

# Independent Interim Evaluation

---

Country Level Engagement and Assistance  
to Reduce Child Labor II Project

– CLEAR II –

---

Implemented by:

Winrock International

Evaluators:

Sandy Wark, Lead Evaluator  
Keith Jeddere-Fisher  
Rafael Muñoz

**Cooperative Agreement Number:** IL-26260-14-75-K

**Financing Agency:** U.S. Department of Labor

**Dates of Project Implementation:** September 2014 – September 2018

**Evaluation Fieldwork Dates:** February 21 – March 22, 2017

**Total Project Funds from USDOL:** US \$7,000,000



*Sistemas, Familia y Sociedad*  
*Consultores Asociados*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

ACRONYMS.....	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	iii
I. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	1
1.1 Project Context .....	1
1.2 Project Description .....	1
II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY .....	4
2.1 Evaluation Objectives .....	4
2.2 Scope and Intended Users.....	4
2.3 Methodology.....	4
2.4 Evaluation Limitations .....	6
III. EVALUATION FINDINGS.....	7
3.1 Relevance and Validity of Project Design.....	7
3.2 Project Effectiveness.....	20
3.3 Efficiency of Resource Use.....	27
3.4 Sustainability.....	32
IV. MAIN CONCLUSIONS .....	33
V. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES .....	35
5.1 Good Practices .....	35
5.2 Lessons Learned .....	35
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	37

## ANNEXES

---

ANNEX 1: Overview of Project Progress in Nepal.....	39
ANNEX 2: Evaluation Terms of Reference .....	45
ANNEX 3: Evaluation Question Matrix .....	66
ANNEX 4: List of Documents Reviewed .....	81
ANNEX 5: Schedule of Field Visits and Other Stakeholder Meetings .....	83
ANNEX 6: Stakeholder Workshop Agenda and Participants.....	84
ANNEX 7: Good Practice Case Study.....	85

## ACRONYMS

---

ARCH	Actions to Reduce Child Labor Project (Liberia)
CEACR	ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations
CL	Child Labor
CLEAR II	Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II
CLMS	Child Labor Monitoring System
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
CRC	UN Convention on the Rights of the Child
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DMP	Disaster Management Plan (Nepal)
DoL	Department of Labor (Nepal)
GLP	Global Learning Platform
IAC	International Advisory Council
IAWG-CL	Inter-Agency Working Group on Child Labor (Nepal)
ILO	International Labor Organization
ILS	International Labor Standards
IO	Intermediate Objective
LI	Labor Inspection
ILAB	International Labor Affairs Bureau
LRC	Legal Reform Committee
LWOB	Lawyers Without Borders
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOL	Ministry of Labor (Burkina Faso)
MOLE	Ministry of Labor and Employment (Nepal)
NACOMAL	National Commission Against Child Labor (Liberia)
NAP	National Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NMP	National Master Plan (Nepal)
NPC	National Planning Commission (Nepal)
NSC	National Steering Committee (Burkina Faso)
PAN/PFTE	National Action Plan to Combat the Worst Forms of Child Labor (Burkina Faso)
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
RAP	Regional Action Plan
SAARC	South Asia Association for Regional Cooperation
SAIEVAC	South Asia Initiative to End Violence Against Children
SFS	Sistemas, Familias y Sociedad – Consultores Asociados
SCA	Solicitation for Cooperative Agreement
SO	Supporting Objective
TA	Technical Assistance
TDA	Trade and Development Act
ToC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPR	Technical Progress Report
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

This report documents the main findings and conclusions of an independent interim evaluation of Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II (CLEAR II), a four-year, United States Department of Labor (USDOL)-funded project that aims to support a global reduction in child labor (CL). The project, with a total budget of US\$7,000,000 not including an additional US\$294,000 of cost sharing, was initiated on September 30, 2014 and is currently scheduled to close on September 29, 2018. It is being implemented by Winrock International and its partners Verité International and Lawyers Without Borders (LWOB).

CLEAR II proposes to partner with the governments of at least eight countries to enhance their capacity to reduce child labor in four main areas: (1) Strengthening legal frameworks in harmony with International Labor Standards; (2) Improving monitoring and enforcement of laws and regulations prohibiting child labor; (3) Implementation of national plans on child labor; and (4) Strengthening social programs and services that address the root causes of child labor.

The interim evaluation assessed the project's implementation since its launch in October 2014 until the time of the evaluation (February/March 2017), covering approximately the first 29 of the 48 months of the project. The evaluation findings, good practices, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations are primarily intended for USDOL, Winrock and its partners.

A team of three international consultants carried out the interim evaluation using document review, performance analysis and face-to-face interviews with national stakeholders in three countries (Nepal, Burkina Faso, and Liberia), with project management and USDOL representatives in Washington DC, and through calls to other stakeholders in Honduras, Mozambique, India and Geneva, among other places. The evaluators used the following evaluation criteria in their analysis of project achievements and outcomes to date: (a) relevance and validity of project design, (b) project effectiveness, (c) efficiency of resource use, and (d) sustainability. The evaluation was framed by the key evaluation questions contained in the evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) (see **Annex 2**).

### Summary of Evaluation Findings

---

At the time of the interim evaluation, CLEAR II had made limited progress against its overall objectives. The project was operational in one out of the eight countries planned to receive CLEAR II support. In Nepal, it had made moderate progress despite the massive earthquake that struck the country one day after the project's official launch in Kathmandu. In contrast, in Burkina Faso, the other country that the project planned to provide with assistance early on, start-up was delayed for over two years due to political instability and security concerns. CLEAR II carried out a short intervention in one other country (Honduras) that was ended prematurely. Out of the five additional countries slated to receive project assistance, only Liberia has been formally approved to be added to the project with other beneficiary country candidates still in various stages of negotiation at the time of the evaluation.

## Relevance and Validity of Project Design

Consistency of project objectives with national stakeholder needs: Although CLEAR II's multi-country Theory of Change and results framework are coherent, the interim evaluation findings highlight the need to adapt project interventions to the opportunities, constraints and priority needs of stakeholders in each recipient country. Moreover, the project design's entry point for establishing country level assistance strategies, which proposes to deliver technical assistance to partner countries to implement *Findings on Worst Forms of Child Labor* report recommendations, may be perceived as overly prescriptive and limit project relevance as well as government buy-in. More comprehensive assessments prior to proposing an intervention strategy, responding to specific requests for success (as is being considered in Jamaica), and building government capacity to sustain the results of past child labor projects that were perceived as successful (planned in Burkina Faso and Liberia), are good strategies used by CLEAR II to be more responsive to national stakeholder priorities and encourage ownership of project interventions.

Evidence of how the project interacts with stakeholders to strengthen ownership during implementation is limited to Nepal, where the project has faced a number of challenges in achieving government buy-in. Notably, CLEAR II's scope to adapt to country needs post-earthquake was limited by its focus on government capacity building versus direct action and it faces government resistance to engage with it on legislative reform. The project has used effective strategies to overcome some of its limitations and challenges by working through a forum of international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other organizations (an example being CLEAR II's effective follow up on previous work done by the International Labour Organization [ILO] on developing a National Action Plan [NAP] by contributing to the efforts of an inter-agency working group) and by working with local government structures where there has been a stronger demand for support (for example its work on municipal disaster management plans). The project also seized an opportunity to contribute to Nepal's participation in the formulation of a Regional Action Plan (RAP) on child labor which was endorsed by the South Asia Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) in July 2016.

## Project Effectiveness

Delays naming new recipient countries and beginning implementation: Internal political and bureaucratic factors within the US government agencies and similar factors within the potential recipient country contributed to CLEAR II's slow progress expanding to new countries. Limited in-country human resources to facilitate introductions, planning and country level start-up have also constrained overall project progress.

CLEAR II progress achieving targets in Nepal: In Nepal, CLEAR II has made moderate progress toward project objectives. Overall, the progress that has been made is not in accordance with planned targets. At the outcome level, it has not achieved the outcome that was anticipated by the time of the interim evaluation (a functional Legal Reform Committee) but has achieved two others that were not planned (the regional NAP and the incorporation of child labor and child trafficking issues in the Penauti Disaster Management Plan [DMP]). Similarly, at the output level, many targets have not been achieved on time while there has been progress in areas not anticipated. Project performance was affected by multiple, mostly unexpected external challenges (the earthquake, political instability) as well as other factors described in the

evaluation findings. The project adjusted its strategy to unexpected events and has been able to seize new opportunities producing some unplanned outcomes and outputs.

Coordination with other international and non-profit organizations also working on child labor related issues: In Nepal, Winrock is an active member of the Nepal Inter-Agency Working Group on Child Labor. CLEAR II has coordinated with NGOs on awareness raising and advocacy issues and included NGO representatives in its training on child labor law enforcement systems. Similar collaboration is anticipated in Burkina Faso and Liberia.

Role and Effectiveness of International Advisory Council (IAC): The International Advisory Council IAC, a “global” project output, has been created and includes relevant expertise and motivated members, although it is lacking country-specific expertise. The Council as a whole has had limited contact with project management to date and a clear role for the Council in project implementation has not yet been identified.

Progress on Global Learning Platform (GLP):<sup>1</sup> The GLP is another “global” project output which was conceived to facilitate knowledge sharing across partner countries. The platform hosts a variety of resources, most of which are readily available on better known websites. To date, there are almost no project-produced content, webinars, or blog posts and there are problems with the site’s ease of navigation. For this reason, the site link has not yet been diffused to partners.

## **Project Efficiency**

Efficiency of CLEAR II management structure: The CLEAR II project management structure is currently very centralized. Although plans exist to hire senior national staff and decentralize many project management tasks to the country level, the shift from centralized to country level project management has not occurred yet due to various delays extending the project to new countries. Stakeholders in Burkina Faso emphasized the importance of having a strong in-country presence for project effectiveness and sustainability. In Nepal, the project team expressed that more could be done to effectively integrate them in project management. Given the large workload in the remaining nineteen months of project implementation, during which CLEAR II anticipates a rapid expansion into six additional countries, it is unlikely that the current project management structure will have sufficient capacity without adjustments being made.

Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) as a planning and project monitoring tool: The participative process of developing the project CMEP contributed positively to the start-up process. The global project Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework is flexible and enables measuring progress on a broad range of intervention strategies, but it needs to be adapted to country level interventions strategies in order to be a useful tool for planning and monitoring. In Nepal, with many activities/outputs not expected to be implemented, the global CMEP is unnecessarily complex for project management.

---

<sup>1</sup> The platform is online at [www.winrock-clearii-glp.org](http://www.winrock-clearii-glp.org)

## Project Sustainability

Sustainability of project outcomes and sub-objectives in Nepal: Project interventions at the municipal level have encouraged institutional ownership and capacity, factors that contribute to their sustainability. The Nepal National Master Plan (NMP), the South Asia Regional Action Plan and the Penauti Disaster Management Plan are reference strategies developed with national stakeholder participation and potentially will be used by them to guide actions post-project. At the present time, the CLEAR II expert publications (review of legislation framework and the Labor Inspectorate Assessment, both in Nepal), which to date have not been well-circulated, are unlikely to have impact unless additional measures are taken to promote their ownership by national stakeholders.

## Good Practices and Lessons Learned

The interim evaluation highlights good practices from Nepal: (a) CLEAR II participation in a network of international agencies focused on addressing child labor for policy and legal reform, and (b) the interactive process engaged by the project with officials in Penauti Municipality to mainstream child protection measures into the Disaster Management Plan.

Key lessons learned from the challenges experienced by CLEAR II when adding new countries to the project, that may be considered for future multi country projects, include: the need to factor in the time required for identifying and validating new countries in the design of the project; the need for face-to-face meetings with a variety of key national stakeholders during the country scoping phase (example of Belize); and the importance of existing USDOL and grantee relationships in potential target countries to facilitate entry into a new country (applied in Liberia).

## Recommendations

---

### Recommendations for USDOL

1. Revise the design of future projects: In future projects, target fewer countries, with countries being preselected and having larger budgets. Regionally-focused projects should be considered to facilitate knowledge sharing. Allocate sufficient time and resources for in-country scoping missions prior to selecting target countries.

### Recommendations for CLEAR II and USDOL Project Management

2. Reduce the number of overall target countries in CLEAR II and extend the project implementation period: Because of delays in identifying and initiating activities in new countries, and in light of the limited time left in the project, CLEAR II should reduce the total number of target countries. Project resources should be realigned to provide technical assistance to those countries that have already been identified and for which assessments have already been or are currently being carried out (5-6 countries). The project implementation period should be extended to allow additional time to assist national stakeholders in these countries on priority initiatives.

## Recommendations for CLEAR II Project Management

3. Revise country level results frameworks: After carrying out country-specific needs and context analyses (taking into consideration past and existing initiatives to fight child labor), country level performance management matrices, results frameworks and related work plans should be revised so that proposed technical assistance and capacity building strategies are contextualized and align with the priorities and capacity of relevant project counterparts.
4. Decentralize project management: Integrate country coordinators in overall country level planning and project management more comprehensively (choice of interventions, target setting, activity planning and implementation). Consider ways to engage more national level expertise in project implementation as a strategy to deploy faster in new countries, build national capacity and ownership, and enable more continuous follow-up with stakeholders.
5. Decentralize technical assistance and capacity building: In cases where CLEAR II faces resistance or slow pace from high level government agencies in Burkina Faso and Liberia (and other countries that may be added), the project should intensify work at the local level, building on good practices and lessons learned in Nepal. The work that the project is carrying out at municipality level should be continued and expanded. (Nepal)
6. Focus on sub-objectives where impact is most likely in the time remaining: The project should focus attention on sub-objectives where it is more realistic to expect results in the time remaining in the project; for example, the development of municipality Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS) and the promotion of coordination between enforcement agencies, local government and civil society.
7. Engage national stakeholders from the beginning to strengthen legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines: Use a more interactive and country-based approach to promote legal reforms. Use strategies that include in-country assessments and involve national legal and other experts more in the review process. Organize validation workshops to present expert reviews/studies to national stakeholders. Make table of proposed legislative changes more succinct to engage readers more effectively. (Nepal)
8. Build on existing CLMS models where these exist: Evaluate the Child Labor Monitoring System piloted by previous child labor projects and, if relevant to stakeholders, support the government and other stakeholders on its replication and/or scaling-up. (Burkina Faso and Liberia)
9. Support implementation of National Action Plans on Child Labor: Consider opportunities for supporting the implementation and resource mobilization for the NAP in Burkina Faso and Liberia. When the Nepal NMP has been endorsed by government, look for opportunities to provide support to the government for its implementation.
10. Strengthen and orient the International Advisory Council: Identify experts with relevant country level experience or relevant thematic experience. Consider feasibility of investing expertise in producing original content for GLP.
11. Refocus Global Learning Platform: Refocus efforts on producing and posting original, more tailored content on platform. Push content out to relevant users, capitalizing on the project's M&E database of national stakeholders.

# I. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

This report documents the main findings and conclusions of an independent interim evaluation of Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II (CLEAR II), a four-year, United States Department of Labor (USDOL)-funded project that aims to support a global reduction in child labor (CL).

## 1.1 Project Context

---

According to the latest global estimates presented by the International Labour Organization (ILO) in 2012, there were 168 million children worldwide engaged in child labor, accounting for almost 11 percent of the child population as a whole. According to these estimates, 85 million children – more than half of all child laborers – are engaged in hazardous work, directly endangering their health, safety and moral development.<sup>2</sup> Child laborers number some 77.7 million in Asia and the Pacific, 59 million in Sub-Saharan Africa, 12.5 million in Latin America and the Caribbean and 9.2 million in the Middle East and North Africa.

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over \$900 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects in more than 90 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate child labor. USDOL has also designed some projects to focus primarily on strengthening policies on child labor, education, and sustainable livelihoods, and on building the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor and address its root causes. In particular, these projects, including the project that is subject to this evaluation, are designed to support meaningful efforts by host governments and other relevant stakeholders to implement country level actions identified as important for progress in the fight against child labor in the USDOL's *Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor* report (also known as the Trade and Development Act [TDA] report).

## 1.2 Project Description

---

CLEAR II is a project to reduce child labor implemented by Winrock International and funded by USDOL with a total budget of US\$7,000,000, not including an additional US\$294,000 of cost sharing. It was initiated on September 30, 2014 and is currently scheduled to close on September 29, 2018. CLEAR II proposes to partner with the governments of eight countries to enhance their capacity to reduce child labor by supporting their efforts to implement actions described in the USDOL's most recent *Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor* report.

The project has four intermediate objectives (IO):

IO 1: Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with International Labor Standards (ILS);

---

<sup>2</sup> Making Progress Against Child Labour, Global Estimates and Trends 2000-2012, International Labour Office, 2013.

- IO 2: Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation and regulations related to CL improved;
- IO 3: Increased implementation of National Action Plans (NAP) on CL, including worst forms of child labor (WFCL);
- IO 4: Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL, including WFCL.

Activities that fall within the project scope include, but are not limited to:

- Assessing gaps and recommending and supporting actions to improve laws and policies;
- Facilitating stakeholder work and cross sector coordination on initiatives to combat child labor by mapping relevant institutions, assessing needs, and supporting the creation or improved functioning of working groups, multi stakeholder committees and task forces at the local or national level;
- Training and producing tools for community level child labor monitoring;
- Building the capacity of relevant stakeholders engaged in public private initiatives to address child labor in supply chains;
- Training and producing tools on child labor for government officials, labor inspectors, law enforcement and public social service providers from relevant institutions;
- Facilitating multi-stakeholder efforts to prioritize, mobilize resources and coordinate implementation of actions elaborated in National Plans of Action that aim directly or indirectly to combat child labor, including its worst forms;
- Conducting child labor research; and
- Supporting awareness raising initiatives.

In each country, the project intended to assess which government needs and priorities were within the scope of the project. Based on the assessment, it would then identify and implement country specific interventions. In parallel, CLEAR II planned to develop global strategies and tools to support project interventions in each country, including establishing an online global knowledge sharing platform, documenting and sharing good practices in combating child labor in target countries, carrying out research on child labor and establishing an International Advisory Council (IAC) composed of international experts who would provide pro bono technical support for project implementation.

### **Country Level Context**

Two of eight country recipients of CLEAR II technical assistance were named at the time of project start-up: Nepal and Burkina Faso. Both countries were subject to unforeseen events during the period of time covered by this evaluation that affected project implementation. The box below summarizes these and other key contextual factors.

## NEPAL

**Legal Framework:** Ratified ILO Convention 138 (minimum age), ILO Convention 182 (worst forms of child labor) and the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). Number of acts that relate to child labor, the main one being the Child Labor (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 2000.

**Policy Framework:** Since the 2004 - 2014 Nepal Master Plan on the Elimination of Child labor expired, there has been no overall master plan in the country, although the unendorsed draft master plan for the period 2011 – 2020 has provided some unofficial direction.

**Political, Economic and Social Environment:** Since the abolition of the monarchy in Nepal, there has been an Interim Constitution in place for the period 2007 until September 2015 when the new Constitution was endorsed. The Constituent Assembly which currently forms the parliament was elected in 2013, but there have been no local elections (at the municipality and village levels) for 20 years and these councils and committees are headed by appointed officials. During the period of the project there has been considerable political instability. Prior to the endorsement of the Constitution there was ongoing activism in order to influence it in one way or another, and since its endorsement there have been protests which included a blockade for four months of the main trade border with India which resulted in a numerous shortages including fuel.

In April 2015, a 7.8 earthquake struck Nepal, killing over 9,000 people and injuring many more. There were numerous aftershocks including one of 7.3 in May resulting in further casualties. The first priority for everyone at that time and for some months afterwards was on rescue, recovery and reconstruction. Reconstruction is continuing.

## BURKINA FASO

**Legal Framework:** Ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) in 1990, as well as ILO Conventions No. 138 (Minimum Age) in 1999, and No. 182 (Worst Forms) in 2001. Labor Code revised establishing the minimum age for work at the age of 16 and the minimum age for hazardous work at 18. Law Orienting the Education System reviewed, establishing universal free public education, and setting the compulsory education age at 16.)

**Policy Framework:** In 2012, Adopted the National Action Plan to Combat the Worst Forms of Child Labor (PAN/PFTE) (2011–2015)

**Political, Economic and Social Context:** From 2014-2016, Burkina Faso experienced high levels of political turmoil. In October 2014, a political uprising resulted in the ouster of its President of 27 years. Elections were held at the end of 2015 but were followed by a second coup. In January 2016, Al-Qaeda perpetrated a terrorist attack in the heart of Ouagadougou with significant loss of life.

