- Review of content of web portal if available https://www.winrock.org/ms/clear-ii-glp/</p>	<p>- KIIs and FGDs/SGIs as above - Telephone interviews as above - Web portal visit/navigation</p>

³⁷ “Resources” include curriculums and/or manuals or checklists, tools, and awareness materials related to CL for use by individuals and agencies responsible for inspection and enforcement (OTP 14)

<p>6. What challenges were encountered during project implementation and how did the project overcome the challenges?</p>	<p>6.1. What challenges were encountered in addressing (intermediate objective)? How, if at all, were they overcome? Probe: What project internal factors were a major challenge (e.g., staff, resources) Probe: What external factors were a major challenge (e.g., the operating environment, political will)</p> <p>6.2. What was the effect of these challenges on the project's effectiveness?</p> <p>6.3. To what extent did the project experience staff turnover (of IPs and beneficiaries)? To what extent was staff turnover a challenge for project implementation and effectiveness? If yes, how (if at all) was it overcome?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project Documents: TPRs - Stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementing partners and beneficiaries - DOL officers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIIs and FGDs/SGIs as above - Document review - Telephone interviews as above
<p>II. RELEVANCE</p>			
<p>7. To what extent did the project address the needs and interests of the target groups?</p>	<p>7.1. How did project planning and work plans in (country) address target groups specific needs and interests? How were the needs and interests of the target groups initially established? To what extent was feedback from target groups sought and taken into consideration over the life of the project?</p> <p>7.2. What assessments of needs and interests of target groups were developed? Were the assessments validated by host government authorities and other stakeholders including target groups?</p> <p>7.3. To what extent were the needs and interests of the target groups fully addressed? What needs remain? What was the reason why the needs were not met?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementing partners and beneficiaries - Global stakeholders (not in-country) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - KIIs and FGDs/SGIs as above - Telephone interviews as above
<p>III. EFFICIENCY</p>			

<p>8. How did the following factors contribute to or hinder the achievement of results? a. Funding; b. Personnel; c. Administration; d. Time; e. Country selection; f. Cost increase</p>	<p>8.1 . To what extent were the level of project resources (inputs) sufficient to produce the expected results? 8.2. Were the project’s outputs and results achieved within plans and budgets? If not, why? How were deviations addressed? 8.3. To what extent did the following factors (funding, personnel, administration, time allocated, country selection, cost increase) contribute to or hinder the achievement of the project’s results?</p>	<p>- Stakeholders:- Implementing partners: CLEAR II Project staff, Sub grantees- Global stakeholders (not in-country)- Project documents: CMEP, TPRs, financial and budget reports as available</p>	<p>- Document review – KIIs, FGDs/SGIs as above- Telephone interviews as above</p>
<p>IV. SUSTAINABILITY</p>			
<p>9. What are the project’s sustainability goals (i.e., what is intended to be sustained?) To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the threats to sustainability? What are the enablers of sustainability? What is the sustainability of the project’s implementation model? If it is sustainable, are there any major risks that can make the model unsustainable?</p>	<p>9.1. What are the products/activities/outcomes the project would like to be sustained? For how long or under what conditions? 9.2. To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the foreseen threats or enablers? 9.3. What are the threats to sustainability regarding each of the project’s intermediate objectives? 9.4. What are the enablers to sustainability regarding each of the project’s intermediate objectives?</p>	<p>- Stakeholders: - Implementing partners: CLEAR II Project staff, Sub grantees - Project Beneficiaries - Global stakeholders (not in-country)</p>	<p>- KIIs and FGDs as above - Telephone interviews as above</p>

V. LESSONS LEARNED AND REPLICABILITY			
10. What are key lessons learned, best practices, success stories and good models that can be applied to current or future global and country-level child labor projects?	10.1. What, if any, activities went really well? What contributed to the success? What did the project learn? 10.2. To what extent can lessons learned in (country) be applied to in other countries? Why?	- Stakeholders: - Implementing partners: CLEAR II Project staff, Sub grantees - Global stakeholders (not in-country) - Project documents: TPRs, Interim evaluation report	- KIIs and FGDs as above - Telephone interviews as above

^a Not all evaluation questions or dimensions of inquiry will be asked to all stakeholders. There will be different interview guidelines for implementing partners (IPs), beneficiaries (Bs), and other stakeholders (not IPs or Bs). Questions will be adapted to take into account the level of involvement and/or knowledge of respondents regarding project design, implementation and results.

Respondent list as of 3/18/2019 include:

Belize: CLEAR II Project staff, Ministry of Labor, Attorney General’s Ministry, Family Court, Child Development Foundation, Attorney at Law, Chamber of commerce, Business associations

Jamaica: Ministry of Labor and Social Security, Jamaica Employers Federation, Jamaica Confederation of Trade Unions, Bureau of Gender Affairs, Office of the Children’s Advocate, Ministry of Justice, Jamaica Constabulary Force, Jamaica Teachers Association, Children First, Ministry of Industry Commerce Agriculture and Fisheries, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Tourism, Ministry of Education Youth and Information, Child Protection and Family Services, Department of Corrections, Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, Ministry of National Security.

Burkina Faso: CLEAR II Project staff, Ministry of Justice Human Rights and Civil Protection, Ministry of Public Service Labor and Social Protection, Ministry of Women’s Affairs National Solidarity and the Family, NGO, Private sector-Gold Panners Union, UNICEF, Christian Children Fund of Canada, National Youth Organization, Terre Des Hommes.

Liberia: CLEAR II Project staff, Ministry of Labor, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Youth and Sports, Ministry of Gender-Children and Social Protection, Judicial Institute, General Agriculture and Allied Workers Union, Labor Congress Office, National Union for Informal Sector Women and Youth, WOCHAID, Legislative Reform Committee Members, NACOMAL and ALL, CAFOL, Ministry of Justice, Chamber of Commerce, Law Reform Commission, CLEAR Project staff, via telephone GVL, LWOB, Verite

ANNEX II: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Sistemas, Familiay Sociedad: CLEAR II Independent Interim Evaluation, August 2017

CLEAR II: Baseline CLCS Reports for Belize, Burkina Faso, Jamaica, and Liberia

CLEAR II: Changes in CLEAR II Child Labor Capacity Scores, April 2019

CLEAR II: CMEP November 2015

CLEAR II: CMEP November 2018 revision

CLEAR II: Outcomes Overview, May 2019

CLEAR II: September 2014 Cooperative Agreement and modifications 1-9

CLEAR II, Winrock, April 2018: Liberia Pre-Situational Analysis Report, April 2018

CLEAR II, Winrock, August 2018: Burkina Faso Pre-Situational Analysis Report, August 2018

CLEAR II, Winrock, April 2018: Jamaica Pre-Situational Analysis Report, April 2018

CLEAR II, Winrock, July 2018: Belize Pre-Situational Analysis Report, July 2018

CLEAR II: Winrock, Technical Progress Reports including appendices from 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019

CLEAR II, LWOB, 2018: An Assessment of Child Labor Issues in Liberia

CLEAR II, LWOB, 2017: An Assessment of Child Labor Issues in Burkina Faso

CLEAR II, LWOB, 2017-2018: An Assessment of Child Labor Issues in Belize

CLEAR II, LWOB, 2017: Liberia Rapid Reference Cards Hazardous Work, Light Work and Minimum Age for Employment

CLEAR II, LWOB and WI (no date): Belize rapid reference cards on minimum age, hazardous and light work

CLEAR II, Verité, 2017: Review of the Liberia Labor Inspectorate's work on Child Labor 2017

CLEAR II, Verité, 2017: Assessment of the Burkina Faso Labor Inspectorate's Work on Child Labor 2016

CLEAR II, Verité, 2017: Review of the Belize Labor Inspectorate's work on Child Labor 2017

CLEAR II, LRC (no date): Belize Legislative Analysis table final

CLEAR II (2017): Results frameworks of Belize, Jamaica, Liberia and Burkina Faso. TPR October 2017

CLEAR II (2018): Results frameworks of Belize, Jamaica, Liberia and Burkina Faso. TPR October 2018

CLEAR II (2018): Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP), TPR October 2018

CLEAR II, LRC (no date), Legislative Review Committee (LRC) Recommendations, Belize.