At the time of the evaluation, the security situation was relatively calm. The current Administration continues to function without further incidents. Information gathered by the evaluator highlights a more favorable “enabling environment” for project implementation currently present in Burkina Faso.

## Information about the Project Implementing Organizations

Winrock, a non-governmental organization (NGO) based in the United States with a focus on social, agricultural and environmental issues, is the lead implementing organization on CLEAR II; it has carried out projects to combat child labor in several countries around the world. Winrock is partnering with two other NGOs: Lawyers Without Borders (LWOB) which specializes in mobilizing pro bono lawyers in global rule of law, capacity building and access to justice initiatives; and Verité, which conducts research, advocacy, consulting, trainings, and assessments with the aim to eliminate the serious labor and human rights abuses in global supply chains.

## II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

---

### 2.1 Evaluation Objectives

---

The interim evaluation assessed and evaluated the project's implementation since its launch in October 2014 until the time of the evaluation (February/March 2017), covering approximately the first 29 of 48 months of the project. The main objectives of the evaluation were as follows:

1. Assess the relevance of the project's Theory of Change, as stated in the CLEAR II CMEP, to the issue of child labor in the implementing countries and whether activities are being implemented in accordance with the project design.
2. Review the design and implementation of CLEAR II to determine whether the project is on track to meeting its objectives and identify challenges and/or successes encountered in doing so. Analyze the possible factors, internal and external to the project, which may be contributing to these successes and challenges.
3. Provide recommendations for the remaining period of the project that will improve the delivery and sustainability of outputs and objectives and inform stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future child labor elimination projects as appropriate.
4. Describe whether the CMEP is being implemented as designed and whether it is accurately measuring project results.

### 2.2 Scope and Intended Users

---

The scope of the independent interim evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with Winrock. The evaluation findings, good practices, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations are primarily intended for USDOL, Winrock and its partners, as well as other stakeholders working to combat child labor more broadly in CLEAR II target countries.

### 2.3 Methodology

---

A team of three international consultants carried out the interim evaluation using the following evaluation criteria in their analysis of project achievements and outcomes to date: (a) relevance and validity of project design, (b) project effectiveness, (c) efficiency of resource use, and (d) impact orientation and sustainability. The evaluation was framed by the key evaluation questions contained in the final evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) (see **Annex 2**).

The evaluators' main data collection methods included a review of project documents,<sup>3</sup> discussions with project staff and key stakeholders, project performance analysis, and a quality review of project research and other products produced to date.

After an initial review of key project documents, the evaluation team leader kicked off the evaluation in Washington, DC with consultations with the principal members of the project management team, representatives of USDOL and DC-based consultants and advisors (February 21-24, 2017). The following week, members of the evaluation team separately carried out field trips to Burkina Faso, Liberia, and Nepal (February 27-March 3).<sup>4</sup> During these field missions, the evaluators conducted individual interviews and facilitated discussion groups with project stakeholders including government counterparts, trade union representatives, civil society organizations, other international NGOs and organizations, as well as in-country project personnel as applicable (see **Annex 5** for list of interviews and meetings).

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

- Stakeholders' perceptions of project challenges and opportunities to date;
- The validity of project strategies used in the field; and
- The quality of services already delivered or in progress (mainly in Nepal; the project is only starting up in Burkina Faso and Liberia).

Stakeholder consultations in Nepal were more extensive than in Burkina Faso and Liberia due to the differing degrees of progress in the respective countries. Evaluation team members also carried out phone interviews with stakeholders and key informants from other countries not visited in person, including Honduras (which received technical assistance from CLEAR II), Bhutan and Mozambique (countries that had been considered for project support). The latter two were conducted to shed light on challenges experienced by the project in adding new countries.

The evaluators used semi-structured question guides prepared in advance for individual interviews and (where relevant) focus group discussions (see the question outline in the question matrix in **Annex 3**).

Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives were triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions to strengthen the credibility and validity of the findings. As

---

<sup>3</sup> These include the project document, the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, the cooperative agreement, other project results frameworks and monitoring plans, work plans, Technical Progress Reports, correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports, country situational assessments, National Action Plans, other legal/policy documents and draft regulations on CL developed with project support in target countries, management procedures and guidelines, training materials and curricula, as appropriate, and research or other reports undertaken by the project or relevant to its aims. A full list of consulted documents is included in **Annex 4**.

<sup>4</sup> The team was comprised of the following members: Sandy Wark (Team Leader) who interviewed stakeholders in Washington, DC and Liberia, and compiled and edited final report. Keith Jeddere-Fisher interviewed stakeholders in Nepal (in-person) and Bhutan (by phone). Rafael Muñoz interviewed stakeholders in Burkina Faso (in-person) and in Honduras and Mozambique (by phone).

far as possible, a consistent approach was followed in each project site, with adjustments made for the different stakeholders involved, activities conducted, and the progress of implementation in each locality.

The evaluation team facilitated a stakeholder workshop in Washington, DC on March 17, 2017 attended by CLEAR II core management team, representatives of USDOL and by the Nepal country coordinator via Skype. The evaluation team presented the initial findings, good practices, lessons learned and recommendations and invited feedback from the participants which was incorporated into the draft report.

## 2.4 Evaluation Limitations

---

Evaluation limitations include the following:

- The Nepal and Burkina Faso evaluation consultants did not participate in the briefing and meetings in Washington, DC with the CLEAR II management team. In order to address this, there was regular email communication with the evaluation team leader who did meet with the management team, and who was able to put questions to them that were raised by the other evaluators.
- All of the suggested meetings and interviews were achieved. In Nepal, the frequent change in personnel in some of the key government positions meant that there was no one interviewed from the government who was able to answer questions on whether their office had been involved in the pre-project preparation stage.
- At the time of the interim evaluation, CLEAR II was only operational in one of eight countries: Nepal. One country is a limited context from which to draw conclusions about how the project adapts its strategies at the country level.
- In Burkina Faso and Liberia, CLEAR II was in the early stages of implementation. While these two countries were selected for interim evaluation fieldwork, the evaluation team was instructed by USDOL to limit consultations to a small number of stakeholders with whom the CLEAR II team had already met and would likely collaborate.<sup>5</sup> As a result, in Burkina Faso and Liberia, the evaluators were not able to assess the responsiveness of proposed project strategies and activities to the needs of a broad cross section of key stakeholders through direct interviews (but referred to project and third party reports and other relevant documentation).

---

<sup>5</sup> USDOL and Winrock explained that contact between the evaluation team and other stakeholders at an early stage in project implementation had the potential to raise expectations, create confusion and possibly negatively affect project start-up efforts.

## III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

---

### 3.1 Relevance and Validity of Project Design

---

#### 3.1.1 Consistency of Project Objectives with National Stakeholder Needs in Nepal, Burkina Faso and Liberia

**Finding 1** In Nepal, although CLEAR II Intermediate Objectives (IOs) and most of the Supporting Objectives (SOs) address needs identified in external assessments of Nepal's capacity to address child labor, key national stakeholders did not perceive that their needs were well taken into account by the project. In Burkina Faso and Liberia, stakeholders found CLEAR II's overall focus on enhancing government capacities to address CL to be highly relevant. There are numerous synergies between the initial project results framework and needs expressed by stakeholders during evaluation fieldwork.

##### *Overall Assessment of Project Relevance to Stakeholder Needs in Nepal*

The multi-country results framework, although fulfilling needs in Nepal as identified from outside of the country, does not meet many needs currently expressed by government stakeholders within Nepal. As one senior government official said to the evaluator in response to the question whether needs were adequately identified by the project before the development of the intervention plan: "The needs assessment was already made before the project was started."

The project has adapted to find some opportunities to meet current needs with activities, outputs and outcomes that are in the results framework. However this poor fit has made it slower to get activities started and has contributed to a difficult working relationship between the project and the Government.

CLEAR II developed a specific Nepal results framework but it is largely the same as the full project one, with the deletion of the outputs related to the Global Learning Platform (GLP). Within this country level results framework, there are a large number of activities for which no targets have been set during the project period: 12 out of 29 outputs (after taking out the GLP outputs). The Nepal project team has worked with this Nepal specific results framework, but it has added complexity to management. In retrospect it would have been useful to have reviewed the country results framework in April 2015 following the Pre-situation Analysis and the Launch Workshop.

One advantage of having the large number of activities and outputs listed in the results framework is that it has made it easier for the project to pick up on opportunities that may not have been expected at the planning stage. However, the same might have been accomplished through timely revisions of a more specific country level results framework in line with evolving country needs and opportunities.

##### *Consistency of Project IOs and SOs with National Stakeholder Needs in Nepal*

Nepal was one of two CLEAR II countries that were known when Winrock prepared the project document. The four intermediate objectives and the majority of supporting objectives address

needs that have been clearly identified in external assessments including the recent ILAB reports on WFCL and the recent ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) observations on Conventions 138 and 182. The objectives are also in accordance with the overall strategic direction of the un-endorsed Master Plan for the Elimination of Child Labor (2011-2020). However there are significant inconsistencies between project objectives and what key national stakeholders expressed as needs and to what the specific needs are in relation to the current situation in Nepal. These are discussed below with regard to each IO.

*Intermediate Objective 1: Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with International Labor Standards (ILS)*

The difference in perspective on the need for this objective was clearly identified during the preparation of the Project Document. Footnote 10 of this document states “During the rapid-assessment in May 2014, stakeholders, including Ministry of Labor and Employment (MOLE) representatives and implementing agencies, repeatedly stated that the CL legislation and laws are strong. There is a grave misconception on the status of the current laws and their compliance with international standards.” The MOLE current perspective does acknowledge differences with international standards, but they clearly state that they wish to revise the legislation themselves. In addition there was some overlap with the ILO ACHIEVE project that was seeking to provide support for legislative reform. The ACHIEVE project had submitted recommendations based on identified gaps in the Child Labor (Prohibition and Regulation) Act and on the comments from the ILO Supervisory Bodies in 2013 and in 2015. The CLEAR II legislative review assesses eight other Nepalese laws that relate to Child Labor, providing a comprehensive, system-wide overview of the whole of Nepalese legislation affecting child labor. It should be noted that ILO states that it is still ready to provide support to MOLE for reform of child labor legislation.

SO 1.2 ‘Coordinating mechanism to adapt legislation to ILS functional’ is an objective that was redundant at national level in Nepal. Creating a Legal Review Committee is not valid in the context, since a multi-party Labor Committee already exists to look at legislation.<sup>6</sup> The project has not been able to find an effective way of providing support to the legislative revision process within the context described above. At the time of the evaluation discussions had recently been started with Bharatpur Municipality for the purpose of establishing a municipality policy review committee in order to review legislation at that level.

*Intermediate Objective 2: Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation and regulations related to CL improved*

The national stakeholders agree that this is a priority issue, however sub-objective 1.2 and many of the outputs do not adequately respond to one of the main constraints in Nepal: the very

---

<sup>6</sup> According to CLEAR II, the functionality of this group has been in question since the beginning of the project.

limited number of posts for Labor/Factory Inspectors and the even smaller number of Labor Inspectors in position.

The project refocused its support to local efforts in this area and thus it is giving its attention to those sub-objectives where it is more realistic to expect results: the development of municipality Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS) and the promotion of coordination between enforcement agencies, local government and civil society.

There is an ongoing dialogue amongst stakeholders on which other actors (i.e. District Child Welfare Board, District Women Development Officer, District Child Protection Officer, Police, etc.) would be best placed to support Labor Inspectors at the local level in their formal responsibilities regarding child labor. CLEAR II could support this process in order to reach a consensus and with making the necessary legislative change that would be required.

*Intermediate Objective 3: Increased implementation of National Action Plans on Child Labor, including WFCL*

Currently there is no endorsed National Master Plan on Elimination of Child Labor, the last one having expired in 2014. There is consensus among many stakeholders that one is required. ILO has, through a series of projects, supported MOLE in developing a number of drafts for a revised National Master Plan (NMP). The most recent ILO project, ACHIEVE, was still active when CLEAR II started. For this reason there are no CLEAR II targets set for any outputs or outcomes under sub-objectives 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.

The project has been able, through its support for and participation in the Interagency Working Group on Child Labor (IAWG-CL) (a group of about 10 international organizations), to pick up on providing support to the NMP process when the ACHIEVE project ended in August 2016.

While the possibilities to work on the national action plan were constrained, the project effectively seized the opportunity to contribute to the development of a South Asia Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) Regional Action Plan for the Prevention and Elimination of all Forms of Child Labor.

*Intermediate Objective 4: Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL, including WFCL*

This objective is consistent with current needs, and following the earthquake in April 2015 the project was able to respond to support municipalities in developing child labor/trafficking sensitive disaster management plans under this objective.

*Relevance of Proposed Actions to Stakeholder Needs in Burkina Faso and Liberia*

In Burkina Faso and Liberia, national stakeholders viewed CLEAR II's overall focus on enhancing national capacities to address CL as highly relevant. However, there is a need to adjust the planned interventions in the country to the present national context and needs. For example, in Liberia, stakeholders underlined that logistic and material (tools) resource constraints affecting government capacity needed to be taken into account in project strategies in the country.

CLEAR II has produced preliminary results frameworks in Burkina Faso and Liberia. There are numerous synergies between the initial project results framework and needs expressed by stakeholders during evaluation fieldwork. The following table identifies areas where there are synergies between the draft results framework for Burkina Faso and Liberia and stakeholder suggestions by IO, and SO:

**Table 1. Identified Synergies: Project Results Framework and Needs Identified by Stakeholders**

IO 1 Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with ILS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate child labor related laws and regulations among all concerned parties to raise awareness and understanding of such laws and regulations. (SO1.2) <i>Burkina Faso and Liberia</i></li> <li>• Assist national stakeholders in identifying and addressing gaps and detecting opportunities relating to child protection in broader legal frameworks and programs (social welfare, agriculture, poverty reduction, etc.). (SO1.1) <i>Burkina Faso and Liberia</i></li> </ul>
IO 2 Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation and regulations related to CL improved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve law enforcement instruments; monitoring mechanisms of child labor; interagency protocols on how to identify, refer and assist victims of child labor; and the capacity to intervene in the informal economy. <i>Burkina Faso and Liberia</i></li> <li>• Support the Ministry of Labor for the preparation and training of trainers on child labor issues targeting labor inspectors. (SO2.2) <i>Burkina Faso</i></li> <li>• Evaluate and, on the basis of the results, provide technical assistance to scale-up existing CLMS. (SO2.1) <i>Burkina Faso and Liberia</i></li> <li>• Support the Ministry of Labor, Unions and Employers' organizations to promote spaces for dialogue and cooperation to tackle child labor in selected supply chains. (SO2.3) <i>Burkina Faso and Liberia</i></li> </ul>
IO 3 Increased implementation of National Action Plans on Child Labor, including WFCL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activities and mechanisms to improve coordination between government agencies (example between Min of Gender and MOL) and between government agencies and grassroots organizations. (SO3.4) <i>Liberia</i></li> <li>• Support to National Strategy on the WFCL.</li> <li>• Support research on WFCL.</li> </ul>
IO 4 Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL, including WFCL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map and strengthen existing coordination mechanisms amid diverse line ministries, social partners, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and other relevant players that implement social programs, policies and/or services related to child protection and child labor.<sup>7</sup> (SO 3.4 and SO4.2) <i>Burkina Faso and Liberia</i></li> <li>• Map and assess relevant policy areas and capacity gaps and that contribute to child labor awareness. <i>Burkina Faso and Liberia</i>.</li> </ul>

### *Potential Duplication of Efforts*

In Liberia, the ILO pointed out that it has already conducted an analysis of gaps in national legislation and ILS as part of the NAP (through the GAP 11 project funded by USDOL). This is currently identified as a potential activity for LWOB in Liberia.<sup>8</sup> The ILO representative also

---

<sup>7</sup> In Burkina Faso, there is a National Steering Committee (NSC) with representatives from the Ministries of Labor, Social Affairs, and Education; ILO-IPEC; the Cotton Producers Union and the Traditional Gold Miners' Union; and several NGOs, including Counterpart's R-CLES project director. It is engaged in piloting a CLMS in 6 villages of 2 provinces of the Boucle du Mouhoun region.

<sup>8</sup> Similarly to the ILO analysis in Nepal, LWOB finds that the GAP 11 project analysis is limited in scope.

pointed out that labor inspector training on child labor has already occurred and that training on CLMS is planned in the near future.

### 3.1.2 Project Strategies to Ensure Government Buy-in

**Finding 2** CLEAR II has used some good strategies to promote partner government buy-in at the initial planning stages. However, some of the ways CLEAR II conducts its initial engagement with key stakeholders to determine the design and scope of project interventions includes practices that may limit buy-in from national stakeholders.

#### *Good Strategies to Promote Government Buy-in*

CLEAR II has used some good strategies for engaging stakeholders in the design and planning of project interventions. These include:

- In Nepal, the Project Start-Up workshop was carried out as a 2-day high profile event in April 2015 with a high level of participation from government and non-government offices. There was very active participation and it was successful in starting the process of specific needs identification and fleshing out a strategy to address the identified needs. The report was circulated to participants in order to reinforce the progress made. However some of this momentum was lost due to the earthquake that followed one day after the workshop and the change in priorities that this brought.
- In Jamaica, the government has proposed a specific intervention for which it would like project assistance, which broadly aligns with project objectives. If the project is able to respond to the government's request, the responsiveness of the project to a government proposal will favor government ownership and engagement, at least by the agency that made the request.
- In Liberia, CLEAR II is participating in the Actions to Reduce Child Labor (ARCH) project's sustainability workshop which is an opportunity to gather information to orient the design of CLEAR II interventions to capitalize on the momentum and experiences of a previous CL project.

#### *Practices That May Limit Stakeholder Ownership*

Some of the ways CLEAR II conducts its initial engagement of key stakeholders to determine the scope and design of project interventions includes practices that may limit buy-in:

Proposing a predetermined "menu" of interventions to national stakeholders. In its initial contacts with potential recipient countries, CLEAR II suggests areas of project support according to a predetermined menu of potential interventions based on the USDOL recommended actions. These actions may, or may not align with national priorities, available resources and greatest opportunities for sustainable impact on the problem of child labor. Although the recommended actions are based on relevant USDOL research, they were not always produced in a participative manner with direct input from all relevant national stakeholders. The project director notes however that in her interactions with government decision makers, she emphasizes that the project may consider other types of interventions.

Limiting input from government counterparts other than the Ministry officially mandated to coordinate “child labor” interventions into the initial project work plan. According to the project director, CLEAR II follows government protocol when engaging with government agencies. At the time of the evaluation (February 2017), in both Liberia and Burkina Faso, CLEAR II indicated that it was waiting to engage with other government stakeholders on potential program activities until after it had agreed on the initial work plan with the Ministry of Labor.<sup>9</sup> While starting with the Ministry of Labor does not exclude the possibility of working with other Ministries and government agencies, in Liberia a US Embassy official noted that Ministries compete with each other for international resources and therefore it was important to consult other Ministries (notably, the Ministry of Gender and Social Affairs) before finalizing the work plan. More generally, among those interviewed both in DC and in target countries, there was agreement that the choice of government counterparts should also consider the actual duties and capabilities of government counterparts.

Limiting the initial discussions that determine the project work plan to a relatively few high level decision-makers. CLEAR II contacts with the Ministry of Labor are made at a very high level and may not reflect the full range of views and priorities of officials who will later be asked to engage with the project. In Liberia, although the coordinator of the National Commission Against Child Labor (NACOMAL) was consulted by CLEAR II in addition to the Minister of Labor during an initial scoping mission in October 2016, she had not received any follow-up information from the project and was unaware of the draft project results framework that was given to the evaluator.<sup>10</sup>

**Finding 3** In Nepal, the project has faced a number of challenges in achieving government buy-in at the national level during the implementation phase. It has proposed some effective strategies to overcome these, most notably by working through a forum of international agencies and refocusing project capacity building on local government structures where there has been a stronger demand for its support.

The Nepal Country Coordinator, who started in February 2015, is a very well respected professional with many years of experience working on child labor issues for different organizations. This has facilitated the project to have access to key officials particularly within the MOLE.

Despite this advantage, the country coordinator has faced many challenges engaging with officials. He identified issues related to the project’s alignment with stakeholder needs (already

---

<sup>9</sup> In Burkina Faso, Representatives of the Ministry of Labor and Social Security were interviewed for pre-situational assessments, briefed on CLEAR II project and discussed potential activities/coordination. Also, representatives of the Regional Offices of the Ministry Labor and the Ministry of Women, Solidarity and the Family at Bobo Dioulasso were interviewed in order to conduct a labor inspectorate assessment. Consequently, so far, the project hasn’t engaged with other government stakeholders on potential program activities, as Winrock is in the process of agreeing on the work plan with the Ministry of Labor.