CLEAR II, Verité (2018): Belize Labor Inspection Training on Child Labor Released October 2018 (Labor Inspector Curriculum)

CLEAR II (no date): Liberia Hazardous Work List

CLEAR II (no date): Liberia Light Work List

CLEAR II (no date): Liberia List of Labor Act Amendment Recommendations

CLEAR II (no date): Liberia Penalties and Remedies: Recommendations for the Decent Work Act

CLEAR II, Ministry of Labor Liberia, 2018: Multi-Year Workplan (2018 to 2020) for the National Action Plan on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor

CLEAR II, VERITÉ, 2018: Liberia Labor Inspection Training on Child Labor, Curriculum

CLEAR II, Ministry of Labor Liberia, 2018: Consolidated Report of Regional Workshops for the development of County Action Plans Towards the Implementation of the NAP Document

CLEAR II, 2019: Terms of Reference of Activities to the implementation of Regional Action Plans in Burkina Faso

CLEAR II, Ministry of Public Service, Labor and Social Protection, Regional Directorate of Labor and Social Protection, North Region, Burkina Faso, 2018: Regional Action Plan on the Fight Against Child Labor, North Region, Burkina Faso

CLEAR II, Ministry of Public Service, Labor and Social Protection, Regional Directorate of Labor and Social Protection, Boucle du Mouton Region, Burkina Faso, 2018: Regional Action Plan on the Fight Against the Worst Forms of Child Labor, Boucle du Mouton Region, Burkina Faso

CLEAR II, Ministry of Public Service, Labor and Social Protection, Regional Directorate of Labor and Social Protection, Cascades Region, Burkina Faso, 2018: Triennial Operational Regional Action Plan of the Regional Directorate of Labor and Social Protection 2018-2020, Cascades Region, Burkina Faso

International Labor Office (ILO), Geneva, 2017: Global estimates of child labour: Results and trends, 2012-2016

International Labor Office (ILO): Child Labor in Belize: A statistical Report, 2003

International Labor Office (ILO): Report of the National Child Activity Survey Belize 2013, Statistical Institute of Belize.

LWOB (no date): An Assessment of Child Labor Issues in Burkina Faso. Lawyers Without Borders

Republic of Liberia: National Action Plan on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (2018-2020)

USDOL Solicitation for Cooperative Agreements: Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce (CLEAR) Child Labor II, 2014

USDOL, 2017: Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor

Winrock International (no date): Web site of the Global Learning Platform (GLP)
<https://www.winrock.org/ms/clear-ii-glp/>, accessed various dates.

Winrock International (2018): Child Labor Capacity Framework, CMEP November 2018 revision

ANNEX III: LIST OF INTERVIEWS

#	Country	Type (KII, FGD, SGI)	Date
1	Belize	SGI	1 April
2	Belize	KII	1 April
3	Belize	KII	2 April
4	Belize	KII	2 April
5	Belize	KII	3 April
6	Belize	SGI	3 April
7	Belize	KII	3 April
8	Belize	SGI	4 April
9	Belize	KII	4 April
10	Belize	KII	5 April
11	Belize	KII	5 April
12	Burkina Faso	KII	3 May
13	Burkina Faso	KII	14-15 May
14	Burkina Faso	SGI	29 April
15	Burkina Faso	KII	29 April
16	Burkina Faso	KII	29 April
17	Burkina Faso	KII	30 April
18	Burkina Faso	KII	30 April
19	Burkina Faso	KII	30 April
20	Burkina Faso	KII	30 April
21	Burkina Faso	KII	2 May
22	Burkina Faso	KII	2 May
23	Burkina Faso	KII	2 May
24	Burkina Faso	KII	2 May
25	Global	KII	17 May
26	Global	KII	17 April
27	Global	KII	10 May
28	Global	SGI	23 April
29	Global	SGI	18 April
30	Global	SGI	22 April
31	Jamaica	SGI	29 April
32	Jamaica	KII	29 April
33	Jamaica	SGI	30 April
34	Jamaica	KII	30 April
35	Jamaica	KII	1 May
36	Jamaica	KII	1 May
37	Jamaica	KII	2 May
38	Jamaica	SGI	2 May
39	Jamaica	SGI	2 May

40	Jamaica	KII	2 May
41	Jamaica	KII	3 May
42	Jamaica	KII	3 May
43	Liberia	KII	10 April, 12 April
44	Liberia	KII	9 April
45	Liberia	KII	10 April
46	Liberia	KII	10 April
47	Liberia	KII	10 April
48	Liberia	KII	10 April
49	Liberia	KII	10 April
50	Liberia	KII	10 April
51	Liberia	KII	11 April
52	Liberia	KII	12 April
53	Liberia	FGD	9 April
54	Liberia	FGD	11 April
55	Liberia	FGD	12 April

ANNEX IV: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES: WINROCK INTERNATIONAL IMPLEMENTERS IN THE FIELD

Introduction

Thank you very much for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is _____. I am working for a US-based company named Institute for Development Impact (I4DI), that was contracted to perform the final evaluation of the CLEAR II Project. As you are probably aware, the program, funded by the US Department of Labor (USDOL) aims at reducing child labor (CL), including the worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

During the course of this interview, I/we will ask you a number of questions about your opinions/interests/perspectives related to the CLEAR II Project implementation and outcomes. There are no right or wrong answers, we are interested in learning about your opinions, perceptions and interests.

Your answers will help us to understand and identify the outcomes achieved by the project, and we will use the information gathered today to elaborate a set of recommendations to USDOL for future design of projects aimed at reducing CL and WFCL.

Your participation is voluntary and your specific answers will be kept confidential. If you do not want to answer a question, please tell me, and we can skip to the remaining questions. You can also stop answering the questions in case you do not want to continue at some point of the interview.

Informed consent:

Are you willing to participate in this interview? Yes ___ / No ___

If you have any questions about the evaluation or your participation here today, please feel free to contact I4DI.

Date:

Name of Interviewer:

Location of Interview (country, province, city):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Name of Respondent(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Organization(s):

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Position(s):

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Sex:

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Can you describe briefly, in two to three sentences, your history and role on the CLEAR II Project?

(Note: obtain answer for each respondent in case of a SGI)

Intermediate objectives addressed/involved with/ known by interviewee(s):

NOTE: The interviewer will check the objectives based on the description given above

Check all that applies 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___

I. RELEVANCE

I'd like to start by talking about the initial project planning.

1. How were the needs and interests of the target countries/groups initially established and how did project planning and work plans in Belize, Burkina Faso, Jamaica and Liberia address such needs and interests?

2. What assessments of needs and interests of target groups were developed?

Probe: Were the assessments validated with target groups? How?

To what extent were the needs and interests of the target groups fully addressed? What needs remain? What was the reason why the needs were not met?

II. EFFECTIVENESS

Now, I would like to talk about achievements.

4. Did the program meet its output and outcome targets (as specified in the CMEP)? If not, where were the deviations (by output/outcome)? Why did these deviations occur?

5. Did the project achieve other results that were not articulated -intended- in the CMEP?

6. Did the project implement any major non-planned activities to ensure achievements?

7. What activities or approaches were especially successful in achieving (intermediate objective 1, 2, 3, or 4 as appropriate) Why?

8. Were there activities or approaches that didn't work well in regards to (intermediate objective)? If yes, which and Why?

NOTE: Intermediate objectives are:

1. Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with international labor standards

2. Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation, and regulations related to CL improved

3. Increased implementation of national action plans on Child Labor including WFCL

4. Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL including WFCL

9. How did the project coordinate with implementing partners, other donor-funded projects, host government? How did the field coordinate with headquarters?

10. What were, if any, the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration?

Probe: How did the willingness/commitment/engagement of government authorities contribute to project success or lack of success?

11. Did the project develop and disseminate all resources planned? If not, why? (*note to interviewer: ask about Global and Local resources*)

12. How did resources developed contribute to the four project intermediate objectives?

13. How were resources disseminated?

14. What dissemination strategy, if any, has worked the best? Why?

15. What challenges were encountered in addressing intermediate objective? How, if at all, were they overcome?

Probe: What project internal factors were a major challenge (e.g., staff, resources)

Probe: What external factors were a major challenge (e.g., the operating environment, political will)

Probe: What was the effect of these challenges on the project's effectiveness?

16. To what extent did the project experience staff turnover (of IPs and beneficiaries)? To what extent was staff turnover a challenge for project implementation and effectiveness? If yes, how (if at all) was it overcome?

III. EFFICIENCY

Now I'd like to talk about efficiency.

17. How did the following factors contribute to or hinder the achievement of results?

a. Funding

b. Personnel

c. Administration

d. Time

Probe: To what extent were the level of project resources (inputs) sufficient to produce the expected results?

Probe: Were the project's outputs and results achieved within plans and budgets? If not, why? How were deviations addressed?

Probe: To what extent did the following factors (funding, personnel, administration, time allocated, country selection, cost increase) contribute to or hinder the achievement of the project's results?

IV. SUSTAINABILITY

Now, I have a few questions related to sustainability of activities and achievements.

18. Here in your country, what are the products/activities/outcomes the project would like to be sustained? For how long or under what conditions?

19. To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the foreseen threats or enablers?

Probe: What are the threats to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

Probe: What are the enablers to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

V. LESSONS LEARNED AND REPLICABILITY

Thanks for all of your answers so far. I only have a couple more questions, and they are about overall lessons learned -- especially anything you haven't already told me.

20. What, if any, activities went really well? What contributed to the success? What did the project learn?

21 To what extent can lessons learned in (country) be applied to in other countries? Why?

Is there anything else we haven't discussed that you think we should know for the evaluation?

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES: HOST GOVERNMENT IMPLEMENTERS IN THE FIELD

Introduction

Thank you very much for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is _____. I am working for a US-based company named Institute for Development Impact (I4DI), that was contracted to perform the final evaluation of the CLEAR II Project. As you are probably aware, the program, funded by the US Department of Labor (USDOL) aims at reducing child labor (CL), including the worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

During the course of this interview, I/we will ask you a number of questions about your opinions/interests/perspectives related to the CLEAR II Project implementation and outcomes. There are no right or wrong answers, we are interested in learning about your opinions, perceptions and interests.

Your answers will help us to understand and identify the outcomes achieved by the project, and we will use the information gathered today to elaborate a set of recommendations to USDOL for future design of projects aimed at reducing CL and WFCL.

Your participation is voluntary and your specific answers will be kept confidential. If you do not want to answer a question, please tell me, and we can skip to the remaining questions. You can also stop answering the questions in case you do not want to continue at some point of the interview.

Informed consent:

Are you willing to participate in this interview? Yes ___ / No ___

If you have any questions about the evaluation or your participation here today, please feel free to contact I4DI.

Date:

Name of Interviewer:

Location of Interview (country, province, city):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Name of Respondent(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Organization(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Position(s):

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Sex:

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Can you describe briefly, in two to three sentences, your history and role on the CLEAR II Project?

Probe: How long have you been involved with CLEAR II?

(Note: obtain answer for each respondent in case of a SGI)

Intermediate objectives addressed/involved with/ known by interviewee(s):

NOTE: The interviewer will check the objectives based on the description given above

Check all that applies 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___

I. RELEVANCE

I'd like to start by talking about the initial project planning.

NOTE: You may need to skip this, if they are not familiar with the initial project planning. Instead please ask: How familiar are you with the initial project planning for CLEAR II?

1. Did the CLEAR II Project develop assessments of needs and interests of beneficiaries? If so, were the assessments validated by host government authorities and other stakeholders including target groups? What was the process for validation?

II. EFFECTIVENESS

Let's talk about project achievements.

2. To what extent has the CLEAR II project achieved its activities and expected results?

3. What are the project's major contributions to reduce child labor in (country)?

Probe: What would be some best examples of those contributions?

4. What were CLEAR II activities or approaches that you find were especially successful (by IO)

5. What activities didn't work well? Why? (by IO)

NOTE: Intermediate objectives (IO) are:

1. Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with international labor standards

2. Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation, and regulations related to CL improved

3. Increased implementation of national action plans on Child Labor including WFCL

4. Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL including WFCL

6. During CLEAR II Project, have been there other efforts/projects working to reduce child labor?

Probe: Who are the main implementing partners for these efforts? Did CLEAR II contribute to those efforts? How?

7. How did the project coordinate with the (country) authorities, as well as other CL projects, including other donors?

8. What were, if any, the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration?

Probe: How did the government contribute to project success or lack of success?

9. Are you familiar with the web portal developed by this project? Did you ever use it? If so, what is your opinion about the quality and usefulness of the content?

10. What are the stakeholders' perceptions of the global and local resources developed?

Link this question to question 11.

11. For the various resources developed in (country) through the CLEAR II project, can you describe how they were disseminated locally and whether the dissemination has been effective? Were there any planned resources that were not developed or disseminated? Why?

12. What challenges were encountered in Project implementation? How, if at all, were they overcome?

Probe: What project internal factors were a major challenge (e.g., staff, resources)

Probe: What external factors were a major challenge (e.g., the operating environment, political will)

Probe: What was the effect of these challenges on the project's effectiveness?

13. To what extent did the project experience staff turnover (of IPs and beneficiaries)? To what extent was staff turnover a challenge for project implementation and effectiveness? If yes, how (if at all) was it overcome?

III. EFFICIENCY

Now I'd like to talk about efficiency.

14. Were there any ways that the project could have operated more efficiently (achieving more in the same amount of time)? If so, how?

IV. SUSTAINABILITY

Now, I have a few questions related to sustainability of activities and achievements.

15. Here in your country, what are the products/activities/outcomes of CLEAR II that you consider important to be sustained? For how long or under what conditions?

16. To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the foreseen threats or enablers?

Probe: What are the threats to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

Probe: What are the enablers to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

V. LESSONS LEARNED AND REPLICABILITY

Thanks for all of your answers so far. I only have a couple more questions, and they are about overall lessons learned -- especially anything you haven't already told me.