<sup>10</sup> At the date of the evaluation, there was a draft results framework. According to the project manager, it was created for internal CLEAR II team discussions and was meant to be revised prior to any presentation to the government.

discussed) and high turn-over rates in project counterpart institutions (discussed later in this document). Reluctance by some government counterpart institutions to engage with an International NGO on areas of intervention that the ILO has traditionally led has also been a challenge. In addition, the country coordinator feels that not informing stakeholders about the budget available for activities and support in Nepal may limit trust and understanding about the project scope. This, the limited size of the budget, and the constraint of only being able to fund activities directly carried out by the project, have all contributed to a challenging environment in which to work with the central government.

The project strategies in response to this situation are:

- Considerable time is spent meeting and briefing new officials in key positions. Given the weak perceived relevance and the size of the budget of the project, this is a challenging and time-consuming task.
- The project has strongly supported the IAWG-CL, encouraging it to meet regularly and for it to address important legislative and policy issues. The CLEAR II Country Coordinator, as a member of the IAWG-CL, has taken a leading role in facilitating discussion sessions and workshops on these issues. For example the CLEAR II support to the 3-day workshop on the NMP, and the subsequent work on developing an operational plan for the first 3 years, was provided as a member of the IAWG-CL.
- The project has developed relationships with local government and has been able to provide services to build their capacity and to support them in initiating work in specific areas related to addressing child labor, such as integrating child protection issues in disaster management plans and facilitating coordination among local authorities and NGOs related to monitoring the works status of vulnerable children.

### 3.1.3 Project Contributions to Broader Child Labor NAPs

**Finding 4:** In Nepal, CLEAR II has been able to follow up on previous work done by the ILO on NAP development by contributing to the efforts of an inter-agency working group. The Nepal National Master Plan (NMP) is now in a final stage and the government expects it to be endorsed by the end of March 2017. Following its endorsement, there are likely to be opportunities to provide support for its implementation. Perspectives on CLEAR II's work on NAPs in Burkina Faso and Liberia are good based on government interest and near term plans.

#### *Contributions to NAP Implementation in Nepal*

At the time when CLEAR II started, the ILO ACHIEVE project was providing support to MOLE for the revision/development of a current NMP for the elimination of child labor – a process that has been ongoing since 2009. With this process unfinished at the end of the ACHIEVE project in August 2016, and with no follow-up project by ILO expected, the IAWG-CL took over by organizing a 3-day workshop with approximately 50 participants to review and revise the latest draft of the NMP in August 2016. CLEAR II took a major role in facilitating this workshop which was successful in enabling all main stakeholders in Nepal to give their feedback on the draft and in supporting the MOLE in developing a final draft for a plan for 2016 - 2026.

The project, working through the IAWG-CL, also assisted in developing an operational plan for the first 3 years of implementation. CLEAR II worked with the same consultant that ILO had been using for this purpose.

The MOLE planned to present the NMP to the National Planning Commission (NPC) in March 2017. After approval by the NPC it will need to be presented to the Cabinet. The MOLE is expectant that this process will be completed within March 2017. If this happens, it will be looking for support for implementation. There will be opportunities for CLEAR II, through the IAWG-CL, to provide such support.

*Project Contributions to the Regional Action Plan (RAP) for the Prevention and Elimination of All Forms of Child Labor in South Asia 2016-2021*

Although not a part of the CLEAR II results framework, the Nepal team was able to provide support for the development of the Regional Action Plan for the Prevention and Elimination of All Forms of Child Labor in South Asia 2016-2021. The Plan was developed by the SAARC apex body, the South Asia Initiative to End Violence Against Children (SAIEVAC). USDOL readily gave their assent to this work although it was outside of the results framework.

An initial draft of this plan had been developed in August 2014. CLEAR II provided support to the ongoing work through technical support for the Expert Group Meeting in Colombo in December 2015 and by enabling a representative from the Government of Nepal to attend this meeting. A collective of development partners supported the overall process. The RAP was endorsed in July 2016.

At the time the support was provided, the Nepal NMP was not making progress and the RAP provided an opportunity for Nepal to later develop a national action plan as part of the RAP. The RAP provides an overall strategy for the regions and this would provide relevancy to child labor interventions in Nepal in the absence of a NAP. A Nepal action plan has not been developed for the RAP since it now appears likely that the NMP for Nepal will be endorsed.

*Potential Contributions to NAP Implementation in Burkina Faso and Liberia*

In Burkina Faso, in 2016 the National Action Plan to Eliminate the WFCL (2011-2015) was evaluated and currently the Ministry of Labor (MOL) is elaborating a National Strategy on the WFCL. MOL representatives indicated that the Ministry is interested in inviting as many partners as possible to participate in its formulation and implementation, and would welcome CLEAR II to join in these efforts. They likewise indicated that they are open to different cooperation modalities (e.g. partners funding workshops, studies, etc.).

In Liberia, the elaboration of the NAP was led by the ILO with funding from the USDOL-funded GAP 11 project. The ARCH project, which was implemented by Winrock, co-funded research and planning activities for NAP formulation (mainly regional consultations and the national validation workshop) and representatives of both ILO and Winrock took part in the technical committee that drafted the Plan. Two weeks before the CLEAR II interim evaluation (in February 2017), national stakeholders validated the document. The NAP is now awaiting official adoption by the government. Prior Winrock involvement in NAP formulation and the timing of CLEAR II engagement in Liberia represent an opportunity for project follow-up on NAP

implementation. The ILO also hopes to be able to provide follow-up assistance but has not yet identified resources for this purpose.

The government and other stakeholders are eager to have CLEAR II assistance for NAP implementation in Liberia. Suggestions from national stakeholders for priority interventions include the following:

- Technical assistance for mainstreaming CL into existing and the formulation of future social protection policies and programs that target vulnerable families for education, cash transfer and other forms of support to diminish poverty-driven causes of CL;
- Awareness raising campaigns that inform the public and relevant public officials (including teachers) about the risks of child labor and their roles in combating the problem at both national and local levels;
- Capacity building of Child Welfare Offices including support for outreach activities to form, train and monitor community child welfare committees (based on ARCH pilot experiences); and
- Support for legal reforms including reflecting measures outlined in Convention 182 (adopted by the Government of Liberia) in national law and regulations by, for example, establishing a Hazardous List and establishing stronger penalties for violations.

Issues highlighted that may affect project support for NAP implementation include the following:

- Liberia is expecting elections in October 2017 which will result in a change of government. National stakeholders indicated that it is likely that during the election period (from August-October) the attention of many key stakeholders will be on politics. After elections many of the people currently occupying decision making positions at the national and county levels may be changed.
- Public resources for activities and logistics are highly constrained.<sup>11</sup> To date, while the government has shown its commitment by allocating personnel to work on child labor issues, notably the two people manage the Secretariat of NACOMAL, no funding is available for operations.

### **3.1.4 Validity in the Strategy of Focusing on Predetermined Thematic Areas in Multiple Countries**

**Finding 5:** CLEAR II's strategy/approach of focusing on predetermined thematic areas in multiple countries is valid so long as the project allocates adequate time and resources and appropriate processes to adapt the implementation strategy to the internal and external

---

<sup>11</sup> According to US Embassy officials, the entire annual budget of the Ministry of Labor is less than 2 million dollars.

constraints and priority needs of key stakeholders in each target country. Although the CLEAR II project document stated it would adapt its multi-country implementation strategy to the particular characteristics of its target countries using in-depth country level consultations and needs assessments, some factors have limited its effectiveness in following this strategy in the implementation phase.

The design of CLEAR II, as set out in the Solicitation for Cooperative Agreement (SCA) and the project document, proposes to assist host country governments to progress on actions to address child labor as recommended in the Congressionally mandated annual *Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor* report.<sup>12</sup> Countries that are considered for support from CLEAR II are countries where USDOL research indicates gaps in the following topical areas:

- Establishing laws and regulations to prevent and eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labor (WFCL);
- Monitoring and enforcement of existing laws by the mandated national and local institutions; and
- Coordinating, planning and implementing specific policies and plans to combat child labor or in mainstreaming interventions to combat child labor in existing social programs.

In its project document, CLEAR II proposed to adapt its multi-country intervention framework to country level context and requirements through in-depth country level consultations and need assessments. To date, the project has not been sufficiently effective in doing so (see finding 1). Evaluation interviews highlighted the following issues, which if addressed, may improve responsiveness of the project design to country level needs and constraints:

- Based on interviews with USDOL and Winrock project management in Washington, there is need to clarify whether CLEAR II may only consider providing technical assistance to national stakeholders to implement the “recommended actions” contained in the USDOL report. To date, CLEAR II project management has interpreted the need for intervention strategies to adhere to recommended actions in a fairly strict fashion.<sup>13</sup> USDOL in contrast indicated that while it would like to see project technical assistance support the TDA report’s recommended actions, the project can work on intermediate

---

<sup>12</sup> Information in the USDOL report draws on diverse sources of information including the reports of institutions from both inside and outside the country including United National and other International Organizations, local and international NGOs, as well as government agencies. In addition to describing the prevalence and characteristics of child labor in the country, the USDOL child labor research documents what efforts, if any, national governments are making to address the WFCL. It analyses fairly broad sets of policies and initiatives that affect the prevalence of child labor including in the areas of education and training, child protection, social protection, labor; and employment. The research also documents which public agencies are mandated to take relevant actions and what they are actually doing. Recommended actions for each country are listed at the end each country analysis.

<sup>13</sup> The initial proposals to potential country recipients of technical assistance are based on USDOL report recommendations. It states that it is open to other proposals from the government.

steps that are more responsive to stakeholder needs and the national context so long as the latter can be shown to be steps leading to the recommended actions.

- According to CLEAR II project management, the project has 90 days following the validation of a new country to present its country level budget and work plan which constrains the project's ability to engage in more participative processes before submitting the results framework and work plan. During the stakeholder workshop however, USDOL indicated it is willing to be flexible to ensure that the strategy is responsive to national stakeholder needs and will extend the deadline if necessary. To date, USDOL has extended the period beyond 90 days for each of the new countries, and extensions have accommodated Winrock's travel to the countries.
- According to the project director a limited budget for scoping has contributed to delays identifying new countries and may limit the project's capacity to tailor its initial intervention strategy to each country context. Recently in Belize, the project director traveled to the country to discuss its participation in the project face to face, which greatly facilitated progress.

### 3.1.5 Validity of Project Theory of Change and Results Framework

**Finding 6:** CLEAR II's Theory of Change (ToC) is coherent and aligns with a large number of issues affecting the prevalence of child labor in target countries as raised by stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team. Political will, corruption and the availability of resources are issues that national stakeholders, particular those in civil society, thought needed sufficient attention in the project strategies and could be highlighted better in the project ToC and results framework. Likewise, more detail on the full range of policy and capacity building dimensions of key issues affecting child labor would be useful to highlight all potential areas of intervention.

CLEAR II was designed to overcome key constraints that limit government effectiveness in combating child labor. In its comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan (CMEP), Winrock lists three main problems that project strategies and activities will tackle:

- Insufficient awareness of the negative consequences of child labor (lack of understanding of the impact of child labor on a country's international reputation and standing, economic growth and development, and social issues including health and education);
- Limited capacity and engagement (absence of strategies and policies, the lack of coordination and resources, and industry shortcomings); and
- Lack of awareness and implementation of international best practices (decision makers unaware of gaps in their laws, regulations and policies and potential strategies to fight child labor more effectively).

The underlying logic of project interventions is that all countries need a strong legal and policy normative framework to effectively combat child labor, adequate government capacity to monitor child labor and enforce relevant laws and good social programs that include measures to prevent child labor. This theory of change is coherent and aligns with a large number of

issues affecting the prevalence of child labor in target countries, as raised by stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team.

#### *Other Issues and Related Needs That Were Raised by Stakeholders*

Stakeholders raised other issues that may be better highlighted in the project ToC and results framework:

Many stakeholders highlight **political will** as an important factor strongly influencing whether or not capacity building efforts lead to sustainable change. In all countries, programs to combat child labor and address its root causes compete with other government priorities. Opportunities to capitalize on existing political will and expand it may likewise vary considerably among countries, calling for specific country intervention strategies.

Some stakeholders likewise highlighted **corruption** and **lack of accountability** as factors that limit government effectiveness.

The project ToC, which focuses on government capacity, may need to examine and address factors that contribute to strengthening government commitment and accountability more completely, taking into consideration contextual factors in each country. Critical groups outside government may also need project capacity building support (if there are no other programs intervening) to lobby and hold government accountable, including:

- International business and consumer groups: In Liberia, an embassy official believed one of the reasons the Winrock ARCH program had been successful in combating child labor in its target regions was its collaboration with the rubber industry. The official said the private sector has both resources and incentive to address child labor where it intersects with its operations. CLEAR II plans at least two supply chain oriented pilot activities in close collaboration with the private sector but has not to date been able to identify an appropriate intervention.<sup>14</sup>
- Trade unions: Trade Unions in Liberia believe that they are able to leverage their strength to influence government; for example, they claimed that their actions were critical in getting the government to pass the Decent Work Act last year.
- Civil society organizations and human rights groups: When faced with limited opportunities to work directly with government on legislation and policy issues, in Nepal, the project has been able to contribute significantly on these issues through its participation in a network of international agencies and NGOs focused on addressing child labor. In Liberia, US embassy officials recommended including lawyers, prosecutors, and human rights NGOs in project capacity building on laws and enforcement because of the important roles they play in enforcement.

---

<sup>14</sup> In Nepal, the project carried out extensive research to identify a potential supply chain type intervention but to date has not identified an export commodity for which there is strong consumer pressure and private sector commitment to engage on the issue of child labor.

**Real resource deficits** within relevant administrations and agencies were highlighted by stakeholders in all countries visited by the evaluation team. For example, stakeholders in Liberia underlined the need for project support for logistics and tools since the government has no funds for getting out to communities or producing awareness raising and other materials.

Human and budget resource constraints are a dimension of government capacity that is not easily addressed through training and the production of manuals and guidebooks. In Liberia, the US Embassy official stated that the NACOMAL coordinator is extremely well trained but lacks tools and materials to do its job more effectively. Availability of resources is also an area where there is a lot of variation between countries; for example, the number of labor inspectors in Nepal hovers around 10 while in Burkina Faso, at one point, there were over 200 inspectors.

The CLEAR II project director indicated that she tried to tailor interventions to resource constraints by building the capacity of what exists within a given country (personnel) and choosing interventions that do not require large contributions from counterpart governments, such as legal reform. In one case, in Honduras, the project had planned to support resource mobilization and coordination for child protection programs, something that seemed possible given donor interest.

Additionally, the project theory of change might benefit by being a bit more specific and holistic so that the full scope of potential areas of intervention is more explicit. Although CLEAR II articulates the need to strengthen social programs, it does not provide much detail on key policy and capacity areas on which it might work. To do so, it might draw on the experiences of past comprehensive child labor programs, focusing on the legal, policy and public institutional capacity dimensions of key intervention areas (see box).

### **Poverty Alleviation and Social Protection**

- Insufficient social protection for vulnerable children and their families
- Health, child protection and other social workers with insufficient knowledge on child labor

### **Livelihoods**

- Absence of effective economic empowerment programs for vulnerable families
- Agricultural extension officers with insufficient knowledge and awareness on child labor

### **Education and Training**

- Inadequate investment in building schools in some rural areas
- Insufficient investments in quality education
- Teachers and school administrators with insufficient knowledge of child labor or of their roll to ensure child friendly schools and keep at risk children in school
- Absence of vocational training programs for out-of-school youth, especially for youth in rural areas

### **Cultural Norms**

- Inadequate awareness raising among at risk populations and opinion leaders on children's rights
- Local and traditional leaders with insufficient knowledge and awareness of child labor

### **Human Rights**

- Lack of legal protection for minority and other disadvantaged groups

### **Decent Work Deficits**

- Insufficient policies and programs on youth employment
- Lack of enforcement of labor laws

## 3.2 Project Effectiveness

---

### 3.2.1 Delays Naming New Countries and Beginning Implementation

**Finding 7** Slow progress adding new countries is mainly due to internal political and bureaucratic factors within the US government agencies involved making and validating the choice of new countries and similar political and bureaucratic factors within the potential recipient countries. Limited in-country resources to facilitate introductions, planning and start-up is likewise a factor affecting CLEAR II project management which has also contributed to delays in naming new countries and beginning implementation.

CLEAR II has made slow progress adding and beginning implementation in new countries. According to the Cooperative Agreement signed between USDOL and Winrock, CLEAR II is to support a reduction in child labor by building local and national capacity of host governments in a minimum of eight countries, two of which were predetermined in the SCA (Burkina Faso and Nepal). CLEAR II planned to begin implementation in Nepal and Burkina Faso during the first year of the project and gradually expand to the additional countries starting in year two.

In the SCA, USDOL indicated it would be involved in and would ultimately need to approve the selection of new countries for project support. According to the SCA, criteria for selecting the six (6) additional countries would include direct government requests to USDOL/ILAB for technical assistance, to either (a) address the suggested actions listed in the most recent published *Findings on the WFCL* report, or (b) address child labor through activities in one or more of the project's pre-selected capacity building areas. During the project implementation phase, additional criteria were added. USDOL indicated to CLEAR II that this project was an opportunity to work in countries where a country-specific project would not ordinarily be supported. A USDOL official also indicated to the evaluator that they were interested in prioritizing countries that were noted in the TDA report as not making progress. Based on project Technical Progress Reports (TPR) and CLEAR II's memo on additional countries, there has been a fairly long list of countries that have been considered to be among the six "new" countries to be added to the project portfolio including Belize, Bhutan, Colombia, Jamaica, Liberia, Moldova, Mozambique, Panama, Sierra Leone, South Africa and Tanzania. At the time of the interim evaluation, USDOL and Winrock had formally agreed on two new countries to receive project support: Honduras and Liberia. Belize, Jamaica and Panama are expected to be added in the coming days/weeks.

A variety of factors have contributed to slower than planned expansion of project support to new countries:

Internal bureaucratic and political factors: Within the US government, several officials need to sign off on the selection of countries which may slow the approval process or result in rejection. Various individuals within USDOL as well the US State Department including the US Embassy representative responsible for the target country must give their support. Different stakeholders may have different priorities that affect their support for proposed countries.

External bureaucratic and political factors: Before a country can be provided assistance under CLEAR II, the government must provide a letter of support for technical assistance. An example of a country that initially seemed promising to receive project support but was eventually

dropped is Mozambique. Initial contacts made with the Embassy of Mozambique in Washington, DC seemed positive but endorsement from officials in the country was not forthcoming. According to a US Embassy official who was involved in trying to mobilize government support for CLEAR II, contributing factors included the heavy bureaucracy, lack of resources, staff, budget, and facilities in the Ministry of Labor and that specific action to fight child labor is not a high priority of the government. Another example of how this affected the project is Bhutan: CLEAR II had made considerable headway mobilizing support for adding the country from USDOL and government stakeholders in the country only to have the State Department decline its support due to country level concerns about the implementing organization.<sup>15</sup>

Limited in-country resources to facilitate introductions, planning and start-up: Among the people and institutions involved in negotiating with government officials from potential recipient countries, only the US embassy is present in-country. In some cases, Embassy personnel do not have strong contacts within the relevant ministries or have in depth knowledge of CLEAR II, potentially limiting their effectiveness at promoting the project. In several countries, the initial contact by CLEAR II with national stakeholders was done through letters and emails to Ministry of Labor officials without prior introductions. In the absence of a pre-existing relationship and personal contact with Winrock staff, many of these letters went unanswered. Some of the countries that CLEAR II proposed for project assistance early in the project implementation period were countries where Winrock or its partners already had a strong country presence and or contacts with the government based on previous projects but these were not taken up by USDOL (for example, Tanzania).

### 3.2.2 CLEAR II Progress Achieving Targets in Nepal

**Finding 8** In Nepal, CLEAR II has made moderate progress toward project objectives. Overall, the progress that has been made is not in accordance with the targets. At the outcome level, it has not achieved the objective that was anticipated by the time of the interim evaluation but has achieved two others that were not planned. Similarly, at the output level, many targets have not been achieved on time while there has been progress in areas not anticipated. Project performance was affected by multiple, and mostly unexpected challenges in the project implementation environment (identified in the section on project context). The project adjusted its strategy to unexpected events and has been able to seize new opportunities producing unplanned outcomes and outputs.

The assessment of project progress against targets in Nepal is presented in detail in **Annex 1**. The figure in the ‘Target’ column is taken from Annex C of the September 2016 TPR. The figure in the ‘Actual’ column is from the assessment of the evaluator at the end of February 2017. Comments are provided in the text below on outputs or outcomes that were expected to have been achieved by September 2016 and on any that have been achieved ahead of schedule.