17. What, if any, activities went really well? What contributed to the success? What did the project learn?

18. To what extent can lessons learned in (country) be applied to in other countries? Why?

Is there anything else we haven't discussed that you think we should know for the evaluation?

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES: LOCAL COLLABORATORS (NGOs, Private sector, others) IN THE FIELD

Introduction

Thank you very much for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is _____. I am working for a US-based company named Institute for Development Impact (I4DI), that was contracted to perform the final evaluation of the CLEAR II Project. As you are probably aware, the program, funded by the US Department of Labor (USDOL) aims at reducing child labor (CL), including the worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

During the course of this interview, I/we will ask you a number of questions about your opinions/interests/perspectives related to the CLEAR II Project implementation and outcomes. There are no right or wrong answers, we are interested in learning about your opinions, perceptions and interests.

Your answers will help us to understand and identify the outcomes achieved by the project, and we will use the information gathered today to elaborate a set of recommendations to USDOL for future design of projects aimed at reducing CL and WFCL.

Your participation is voluntary and your specific answers will be kept confidential. If you do not want to answer a question, please tell me, and we can skip to the remaining questions. You can also stop answering the questions in case you do not want to continue at some point of the interview.

Informed consent:

Are you willing to participate in this interview? Yes ___ / No ___

If you have any questions about the evaluation or your participation here today, please feel free to contact I4DI.

Date:

Name of Interviewer:

Location of Interview (country, province, city):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Name of Respondent(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Organization(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Position(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Sex:

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

In two to three sentences, can you briefly describe the work you did with CLEAR II Project?

Probe: How long have you been involved with CLEAR II?

(Note: obtain answer for each respondent in case of a SGI)

Intermediate objectives addressed/involved with/ known by interviewee(s):

NOTE: The interviewer will check the objectives based on the description given above

Check all that applies 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___

I. EFFECTIVENESS

Let's talk about project achievements.

1. What are the project's major contributions to reduce child labor in (country)?

Probe: What would be some best examples of those contributions?

2. What activities or approaches were especially successful in enhancing the capacity to address child labor in (country) Why?

3. Were there activities or approaches that didn't work well in regards to (intermediate objective)? Why?

NOTE: Intermediate objectives are:

1. Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with international labor standards

2. Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation, and regulations related to CL improved

3. Increased implementation of national action plans on Child Labor including WFCL

4. Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL including WFCL

4. was there anything planned under this project that wasn't achieved? why?"

5. How did the project coordinate with other donor-funded projects and host government

authorities ?

6. What were, if any, the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration?

Probe: How did the willingness/commitment/engagement of government authorities contribute to project success or lack of success?

7. For the various resources developed in (country) through the CLEAR II project, can you describe how they were disseminated locally and whether the dissemination has been effective? Were there any planned resources that were not developed or disseminated? Why?

8. Are you familiar with the web portal developed by this project? Did you ever use it? If so, what is your opinion about the quality and usefulness of the content?

9. What challenges were encountered in addressing (intermediate objective)? How, if at all, were they overcome?

Probe: What project internal factors were a major challenge (e.g., staff, resources)

Probe: What external factors were a major challenge (e.g., the operating environment, political will)

Probe: What was the effect of these challenges on the project's effectiveness?

10. To what extent did the project experience staff turnover (of IPs and beneficiaries)? To what extent was staff turnover a challenge for project implementation and effectiveness? If yes, how (if at all) was it overcome?

II. EFFICIENCY

Now I'd like to talk about efficiency.

11. Were there any ways that the project could have operated more efficiently (achieving more in the same amount of time)? If so, how

III. SUSTAINABILITY

Now, I have a few questions related to sustainability of activities and achievements.

12. Thinking about the work that your organization did in support of the CLEAR II project, what are the products/activities/outcomes of CLEAR II that you consider important to be sustained? For how long or under what conditions?

13. To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the foreseen threats or enablers?

IV. LESSONS LEARNED AND REPLICABILITY

14. What are key lessons learned, best practices, success stories and good models that can be applied to current or future global and country-level child labor projects?

Is there anything else we haven't discussed that you think we should know for the evaluation?

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES: BENEFICIARIES/RECIPIENTS IN THE FIELD

Introduction

Thank you very much for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is _____. I am working for a US-based company named Institute for Development Impact (I4DI), that was contracted to perform the final evaluation of the CLEAR II Project. As you are probably aware, the program, funded by the US Department of Labor (USDOL) aims at reducing child labor (CL), including the worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

During the course of this interview, I/we will ask you a number of questions about your opinions/interests/perspectives related to the CLEAR II Project implementation and outcomes. There are no right or wrong answers, we are interested in learning about your opinions, perceptions and interests.

Your answers will help us to understand and identify the outcomes achieved by the project, and we will use the information gathered today to elaborate a set of recommendations to USDOL for future design of projects aimed at reducing CL and WFCL.

Your participation is voluntary and your specific answers will be kept confidential. If you do not want to answer a question, please tell me, and we can skip to the remaining questions. You can also stop answering the questions in case you do not want to continue at some point of the interview.

Informed consent:

Are you willing to participate in this interview? Yes ___ / No ___

If you have any questions about the evaluation or your participation here today, please feel free to contact I4DI.

Date:

Name of Interviewer:

Location of Interview (country, province, city):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Name of Respondent(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Organization(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Position(s):

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Sex:

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

In two to three sentences, can you briefly describe how you and your organization were involved in the CLEAR II project?

Probe: how long have you been involved with the CLEAR II project?

(Note: obtain answer for each respondent in case of a SGI)

Intermediate objectives addressed/involved with/ known by interviewee(s):

NOTE: The interviewer will check the objectives based on the description given above

Check all that applies 1. 2. 3. 4.

I. RELEVANCE

I'd like to start by talking about the initial project planning.

1. As the project was being planned, were there any assessments to establish local needs and interests (including those of your organization)? Please describe these assessments. Did anyone from your organization have opportunity to validate the assessment findings?

II. EFFECTIVENESS

2. Tell me about the activities or assistance that the CLEAR II project did in conjunction with your organization. Did the assistance provided meet its results as planned? If not, where were the deviations? Why did these deviations occur?

3. Were there any major unplanned activities that occurred? Why? What happened as a result?

4. Were there any results that were not intended, for better or for worse? Please describe them.

IF TIME IS RUNNING SHORT, SKIP #5

5. Please describe how the activities/assistance your organization received in conjunction with CLEAR II will contribute or have contributed to a reduction in child labor in your country.

Probe: What would be some best examples of those contributions?

6. Did you or your organization ever access or receive any resources developed through the CLEAR II project? Please describe them.

Probe: How were the resources disseminated? Did you ever use a web portal?

Probe: What are your perceptions of the resources? Their quality? Their effect?

7. What, if any, challenges were encountered during the implementation of the CLEAR II project's activities? How, if at all, were they overcome?

Probe: What was the effect of these challenges on the project's effectiveness?

8. Thinking about the needs that the CLEAR II project was meant to address, did the project fully address these needs? What needs remain? (Note: respondent can focus on their organization or other organizations).

IF TIME IS RUNNING SHORT, SKIP #9

9. Since 2015, what if any other efforts/programs/projects have been undertaken in (country) to address child labor?

Probe: Who are the main implementing partners for these efforts? To which of these did CLEAR II contribute? How?

III. EFFICIENCY

Now I'd like to talk about efficiency.

10. Were the CLEAR II project activities sufficient to produce the expected results? Why/why not? What, if any, additional resources or inputs might have improved the efficiency of the project?