---

<sup>15</sup> According an embassy official in New Delhi (that covers unofficial relations with Bhutan), the Embassy did not support the project based on national stakeholders preference for collaborating with its existing partners in the UN system.

*Output 1.1.3: Assessment report on compliance with ILS completed*

The assessment report has been completed and consists of an overview report and a 193 page annex containing details on amendments required in nine separate pieces of legislation. The report has not been circulated within Nepal. In discussion with some of the lawyers who were involved in the review, it was agreed that the annex could be restructured so that the main issues are highlighted and it is presented in a way that will engage readers more effectively. In the Legislative Review Committee manual for Nepal, a simplified list of recommended changes is included; however, the manual has not yet been circulated.

*Sub-Objective 1.2 and its Supporting Outputs: Coordinating mechanism to adapt legislation to ILS functional*

There has been no progress on these outputs and it seems unlikely that a Legal Reform Committee will be formed. No one from LWOB has visited Nepal to consult with stakeholders on the most appropriate way of supporting the adaptation of legislation to international labor standards.<sup>16</sup> One LWOB mission was cancelled at the last minute due to fuel shortages related to the economic blockade on the Indian border.

*Output 2.1.3: National and local structures identified by government for CLMS and/or CL data management*

Although there is no target under this output for the project period, a memo has been submitted to provide support for the development of a CLMS in Penauti Municipality, and it is expected that a formal agreement will be made shortly.

*Output 2.2.4: Training plan developed for district/local level government authorities in charge of labor inspection*

This was expected to be achieved by October 2017. A 2-day training for 22 MOLE staff and 6 NGO staff on enforcement mechanisms, known as the “systems workshop,” has been carried out. A further training is planned for later this year.

*Output 2.2.5: Gaps and recommendations identified regarding Labor Inspection and enforcement of CL law*

The Labor Inspectorate assessment has been completed. It has been shared with the MOLE and the main findings were presented at the systems workshop. It has not been shared more widely and the current acting Director General at the Department of Labor does not appear familiar with it.

---

<sup>16</sup> According to LWOB, the project work plan and budget did not foresee the need for in-country assessments for their legislative reviews but agreed that more national participation in the assessment process would be positive if their budget allowed for this. One LWOB in country mission following the legislative review was planned in Nepal but had to be cancelled due to fuel shortages in 2015 due to political unrest along the India border. In addition, the international law firm that conducted the legislative review consulted with a Nepalese law firm on some legal matters.

*Sub-Objective 3.2 and Output 3.2.1: National policies, plans or programs to combat CL, including WFCL, formulated and/or improved*

Although there is no target during the project for this outcome, the project has supported the preparation of the endorsed South Asia RAP and has also been active in supporting the development of the draft Nepal NMP.

*Output 3.4.3: Institutional coordination plan developed.*

This was planned by April 2016 but has not been developed. There was some initial work done on it as part of the project launch workshop but this was not followed up on subsequent to the interruption caused by the earthquake.

*Sub-Objective 4.2 and Output 4.2.1: Recommendations to fill gaps in social programs, policies and/or services related to CL operationalized by relevant body*

The target for this was set to be achieved by October 2018. Progress towards this target has been made: Penauti municipality has incorporated child labor and child trafficking issues into its Disaster Management Plan (DMP) which should be endorsed shortly; and Dhulikhel Municipality has developed recommendations that will be incorporated when they develop a DMP (both output indicator 31).

When reviewing the level of achievement, the constraints to progress identified in the section on the country context should be kept in mind. Similarly, its success in carrying out activities that had not been planned is an indicator of the project's effective adaption to unexpected challenges.

Although the updated project work plan from Annex F in the April 2016 TPR shows that project interventions in Nepal will mainly end in quarter 2 of year 3 (January to March 2017) (for example the Post-situational analysis is scheduled for this quarter), USDOL and the Nepal team expect implementation to go beyond this date, due mainly to the disruption caused by the earthquake.

### **3.2.3 Current Challenges Faced by CLEAR II in its Implementation and Strategies to Overcome Them**

**Finding 9** In addition to natural disaster and political instability, frequent leadership turn-over in government counterpart organizations has negatively affected project performance in Nepal. The project has utilized relationships with more permanent staff in counterpart institutions and has invested time for briefing and relationship building to address the problem but the turn-over remains significant.

The Director General of the MOLE who participated in, and provided active support for, the launch workshop has since retired and after a number of changes the position at the time of the evaluation was vacant. The key post in MOLE for coordination with the project on child labor issues is the Joint Secretary. The current Joint Secretary is the fifth in the post since the project started. Officials are often reluctant to make decisions because they will either shortly be replaced or because they are new to the post.

An example of the effect of these changes on project implication is that the training for Labor Inspectors and Public Prosecutors on taking child labor cases to court was agreed by the previous Department of Labor Director General. With the post now vacant, it is difficult to get a clear decision on the status of this training.

In order to address turn-over in project counterpart institutions, the project has utilized relationships with more permanent staff in those institutions and has invested time for briefing and relationship building. Maintaining forward momentum with frequent changes in counterpart leadership is likely to remain an ongoing challenge in Nepal.

It should be noted that further constraints are expected before the end of the project. Local elections are planned for May 14, 2017 and during the period prior to this a 'code of conduct' will need to be followed, which will limit the meetings that can be held with government at central and local levels.

### **3.2.4 Coordination with Other International and Non-profit Organizations also working on Child Labor Related Issues**

**Finding 10** In Nepal, Winrock has capitalized on its participation in the Nepal Inter-Agency Working Group on CL effectively to advance NMP. In addition, CLEAR II coordinates with NGOs on awareness raising and advocacy issues and included NGO representatives in its training on child labor law enforcement systems. Similar collaboration is anticipated in Burkina Faso and Liberia.

The CLEAR II project has taken a leading role, along with some of the other members, to promote collaboration among the main international organizations working on child labor through the actions of the IAWG-CL. This group has become more active in recent years. As a member, Winrock International/CLEAR II Project has been able to lobby with government for review of legislation and to work on the development of the NMP.

The project has also kept good links with a number of national NGOs, involving them in informal consultations, promoting their links with government at the national and municipality levels, and by working with them on awareness programs, in particular on events around the World Day Against Child Labor.

The project tried to facilitate the development of a 'Child Labor in Brick Kiln Coalition Group' as an outcome from the start-up workshop but the group has not continued. The USDOL-funded Bridge Project working on forced and bonded labor has recently started in Nepal, with implementation by ILO. The project has certain areas of overlap, particularly in the area of labor inspection capacity building. At this time, there does not appear to have been any specific coordination with this project yet however.

In Burkina Faso and Liberia, it is too early to tell how effective the project will be in working with other international and non-profit organizations also working on child labor related issues. Prospects for effective collaboration are encouraging based on CLEAR II recruitment of experienced project managers with strong track records of working effectively with a variety of national stakeholders.

### 3.2.5 Role and Effectiveness of International Advisory Council

**Finding 11** The International Advisory Council has been created and includes motivated individuals with relevant expertise, although it is lacking country specific expertise. To date, most IAC members have had limited contact with project management and a strong role for them in project implementation has not yet been identified.

The International Advisory Council (IAC) is one element of the project strategy to capitalize on expertise outside the project team to support project planning and implementation. CLEAR II proposed to invite world-renowned CL technical experts from diverse cultural and professional backgrounds to serve as pro-bono CLEAR II advisors through the IAC. Members were asked to donate up to 8 hours a month to participate in online discussions, upload recent reports or relevant news, and interact with country stakeholders through the Global Learning Platform (GLP). It was likewise planned that some IAC members would advise the project on country level implementation issues and potentially be invited to country workshops to present research, strategies, or approaches to combat child labor.

As of March 30, 2015, CLEAR II reported the creation of the IAC with seven confirmed members and has since added one additional member. The evaluation team leader interviewed two members of the IAC as part of the interim evaluation: one former senior Winrock staff person who is charged with coordinating the committee in collaboration with the project director and a member of the committee. According to project reports and those interviewed, members of the committee have been briefed about the objectives of the project and their potential contributions (the latter in general terms). They have likewise participated in one “virtual” meeting with the other members of the Council to discuss and give input on issues affecting project implementation.

The individuals interviewed expressed strong motivation to contribute to CLEAR II, and supported the project approach of working with government bodies to support sustainable actions against child labor. Based on their bibliographies, all IAC members have relevant expertise on child labor and associated issues affecting its prevalence in a number of countries and in some particular sectors and supply chains. Although the project document indicated that the Council would likewise mobilize expertise from within project target countries, it has not yet done this, presumably due, at least in part, to slow progress in adding countries.

According to those interviewed, to date the IAC has not contributed in significant ways to project implementation. One committee member indicated that she had been contacted by the project to provide information about one of the countries being considered for project assistance, which she was able to provide. She was not aware of what had followed that request and more generally indicated that she was not up to date on project progress (for example, she had not received project progress reports).

The CLEAR II project director indicated that more thought is needed on how to effectively capitalize on the IAC, indicating that overcoming implementation challenges in selected countries and identifying new countries have been her main priority to date.

The interviewed members made some suggestions on how IAC might contribute to the project:

- Providing input on project products (assessments, training modules and curricula);

- Contributing content to the GLP;
- Delivering training, either virtually or in person; and
- Serving as resource persons on particular issues.

They also suggested ways to improve their involvement in the program:

- More frequent meetings, either virtual or in person;
- Clearer definition of their role; and
- More frequent updates on project progress.

### 3.2.6 Progress on Global Learning Platform (GLP)

**Finding 12** The GLP is online at [www.winrock-clearii-glp.org](http://www.winrock-clearii-glp.org). The platform hosts a variety of resources, most of which are readily available on better known websites. There is almost no project produced content, webinars, or blog posts and there are problems with ease of navigation. For this reason, the site link has not yet been diffused to partners.

In the CLEAR II project document, Winrock described the Global Learning Platform as an interactive, multilingual web portal that would provide training modules and tools to build capacity at the national and regional level related to:

- Budget management and program planning to better implement social programs
- Negotiating with the private sector and providing resources to labor inspectors and police to improve enforcement
- WFCL policies, laws, and enforcement mechanisms.

Winrock indicated that the web platform would offer webinars, blogs, and best practices. Content was to be available to registered members of CLEAR II, including CLEAR I country stakeholders, USDOL, ILO, and others.

#### *Progress on GLP*

CLEAR II reported in that the GLP was online in its TPR dated October 31, 2015. At the time of the interim evaluation, the platform is mainly a repository of publications and links to online press articles on child labor and related topics. There is just one blog entry and no activity in the online forums.

In February 2017, the website held 131 downloadable resources in English, with only one resource available in French and Spanish. The documents cover a fairly wide range of topics relevant to the project including information on international labor standards, labor inspection, child labor monitoring, and addressing child labor through education and other social programs.

Over half of the available documents (73 resources) were produced by the ILO or by the joint ILO, UNICEF and World Bank “Understanding Children’s Work” research program. Almost 10% are documents produced by USDOL and a little over 10% by a variety of NGOs active on child labor issues. Only one resource was produced by CLEAR II.

In the CLEAR II April 30, 2016 TPR, the project reported that it was posting resources developed by the project, including project assessment reports, legislative analysis, and manuals and curricula but these are not currently available online.

**Table 1. GLP Resources: February 2017**

Topic Area	Number of Resources	Source of Publications	Languages
Laws, Regulations, & Standards	34	ILO (13), USDOL (5), other UN & Inat'l orgs (6), NGOs (2), Other (8)	EN: 34
Monitoring & Enforcement	35	ILO (21), USDOL (5), NGO (4), USAID (1), Verite/Winrock (2), Other (2)	EN: 35
Policies & Social Programs	23	ILO (13), UCW (2), NGO (4), Other UN (2), Other (1)	EN:23
Tools	14	ILO (6), Winrock (4), NGO (1), CLEAR II (1) Other UN (1), Other (1)	EN:14 SP:1 FR: 1
Background Resources	25	UCW (11), ILO (7), NGO (5), Verite (1), Other (1)	EN:25

The CLEAR II project director indicated that she is not satisfied with the GLP in its current form and has not yet diffused the link to the site to project stakeholders. She noted technical issues related to site navigation and search functions.<sup>17</sup>

### 3.3 Efficiency of Resource Use

#### 3.3.1 Efficiency of CLEAR II Management Structure

**Finding 13** The CLEAR II project management structure is currently very centralized, although plans exist to hire senior national staff and decentralize more project management tasks to the country level. Because of delays extending project assistance to new countries and significant challenges initiating and delivering support the countries named in the project document, the shift from centralized to country level project management has not occurred yet. Stakeholders in Burkina Faso emphasized the importance of having a strong in-country presence for project effectiveness and sustainability. In Nepal, the project team expressed that more could be done to effectively integrate them in project management. Given the large workload in the last 19 months of project implementation, during which CLEAR II anticipates a rapid expansion into six additional countries, it is unlikely that the current project management structure will have sufficient capacity without adjustments being made.

#### *CLEAR II Project Management Structure*

---

<sup>17</sup> Publications and links to news are not indexed by sub topics under each thematic area or by geographic area of focus. As a result, it is not easy to navigate by a user who may be looking for specific information (currently, it is necessary to scroll down the page and scan all the titles to find a resource on a specific sub topic). In addition, the search function does not work.

Most of CLEAR II personnel are based in Washington, DC.<sup>18</sup> This centralized core project management structure is needed to coordinate project activities in multiple countries in potentially geographically dispersed regions. The project director indicated that the project planned to employ senior national project managers in six (out of eight) countries overall to manage project activities at the country level. These national project managers were to be supported by project specialists based in DC and elsewhere.<sup>19</sup> Because of delays extending project assistance to new countries and significant challenges initiating and delivering support in Nepal, Burkina Faso and Honduras (among other factors), the shift from centralized to country level project management has not occurred yet.

#### *Stakeholder Feedback on Project Management Structure*

In Burkina Faso, national stakeholders insisted that to be effective, the project should swiftly establish a permanent (during the rest of the project's timeframe) presence in the country, by setting up an office in Ouagadougou and recruiting a project team. This is currently underway, according to CLEAR II project management and some national informants. National stakeholders indicated that a stronger in-country presence would enable the project to quickly engage and promote participation of national stakeholders, especially with the Ministry of Labor/*Direction Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfant (DLTE)* and the Ministry of Social Action, at (future) planning and implementation stages (both at the central and regional levels). They underlined that a continuous presence of project staff in the country level is essential in order to effectively engage with key national stakeholders, promote awareness and ownership on the project's objectives, provide continuous support to project implementation, and ensure the sustainability prospects of project outputs and outcomes.

Based on experiences in Nepal and generally accepted good practices, these observations by national stakeholders in Burkina Faso are likely to be generally true in other soon-to-be-introduced target countries.

#### *Feedback on Project Management Structure from Nepal*

In Nepal, the project employs a country coordinator, an M&E Specialist and an administrative assistant. The country based project team in Nepal does not feel that they are well-integrated into overall management of the CLEAR II program in Nepal. Although the country was 'pre-selected', no one from the team participated in the CMEP meetings and they had limited involvement in its development. The Nepal team submits monthly and quarterly reports but

---

<sup>18</sup> Winrock employs two full time staff: the Project Director and M&E Specialist and one part-time Home Office Coordinator, all of whom are based in its DC office. Verité International employs one Labor Inspection Specialist who is also based in Winrock's Washington office. The project coordination team of LWOB are likewise DC-based but mobilize pro bono lawyers from among its partners around the world according to the expertise that is needed and the lawyers' facility with the language of the recipient country.

<sup>19</sup> The LWOB lawyers performing legal framework and good practice analysis in Nepal were based in London and Washington with support from a local law firm in Nepal. Lawyers performing legal framework analysis for Burkina Faso are based in Paris.

they have not seen any of the TPRs so they do not know how their regular reporting is presented to USDOL, nor do they have an overview of overall project advancement.

At the country level there is a sense that they are responsible for Winrock activities but that they are just coordinators for Verité and LWOB work. Activities for Verité are managed and paid for independently from the CLEAR II country office and there is an assumption that Verité are also carrying out the necessary follow-up to the training. The Nepal team was not involved in the development of the graphic novel produced by LWOB and had not yet seen it at the time of the evaluation. Some of the CLEAR II publications from the central level have the logos of one or more of the partnering institutions which reinforces the sense that there are three implementing organizations.

#### *Human Resource Needs in Project Expansion Phase*

Based on its performance to date, the current project management configuration is unlikely to have sufficient capacity for anticipated needs in the last 19 months<sup>20</sup> of project implementation, during which CLEAR II anticipates a rapid expansion into six additional countries.

- To date, CLEAR II is only active in Nepal, where there are a number of planned interventions on which there has been only limited progress to date.
- At the time of the interim evaluation, CLEAR II had identified experienced country coordinators in Liberia and Burkina Faso who will assume their positions before summer. Although some initial needs assessments have been carried out in these two countries, at the time of the evaluation only few national stakeholders had been consulted to determine their priorities and capacity and detailed action plans had not yet been developed.
- CLEAR II had also progressed in negotiations to provide assistance to stakeholders in Jamaica and Belize, two countries that are new to Winrock and its implementing partners and where it had not yet identified qualified local staff.

Given the limited advancement of project implementation in all but one country and anticipated workloads to plan and carry out project interventions in six countries, an adjustment in the project strategy appears to be warranted. Options that have been discussed include reducing the number of new countries added to the project and reallocating resources to higher levels of assistance in those countries and extending the project implementation period.

### **3.3.2 The CMEP as a Planning and Project Monitoring Tool**

**Finding 14** The participative process of developing the project CMEP contributed positively to the start-up process by facilitating a common understanding of project objectives, activities and

---

<sup>20</sup> Anticipated needs include finalizing selection of new countries, hiring and orienting new staff, identifying and implementing priority interventions in each country, maintaining the project monitoring and evaluation system, and continuing work on global tools and research.

ways that progress would be measured. The multi-country project Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework is flexible and enables measuring progress on a broad range of intervention strategies. However, the multi-country results framework has not been adapted to align with strategies at the country level. In Nepal, with many activities/outputs not expected to be implemented, the CMEP is unnecessarily complex for project management.

The Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) is a project planning and monitoring tool that describes the CLEAR II project's Theory of Change (ToC) and its M&E procedures. It provides a set of indicators that are meant to be used by the project to guide data collection, manage project implementation and obtain empirical evidence on whether the project is achieving its intended results. CLEAR II produced its CMEP with technical support from Sistemas Familia y Sociedad (SFS) (the company that also engaged the evaluation team) in November 2015. The process for elaborating the CMEP included two workshops that were attended by the CLEAR II management team and specialists from both LWOB and Verité as well as USDOL representatives.

#### *Feedback on the CMEP Development Process*

Feedback from participants in the CMEP workshops was mainly positive. The project director appreciated the opportunity to sit down with donor representatives early in the project implementation to develop a common understanding of project objectives, its implementation strategy and the ways progress would be measured. She thought the elaboration of the problem tree repeated unnecessarily work already done by the project and that the target setting exercise was premature in light of the many unknowns of project implementation. LWOB representatives likewise appreciated the process, which resulted in a very clear monitoring and evaluation framework; one LWOB specialist said if she could, she would follow the same process for all her projects.

#### *Analysis of the CMEP as a Tool to Aid Project Planning*

The Nepal country team does not find the Nepal results framework an easy tool to work with, either to communicate with other stakeholders or to manage the project. Although many of the outputs and outcomes do not have targets for Nepal, there is a sense that there are too many activities and results expected and the project cannot achieve everything. With HQ support, they should have come up with their own version of the RF, adapted to the country

The Nepal Baseline Child Labor Capacity Score (March 2016) is a useful assessment tool using easily verifiable indicators for the assessment of capacity across the areas to which the project is aiming to provide support. It was designed to measure the progression of government capacity to address child labor. The score reflects progress in four core capacity areas, including legal frameworks, monitoring and enforcement, national action plans, and social programs and policies. The child labor capacity score for Nepal was calculated prior to CLEAR II interventions and serves as a baseline score; it is supposed to be recalculated at intervals throughout the team's engagement, and at the completion of CLEAR II interventions in each country.