11. Has staff turnover caused any challenges for the work of the CLEAR II project?

Probe: Consider staff at your own organization or at other organizations working on CLEAR II.

IV. SUSTAINABILITY

Now, I have a few questions related to sustainability of activities and achievements.

12. Thinking about how the CLEAR II project has affected your organization, to what extent is sustainability likely? What do you think will continue? What do you think won't continue? What are the foreseen threats or enablers?

V. LESSONS LEARNED AND REPLICABILITY

Thank you for all of your answers so far. We just have a couple more questions about lessons learned, especially anything you haven't already mentioned.

13. What, if any, CLEAR II activities went really well? What contributed to the success? What did you learn?

14. To what extent can lessons learned be applied in other countries? Why?

Is there anything else we haven't discussed that you think we should know for the evaluation?

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES: WINROCK INTERNATIONAL IN THE US

Introduction

Thank you very much for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is _____. I am working for a US-based company named Institute for Development Impact (I4DI), that was contracted to perform the final evaluation of the CLEAR II Project. As you are probably aware, the program, funded by the US Department of Labor (USDOL) aims at reducing child labor (CL), including the worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

During the course of this interview, I/we will ask you a number of questions about your opinions/interests/perspectives related to the CLEAR II Project implementation and outcomes. There are no right or wrong answers, we are interested in learning about your opinions, perceptions and interests.

Your answers will help us to understand and identify the outcomes achieved by the project, and we will use the information gathered today to elaborate a set of recommendations to USDOL for future design of projects aimed at reducing CL and WFCL.

Your participation is voluntary and your specific answers will be kept confidential. If you do not want to answer a question, please tell me, and we can skip to the remaining questions. You can also stop answering the questions in case you do not want to continue at some point of the interview.

Informed consent:

Are you willing to participate in this interview? Yes ___ / No ___

If you have any questions about the evaluation or your participation here today, please feel free to contact I4DI.

Date:

Name of Interviewer:

Location of Interview (country, province, city):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Name of Respondent(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Organization(s):

1. _____

- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Position(s):

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Sex:

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Can you describe briefly, in two to three sentences, your history and role on the CLEAR II Project?

(Note: obtain answer for each respondent in case of a SGI)

Intermediate objectives addressed/involved with/ known by interviewee(s):

NOTE: The interviewer will check the objectives based on the description given above

Check all that applies 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___

I. RELEVANCE.

I'd like to start by talking about the initial project planning.

- 1. How were the needs and interests of the target countries/groups initially established and how did project planning and work plans in Belize, Burkina Faso, Jamaica and Liberia address such needs and interests?
- 2. What assessments of needs and interests of target groups were developed?
- 3. To what extent were the needs and interests of the target groups fully addressed? What needs remain? What was the reason why the needs were not met?

II. EFFECTIVENESS

Now, I would like to talk about achievements.

- 4. To what extent did the program meet its output and outcome targets (as specified in the CMEP)? If not, where were the deviations (by output/outcome)? Why did these deviations occur?
- 5. Did the project achieve other results that were not articulated -intended- in the CMEP?
- 6. Did the project implement any major non-planned activities to ensure achievements?
- 7. What activities or approaches were especially successful in achieving the planned intermediate objectives? Why?

8. Were there activities or approaches that didn't work well in regard to the planned intermediate objectives? If yes, which and why?

NOTE: Intermediate objectives are:

1. Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with international labor standards

2. Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation, and regulations related to CL improved

3. Increased implementation of national action plans on Child Labor including WFCL

4. Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL including WFCL

9. How did the project coordinate with implementing partners, other donor-funded projects, host governments and DOL?

10. What were, if any, the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration?

Probe: How did the willingness/commitment/engagement of government authorities contribute to project success or lack of success?

11. Did the project develop and disseminate all global and local resources planned? If not, why? (*note to interviewer: ask about Global and Local resources*)

12. How did resources developed contribute to the four project intermediate objectives?

13. How were resources disseminated?

14. What dissemination strategy, if any, has worked the best? Why?

15. What challenges were encountered in addressing intermediate objectives? How, if at all, were they overcome?

Probe: What project internal factors were a major challenge (e.g., staff, resources)

Probe: What external factors were a major challenge (e.g., the operating environment, political will)

Probe: What was the effect of these challenges on the project's effectiveness?

16. To what extent did the project experience staff turnover (of IPs and beneficiaries)? To what extent was staff turnover a challenge for project implementation and effectiveness? If yes, how (if at all) was it overcome?

III. EFFICIENCY

Now I'd like to talk about efficiency

17. How did the following factors contribute to or hinder the achievement of results?

- a. Funding
- b. Personnel
- c. Administration
- d. Time

- e. Country selection
- f. Cost increase

Probe: To what extent were the level of project resources (inputs) sufficient to produce the expected results?

Probe: Were the project's outputs and results achieved within plans and budgets? If not, why? How were deviations addressed?

Probe: To what extent did the following factors (funding, personnel, administration, time allocated, country selection, cost increase) contribute to or hinder the achievement of the project's results?

IV. SUSTAINABILITY

Now, I have a few questions related to sustainability of activities and achievements.

18. What are the products/activities/outcomes the project would like to be sustained? For how long or under what conditions?

19. To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the foreseen threats or enablers?

Probe: What are the threats to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

Probe: What are the enablers to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

V. LESSONS LEARNED AND REPLICABILITY

Thanks for all of your answers so far. I only have a couple more questions, and they are about overall lessons learned -- especially anything you haven't already told me.

20. What, if any, activities went really well? What contributed to the success? What did the project learn?

21. To what extent can lessons learned in each of the countries or at the global program be applied to other countries or other global programs? Why?

Is there anything else we haven't discussed that you think we should know for the evaluation?

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES: US DEPARTMENT OF LABOR IN THE US

Introduction

Thank you very much for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is _____. I am working for a US-based company named Institute for Development Impact (I4DI), that was contracted to perform the final evaluation of the CLEAR II Project. As you are probably aware, the program, funded by the US Department of Labor (USDOL) aims at reducing child labor (CL), including the worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

During the course of this interview, I/we will ask you a number of questions about your opinions/interests/perspectives related to the CLEAR II Project implementation and outcomes. There are no right or wrong answers, we are interested in learning about your opinions, perceptions and interests.

Your answers will help us to understand and identify the outcomes achieved by the project, and we will use the information gathered today to elaborate a set of recommendations to USDOL for future design of projects aimed at reducing CL and WFCL.

Your participation is voluntary and your specific answers will be kept confidential. If you do not want to answer a question, please tell me, and we can skip to the remaining questions. You can also stop answering the questions in case you do not want to continue at some point of the interview.

Informed consent:

Are you willing to participate in this interview? Yes ___ / No ___

If you have any questions about the evaluation or your participation here today, please feel free to contact I4DI.

Date:

Name of Interviewer:

Location of Interview (country, province, city):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Name of Respondent(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Organization(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Position(s):

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Sex:

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Can you describe briefly, in two to three sentences, your history with the CLEAR II Project?

Note: Depending on the answer, you might need to adapt Question #1 to account for a shorter history of engagement.

(Note: obtain answer for each respondent in case of an SGI)

Intermediate objectives addressed/involved with/ known by interviewee(s):

NOTE: The interviewer will check the objectives based on the description given above
Check all that applies 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___

I. RELEVANCE

I'd like to start by talking about the initial project planning.

1. How did project planning and work plans address target groups specific needs and interests? How were the needs and interests of the target groups initially established? To what extent was feedback from target groups sought and taken into consideration over the life of the project?

1I. EFFECTIVENESS

Now, I would like to talk about achievements.

- 2. To what extent did the program meet its output and outcome targets?
- 3. Did the project achieve other results that were not articulated -intended- in the CMEP?
- 4. What are the project's major contributions to reduce child labor?

Probe: What would be some of the best examples of those contributions?

- 5. How did the project coordinate with implementing partners (Verite and LWOB), other donor-funded projects, host government and DOL?
- 6. What were, if any, the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration?

III. EFFICIENCY

7. To what extent were the level of project resources (inputs) sufficient to produce the expected results?

IV. SUSTAINABILITY

Now, I have a few questions related to sustainability of activities and achievements.

8. What are the products/activities/outcomes the project would like to be sustained? For how long or under what conditions?

9. To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the foreseen threats or enablers?

Probe: What are the threats to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

Probe: What are the enablers to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

V. LESSONS LEARNED AND REPLICABILITY

Thanks for all of your answers so far. I only have a couple more questions, and they are about overall lessons learned -- especially anything you haven't already told me.

10. What, if any, activities went really well? What contributed to the success? What did the project learn?

11. To what extent can lessons learned in (country) be applied to in other countries? Why? Is there anything else we haven't discussed that you think we should know for the evaluation?

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES: VERITE AND LWOB IN THE US

Introduction

Thank you very much for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is _____. I am working for a US-based company named Institute for Development Impact (I4DI), that was contracted to perform the final evaluation of the CLEAR II Project. As you are probably aware, the program, funded by the US Department of Labor (USDOL) aims at reducing child labor (CL), including the worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

During the course of this interview, I/we will ask you a number of questions about your opinions/interests/perspectives related to the CLEAR II Project implementation and outcomes. There are no right or wrong answers, we are interested in learning about your opinions, perceptions and interests.

Your answers will help us to understand and identify the outcomes achieved by the project, and we will use the information gathered today to elaborate a set of recommendations to USDOL for future design of projects aimed at reducing CL and WFCL.

Your participation is voluntary and your specific answers will be kept confidential. If you do not want to answer a question, please tell me, and we can skip to the remaining questions. You can also stop answering the questions in case you do not want to continue at some point of the interview.

Informed consent:

Are you willing to participate in this interview? Yes ___ / No ___

If you have any questions about the evaluation or your participation here today, please feel free to contact I4DI.

Date:

Name of Interviewer:

Location of Interview (country, province, city):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Name of Respondent(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Organization(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Position(s):

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Sex:

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Can you describe briefly, in two to three sentences, your history and role on the CLEAR II Project?

(Note: obtain answer for each respondent in case of a SGI)

Intermediate objectives addressed/involved with/ known by interviewee(s):

NOTE: The interviewer will check the objectives based on the description given above
Check all that applies 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___

I. RELEVANCE

I'd like to start by talking about the initial project planning.

- 1. How were the needs and interests of the target countries/groups initially established and how did project planning and work plans in Belize, Burkina Faso, Jamaica and Liberia address such needs and interests?
- 2. What assessments of needs and interests of target groups were developed?
- 3. To what extent were the needs and interests of the target groups fully addressed? What needs remain? What was the reason why the needs were not met?

II. EFFECTIVENESS

Now, I would like to talk about achievements.

- 4. Did the program meet its output and outcome targets (as specified in the CMEP)? If not, where were the deviations (by output/outcome)? Why did these deviations occur?
- 5. Did the project achieve other results that were not articulated -intended- in the CMEP?
- 6. Did the project implement any major non-planned activities to ensure achievement?
- 7. What activities or approaches were especially successful in achieving the intermediate objectives? (1, 2, 3, or 4 as appropriate) Why?
- 8. Were there activities or approaches that didn't work well in regards to the intermediate objectives)? Which and Why?

NOTE: Intermediate objectives are:

1. Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with international labor standards

2. Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation, and regulations related to CL improved

3. Increased implementation of national action plans on Child Labor including WFCL

4. Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL including WFCL

9. How did the project ensure coordination between implementing partners? Can you also elaborate on eventual collaboration with other donor-funded projects, host government and DOL?

10. What were, if any, the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in collaboration?

Probe: How did collaboration affect the success of the project?

Probe: How did the willingness/commitment/engagement of government authorities contribute to project success or lack of success?

11. Did the project develop and disseminate all the resources that had been planned for local audiences in the host countries? If not, why?

12. How did resources developed contribute to the four project intermediate objectives?

13. How were resources disseminated?

14. What dissemination strategy, if any, has worked the best? Why?

15. What challenges were encountered in addressing (intermediate objective)? How, if at all, were they overcome?

Probe: What project internal factors were a major challenge (e.g., staff, resources)

Probe: What external factors were a major challenge (e.g., the operating environment, political will)

Probe: What was the effect of these challenges on the project's effectiveness?

16. To what extent did the project experience staff turnover (of IPs and beneficiaries)? To what extent was staff turnover a challenge for project implementation and effectiveness? If yes, how (if at all) was it overcome?

III. EFFICIENCY

Now I'd like to talk about efficiency

17. How did the following factors contribute to or hinder the achievement of results?

a. Funding

b. Personnel

c. Administration

d. Time

e. Country selection

f. Cost increase

Probe: To what extent were the level of project resources (inputs) sufficient to produce the expected results?

Probe: Were the project's outputs and results achieved within plans and budgets? If not, why? How were deviations addressed?

Probe: To what extent did the following factors (funding, personnel, administration, time allocated, country selection, cost increase) contribute to or hinder the achievement of the project's results?

IV. SUSTAINABILITY

Now, I have a few questions related to sustainability of activities and achievements.

18. among the products, activities, outcomes that your organization worked on for this project, which of these are intended to be sustained? For how long or under what conditions?

19. To what extent is sustainability likely? What are the foreseen threats or enablers?

Probe: What are the threats to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

Probe: What are the enablers to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

V. LESSONS LEARNED AND REPLICABILITY

Thanks for all of your answers so far. I only have a couple more questions, and they are about overall lessons learned -- especially anything you haven't already told me.

20. What are key lessons learned, best practices, success stories and good models that can be applied to current or future global and country-level child labor projects?

Probe: What, if any, activities went really well? What contributed to the success? What did the project learn?

Probe: To what extent can lessons learned in (country) be applied to in other countries? Why?

Is there anything else we haven't discussed that you think we should know for the evaluation?

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES: US DEPARTMENT OF LABOR IN THE US, PROJECT MANAGER

Introduction

Thank you very much for taking the time to meet with me today. My name is _____. I am working for a US-based NGO named Institute for Development Impact (I4DI) to evaluate the CLEAR II Project, funded by the US Department of Labor (USDOL). This Project is aimed at reducing child labor (CL), including worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

In this interview, I/we would like to ask you a number of questions about your opinions/interests/perspectives related to the CLEAR II Project implemented by (implementing organization). There are no right or wrong answers, we are interested in learning about your opinions, perceptions and attitudes.

Your answers to the questions will help us to understand and identify the outcomes achieved by the project, and we will use the information gathered today to elaborate a set of recommendations to USDOL for future design of projects aimed at reducing CL and WFCL.

Your participation is voluntary and your identity will be kept confidential. If you do not want to answer a question we can go ahead with the remaining questions. You can also stop answering the questions in case you do not want to continue at some point of the interview.