#### *Relevance of CMEP Indicators to Project Activities*

The CMEP proposes specific measurable indicators of government performance improvements

for each sub-outcome. The overall framework, with a single indicator for most results, is logical and clear to use. The outcome indicators are worded to apply to a large variety of intervention strategies within the overall project framework, which was necessary given that it was developed for a global project at a time when the countries and country level strategies were not yet determined.<sup>21</sup>

### *CLEAR II Monitoring and Evaluation Database*

CLEAR II has developed an M&E tool to help gather data to report on its indicators. It is an online management information system that allows users to see what is planned and implemented in each CLEAR II country, includes an attendance taking tool and a comprehensive database of participants in project activities, and it links activities to project outcomes and sub-outcomes with the possibility of holding relevant documentation. According to the project M&E Specialist, the tool took several months to develop and is currently being used in Nepal. At the time of the interim evaluation, with only one country active, the tool is well-designed but underexploited due to the low volume of information actually being produced by the project.

### *Relevance of CMEP Indicators for Project Performance Management*

There are still a limited number of results in Nepal so that it is difficult to assess the appropriateness of the indicators. On the whole, there has been little difficulty in knowing where different outputs fit into the framework and whether they have been achieved yet. The project monitoring and evaluation specialist based in DC remarked that not all project activities to date fit easily into existing indicators and that some indicators may need to be revised. For example, CMEP indicators only reference national action plans while the project contributed to a regional action plan in South Asia.

The TPR Annex C, the status of project performance against indicators (and with targets) was only received by the Nepal team shortly before the mid-term evaluation.

Target setting has not been particularly accurate. There are quite a number of targets for September 2016 that have not been met and also a number of results achieved where there are no targets, some even by the end of the project. This is a consequence of limited participation by the Nepal team in the target setting and due to the difficult implementation context in Nepal, which has meant that the project has had to respond to opportunities, some unexpected, rather than following a smooth implementation plan. Greater involvement of the Nepal team and a review and streamlining of the Nepal results framework would improve the target setting.

---

<sup>21</sup> For example the outcome indicator for 'SO 1.1 Draft of laws in compliance with ILS on Child Labor approved by relevant body' allows the project to "count" changes to several different kinds of "laws" (Legislation, regulation or directives/guidelines) issued by variety of institutions (government legislation -national or local; private sector policies or standards; or, civil society) at different levels (at any geographic or sectoral level).

## 3.4 Sustainability

---

### 3.4.1 Steps Taken to Ensure Sustainability of Project Outcomes and Sub-outcomes

**Finding 15** Project interventions at the municipal level have encouraged institutional ownership and capacity, factors that should contribute to sustained action on child labor. The Nepal National Master Plan, the South Asia Regional Action Plan and the Penauti Disaster Master Plan are reference strategies developed with national stakeholder participation and potentially will be used by them to guide actions post project. At the present time, the CLEAR II expert publications (review of legislation framework and the Labor Inspectorate assessment), which were developed with little stakeholder participation and to date have not been well-circulated, are unlikely to have impact unless additional measures are taken to promote their ownership by national stakeholders.

Project results in Nepal are still at an early stage. The process oriented approach to working with municipalities on their DMPs and with the initial work on developing CLMSs is encouraging institutional ownership and is building capacity and understanding (see good practices). These aspects will contribute to increasing the sustainability of these outcomes.

The policy documents supported by CLEAR II may likewise enable sustainable actions by the government beyond the project implementation period. They have involved a variety of national stakeholders in their elaboration and are likely to be endorsed by relevant government bodies. This applies to the NMP if it is endorsed by the Cabinet. It also applies to the DMP in Penauti Municipality, which is expected to be endorsed by the Municipality Council in the near future. The South Asia RAP has been endorsed and lasts from 2016 until 2021. These documents provide a framework that can trigger national actions.

There have been a number of expert publications that have been developed with little participation from stakeholders within Nepal and to date these have not been well circulated. This includes the Review of Legislation and the Assessment of the Labor Inspectorate. The impact of project assessments and tools in Nepal is currently in question unless additional measures are taken before the end of the project to promote their ownership by national stakeholders.

## IV. MAIN CONCLUSIONS

---

More than halfway through its planned implementation period, CLEAR II has made limited progress against its overall objectives. The project is operational in one of eight countries planned to receive CLEAR II support. In Nepal, it has made moderate progress despite the massive earthquake that struck the country one day after the project's official launch in Kathmandu. In contrast, in Burkina Faso, the other country programmed to receive assistance beginning early on in the project, political instability and security concerns delayed start-up for over two years. CLEAR II carried out a short intervention in one other country (Honduras) that was ended prematurely. Out of the five additional countries slated to receive project assistance, only Liberia has been formally approved to be added to the project with other beneficiary country candidates still in various stages of negotiation at the time of the evaluation.

### Conclusions on Project Relevance

Although CLEAR II's multi-country theory of change and results framework are coherent, the interim evaluation findings highlight that using a generic framework as a blueprint for country level actions in countries with vastly different needs, priorities, constraints and capacities is unlikely to facilitate authentic national ownership of project interventions or be effective in producing sought-after changes in policy and capacity.

Responding to specific requests for success (as being considered in Jamaica) and building government capacity to sustain the results of past CL projects that were perceived as successful (planned in Burkina Faso and Liberia), are good strategies used by CLEAR II to be more responsive to national stakeholder priorities and encourage ownership of project interventions.

### Conclusions on Project Effectiveness

The slow pace of adding new countries to CLEAR II has severely limited project progress in the first 29 months of implementation. Instead of being a period dedicated to assessing needs and setting up project operations in new countries, the first half of CLEAR II was largely consumed by managing political and bureaucratic constraints in Washington and in potential recipient countries to identify and add additional partner countries. There are several lessons to be learned from this process (see good practices and lessons learned).

Progress to date in Nepal has been accomplished by effectively adapting project objectives to the evolving circumstances of the country including by refocusing some interventions from the national to the local level where demand for support was stronger and progress easier to achieve. Another effective strategy of CLEAR II has been to join forces with and build on the existing efforts of other international NGOs and organizations working on child labor in Nepal. Through the latter approach, CLEAR II has been able to lobby the government for review of legislation and to work on the development of the NMP.

The IAC and GLP are global strategies that were to be driven by country needs. To date, although the committee and the platform have been initiated, both are underdeveloped strategies. Although done outside both strategies, the work carried out by LWOB pro bono lawyers to identify good practices for child protection in emergencies is an example of focusing volunteer expertise on needs identified in the country.

## Conclusions on Efficiency of Resource Use

Slow progress adding new countries, among other factors, has delayed the decentralization of project management to the country level. Stakeholders in Burkina Faso highlighted the importance of a strong in-country presence in order to effectively engage national stakeholders in project planning and interventions. At the time of the interim evaluation, CLEAR II has recruited experienced project coordinators in Nepal, Burkina Faso and Liberia and has plans to recruit senior level coordinators in most of the new countries that will be added to the project. Lessons may be learned from Nepal, where the country team has not felt that they were sufficiently integrated into overall country level project management.

The project M&E framework is valued as a shared and flexible tool for measuring project progress by participants in the CMEP workshops. However, based on the experience of Nepal, CLEAR II project management have not taken adequate steps to adapt the framework for the needs of national program staff or effectively made it a useful tool to plan and monitor project interventions. The Nepal Baseline Child Labor Capacity Score (March 2016) developed by the project is a useful assessment tool using easily verifiable indicators for the assessment of capacity across the areas that the project addresses.

Given the short time remaining in the project implementation period and the significant workload that is anticipated to effectively identify and implement project activities, an adjustment in the project strategy appears warranted. Both reducing the number of target countries and extending the project implementation period are justified by the current status of project progress.

## Conclusions on Sustainability

Project results in Nepal are still at an early stage. The participatory approach to working with municipalities on their DMPs and with the initial work on developing CLMSs is encouraging institutional ownership and is building local capacity and understanding, which should contribute to sustaining action on child labor following the end of project interventions. The sustainability of policy outcomes is likewise potentially high. The NMP and DMP engaged a variety of national stakeholders in their development and are in the process of validation by relevant government authorities. The South Asia RAP has been already been endorsed. These policy documents will provide a framework for future action on child labor.

## V. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

---

### 5.1 Good Practices

---

The evaluator who visited Nepal identified the following good practices.

**Implementation through a network:** When faced with limited opportunities to work directly with government on legislation and policy issues, the project has been able to contribute significantly on these issues through its participation in a network of international agencies focused on addressing child labor.

**Capacity building process to incorporate child labor and child trafficking prevention in the Penauti Municipality Disaster Management Plan:** The project followed an interactive process with officials in Penauti Municipality including a series of meetings, a gap analysis, a workshop with officials, and the Municipality Social Development Officer taking responsibility to incorporate the outcomes into the DMP. Key characteristics of this good practice:

- The proposed support was in response to a clearly identified need;
- Penauti Municipality had already taken some steps regarding child labor elimination and in preparing a previous DMP;
- The interactive nature of the process built trust, confidence and understanding among the key staff in the municipality; and
- Responsibility for action remained with the municipality throughout.

A detailed case study of this good practice is included in **Annex 7**.

**Using international good practices to inform local technical assistance strategies:** When CLEAR II identified the need for attention to child protection strategies and processes to prevent trafficking and other negative outcomes for children in the midst of Nepal's earthquake, LWOB effectively mobilized pro bono lawyers to identify good practices from other countries. This was both a good practice in how to mobilize volunteer resources to serve project implementation and in how to capitalize on good practices and lesson learned from past disasters and disaster responses.

### 5.2 Lessons Learned

---

There are a number of potential lessons learned for USDOL and the CLEAR II project management team based on experience to date:

To improve project responsiveness and stakeholder engagement, it is important that country level results frameworks are contextualized: The lack of a country-specific results framework makes it harder to engage effectively with stakeholders who want to see what the project is planning to do and what the expected outcomes and results are.

Country selection is a critical stage in project design that needs adequate time and resources: Due to political and bureaucratic factors, the process of identifying and agreeing on project target countries takes a considerable amount of time. In most countries, a scoping mission that includes face-to-face discussions with a variety of national stakeholders is needed prior to country selection and the development of a results framework. This is particularly true for grantees like the CLEAR II consortium that may be entering countries where the grantee has no permanent presence and limited or no prior relevant in-country experience.

Existing USDOL and Grantee relationships in target countries are potential assets to facilitate entry into a new country: A member of the project management team suggested that USDOL might capitalize more on its existing grantee programs when choosing countries for government technical assistance and capacity building. She felt that there would be opportunities for complementary actions and that CLEAR II could build on existing relationships with USDOL and its grantees on the issue of child labor. Another stakeholder within Winrock suggested that allowing Winrock and its partners to capitalize more on its existing relationships by choosing countries where it has a track record would have facilitated timelier project expansion into new countries.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### Recommendations for USDOL

1. Revise design of future projects: In future projects, target fewer countries, with countries being preselected and larger budgets for each country. Regionally focused projects should be considered to facilitate knowledge sharing. Allocate sufficient time and resources for in-country scoping missions prior to selecting target countries.

### Recommendations for CLEAR II and USDOL Project Management

2. Reduce number of overall target countries in CLEAR II and extend the project implementation period: Because of delays in identifying and initiating activities in new countries, and in light of the limited time left in the project, CLEAR II should reduce the total number of target countries. Project resources should be realigned to provide technical assistance to those countries that have already been identified and for which assessments have already been or are currently being carried out (5-6 countries). The project implementation period should be extended to allow additional time to assist national stakeholders in these countries on priority initiatives.

### Recommendations for CLEAR II Project Management

3. Revise country level results frameworks: After carrying out country-specific needs and context analysis (taking into consideration past and existing initiatives to fight child labor), country level performance management matrices, results frameworks and related work plans should be revised so that proposed technical assistance and capacity building strategies are contextualized and align with the priorities and capacity of relevant project counterparts.
4. Decentralize project management: Integrate country coordinators in overall country level planning and project management more comprehensively (choice of interventions, target setting, activity planning and implementation). Consider ways to engage more national level expertise in project implementation as a strategy to deploy faster to new countries, build national capacity and ownership, and enable more continuous follow-up with stakeholders.
5. Decentralize technical assistance and capacity building: In cases where CLEAR II faces resistance or slow pace from high level government agencies in Burkina Faso and Liberia (and other countries that may be added), the project should intensify work at the local level, building on good practices and lessons learned in Nepal. The work that the project is carrying out at municipality level should be continued and expanded. (Nepal)
6. Focus on sub-objectives where impact is most likely in the time remaining: The project should focus attention on sub-objectives where it is more realistic to expect results in the time remaining in the project, for example, the development of municipality CLMS and the promotion of coordination between enforcement agencies, local government and civil society.

7. Engage national stakeholders from the beginning to strengthen work on legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines: Use a more interactive and country-based approach to promote legal reforms. Use strategies that include in-country assessments and involve national legal and other experts more in the review process. Organize validation workshops to present expert reviews/studies to national stakeholders. Make the table of proposed legislative changes more succinct to engage readers more effectively. (Nepal)
8. Build on existing CLMS models where these exist: Evaluate the Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS) piloted by previous child labor projects and, if relevant to stakeholders, support the government and other stakeholders on its replication and/or scaling-up. (Burkina Faso and Liberia)
9. Support *implementation* of National Action Plans on Child Labor: Consider opportunities for supporting the implementation and resource mobilization for the NAP in Burkina Faso and Liberia. When the Nepal NMP has been endorsed by government, look for opportunities to provide support to the government for its implementation.
10. Strengthen and orient the International Advisory Council: Identify experts with relevant country level experience or relevant thematic experience. Consider feasibility of investing expertise in producing original content for GLP.
11. Refocus Global Learning Platform: Refocus efforts on producing and posting original, more tailored content on platform. Push content out to relevant users, capitalizing on the project M&E database of national stakeholders.

## ANNEX 1: Overview of Project Progress in Nepal

Project Progress Matrix - Nepal			
Area	Indicators with Targets, Achieved and Progress		
<b>SO 1.1</b> <b>Draft of laws in compliance with ILS on Child Labor approved by relevant body</b>	OTC 1. Number of countries where legal framework is adapted to meet international labor standards (ILS) (C)	<b>Target</b>	0
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 1.1.1 New/ improved legislation drafted and submitted by LRC	OTP 1. Number of draft laws and regulations submitted to relevant bodies for approval	<b>Target</b>	2 by October 2017
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 1.1.2 Recommendations on legislation validated	OTP 2. Number of legislation validation documents produced	<b>Target</b>	1 by April 2017
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 1.1.3 Assessment report on compliance with ILS completed	OTP 3. Number of country assessment reports on CL legislation completed	<b>Target</b>	1 by April 2016
		<b>Actual</b>	1
Completed by LWOB through a remote review. The report has not been circulated in-country.			
<b>SO 1.2</b> <b>Coordinating mechanism to adapt legislation to ILS functional</b>	OTC 2. Number of LRC functioning	<b>Target</b>	1 by April 2016
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 1.2.1 LRC established	OTP 4. Number of LRC established	<b>Target</b>	1 by April 2016
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Discussions have taken place with Bharatpur Municipality regarding the establishment of a municipality-level review committee and a visit is planned.			
Output 1.2.2 LRC members trained to review/draft legislation/policies	OTP 5. Number of LRC members trained	<b>Target</b>	8 by October 2016
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 1.2.3 Materials disseminated to civil society/NGO representatives	OTP 6. Number of civil society/NGOs accessing materials	<b>Target</b>	5 by October 2016
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 1.2.4 Tools and guidelines on legal analysis of CL laws developed for GLP	OTP 7. Number of countries that have tools for legal analysis produced by the project	<b>Target</b>	1 by Oct 2016
		<b>Actual</b>	0

Project Progress Matrix - Nepal			
Area	Indicators with Targets, Achieved and Progress		
<b>SO 2.1</b> <b>CLMS structures established and/or strengthened at national and/or sub-national levels</b>	OTC 3. Number of countries with a CLMS established (C)	<b>Target</b>	1 by Oct 2018
		<b>Actual</b>	0
	OTC 4. Number of strengthened CLMS	<b>Target</b>	0
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 2.1.1. Community level CLMS plans developed	OTP 8. Number of CLMS plans drafted	<b>Target</b>	0
		<b>Actual</b>	0
<p>Stakeholders mapping &amp; role of different agencies in monitoring of CL programs; held in Penauti, November 2016 (see report)</p> <p>Concept note developed, first for HQ, then for Penauti. In about December 2016.</p> <p>Penauti has to request DDC for approval. The plan is to launch in March 2017.</p> <p>There has also been a request from Dhulikhel municipality but project wants to work with Penauti first.</p> <p>Note that the municipality CLMS in Penauti has been selected for the CLEAR II Nepal case study.</p>			
Output 2.1.3 National and local structures identified by government for CLMS and/or CL data management	OTP 10. Number of CLMS recommendations memos drafted	<b>Target</b>	0
		<b>Actual</b>	1 (Penauti municipality)
<p>Child Labor Monitoring System, Concept Note and Recommendation Memo, Panauti Municipality. This has recently been approved.</p> <p>The Assessment document gives a good description of the current system, situation and needs.</p>			
<b>SO 2.2</b> <b>CL concerns integrated into labor inspection process</b>	OTC 5. Number of countries where training on CL is institutionalized within government agencies (C)	<b>Target</b>	1 by Oct 2018
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 2.2.1 Lead trainers trained to deliver LI curriculum	OTP 11. Number of lead trainers trained	<b>Target</b>	0
		<b>Actual</b>	0

Project Progress Matrix - Nepal			
Area	Indicators with Targets, Achieved and Progress		
Output 2.2.2 LI trained in organizational improvement	OTP 12. Number of LI staff trained	Target	0
		Actual	0
LWOB planning to come for training on litigation etc. To be given to LIs and to public prosecutors. Planned for 1 <sup>st</sup> week of April. There is a Concept note: 'Cooperative training on prosecution of child labor in Nepal'.			
Output 2.2.4 Training plan developed for district/local level government authorities in charge of labor inspection	OTP 14. Number of training plans on CL/LI created	Target	1 by Oct 2017
		Actual	1 two-day training for 22 DoL/MOLE staff and 4 NGO staff in systems workshop
The systems w/s was divided into two groups so that there was still staff in the offices. 1 <sup>st</sup> w/s (2016) was for gazetted officers. The 2 <sup>nd</sup> is planned for junior officers for March.			
Output 2.2.5 Gaps and recommendations identified regarding LI and enforcement of CL law	OTP 15. Number of labor inspectorate assessments completed	Target	1 by April 2016
		Actual	1
Report completed by Verite. It has been shared with the Department of Labor (DOL) and main findings were presented at the systems workshop.			
<b>SO 2.3</b> <b>Coordination plan between public and private sector developed</b>	OTC 6. Number of coordination plans between public and private sector created	Target	1 by April 2018
		Actual	0
Initial research concluded that this would not be feasible. There is now some discussion on the possibility of working on sand and stone quarrying in the Pokhara area.			
Output 2.3.1 Enforcement agencies, private sector and other relevant stakeholders sensitized on their role and responsibilities to report and address CL cases	OTP 16. Number of participants attending trainings	Target	0
		Actual	26
<b>SO 3.1</b> <b>Local level strategic plans on WFCL operationalized</b>	OTC 7. Number of countries with operationalized local strategic plans for NAP implementation	Target	0
		Actual	0

Project Progress Matrix - Nepal			
Area	Indicators with Targets, Achieved and Progress		
Output 3.1. Local level authorities trained in local resource mobilization and management skills	OTP 17. Number of local authorities trained	Target	0
		Actual	0
Output 3.1.2 Local strategic plans developed	OTP 18. Number of local strategic plans created	Target	0
		Actual	0
Output 3.1.3 Strategies for NAP roll-out disseminated to local level authorities	OTP 19. Number of localities where NAP roll-out strategy is introduced	Target	0
		Actual	0
<b>SO 3.2</b> <b>National policies, plans or programs to combat CL, including WFCL, formulated and/or improved</b>	OTC 8. Number of countries where policies, plans or programs to combat child labor are formulated and adopted (C)	Target	0
		Actual	1 (South Asia RAP)
IAWG-CL planning a delegation in March 2017 to MOLE to move the NMP forwards. Also to ask if there are any areas for support required from the IAWG.			
Output 3.2.1 NAP revised/updated	OTP 20. Number of countries with NAP roll-out strategy created	Target	0
		Actual	0
	OTP 21. Number of countries with new or improved draft NAP	Target	0
		Actual	2 (Nepal and South Asia RAP)
<p>NMP revision process has been on-going since 2009. CLEAR II picked up the process of coordinating the revision of the NMP from ILO ACHIEVE project that closed in August 2016. Coordinated a 3-day workshop in August 2016 resulting in a NMP 2016-2026 that MOLE is satisfied with. An operational plan has been developed. IAWG-CL coordinated the 3-day workshop with &gt; 50 participants. Main financial support was from ILO. Main coordination by CLEAR II. But different agencies took different roles and picked up different costs. IAWG-CL also helped in the preparation of an operation plan for the first 3 years. After NMP is approved, can ask IAWG to provide support in implementing.</p> <p>Regional action plan (RAP) for the prevention and elimination of all forms of child labor in South Asia 2016 – 2021 was finalized in July 2016. An initial draft had been prepared by August 2014. CLEAR II provided support to the ongoing work through technical support and by enabling the Government of Nepal representative to attend the Expert Group Meeting in Colombo in December 2015. A collective of development partners supported the process. It is purposively not prescriptive. Each country has its own specifics. Triggers national actions that contribute to regional agenda.</p>			

Project Progress Matrix - Nepal			
Area	Indicators with Targets, Achieved and Progress		
<b>SO 3.3</b> <b>Institutional framework to carry out research on WFCL in place</b>	OTC 9. Number of countries with Research on Child Labor institutionalized (C)	<b>Target</b>	0
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 3.3.2 Research on CL conducted	OTP 23. Number of research projects supported by CLEAR II	<b>Target</b>	0
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Research planned with Bharatpur municipality. Support for CL census and then develop a social protection strategy based on this data under CFLG. Planning to go for informal discussion after the evaluation.			
Output 3.3.3 Research component included in NAP	OTP 24. Number of NAP with research component included	<b>Target</b>	0
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 3.3.4 Coordinating body members trained in use of CLMS / CL research data	OTP 25. Number of participants trained in use of CLMS and/or research data	<b>Target</b>	0
		<b>Actual</b>	0
<b>SO 3.4</b> <b>Coordinating body to enforce/ implement NAP established/ strengthened</b>	OTC 10. Number of countries with functional CLU/ coordinating body	<b>Target</b>	1 by Oct 2018
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 3.4.1 Coordinating body members identified and trained	OTP 27. Number of coordinating body members trained	<b>Target</b>	0
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 3.4.2 Roles and responsibilities of relevant stakeholders clarified and documented	OTP 28. Number of countries with documented roles and responsibilities for relevant stakeholders	<b>Target</b>	1 by April 2017
		<b>Actual</b>	0
Output 3.4.3 Institutional coordination plan developed	OTP 29. Number of countries with draft institutional coordination plan	<b>Target</b>	1 by April 2016
		<b>Actual</b>	0
<b>SO 4.1</b> <b>Relevant government stakeholders dedicate assets/resources to appropriate social programs, policies and/or services to reduce CL</b>	OTC 11. Number of government agencies that address CL within their social programs, policies and/or services	<b>Target</b>	0
		<b>Actual</b>	0

Project Progress Matrix - Nepal			
Area	Indicators with Targets, Achieved and Progress		
Output 4.1.1 Relevant government officials and other stakeholders trained in resource mobilization and management skills to implement social programs, policies and/or services	OTP 30. Number of government officials and/or other stakeholders trained in budget/management	Target	0
		Actual	0
<b>SO 4.2</b> <b>Recommendations to fill gaps in social programs, policies and/or services related to CL operationalized by relevant body</b>	OTC 12. Number of countries where relevant development, education, anti-poverty and other social programs, policies and/or services include CL (C)	Target	1 by Oct 2018
		Actual	0
Output 4.2.1 Recommendations drafted to address gaps in social programs, policies and/or services related to CL issues	OTP 31. Number of draft recommendations submitted to relevant body for approval	Target	0
		Actual	2
<p>Penauti Municipality has finalized the incorporation of CL and CT issues into its existing DMP and will take effect from 2074 (April 2017). They are currently working on the budget.</p> <p>Dhulikhel does not have a DMP yet so the gap analysis and recommendations remains as a stand-alone resource.</p> <p>LWOB developed a memo on BPs in child protection in post-disaster situations.</p> <p>'Mini-graphic novel' developed by LWOB as a public awareness tool. The evaluator accessed a copy of this from the project dropbox but the Nepal team were had not seen the product and, although the context of the novel's drawings was Nepal, they had not been involved in its development.</p>			
Output 4.2.3 Line ministry representatives informed on the impact of CL	OTP 33. Number of line ministry representatives informed on the impact of CL	Target	0
		Actual	0
Output 4.2.4 Assessment report completed identifying gaps in social programs, policies and/or services related to CL issues	OTP 34. Assessment report on gaps in social programs, policies and/or services created	Target	1 by October 2017
		Actual	2 at municipality level (Dhulikhel and Penauti)
<p>Gap analyses including recommendations carried out for Penauti (May 2016) and Dhulikhel (August 2016) municipalities on CL and CT within their DRMP – see 2 reports. Carried out research and presented this to a workshop. The reports are based on the research presented and the resulting group work.</p> <p>See the case study on this process as a good practice.</p>			

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

for the  
**Independent Interim Evaluation**  
of  
**Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II  
Project (CLEAR II)**

---

Cooperative Agreement Number:	IL-26260-14-75-K
Financing Agency:	U.S. Department of Labor
Grantee Organization:	Winrock International
Dates of Project Implementation:	30 September 2014 - 29 September 2018
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Interim Evaluation
Evaluation Field Work Dates:	February 21 - March 22, 2017
Preparation Date of TOR:	January 2017
Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:	US \$7,000,000

---

## ACRONYMS

CL	Child Labor
CLEAR II	Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II Project
CLMS	Child Labor Monitoring System
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
DINAF	Honduras Department for Children, Adolescents and Families / Dirección de Niñez, Adolescencia y Familia
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GLP	Global Learning Platform
HCL	Hazardous Child Labor
ILAB	USDOL Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILS	International Labor Standards
IO	Intermediate Objective
LI	Labor Inspectorate
LRC	Legal Reform Committee
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAP	National Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OCFT	USDOL Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking
RF	Results Framework
SFS	Sistemas, Familias y Sociedad – Consultores Asociados
SO	Supporting Objective
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats Analysis
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPR	Technical Progress Report
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor

## I. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

### USDOL - OCFT

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

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

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

### Project Context<sup>22</sup>

Heightened global recognition of exploitive child labor as an economic development and human rights issue, combined with commendable efforts by governments, non-profits, and others to reduce the WFCL, have led to a worldwide decrease in the prevalence of CL. However, further

---

<sup>22</sup> Adapted from the CLEAR II CMEP

analysis reveals that national stakeholders need to accelerate efforts to achieve international goals. Worldwide, there are 168 million children engaged in CL, including 85 million in hazardous child labor (HCL). A more detailed look reveals 77 million child laborers in Asia, with 33 million in HCL, 12 million children in Latin America and the Caribbean, with 9.6 million in HCL, 9.2 million children in the Middle East and North Africa, with 5.2 million in HCL, and 59 million children in Sub-Saharan Africa engaged in child labor, 28 million of them in HCL work.<sup>23</sup>

There are multiple factors that contribute to CL around the world. Winrock has identified some of the contributing problem areas related to the existence of CL, including: poverty; limited access to education; insufficient awareness of the negative consequences of CL; limited engagement of the private sector and government stakeholders in preventing and combating the problem; and a lack of awareness and implementation of international best practices and good methods for addressing child labor.

While poverty, limited access to education and others are contributing factors in the prevalence of CL, 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 of CL issues:* Communities, relevant industry leaders, key government stakeholders and local stakeholders such as police and judges are often not sufficiently 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 development, and social issues including health and education. As a result, governments and relevant stakeholders may continue to tolerate or even encourage the practice. In addition, insufficient awareness about the root causes of CL may limit capacity for stakeholders to advocate for or propose appropriate solutions.

*Limited capacity:* Various stakeholders are positioned to prevent and combat CL in communities and industries around the world. However, many factors limit their actions, including the absence of capacity, strategies and policies, the lack of coordination and resources, and industry shortcomings. Often government stakeholders including national level coordinating bodies on child labor lack resources, training and knowledge, and do not coordinate with other stakeholders with similar goals. In addition, countries often do not have effective, up to date action plans to combat CL, and inspections of CL infractions can be compromised by a lack of resources and skills to enforce existing laws. Insufficient resources for programs that address CL also limit the ability of labor inspectors and relevant civil servants to monitor CL in their communities and conduct outreach.

---

<sup>23</sup> Source: ILO-IPEC, "Marking progress against child labor, Global Estimates and trends 2000-2012"

*Insufficient awareness of international best practices:* Often countries may have ratified International Labour Organization (ILO) Conventions, but do not have strategic plans on how to effectively operationalize the conventions. Many times government stakeholders believe that laws, regulations and policies are compliant with international standards on CL when they are not, or believe that laws in place, although not compliant, effectively address the issue. Laws and regulations often have holes in them, such as minimum age exceptions included, definitions such as “light work” or “worst forms” modified or ignored, and informal sectors neglected. In addition to underfunded, undertrained labor inspectors and industry shortcomings, countries often focus resources for enforcement on particular groups of children, geographic areas or sectors. This often leaves gaps in enforcement for children of certain ages, in remote communities, or in the informal sector.

### The CLEAR II Project<sup>24</sup>

In September 2014, Winrock International signed a four-year Cooperative Agreement with OCFT worth US \$7,000,000 to implement the Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II Project (CLEAR II). Winrock is partnering with Lawyers Without Borders and Verité to implement this project.

The purpose of the Cooperative Agreement was to support a reduction in child labor by building local and national capacity of host governments in a minimum of eight countries, including Belize, Burkina Faso, Liberia, and Nepal. Honduras was added in the first quarter of 2015 and activities came to completion in early 2016. Discussions regarding the addition of potential countries to the project portfolio are underway, including Mozambique, Panama, Sierra Leone and Jamaica. Bhutan, Colombia and South Africa were previously the topic of some discussion but the decision has been made not to include them in the project.

Using targeted activities, CLEAR II partners with governments to enhance their capacity to reduce child labor and support their goals to make meaningful efforts to implement actions described in the USDOL’s most recent *Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor* report. While the duration and specific activities to be conducted in each country depends on the nature of the needs and requests presented, the project as a whole has established four intermediate objectives (IO):

**Intermediate Objective 1:** Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL compliant with International Labor Standards (ILS)

**Intermediate Objective 2:** Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation and regulations related to CL improved

**Intermediate Objective 3:** Increased implementation of National Action Plans (NAP) on Child Labor, including WFCL

---

<sup>24</sup> Adapted from the CLEAR II Cooperative Agreement, CMEP and TPRs

**Intermediate Objective 4:** Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL, including WFCL

Winrock International and its partners are using an approach with three integrated pillars:

- 4 *Authority to Act: Strengthened Legal Framework*—Host country governments will have the capacity to analyze legislation and produce a clear legal and institutional framework that adheres to international standards and commitment;
- 5 *Ability to Act: Improved Enforcement*—Technical assistance will support government ministries, institutions and industries to strengthen current judicial and legal frameworks to enhance their ability to enforce child labor laws; and
- 6 *Incentive to Prevent: Better-Supported Social and Economic Programs*—CLEAR II will enhance governments' capacity to effectively implement National Action Plans to address child labor and mainstream child labor reduction programming through line ministries.

CLEAR II supports the following innovations with host governments to reduce child labor: An International Advisory Council to provide technical guidance and support; and an online Global Learning Platform (GLP) that offers worldwide access to tools, resources, and materials, and facilitates cross-country learning through chats and blogs.

The CLEAR II team developed a Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) that organizes program activities, outputs, outcomes and indicators at an overall project level. Activities and indicators for each individual country then roll up into this global framework, as relevant, and not every component is implemented in every country. Below is a Results Framework (RF) that depicts the supporting objectives (SO) and outputs established for each of the project's four intermediate objectives.

## 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 for GLP

### **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 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 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 report and address CL cases

### **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

## II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

OCFT-funded projects are subject to independent interim and final evaluations. An interim evaluation of the CLEAR II project is due in early 2017.

### Interim Evaluation Purpose and Scope

Interim evaluations allow the donor and grantee to learn from the project's initial implementation in order to continue or redesign strategies as needed to improve the success of the project. The evaluation report should focus on the areas of project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, lessons learned and sustainability. Specific evaluation questions, as determined by USDOL and the project, are listed below. The Evaluation Team may also identify further points of importance during the mission that should be included in the analysis as appropriate.

The overall purpose of the interim evaluation is to:

5. Assess the relevance of the project's Theory of Change, as stated in the CLEAR II CMEP, to the issue of child labor in the implementing countries and whether activities are being implemented in accordance with the project design.
6. Review the design and implementation of CLEAR II to determine whether the project on track to meeting its objectives and identify challenges and/or successes encountered in doing so. Analyze the possible factors, internal and external to the project, which may be contributing to these successes and challenges.
7. Provide recommendations for the remaining period of the project that will improve the delivery and sustainability of outputs and objectives.
8. Describe whether the CMEP is being implemented as designed and whether it is accurately measuring project results.

The scope of the independent interim 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 time of evaluation fieldwork should be considered. The interim evaluation will assess and evaluate the project's implementation for the first two years, providing insight on what aspects are effective and determining whether the project is on track towards meeting its goals and objectives.

### Intended Users

The intended users are OCFT, Winrock and its partners, as well as other stakeholders working to combat child labor more broadly. The evaluation will provide an assessment of the project's experience in implementation and its effects on the child labor climate. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations will serve to inform any project adjustments that may need to be made in order to maximize the effectiveness and sustainability of the remaining project period, and to inform stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future child labor elimination projects as appropriate.

The evaluation report will be published on the USDOL website, so the report should be written as a standalone document, providing the necessary background information for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

### Evaluation Questions

Specific questions that the evaluation should seek to answer are found below. The Evaluation Team may add, remove, or shift evaluation questions, but the final list will be subject to approval by USDOL.

#### Relevance

1. Are project IOs, SOs, and activities consistent with the current needs of key national stakeholders and are they linked to CL national plans and strategies? Has the project successfully adapted to meet current needs, and if so, how? (NEPAL)
2. What steps is the project taking at the planning stage to ensure government buy-in? (NEPAL, BURKINA FASO, LIBERIA). What steps is the project taking regarding implementation (NEPAL).
3. How has the project contributed to broader child labor NAPs and other strategic frameworks related to child labor? (NEPAL) In new countries, what opportunities and challenges are there to contribute to NAPs? How open are governments to collaborating on the NAP process?

#### Project Design

4. Is there validity in the strategy/approach of focusing on predetermined thematic areas in multiple countries, with smaller budgets and scope in each country, as compared to the more traditional comprehensive child labor strategies that are implemented in specific countries?
5. Are the Theory of Change and Results Framework still valid since implementation has begun? Is a single Theory of Change and Results Framework relevant for all project countries?

#### Effectiveness

6. What has contributed to delays in naming new countries to the project and beginning implementation? How can the country selection process be improved?
7. By the time of the evaluation, is the project achieving its targets according to plan in the latest TPR? (NEPAL)
8. What are the current challenges that the project is facing in its planning and implementation, including securing government engagement, and what efforts have been made to overcome these challenges?
9. Of the four project component areas, which are more challenging or difficult to address and why?

10. How has the International Advisory Council supported the project to achieve outcomes?
11. At the country level, how does the project (intend to) work with other international and non-profit organizations also working on child labor related issues? (ALL COUNTRIES)  
How effectively has the project coordinated key stakeholders working on child labor issues to contribute to project objectives? (NEPAL)
12. Is the Global Learning Platform a relevant strategy to facilitate knowledge sharing and cross-country learning? Based on progress to date, are there ways the design of the portal might be improved. If so, how?

### Efficiency

13. How does the management structure, with key personnel housed in Washington, D.C., impact project results at the country-level?
14. Was the CMEP useful as a planning and project monitoring tool? How has the M&E system been used to provide evidence on project progress?
15. Were the selected indicators effective for project performance management of capacity building projects? Were targets realistic? How can target-setting be improved?

### Sustainability

16. What steps toward sustainability have been taken so far, and what else can be done to maximize handover and sustainability?
17. Are the project outcomes and sub-outcomes sustainable at the local and/or national level?<sup>25</sup> Please identify steps that can be taken to increase their sustainability. (NEPAL)

## III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

### A. Approach and Data Collection Methods

Technical assistance/capacity building projects aim to produce direct and relevant indirect effects on specific issues through the action of third parties. Project outcomes acquire an utmost importance in this kind of project because the effectiveness of project interventions is to be measured by medium term outcomes at the institutional and enabling environment levels. Additionally, institutional responsibilities and means may vary substantially in each project target country. Likewise, difference in the social, political and economic context in each country, and even the occurrence of natural disasters in some regions may have an influence over project outcomes. The evaluation methodology will take into account these factors, as well as the fact

---

<sup>25</sup> It is understood that this question can be answered only to the extent that the project has assessed its outcomes and sub-outcomes. This evaluation is not a formal impact assessment.

that it will only be able to collect information on the ground for three target countries: Nepal, Burkina Faso and Liberia. The latter will be compensated through the use of various conference calls in Honduras. The evaluation team will also hold conference calls with stakeholders in Bobbo Dioulasso (Burkina Faso) as well as project consultants in France. The evaluation team will also hold face-to-face interviews with Winrock staff and review of project databases and documentation.

Likewise, in order to adequately address the varied cultural and linguistic differences in the target countries to be visited, SFS has engaged three Co-Evaluators to conduct the fieldwork. After the Lead Evaluator meets with Winrock team members in Washington, DC, the evaluation team members will travel to meet staff and other relevant stakeholders working in the three countries to be visited during the evaluation. Key stakeholders in Honduras will participate in conference calls aimed to collect information about the main features, successes and challenges of the project in that country. Where online forms appear incomplete or where country stakeholders have difficulties filling in the online form, Skype calls will be set up to provide needed explanations, collect clarifications on answers provided and any other necessary information.

The Evaluation Team will collect diverse information using a varied set of (mainly) qualitative and quantitative methods, including but not limited to:

<b>Method</b>	<b>Tools / Target Groups / Products</b>
<b>Interviews with key informants</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Various questionnaires/interview forms used with project management team, national project coordinators and representatives of relevant stakeholders in each country.</li> <li>-Visit municipalities and institutions, as relevant, to interview key stakeholders, assess their perception and satisfaction with project implementation, contrast the validity of project strategies used in the field, appraise the quality of services (technical assistance, training) delivered by the project, and identify unexpected effects of project activities as well as other relevant features of project implementation.</li> </ul>
<b>Document review and extensive discussions with Project staff and key stakeholders</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Review project's investments in capacity building: Training materials and curricula of the courses produced for various target groups.</li> <li>-Review the consistency of implementation and ownership of CLMS by stakeholders</li> <li>-Review the strategy to promote ownership and implementation of NAP by national institutions</li> <li>-Review legislative analysis of CL developed with project support in target countries</li> <li>-Review labor inspectorate assessments developed with project support in target countries</li> </ul>
<b>Focus group discussions (FGD)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FGD guidelines and forms addressed to various key stakeholders (e.g. labor inspectors) and other target groups as needed.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Performance Analysis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review baseline information/ pre-situational assessments and CL capacity assessment tool. Compare planned/actual achievements per project indicator, analyze emerging trends and identify factors that favor or hamper project success in each case.</li> </ul>

<b>Assess quality of monitoring system data</b>	Review consistency of M&E system, quality of indicators and effective use of the same by project DC staff and project staff in each country.
<b>Budget Analysis Matrix</b>	Review project expenditures (planned/actual) per component under most recent budget revision.

The following 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, 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. Interim Evaluation Team**

The evaluation will be conducted by an Evaluation Team comprising the following evaluators:

1. Sandy Wark (Team Leader) who will visit Washington, DC and Liberia,
2. Keith Jeddere-Fisher, who will visit Nepal, and
3. Rafael Muñoz, who will visit Burkina Faso.

The Evaluation Team will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with Sistemas, Familias y Sociedad (SFS), USDOL, and the project staff; directly conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; analyzing the evaluation material gathered; and preparing the evaluation report. The Evaluation Team will decide on the composition of field visit interviews in order to ensure the objectivity of the evaluation and will develop and implement an evaluation methodology that will answer the evaluation questions. The Evaluation Team will also develop a proposed agenda for field visit interviews in coordination with the Grantee.

In Nepal, a member of the project staff may travel with the evaluators to make introductions. This person will not be involved in the evaluation process and will not be present during interviews. CLEAR II staff will set up meetings with local stakeholders in Liberia and Burkina Faso. In these cases, a consultant will travel with the evaluators and introduce them to the interviewees in each country.

Given that the evaluation team members are proficient in English, Nepali, French and/or Portuguese, no interpretation needs are deemed necessary.