Informed consent:

Are you willing to participate in this interview? Yes ___ / No ___

If you have any questions about the evaluation or your participation here today, please feel free to contact I4DI.

Date:

Name of Interviewer:

Location of Interview (country, province, city):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Name of Respondent(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Organization(s):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Position(s):

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Sex:

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Can you describe briefly, in two to three sentences, our history and role on the CLEAR II Project?

Intermediate objectives addressed/involved with/ known by interviewee(s):

NOTE: The interviewer will check the objectives based on the description given above

Check all that applies 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___

I. RELEVANCE

I'd like to start by talking about the initial project planning.

- 1. How did CLEAR II project identified and selected beneficiary countries initially – Nepal and Burkina Faso?

Probe: What selection criteria were to identify and select BF and Liberia?

Probe: What are the normal ways/procedures for selecting countries, establishing priorities, etc.?

- 2. How were other countries selected - Liberia, Jamaica, Belize, Panama and Honduras?

- 3. To what extent planning and work plans address countries specific needs and interests? How were the needs and interests of the countries established?

Probe: What was the approach to agree on assistance to be provided by CLEAR II to selected countries?

II. EFFECTIVENESS

Now, I would like to talk about achievements.

- 4. In your opinion, to what extent did the program meet its output and outcome targets?
- 5. Did the project achieve other results that were not articulated -intended- in the CMEP?
- 6. What are the project's major contributions to reduce child labor?

Probe: What would be some best examples of those contributions?

How did the project coordinate with Verité and LWOB, other donor-funded projects, host government and USDOL?

III. EFFICIENCY

Now I'd like to talk about efficiency.

7. To what extent were the level of project resources (e.g. funds, personnel, time, administration, home office support) sufficient to produce the expected results?

How and to what extent the country selection process of CLEAR II impacted Project implementation? Positive or negatively.

IV. SUSTAINABILITY

Now, I have a few questions related to sustainability of activities and achievements.

8. What are the products/activities/outcomes the project would like to be sustained?

9. To what extent is sustainability likely?

Probe: What are the threats to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

Probe: What are the enablers to sustainability regarding each of the project's intermediate objectives?

V. LESSONS LEARNED AND REPLICABILITY

Thanks for all your answers so far, I only have a couple more questions, and they are about overall lessons learned –especially anything you haven't already told me.

10. What were, if any, the successes and challenges? What contributed to the success?

11. What did the project learn?

12. To what extent can lessons learned be applied in other countries or projects? Why?

13. If we were to return to Liberia, Burkina Faso, Belize and/or Jamaica in two years, what activities or outcomes from this program do you think we'd find to be continuing? Why do you think that?

Is there anything else we haven't discussed that you think we should know for the evaluation?

INTERVIEW GUIDELINES: INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Introduction

Thank you very much for taking the time to talk with me today. My name is _____. I am working for a US-based company named Institute for Development Impact (I4DI), that was contracted to perform the final evaluation of the CLEAR II Project. As you are probably aware, the program, funded by the US Department of Labor (USDOL) aims at reducing child labor (CL), including the worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

We are interested in learning about your opinions, perceptions and interests as they relate to CLEAR II Project implementation and results achieved by IAC.

Your answers will help us to understand and identify the role and outcomes achieved by IAC as they relate to the Project. The evaluation team will use the information gathered to elaborate a set of recommendations to USDOL for future design of projects aimed at reducing CL and WFCL.

Your participation is voluntary and your specific answers will be kept confidential. If you do not want to answer a question, please tell me, and we can skip to the remaining questions. You can also stop answering the questions in case you do not want to continue at some point of the interview.

Informed consent:

Are you willing to participate in this interview? Yes ___ / No ___

If you have any questions about the evaluation or your participation here today, please feel free to contact I4DI.

Date:

Name of Interviewer:

Location of Interview (country, province, city):

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Name of Respondent(s):

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Organization(s):

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Position(s):

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

Sex:

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

In two to three sentences, can you briefly describe how you and your organization were involved in the CLEAR II project?

Probe: how long have you been involved with the CLEAR II project?

Intermediate objectives addressed/involved with/ known by interviewee(s):

NOTE: The interviewer will check the objectives based on the description given above
Check all that applies 1. ___ 2. ___ 3. ___ 4. ___

I. RELEVANCE

I'd like to start by talking about the initial planning about IAC.

- 1. Once created within the CLEAR II project, how did the International Advisory Council (IAC) coordinate with CLEAR II Project to address the needs and interests of the target countries as they relate to child labor (CL)?
- 2. What activities and results were planned? In your opinion, were the activities and results comprehensive enough to address the needs of targeted groups?

II. EFFECTIVENESS

Let's talk some more about IAC achievements.

- 3. To what extent were the activities implemented and results achieved? What needs remain? What was the reason why the needs were not met?
- 4. Did IAC achieve other results that were not initially planned?
- 5. Did IAC carry out any major support/activities non-planned to ensure achievements?
- 6. How did IAC communicate and coordinate with CLEAR II during project implementation?
- 7. What were, if any, the successes, challenges, and lessons learned in communication and coordination with CLEAR II or other stakeholders of CLEAR II –ex. USDOL, VERITE, LWOB?

III. EFFICIENCY

Now I'd like to talk about efficiency related to IAC implementation.

- 8. How the resources available (for example: funding, personnel, time and administration) contribute to or hinder the implementation of activities and/or achievement of results? In

your opinion, were the resources available sufficient to implement the activities planned?

9. To what extent did the Global Learning Platform (GLP) facilitate implementation of activities and achievement of expected results? If not, why?

IV. SUSTAINABILITY

Now, I would like to ask about sustainability of activities and achievements pertaining to IAC.

10. What is going to happen with the IAC once the CLEAR II project ends?

11. What is the likelihood that the types of activities that the IAC members conducted might continue after CLEAR II ends, based on the linkages formed during this project?

V. LESSONS LEARNED AND REPLICABILITY

Thanks for all of your answers so far. I only have a couple more questions, and they are about overall lessons learned -- especially anything you haven't already told me.

12. To what extent can lessons learned by IAC be applied to in other countries/projects? Why?

Is there anything else we haven't asked/discussed that you think we should know for the evaluation?

FOCUS GROUPS GUIDELINES

LIBERIA

CLEAR II PROJECT - Final Evaluation

The performance evaluation of the CLEAR II Project in Belize, Jamaica, Burkina Faso and Liberia contemplates the potential implementation of focus group discussions. The evaluation team foresees for the organization of focus group discussions (FGDs) in Liberia related to three intermediate Objectives of the CLEAR II Project. These objectives are as follows:

1. Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with international labor standards
2. Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation, and regulations related to CL improved
3. Increased implementation of national action plans on Child Labor including WFCL

Participants will be invited to discuss and provide their perceptions, opinions, and perspectives regarding performance of the CLEAR II Project. The objective of the FGDs will be to gather relevant data and information that can contribute to the analysis on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, lessons learned and replicability of the Project.

The assumption is that stakeholders convened to take part in the discussions (host government implementers, non-government collaborators, and beneficiaries) will have close knowledge of Project implementation, outputs and results achieved. The information collected will complement the quantitative/qualitative data gathered through key informant interviews and document review. There are no right or wrong answers and all responses will be kept anonymous and confidential.

The ideal number of participants in the FGDs is between 6-8 per FGD and should not be more than 12. Duration of the FGDs is estimated at 1.5 hours. The facilitator will tailor the questions to the audience and conduct the discussion so that the FGD does not take more than the planned 1.5 hours.