## C. Methodology Milestones

### 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
- If available, documents may include:
  - CMEP documents,
  - Project document and modifications,
  - Cooperative Agreement,
  - Project Results Frameworks and Monitoring Plans,
  - Work plans or Plans of Action,
  - Technical Progress Reports and other status or trip reports,
  - Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports,
  - Country or situational assessments,
  - National Action Plans, country regulations and local legal frameworks, where relevant;
  - Other legal/policy documents and draft regulations on CL developed with project support in target countries,
  - Management Procedures and Guidelines,
  - Training materials and curricula, as appropriate,
  - Research or other reports undertaken by the project or relevant to its aims, and
  - Project files and strategies, as appropriate.

### 2. Question Matrix and List of Stakeholders

Before beginning fieldwork, the Evaluation Team will work with SFS, USDOL and Winrock to create a list of stakeholders to interview and a Data Collection Matrix, which outlines the source of data from where they plan to collect information for each TOR question. This will help the Evaluation Team to make decisions as to how they are going to allocate time in the field. It will also help the Team to ensure that they are exploring all possible avenues for data triangulation and to clearly note where their evaluation findings are coming from. The data collection matrix and list of stakeholders shall be forwarded by the Evaluation Team to SFS before start of field work and shared with USDOL.

### 3. Interviews with Stakeholders

Informational interviews will be held with as many project stakeholders as possible. The evaluators will visit institutions and communities, as relevant, to interview key stakeholders; assess their perception and satisfaction with project implementation; contrast the validity of project strategies used in the field; appraise the quality of services delivered by the project; and identify unexpected effects of project activities as well as other relevant features of project implementation. Depending on circumstances, these meetings will be one-on-one or group interviews.

#### 4. Other Meetings/Conference Calls

The evaluation team will also hold conference calls with key stakeholders in Honduras, where activities were carried out, but which will not be visited during the evaluation. The evaluation team will also hold conference calls with stakeholders in Bobbo Dioulasso (Burkina Faso), who have been involved in planning an assessment of the labor inspection system in that country and who may provide contextual information to assess the relevance of proposed project interventions. For Honduras, the Lead Evaluator will also meet with a CLEAR II consultant during her time in Washington, DC and other calls will be held with stakeholders as relevant. Finally, the team will conduct a phone call with volunteer lawyers from Paris who had been involved in an assessment of Nepal's legal framework regarding child labor.

#### D. Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the evaluation fieldwork. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure a maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners and stakeholders, only the respondents will be present during interviews. However, implementing partner staff may accompany the evaluators to make introductions whenever necessary, to facilitate the evaluation process and to allow the evaluators to observe the interaction between the implementing partner staff and interviewees.

#### E. Stakeholders Meeting

Following the field visits, a debriefing meeting will be conducted in Washington, DC by the Lead Evaluator that brings together project staff and other Winrock staff related to project implementation. The list of participants to be invited will be drafted prior to the evaluation fieldwork and confirmed in consultation with project staff during fieldwork. Stakeholders from some countries served by the project may be invited to attend the presentation through video-conference means.

The meeting will be used to present the major preliminary findings and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders. 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. If appropriate, a possible Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) exercise on the project's performance
4. 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 stakeholder workshop to provide USDOL with preliminary findings and solicit feedback as needed.

#### F. Limitations

The Evaluation Team will only be able to visit three countries included in this project. Of the other project countries selected for implementation, Skype/ phone calls will be conducted for Honduras. As a result, the information collected from phone calls will not contain the same level of depth as the three countries visited and will depend on the project’s progress in initiating activities.

Findings for the evaluation will be based on information collected from background documents and in interviews with stakeholders and project staff. The accuracy of the evaluation findings will be determined by the integrity of information provided to the Evaluation Team from these sources.

Furthermore, the ability of the Evaluation Team 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. Timetable

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

Draft General Schedule and Itinerary for CLEAR II Evaluation	
Task	2017 Date(s)
USDOL provides background documents	Wed, Jan 11
SFS sends Draft TOR to USDOL and Winrock	Mon, Jan 17
USDOL sends revised Draft TOR to SFS	Thu, Jan 19
SFS sends Draft TOR to Winrock	Fri, Jan 20
Winrock send Evaluation Questions and feedback on Draft TOR	Tue, Jan 25
Evaluators submit Methodology/Sampling Plan to SFS for TOR	Fri, Jan 27
Winrock submits Suggested List of Stakeholders per country	Fri, Jan 27
SFS submits full TOR	Fri, Feb 3
Evaluators submit Draft Itinerary and Logistics Needs	Fri, Feb 3
Cable Clearance Request sent to USDOL	Fri, Feb 3
USDOL and Winrock provide Input on Draft Itinerary	Fri, Feb 10
TOR Finalized	Mon, Feb 13
Logistics Call	Tues, Feb 14
Itinerary Finalized	Tue, Feb 14
Contracts signed by Evaluators	Tue, Feb 14
Evaluators submit Data Collection Matrix	Wed, Feb 15
Evaluators interview USDOL	Fri, Feb 17
Sandy Wark: Fieldwork in Washington, DC	Feb 21-24
Sandy Wark: Fieldwork in Liberia	Feb 28 – Mar 2
Keith Jeddere-Fisher: Fieldwork in Nepal	Feb 27 – Mar 3
Rafael Muñoz: Burkina Faso	Feb 27 – Mar 3

Draft General Schedule and Itinerary for CLEAR II Evaluation	
Task	2017 Date(s)
Skype calls with selected countries (calls will be conducted separately in each country, as needed, with government staff, Winrock staff, LWOB researchers)	March 6-10
Stakeholders' Meeting in Washington DC	Wed, Mar 22
Post-fieldwork Debrief Call with USDOL	Mon, Mar 27
Draft Report sent to SFS for quality review	Fri, Apr 7
Draft Report to USDOL and Winrock for 48 hour review	Wed, Apr 12
Draft Report sent to USDOL, Winrock and partners for full comments	Fri, Apr 14
Comments due to SFS	Fri, Apr 28
Revised Report sent by Evaluators to SFS for quality review	Thurs, May 4
Revised Report sent to USDOL	Mon, May 18
Approval from USDOL to Copy Edit/Format Report	Mon, May 15
Final Report sent to USDOL	Mon, May 29

## IV. EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

On March 24, 2017 a first draft evaluation report will be submitted to SFS. The report should have the following structure and content:

- I. Table of Contents
- II. List of Acronyms
- III. Executive Summary - Providing a brief overview of the evaluation, including sections IV-IX
- IV. Project Description
- V. Evaluation Objectives, Methodology and Table listing evaluation questions and corresponding report findings sections
- VI. Findings - Answers to each of the evaluation questions, with supporting evidence included and organized into sub-sections as evaluators see fit
- VII. Lessons Learned and Good Practices
- VIII. Main Conclusions - Primary takeaways and main conclusions of the evaluation
- IX. Recommendations
  - Key Recommendations – critical for successfully meeting project objectives and judgments on what changes need to be made for future programming
  - Other Recommendations – as needed
- X. Annexes, including but not limited to:
  - An overview of project progress (see template in Annex 1 below)

- TOR
- Question Matrix
- List of documents reviewed
- List of interviews, meetings and site visits
- Stakeholder workshop agenda and participants

The total length of the report should be approximately between **30-45 pages** for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes. The Lead Evaluator will be responsible for writing the draft and final reports. The Co-Evaluators will write up their findings from the fieldwork and the phone conference for Honduras and other sites, the Lead Evaluator to integrate into the evaluation report.

The first draft of the report will be circulated to core staff of OCFT and Winrock for a 48 hour review. This initial review serves to identify and correct potentially sensitive information and/or significant inaccuracies before the report is released for formal, detailed comments. Then the draft report will be officially submitted to OCFT, Winrock, and project partners individually for a full two week review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final report as appropriate, and the Evaluation Team 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 Evaluation Team, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/OCFT in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR. **All reports, including drafts, will be written in English.**

## V. EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

SFS has contracted with Sandy Wark, Keith Jeddere-Fisher and Rafael Muñoz to conduct this evaluation. The Evaluation Team will work with OCFT, SFS and relevant Winrock staff to evaluate this project.

- **Sandy Wark**, who is based in Rabat, will serve as Lead Evaluator and will travel to **Washington DC and Liberia**. She will be responsible for attending the stakeholders' meeting and will have overall responsibility for the evaluation report. She is an evaluator with ample experience in child labor and workers' rights projects, capacity building and monitoring of international labor standards. Mrs. Wark has conducted several independent final evaluations of US Department of Labor-funded projects including in 2015 the evaluation of the 43-country GAP 11 project. She is fluent in **English and French**.
- **Keith Jeddere-Fisher**, who is based in the UK, will serve as Co-Evaluator for **Nepal**. He is an evaluator with relevant experience in Nepal, who has lived in that country for more than 10 years. Mr. Jeddere-Fisher has developed 20 evaluations on elimination-of-child-labor-projects, including eight (8) evaluations of USDOL-funded projects. He has carried out 14

diverse work assignments in Nepal, including the evaluation of child labor projects. He is fluent in **English and Nepali** and has basic knowledge of Bangla, Mandarin and French.

- **Rafael Muñoz**, who is based in Madrid, will serve as Co-Evaluator for **Burkina Faso**. He is an evaluator with more than 15 years of experience in international development and has carried out six work assignments in Mozambique and one in Burkina Faso (2016). He has wide experience in carrying out evaluations in Africa and the Americas (including Honduras), and has recently completed two evaluations of USDOL-funded projects, as well several evaluations on ILO child labor projects. Mr. Muñoz is fluent in **English, Spanish, French and Portuguese**.

Mr. Jeddere-Fisher and Mr. Muñoz will conduct Skype/ phone interviews with stakeholders in selected countries

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

## ANNEX 3: Evaluation Question Matrix

Evaluation Question	Methodology/Questions	Relevant Desk Review Documents	Stakeholders to Interview
<b>Relevance and Validity of Project Design</b>			
<p>1. Are project IOs, SOs, and activities consistent with the current needs of key national stakeholders and are they linked to CL national plans and strategies? Has the project successfully adapted to meet current needs, and if so, how? (Nepal)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To identify objectives, outcomes, activities, review project strategy based on project documentation, and interviews with project management and experts.</li> <li>To understand key national stakeholder needs, requirements, priorities: Interviews with main national partners, project management, project experts. Triangulate views.</li> <li>Analyze needs identified in other reports related to CL in target countries including ILAB 2015 report on WFCL. ILO’s CEACR comments and recommendations on C.138 and C.182</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/burkina-faso">https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/burkina-faso</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/iberia">https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/iberia</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/explore-our-resources/reports/child-labor/nepal">https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/explore-our-resources/reports/child-labor/nepal</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus on specific needs, requirements, priorities relative to CLEAR II thematic areas</li> <li>To understand evolution of needs and project response, identify and analyze significant events, and changes in relevant policies and programs in target countries since the project was designed.</li> </ul>	<p>Document review of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Document</li> <li>Project CMEP</li> <li>Project work plan</li> <li>Project TPRs</li> <li>CL national plans and strategies in target countries</li> <li>Assessment reports</li> <li>ILO’s CEACR comments and recommendations on C.138 and C.182</li> </ul>	<p>Target country government representatives (national, municipal, reps of labor inspectorate)</p> <p>Project Management (in country and in DC)</p> <p>Project experts and specialists</p> <p>USDOL officials engaged with CLEARII</p>

	<p><u>Sample questions:</u></p> <p>All countries:</p> <p>Were needs assessments carried out in all countries?</p> <p>How did Nat. Stakeholders participate in the design of project interventions in each country?</p> <p>Do the four areas of support (legal framework, monitoring and enforcement, NAP implementation, social program improvement/CL mainstreaming) and related strategies and activities offered by CLEAR II align with the current priorities of the government? Are there other areas of support that are higher priority/more relevant to current needs? If so, which ones?</p> <p>How do the interventions and activities proposed by CLEAR II fit in with other projects and organizations that support the target country's efforts to fight child labor? Complementary?</p> <p>Nepal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How did the earthquake and recovery and subsequent political unrest affect key national stakeholders needs?</li> <li>• How relevant to stakeholder needs were the following activities: (<i>main activities and products</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Legal Framework Assessment</li> <li>○ Systems Workshop</li> <li>○ Workshop on Draft National Master Plan on Child Labor Elimination</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Burkina</u></p> <p>How have the events of the last two years (2 attempted coups, elections, major deadly terrorist attack) affected government ability to engage effectively on issues affecting the prevalence of child labor in the country? How has it affected national strategies, plans, actions on child labor that started subsequent to the period of unrest?</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>2. What steps is the project taking at the planning stage to ensure government buy-in? (Nepal, Burkina Faso, Liberia).</p> <p>What steps is the project taking regarding implementation (Nepal).</p>	<p>To analyze government officials awareness and engagement interview government officials who have interacted with project, analyze how often meetings have occurred, how deep or superficial discussions have been, analyze whether or not the project has been able to work with all of the most relevant stakeholders. See list of key government agencies involved in programs to combat child labor listed here:</p> <p><a href="https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/burkina-faso">https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/burkina-faso</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/liberia">https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/liberia</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/explore-our-resources/reports/child-labor/nepal">https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/explore-our-resources/reports/child-labor/nepal</a></p> <p>To identify most effective practices, describe various strategies used by project to engage with various government officials (meetings, workshops, joint events, advocacy activities). Analyze outcomes of various strategies in terms of how it has moved the project agenda forward.</p> <p>To identify challenges, interview project personnel (country manager or consultant, backstopping team, project specialists), other organizations working on same or similar issues in target country, and government representatives themselves. Triangulate views.</p> <p><u>Sample questions</u></p> <p>How have the following factors influenced government engagement with the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ relevance of proposed activities to country context</li> <li>○ size of project budget</li> <li>○ track record of project grantees in the target countries or in the area of child labor</li> <li>○ perceptions of the project grantees as an international NGO</li> <li>○ the persons hired by the grantee to represent the</li> </ul>	<p>Document review of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project TPRs</li> <li>• Activity reports</li> <li>• Mission reports</li> </ul>	<p>Target country government representatives (national, municipal, reps of labor inspectorate)</p> <p>Project Management (in country and in DC)</p> <p>Project experts and specialists</p> <p>Other organizations (international, NGO) working on CL in target country</p> <p>To learn more about Burkina Faso NAP, there is no ILO person working on CL in the country.</p>
---	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o project in country</li> <li>o frequency of contact with project team</li> <li>o etc.</li> </ul>		
<p>3. How has the project contributed to broader child labor NAPs and other strategic frameworks related to child labor? (Nepal)</p> <p>In new countries, what opportunities and challenges are there to contribute to NAPs? How open are governments to collaborating on the NAP process? (BF, Liberia)</p>	<p>To determine relevancy, identify and analyze broader child labor NAPs and other strategic frameworks related to child labor in target countries. Look for linkages with actual and planned project interventions.</p> <p>To determine if/how project involvement in the regional action plan improved project design, interview South Asian Initiative to End Violence Against Children (SAIEVAC), participants in regional meeting(s) and assess relevance of CLEAR II contributions and what have been the outcomes to date.</p> <p><u>Sample questions</u></p> <p>Nepal:</p> <p>How has the project addressed concerns raised by Ministry of Labor officials that CLEAR II is overlapping with the ILO in regards to work on NAP? Have CLEAR II and ILO been able to identify complementary actions related to the NAP?</p> <p>How did CLEAR II contribute to the Child Labor Experts Meeting for experts from SAARC country governments? Has there been any follow-up since the meeting? How has CLEAR contributed to follow-up on the meeting?</p> <p>Burkina Faso:</p> <p>How do proposed activities link with existing NAP on CL in Artisan Mining?</p>	<p>National Master Plan 2011-2020 for Nepal</p> <p>National Action Plan to Combat Trafficking and the National Program for the Fight against Child Labor on Artisanal Gold Mining Sites and Quarries (Burkina Faso)</p> <p>National Action Plan to Combat the Worst Forms of Child Labor (PAN/PFTE) (2011–2015)</p> <p>West Africa Regional Action Plan of Child Labour.</p> <p>Regional Action Plan on Child Labor SAARC</p>	<p>South Asian Initiative to End Violence Against Children (SAIEVAC)</p> <p>The South Asia Coordinating Group on Action against Violence against Children (SACG) (see <a href="http://www.saievac.org/">http://www.saievac.org/</a>)</p> <p>Winrock Nepal Country Coordinator</p> <p>Stakeholders in Nepal who participated in regional activity (ies)</p> <p>Directorate to Combat Child Labor (MOL)</p> <p>PAN/PFTE National Coordinating Committee</p>
<p>4. Is there validity in the strategy/approach of focusing on predetermined thematic areas in multiple countries, with smaller budgets and scope in each country, as compared to the more traditional comprehensive child</p>	<p>To determine validity of the strategy/approach of focusing on predetermined thematic areas in multiple countries, with smaller budgets and scope in each country, assess relevance of thematic areas to stakeholders (question 1). Is the project equally relevant to the needs of stakeholders in each country? How are they similar? How are they different? Does the range of strategies available to the project allow it</p>		<p>Target country government representatives</p> <p>Project Management (in country and in DC)</p>

<p>labor strategies that are implemented in specific countries?</p>	<p>to adapt to the differences in each country?</p> <p>Assess real or potential outcomes of traditional comprehensive child labor strategies (based on evaluators', Winrock personnel, host government reps, and other key informants' knowledge and experience).</p> <p>Analyze pros and cons of limited engagement in target countries. Analyze pros and cons of traditional comprehensive CL strategies. Compare and contrast.</p> <p><u>Sample questions</u></p> <p>Are there factors that affect the potential success of capacity building related to legal framework, law enforcement, NAP implementation, CL mainstreaming in Social Programs that are specific/unique to each country? What are they? How should project strategies differ to effectively address these?</p> <p>Are there basic preconditions for a successful government capacity building program that more or less apply to all countries? If so, what are they?</p> <p>How has the size of the project budget affected its relevance? How has the scope of the project affected its relevance?</p> <p>How would having a direct action component in addition to the "upstream" activities have affected project implementation and potential outcomes related to policy, programs, and monitoring, referral and enforcement? Justify answer.</p> <p>How would focusing on a specific sector or sectors in which child labor is prevalent in a more comprehensive way affect project implementation and potential outcomes related to policy, programs and monitoring, referral and enforcement?</p> <p>How does this project compare with other, more comprehensive projects on child labor that have been</p>		<p>Project experts and specialists</p> <p>Other organizations (international, NGO) working on CL in target country</p>
---	---	--	--

	implemented in the target country in terms of progress and outcomes? What are the main factors that contribute to the differences?		
5. Are the Theory of Change and Results Framework still valid since implementation has begun? Is a single Theory of Change and Results Framework relevant for all project countries? <b>Nepal, BF, Liberia (mainly second part of question)</b>	<p>To assess validity of ToC and RF, review presentation of original ToC and RF in project document and CMEP and compare with what has emerged as stakeholder priorities, key issues in the country</p> <p>Describe the “menu” of services, interventions, activities that Winrock planned to offer to host country governments to build their capacity to combat CL and the rationale for each one</p> <p>Have new services, interventions and activities been added to this menu to address issues that have arisen since the start of implementation?</p> <p>How flexible has the project framework been to allow for new types on interventions that were not originally planned? How flexible has USDOL been in granting approval?</p> <p>To what extent has the types of interventions and activities being offered by CLEAR II contributed to slow progress in target countries? To adding new countries? Is there a problem finding countries that need this type of assistance? What other issues need to be considered?</p>	<p>Document review of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Document</li> <li>• Project CMEP</li> <li>• Project initial work plan and annual work plans</li> <li>• Project TPRs</li> </ul>	<p>Target country government representatives (national, municipal, reps of labor inspectorate)</p> <p>Project Management (in country and in DC)</p> <p>Project experts and specialists</p> <p>USDOL officials engaged with CLEARII</p>
<b>Project Effectiveness</b>			
6. What has contributed to delays in naming new countries to the project and beginning implementation? How can the country selection process be improved? <b>(Bhutan, Mozambique, Liberia, DC)</b>	<p>To determine why adding new countries to the project has been slower than anticipated:</p> <p>Ask USDOL and Winrock to explain criteria and process for identifying and approving additional countries.</p> <p>Analyze process actually followed to date when attempting to add additional countries. Where are the bottlenecks? What are the reasons for failure?</p>	<p>Project initial work plan and annual work plans</p> <p>Project TPRs</p>	<p>CLEAR II project management in DC</p> <p>CLEAR II experts</p> <p>USDOL officials engaged in project</p>