The event should be conducted in a location different from office locations or work environment to stimulate participation. The participants should not be in a work relationship as boss-subordinate. If the latter is not met, the reliability of data and information produced may be hampered.

FGD will be facilitated by Mr. Vasco Veloso, evaluator team member.

The facilitator will introduce the activity by describing its objectives and present the ground rules for participation. Participants will be informed about anonymity and confidentiality of data, duration of the FGD, etc. Participants will be asked to sign an attendance list.

The facilitator may ask participants for agreement on recording the discussion; the discussion will not be transcribed but recording will allow the facilitator to focus on the discussion and provide the opportunity to check and complete the notes taken by the facilitator during the FGD. This will minimize possible errors in note-taking during the event.

The three focus discussions will be on:

1. legislative reform committee (LRC)
2. National action plan (NAP)
3. Child labor monitoring system (CLMS)

FGD PARTICIPANTS

1. Three groups: Legislative Reform Committee (LRC), National Action Plan (NAP) and Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS). The participants are related to three –out of four- intermediate objectives of CLEAR II Project:
 - a. Child labor (CL) standards
 - b. Monitoring and enforcement of CL legislation
 - c. National planning
2. Balanced gender representation (50-50 as possible).
3. Sound knowledge of project implementation regarding each topic.
4. To the extent possible participants should not be familiar with each other to avoid small group discussions.

FOCUS GROUPS IN LIBERIA

Proposed FGD Number 1: LEGISLATIVE REFORM COMMITTEE (LRC)

Participants: Members of the committee.

The LRC's purpose is to "review laws on child labor, identify gaps in the laws and develop a list of hazardous and light work" in line with international standards. LRC members received training on legislative analysis and child labor regulations from the CLEAR II team and its partner Lawyers without Borders. Through these trainings, LRC members increased their confidence in discussing key child labor terms and concepts and gained knowledge to draft key pieces of legislation.

Purpose of Discussion: Understand how adaptation of local child labor legislation has advanced towards meeting ILS.

The FGD facilitator will tailor the questions to be asked for this group and ensure that the discussion is covered within 1.5 hours.

Questions

1. Tell me about the formation of the Legislative Reform Committee. How did you come to be members and what is your purpose?
2. Can you describe the activities and objectives you pursued? Advice, training, technical assistance (specify:_____). Objectives 1,2,3,4 (specify activities/objectives:_____).
3. What have been your main successes?
4. What factors have helped enable your successes?
5. Please describe the assistance you received from the CLEAR II project. Please comment on the extent to which the assistance was helpful/necessary/adequate. What else might have been helpful?
6. What have been the main challenges of your work? What is needed to help address these challenges?
7. To what extent are the LRC's successes sustainable? Or, how can the results can be made sustainable (In terms of drafting reforms, laws, policies, etc.)
8. What are your future goals for the LRC? If we come back in two years, what will we find?

Proposed FGD Number 2: NATIONAL ACTION PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

Participants: Members of National Commission on Child Labor (NACOMAL) and the National Steering Committee on Child Labor (NSC).

NACOMAL is charged with monitoring child labor issues and directing policies. The commission is headed by the Ministry of Labor and includes representatives from the Ministries of Health & Social Welfare, Gender & Development, and Youth & Sports. The objectives of NACOMAL include awareness raising, reforming national child labor laws, and designing a national child labor database. The NSC is chaired by the MOL, is composed of NACOMAL, government ministries, private sector representatives, and NGOs. Objectives include Liberia's ratification of ILO C.

Purpose of Discussion: Learn about National Action Plan (NAP) development and implementation

The FGD facilitator will tailor the questions to be asked to this group and ensure that the discussion is covered within 1.5 hours.

The FGD facilitator will tailor the questions to be asked for this group and ensure that the discussion is covered within 1.5 hours.

Questions

1. Tell me about the National Action Plan development? Who developed it and how? Is it fully enacted?
2. Can you describe the activities and objectives you pursued? Advice, training, technical assistance (specify:_____). Objectives 1,2,3,4 (specify activities/objectives:_____).
3. What is the status of the deployment of the NAP at local/regional level?
4. What have been your main successes?
5. What factors have helped enable your successes?
6. Please describe the assistance you received from the CLEAR II project. Please comment on the extent to which the assistance helpful/necessary/adequate. What else might have been helpful?
7. What have been the main challenges of your work? What is needed to help address these challenges?
8. To what extent are the NAP's successes sustainable? Or, how can the results be made sustainable (In terms of introducing NAP implementation at regional/district levels, local action plans development, steering committee, etc.)
9. What are your future goals for the NAP? If we come back in two years, what will we find?

Proposed FGD Number 3: CHILD LABOR MONITORING SYSTEM (CLMS) WORKING GROUP

Participants: Members of the working group on CLMS.

The child labor monitoring systems (CLMS) are intended to contribute to reduce child labor through monitoring activities and provide statistics on child labor in Liberia.

Purpose of Discussion: Learn about Child Labor Monitoring System roll-out, coordination and guidelines development/dissemination

The FGD facilitator will tailor the questions to be asked to this group and ensure that the discussion is covered within 1.5 hours.

Questions

1. Tell me about the Child Labor Monitoring System. What are the main differences/evolution from the initial CLMS established in the ARCH project?
2. What is its purpose and how is it organized (working groups)?
3. Can you describe the activities and objectives you pursued? Advice, training, technical assistance (specify:_____). Objectives 1,2,3,4 (specify activities/objectives: _____).
4. Where do CLMS activities take place?
5. What have been your main successes? (Institutionalization, CLMS Plan, guidelines and resources development)?
6. What factors have helped enable your successes?
7. Please describe the assistance provided by the CLEAR II project. Please comment on the extent to which the assistance helpful/necessary/adequate. What else might have been helpful?
8. What have been the main challenges of your work? Did you overcome them? If so, how?
9. To what extent is the CLMS sustainable? Or, how can the results be made sustainable (In terms of drafting reforms, laws, policies, etc.)
10. What are your future goals for the CLMS? If we come back in two years, what will we find?

ANNEX V. PARTICIPANT LIST FOR CLEAR II FINAL EVALUATION STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

Affiliation/Organization	No. Participants
Atlas	3
Atlas Thailand	2
CLEAR II	5
CLEAR II CC	3
Evaluator, Institute for Development Impact	1
Institute for Development Impact (I4DI)	2
Lead Evaluator, Institute for Development Impact	1
LWOB	2
OCFT, USDOL	2
QED	2
USDOL	1
Verite	2
WI	3

ANNEX VI. AGENDA FOR CLEAR II FINAL EVALUATION STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

Date: June 4, 2019

Venue: Winrock International: 2121 Crystal Drive #500 Arlington, VA 22202

Agenda:

9:00 am - 9:10 am	Welcome and Introductions
9:10 am - 10:30 am	Evaluation Team Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Methodology• Findings, Conclusions and Lessons Learned
10:30 am - 10:45 am	Break
10:45 am - 11:50 pm	Stakeholder Q&A <ul style="list-style-type: none">• IP feedback• Dialogue to address clarifying questions
11:50 am - 12:00 pm	Pre- Small Group Recommendation Presentation
12:00 pm - 12:15 pm	Lunch Break
12:15 pm - 1:00 pm	Working Lunch: Small group discussions recommendation development and application
1:00 pm - 1:30 pm	Facilitated report out of small group work