	<p>Identify alternative criteria or processes. Analyze how applying these could potentially result in improvements.</p> <p><u>Sample questions</u></p> <p>What are the main criteria used by USDOL for selecting/approving a country to be added to CLEAR II?</p> <p>Is it necessary/important that CLEAR II potentially engages with the host government on all four thematic areas? What are the factors that contribute to potential success by thematic area?</p> <p>What is the process followed to add a country to CLEAR II? What steps in the process have been slow to date?</p> <p>What are the main reasons that countries that were proposed to be added to CLEAR II were eventually rejected? Honduras, Mozambique, Panama, Sierra Leone and Jamaica. Bhutan, Colombia and South Africa.</p> <p>Based on experience to date, what should be the most important criteria for selecting new countries?</p> <p>Are there common factors that should potentially disqualify a country from being considered? What are they?</p> <p>What is the process for dropping a country from the project? What are the consequences of dropping a country once it has been added?</p>		
<p>7. By the time of the evaluation, is the project achieving its targets according to planned in the latest TPR? (Nepal)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use table to compare project actual achievements with targets.</li> <li>○ In narrative, provide overview of progress in each component.</li> <li>○ Provide brief description of status of activities linked to the achievement of targets and future plans.</li> <li>○ Based on progress to date, assess likelihood of targets being achieved in the time remaining in the project.</li> </ul>	<p>Document review of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Project Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP)</li> <li>● Project TPRs</li> </ul>	<p>Target country government representatives</p> <p>Project Management (in country and in DC)</p>

<p>8. What are the current challenges that the project is facing in its planning and implementation, including securing government engagement, and what efforts have been made to overcome these challenges? (Nepal, Burkina Faso, Liberia, Honduras)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To determine contextual factors influencing project performance,</li> <li>○ Review key documents: Project TPRs (especially county information and developments, problems and solutions)</li> <li>○ Background material on major social, economic, and political events in target countries. How did these affect stakeholder commitment to project implementation</li> <li>○ Conduct interviews with main partners and key informants</li> </ul> <p><u>Sample questions:</u></p> <p>What have been the challenges in the country operating environment during project implementation period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Elections and political change?</li> <li>○ Political unrest?</li> <li>○ Natural disaster?</li> <li>○ Has there been frequent turnover of key project government counterparts? Which ones? How frequent the turnover?</li> </ul> <p>How have these affected project implementation?</p>	<p>Document review of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Project PMP</li> <li>● Project initial work plan and annual work plans</li> <li>● Project TPRs</li> </ul>	<p>Target country government representatives</p> <p>Project Management (in country and in DC)</p> <p>Project experts and specialists</p> <p>Other organizations (international, NGO) working on CL in target country</p>
<p>9. Of the four project component areas, which are more challenging or difficult to address and why? (Nepal)</p>	<p>Assess specific challenges experienced by the project when trying to address the following four component areas.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Harmonizing Legislation, regulations and directives/guidelines related to CL with ILS</li> <li>2. Improving Monitoring and enforcement of policies, legislation and regulations related to CL</li> <li>3. Implementing National Action Plans (NAP) on Child Labor, including WFCL</li> <li>4. Improving Social programs, policies and/or services improved to address CL, including WFCL</li> </ol> <p>For each country, what are the factors that may contribute to potential success/failure by thematic area?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project TPRs</li> <li>○ Relevant assessments</li> <li>○ Activity reports</li> </ul>	<p>CLEAR II project management team</p> <p>CLEAR II country coordinators and consultants</p> <p>Other key stakeholders in each country who may have an informed opinion</p>

<p>10. How has the International Advisory Council supported the project to achieve outcomes?</p>	<p>To determine how the IAC has supported project outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess progress identifying appropriate members of Council.</li> <li>• If/how they have engaged with CLEAR II</li> <li>• Relevance of engagement in terms of assisting the project to make progress against its objectives and outcomes.</li> </ul> <p><u>Sample questions</u></p> <p>In what ways did CLEAR II anticipate it would be able to engage IAC members in project implementation?</p> <p>How did you go about identifying potential members of the IAC? What were your selection criteria?</p> <p>What challenges has CLEAR II experience in adding members to the Council?</p> <p>What challenges has CLEAR II experienced in involving members of the Council in the project? What are the main strategies it has used to date?</p> <p>How have you documented IAC contributions?</p> <p>Have there been any success stories regarding the IAC?</p> <p>Based on your experience to date, would you/how would you change the project strategy for engaging IAC members?</p> <p>For IAC members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why did you accept to be a member?</li> <li>○ What commitments did you make when you accepted?</li> <li>○ Have you been able to respect your commitments? Why or why not?</li> <li>○ How do you think CLEAR II might improve how it engages with members of the IAC?</li> </ul>	<p>List of IAC members and their bios</p>	<p>CLEAR II Project Management team</p> <p>If relevant, national stakeholders who have engaged with a member of the IAC</p> <p>IAC members</p>
--	--	---	--

<p>11. At the country level, how does the project (intend to) work with other international and non-profit organizations also working on child labor related issues? (all countries)</p> <p>How effectively has the project coordinated key stakeholders working on child labor issues to contribute to project objectives? (Nepal)</p>	<p>To determine how the project is working with other international and non-profit organizations also working on child labor related issues,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify the organizations that fit this profile in the countries visited by the evaluation team.</li> <li>○ Consult with them and in-country project management about collaboration to date.</li> <li>○ Assess relevance of collaboration to project objectives.</li> <li>○ ** These organizations may also be used by the evaluation team as key informants to understand contextual factors that support or hinder project efforts to date.</li> </ul> <p><u>Sample questions</u></p> <p>How familiar are you with the objectives of CLEAR II? How relevant is the project to the objectives of your organization?</p> <p>Is CLEAR II complementary to your activities? How?</p> <p>Are there opportunities for collaboration between your organization and CLEAR II? Have these opportunities been exploited? In not, why not? If so, how?</p> <p>What are examples of collaboration between your organization and CLEAR II to date? How satisfied are you with the quality and quantity of collaboration?</p>	<p>Project TPRs</p> <p>Activity reports</p>	<p>Relevant international and non-profit organizations in each country</p>
<p>12. Is the Global Learning Platform (GLP) a relevant strategy to facilitate knowledge sharing and cross-country learning? Based on progress to date, are there ways the design of the portal might be improved. If so, how?</p>	<p><a href="http://www.winrock-clearii-glp.org/">www.winrock-clearii-glp.org/</a></p> <p>To assess relevance of strategy for knowledge sharing and cross country learning,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Find out if/how the platform is currently being used by its target audience.</li> <li>● What services are offered through the platform?</li> <li>● How many resources? How great the range of documents? Are these documents easily accessible to users elsewhere?</li> </ul>	<p>Platform design documents</p> <p>The website</p>	<p>Clear II project management team</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How users and potential users perceive the platform? (do they think it is/could be useful to them?)</li> </ul> <p>To assess how to improve:</p> <p>Identify good practices in online knowledge sharing strategies and see where are the GLP gaps§</p> <p><u>Sample questions:</u></p> <p>In countries visited by Evaluation Team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are you aware of the Global Learning Platform developed by the project?</li> <li>• How did you hear about it?</li> <li>• Have you visited the platform? Is it useful to you? If so, how?</li> </ul> <p><u>WINROCK DC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Who is responsible for managing the portal?</li> <li>○ How many resources are currently hosted on the portal?</li> <li>○ Besides access to resources, what other services are offered through the portal?</li> <li>○ Are statistics available on the number of monthly views since the portal went online?</li> <li>○ Are statistics available about where users come from, the amount of time they spend on the site (usually available from google analytics)</li> <li>○ How has the project promoted the portal to its potential users?</li> <li>○ What are your plans for developing the platform between now and the end of the project?</li> <li>○ What are the plans for sustaining the platform post project?</li> </ul>		
<b>Efficiency of Resource Use</b>			
13 How does the management structure, with key personnel	To determine how the project management structure, with key personnel housed in Washington D.C., has influenced		CLEAR II project management

<p>housed in Washington, D.C., impact project results at the country-level? (Nepal, Burkina Faso, Liberia, Honduras)</p>	<p>project results at the country level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Assess the roles of key personnel based in DC</li> <li>○ Which are the key project deliverables to which they have contributed to date?</li> <li>○ How great was their contribution to these deliverables?</li> <li>○ What was the nature of their contribution?</li> <li>○ How much of their time is dedicated to/paid for by the project?</li> <li>○ How much of their time has been spent in target countries?</li> <li>○ How have project specialists invested their time during the first half of the project with only one country really operational?</li> <li>○ How will the project manage available resources if/when the number of countries increases?</li> </ul> <p>Assess perceived need for their expertise/backstopping in target countries for actual or planned key interventions by in country staff and key project counterparts?</p> <p><u>Sample questions:</u></p> <p>For in country staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What have been the main contributions of DC based personnel to project implementation to date?</li> <li>○ What types of backstopping support do you receive from project management staff in DC</li> <li>○ How effective has their support been to date?</li> <li>○ Are there areas for improvement?</li> <li>○ Are there alternative management structures that might have been more effective?</li> </ul> <p>For key national stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Who has been your main counterpart with</li> </ul>		<p>team</p> <p>USDOL</p> <p>CLEAR II country coordinators/consultants</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>CLEAR II for project planning and coordination?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How often have you interacted with the CLEAR II project management team in Washington?</li> <li>○ How do you perceive their contributions to project activities to date?</li> <li>○ Are the areas for improvement?</li> </ul>		
14. Was the CMEP useful as a planning and project monitoring tool? How has the M&E system been used to provide evidence on project outcomes and progress? (Nepal, DC)	<p>To determine utility of CMEP as planning and project monitoring tool, assess</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How participants in CMEP workshops perceived the process of elaborating the plan</li> <li>○ If/how the process for developing the plan or the plan itself affected project planning</li> <li>○ If/how the CMEP PMP has been used for project monitoring</li> <li>○ Relevance of indicators to provide evidence of project outcomes to date</li> </ul>		CLEAR II project management and experts (in DC and in country)
15. Were the selected indicators effective for project performance management of capacity building projects? Were targets realistic? How can target-setting be improved? (Nepal, DC)	<p>So far this question only appears to apply to Nepal and global outputs since no targets have been set for other countries.</p>		CLEAR II project management and experts (in DC and in country)
<b>Sustainability</b>			
16. What steps toward sustainability have been taken so far, and what else can be done to maximize handover and sustainability? (Nepal, DC)	<p>To determine what steps toward sustainability the project has taken so far, assess how CLEAR II has encourage engagement, ownership and responsibility for activities to date.</p> <p><u>Sample questions</u></p> <p>For key national stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What do you think will remain from CLEAR II after the project is closed?</li> <li>○ In Nepal, to what extent do you think that the legislative analysis and table of proposed legal changes to Child Labor Laws will be used to</li> </ul>	Project TPRs	<p>Target country government representatives (national, municipal, reps of labor inspectorate)</p> <p>Project Management (in country and in DC)</p> <p>Project experts and specialists</p> <p>USDOL officials engaged with CLEARII</p>

	<p>guide national stakeholder efforts to strengthen the legal framework on CL beyond the project implementation period?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o In Nepal, to what extent do you think the labor inspectorate curriculum will be used to train new labor inspectors on child labor related issues and processes?</li> </ul> <p>For CLEAR II project managers and experts:</p> <p>What will happen to the Global Learning Platform once the project is concluded?</p> <p>Is there any role imagined for the IAC once the project is concluded?</p>		
<p>17. Are the project outcomes and sub-outcomes sustainable at the local and/or national level?<sup>26</sup> Please identify steps that can be taken to increase their sustainability. (Nepal)</p>	<p>Identify project outcomes and sub-outcomes (in Nepal – what has been accomplished or is likely to be accomplished)</p> <p>In BF and Liberia, what is currently proposed to be accomplished)</p> <p>Analyze</p> <p><u>Institutional sustainability</u>: have the relevant institutions engaged with the project in implementation, are relevant people in government supportive</p> <p><u>Technical sustainability</u>: are the proposed strategies for sustaining the outcomes technically sound? Are the people who are supposed to carry out required actions technically prepared?</p>		<p>Target country government representatives (national, municipal, reps of labor inspectorate)</p> <p>Project Management (in country and in DC)</p> <p>Project experts and specialists</p> <p>USDOL officials engaged with CLEARII</p>

---

<sup>26</sup> It is understood that this question can be answered only to the extent that the project has assessed its outcomes and sub-outcomes. This evaluation is not a formal impact assessment.

	<p><u>Financial sustainability</u>: How likely is it the adequate resources will be made available for needed actions?</p> <p>What should be done between now and the end of the project to strengthen potential sustainability?</p>		
--	--	--	--

## ANNEX 4: List of Documents Reviewed

---

- CLEAR II, 2015: Assessment of the Nepal Labor Inspectorate's Work on Child Labor
- CLEAR II, April 2015: Launch workshop report, Nepal
- CLEAR II, August 2015: Pre-Situational Assessment of Child Labor Related Issues: Nepal
- CLEAR II, August 2016: Preliminary findings of assessment on Mainstreaming child labor and child trafficking issues in social programs with DMP of Dhulikhel Municipality
- CLEAR II, August 2016: Report. Workshop on Coordination and Collaboration between Department of Labor and Stakeholders on Addressing Child Labor, Nepal
- CLEAR II, December 2015, Private Sector Pilot Research, Nepal
- CLEAR II, December 2016, CLMS Penauti CLMS Stakeholder analysis
- CLEAR II, June 2015: Proposed Post Disaster Recovery and Reconstruction Activities, Nepal
- CLEAR II, June 2016: Nepal Child Labor Monitoring System, Nepal case study discussion note
- CLEAR II, March 2016: Nepal Baseline Child Labor Capacity Score
- CLEAR II, May 2016: Preliminary findings of assessment on Mainstreaming child labor and child trafficking issues in social programs with DMP of Penauti Municipality
- CLEAR II, no date: Child Labor Monitoring System, Concept Note and Recommendation Memo, Panauti Municipality
- CLEAR II, no date: CLEAR II Results Framework Activities– Nepal
- CLEAR II, no date: CLEAR II Results Framework with Indicators – NEPAL
- CLEAR II, no date: Concept Note: Cooperative Training on Prosecution of Child Labor in Nepal
- CLEAR II, no date: Present/Existing System of Monitoring and follow up of child labor in Panauti Municipality
- CLEAR II: CLEAR II Prodoc
- CLEAR II: CMEP
- CLEAR II: Technical Progress Reports from 2015 and 2016
- GoN, 2000, Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 2000
- GoN, 2004, Ministry of Labour and Transport Management. National Master Plan on Child Labour (2004-2014), Kathmandu, 2004.
- GoN, Ministry of Labour and Employment (2011). National Master Plan on Elimination of Child Labour (2011-2020), Kathmandu, 2011.

- ILO 2013 and 2015: ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) 103TH Session (2013) and 104th ILC session (2015)
- ILO 2013: Draft Amendment related to Child Labour (Regulation and Prohibition) Act, 2000, Kathmandu
- ILO ACHIEVE, 2015: Proposed amendments to Child Labour Act, Kathmandu (in Nepali)
- Jeddere-Fisher, 2016. Final Evaluation of the ILO project: Towards Achieving the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour as priority (ACHIEVE)
- LWOB, 2015: An Assessment of Child Labor Issues in Nepal
- LWOB, 2015: Table of Proposed Legal Changes to Child Labor Law (Nepal)
- LWOB, 2016: Nepal Child Protection Graphic Novel
- LWOB, no date: Survey of Post-Disaster Best Practices to Prevent Child Labor
- LWOB, 2015: Child Labor Definitions: Rapid Reference Card
- Penauti Municipality, no date: DRM Plan, Penauti Municipality, draft
- SAIEVAC 2016. Regional Action Plan for the Prevention and Elimination of All Forms of Child Labour in South Asia 2016 – 2021
- USDOL 2013, 2014 and 2015: Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor
- The twin challenges of child labour and educational marginalization in the ECOWAS region. ILO-UCW (no date)
- ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) 103TH Session (2013) and 104th ILC session (2015)
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics 2010-2012
- Burkina Faso. National Education Profile 2014 Update. UNESCO
- UNICEF Data: Monitoring the Situation of Children and Women
- Labor Inspection Assessment in Burkina Faso. Lawyers Without Borders. (no date)
- An Assessment of Child Labor Issues in Burkina Faso. Lawyers Without Borders. (no date)
- 2015 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor, US Department of Labor.
- CLEAR II - Memo - Proposal to DOL on Burkina Faso Limited Engagement. December 2015
- CLEAR II Memo - Burkina Faso Additional Recommendations for Engagement November 2016
- Mid-term evaluation report of the USDOL funded project R-CLES.
- World Report on Child Labour 2015. Paving the way to decent work for young people. International Labour Organization 2015

## **ANNEX 5: Schedule of Field Visits and Other Stakeholder Meetings**

---

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

## **ANNEX 6: Stakeholder Workshop Agenda and Participants**

---

### **Independent Interim Evaluation of the project “Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II (CLEAR II)”**

Stakeholder Workshop

Crystal City, VA

17 March 2017

9:00-10:00 Presentation of Preliminary Findings: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability

Recommendations

10-12:00 Discussion

## **ANNEX 7: Good Practice Case Study**

---

### **Good practice – The process of support to incorporate child labor and child trafficking prevention in the Penauti Municipality Disaster Management Plan**

#### Context

In April 2015, a 7.8 earthquake struck Nepal, killing over 9,000 people and injuring many more. There were numerous aftershocks including one of 7.3 in May resulting in further casualties. In the period following such natural disasters there are significant risks to children that may increase their vulnerability to child labor and to child trafficking. The Nepal CLEAR II team looked for opportunities to assist the response to the recovery and reconstruction work in ways that were compatible with its agreed objectives.

Penauti Municipality, 23 Km to the East of Kathmandu, already had some awareness on child labor elimination, having received support from ILO's ACHIEVE project for the declaration of child labor-free wards. Penauti is 'on the road to Kathmandu' and is therefore both a destination and a transit point for child laborers and children being trafficked.

Penauti did already have a Disaster Management Plan, although the time period had expired.

During this period Nepal was also going through a significant political transformation, with a new constitution promulgated in September 2015. This was both preceded and followed by sometimes violent protests and included a blockade on the Indian border for four months that resulted in an acute fuel shortage. The protests and the fuel shortage had a negative impact on the timeline of the process described below.

#### The process

After some quick needs assessment, the project team submitted a proposal in early July to USDOL with the following objectives:

- To build capacity of officials in selected municipalities to extend protection to children at risk of trafficking and child labor through existing social programs;
- To build capacity of the municipalities to prevent child labor and trafficking by assisting in the creation of Disaster Response plans or mainstreaming protection into existing plans.

USDOL approved these activities on July 14<sup>th</sup> and the team began visiting relevant stakeholders in two municipalities in order to conduct initial talks on their priorities for child protection, their resources and capacity to address those issues, and the content of their existing Disaster Response Plans.

On 24<sup>th</sup> September 2015, The CLEAR II team participated in a planning meeting with officials from Penauti Municipality to discuss the possibility of including child protection issues, including child

labor and child trafficking, into the Municipality disaster management plan. The District Child Rights Officer and NGO representatives also participated in the meeting.

Penauti Municipality made a formal request to the project to support them in mainstreaming child labor and child trafficking prevention and protection in February 2016.

The project carried out a study and analysis through a desk review and through consultations with key personnel in order to identify gaps in the existing DMP in regard to child labor and child trafficking issues. The findings from this study were written up as the 'Gap Analysis Report' in May 2016.

During this period the project also prepared a memo on 'Best Practices in child protection in post-disaster situations'. This briefly surveys six tools that can be used by local and regional stakeholders in advance of and following a disaster: (1) the development of "safe spaces" for children; (2) temporary and non-formal education; (3) increased documentation of children; (4) training workshops and public education campaigns; (5) child labor monitoring; and (6) increased border security. The memo also offers recommendations for local or regional stakeholders to implement the best practices learned from each example.

The Gap analysis was presented to a small working group of staff from Penauti Municipality and the project, together with an advisor from National Society for Earthquake Technology-Nepal in May 2016. This meeting resulted in a draft DMP including elements to respond to child labor and child trafficking vulnerabilities and in an action plan to take this draft forwards for submission and endorsement by the Municipality.

Following this, a final draft of the DMP for the period 2017 - 2022 has been prepared by the Municipality team including budget allocations and is now ready to be presented to the Penauti Municipality Board (the officers of the municipality) and then to the Municipality Council (the elected/appointed members of the municipality).

#### Key characteristics of this good practice

- The proposed support was in response to a clearly identified need;
- Penauti Municipality had already taken some steps regarding child labor elimination and in preparing a previous DMP;
- The interactive nature of the process built trust, confidence and understanding among the key staff in the municipality;
- Responsibility for action remained with the municipality throughout.