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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Labor Law Compliance Program in Central America and the Dominican Republic, also known as the Cumple y Gana project, aimed to increase compliance with national labor laws and norms in Central America and the Dominican Republic. The project was funded by the United States Department of Labor, International Labor Affairs Bureau (USDOL/ILAB) and awarded to the Costa Rican-based NGO, Foundation for Peace and Democracy (FUNPADEM), with Abt Associates as a subcontractor.

The project consisted of two phases. Phase 1 was implemented from September 30, 2003 to September 30, 2007 in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. In September 2004, Panama and the Dominican Republic were incorporated into the project. With the passage of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR), Congress committed additional funding to the U.S. Department of State for projects to improve labor law compliance in CAFTA-DR countries. As a result, USDOL extended the Cumple y Gana (CyG) project into a second phase, running from June 15, 2006 to September 30, 2008. Phase 2 covered the same countries, except Panama and Costa Rica.

During Phase 1, the project implemented three components: public awareness, inspection, and mediation/conciliation. During Phase 2, these same activities were extended to geographic regions outside the capital cities. In addition, a fourth component targeting women’s labor rights was added.

This final evaluation reviews and assesses all activities carried out during Phase 2 of the Cumple y Gana project. It focuses on the achievements of the project toward reaching its targets and objectives for Phase 2; however, the analysis of the project’s impact cannot be separated from the foundation built during Phase 1. This evaluation identifies project strengths and weaknesses; presents the benefits accrued to the target groups; confirms the implementation of midterm recommendations; identifies lessons learned and best practices in a regional context; and assesses the challenges and opportunities for ensuring sustainability of initiatives begun with this project.

The evaluation revealed that the Cumple y Gana project has successfully put into place all of the components (described below) that are necessary for a comprehensive system that can lead to increased compliance with national labor laws in each of the targeted countries. There were, however, difficulties measuring the impact of the project, due to deficiencies with the project monitoring tools and the application of these tools in monitoring progress towards achieving the immediate objectives. Despite these deficiencies, the qualitative information gathered in this evaluation, combined with the available quantitative information collected, show that the project components carried out in Phase 2 have contributed to achieving the development objective. These project components include the following:

1. **Labor Inspection** activities that have increased the efficiency and reliability of Ministry of Labor (MOL) inspection systems in order to effectively enforce national labor laws.

2. **Alternative Dispute Resolution** (ADR) activities that have improved and expanded alternative mediation and conciliation services for labor conflict resolution.
3. **Public Awareness** activities that have helped increase understanding of national labor laws among target populations in each country.

4. **Women’s Labor Rights** activities that have strengthened mechanisms that promote and protect women workers.

A series of lessons have emerged from the project findings and accomplishments. These lessons should serve as guidelines in the planning of future projects. Key lessons learned include the following:

1. A multifaceted approach is the most effective project design. This includes working with government, labor, and employer sectors, and providing a combination of tangible products as well as technical assistance for longer-term institutional change. The tangible products include equipment and infrastructure improvements for the MOLs, as well as educational materials available to government, employer, and labor sectors. Technical assistance leading to longer-term institutional change within the MOLs includes designing and implementing electronic case management systems, establishing internal procedures, and designing and implementing training programs.

2. The tripartite process of designing, validating, and implementing major project activities or products has proven to be a valuable framework by which to create buy-in and develop relationships with project stakeholders.

3. An excellent organizational model for implementing a regional project is to establish an office that can offer regional oversight, coordination, and evaluation of activities among countries, in combination with a local office/representative in each country that can offer leadership in executing the project activities within the local context.

4. Five years is an insufficient amount of time to establish a regional labor law compliance program, implement activities with tripartite stakeholders, and evaluate the impact on national labor law compliance. Regional projects that establish a strategic objective of long-term institutional and social change require no less than 7 years to effectively implement program activities and evaluate their corresponding impact.

5. Two years is a woefully inadequate amount of time to design and implement activities related to strengthening mechanisms that promote and protect women’s labor rights. A complex subject such as this, that has received little attention in the past, requires years of technical support and effort to effectively implement and institutionalize program activities and evaluate their corresponding impact.

Based on the aforementioned project accomplishments and lessons learned, it is recommended that future additional funding be considered to ensure institutionalization of program activities and evaluation of their corresponding impact.
I. INTRODUCTION

This is the final evaluation report for Phase 2 of the Labor Law Compliance Program in Central America and the Dominican Republic, commonly referred to as Proyecto Cumple y Gana (the Comply and Win Project). The project is funded by the United States Department of Labor, International Labor Affairs Bureau (USDOL/ILAB) and implemented by the Foundation for Peace and Democracy (Fundación para la Paz y la Democracia—FUNPADEM).¹ While the findings of this report focus on the activities of the Phase 2 project, the analysis of the project’s impact cannot be separated from the foundation built during Phase 1 of the project. Therefore, the following project description offers the necessary background information to understand the Cumple y Gana project as a whole.

¹ Created in 1988, FUNPADEM is a nongovernmental organization dedicated to sustainable human development in Central America and based in San José de Costa Rica.
II. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Description

At the time that Cumple y Gana (CyG) was initially funded in September 2003, the United States and five Central American countries (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua) were engaged in negotiations toward a comprehensive free trade agreement. As part of the agreement, the United States sought increased commitment from the Central American countries to effectively enforce their respective national labor laws and to educate employers and workers about their obligations and rights under such laws.

In response, the Central American countries requested technical and financial assistance from the United States to enable them to strengthen the capacity of their Ministries of Labor (MOLs) to meet these goals. Among the specific areas identified by the countries for technical assistance were the promotion and dissemination of information on national labor laws, particularly among workers and employers; strengthening of labor inspection systems; and developing and strengthening alternative dispute resolution systems.

The U.S. Department of Labor provided $6.49 million to fund the Cumple y Gana project, which would help Central American countries improve compliance with their national labor laws. The project was awarded to the Costa Rican-based NGO, FUNPADEM, with Abt Associates as a subcontractor. The initial project duration was from September 30, 2003 through September 30, 2007. In September 2004, USDOL added an additional $2 million to incorporate Panama and the Dominican Republic (DR) into the project, following their inclusion in the free trade negotiations.

Following passage of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR) in July 2005, Congress committed additional funding to the U.S. Department of State for projects that would further improve labor law compliance in CAFTA-DR countries. The funds were intended to support areas outlined in the 2005 Vice Ministers’ White Paper. With $6.5 million received from the Department of State, USDOL extended the Cumple y Gana project for two additional years (from June 15, 2006 to September 30, 2008). This extension, known as ‘Phase 2,’ added a component which looked at the labor rights of women and extended ‘Phase 1’ activities to additional geographic areas within the targeted countries. This extension involved the same countries as the initial project, with the exception of Panama and Costa Rica, which both closed at the end of Phase 1 for specific legal and political reasons. In August 2008, USDOL approved a no-cost extension for Phase 2. With the no-cost extension the project will finish on February 28, 2009 (instead of September 30, 2008).

The four components of CyG Phase 2, their immediate objectives, and the major products (deliverables) as they relate to the Phase 2 countries, are described in Table 1 below:

---

2 Founded in 1965 and based in Bethesda Maryland, Abt Associates Inc is one of the largest for-profit government and business research and consulting firms in the world.

3 Vice Ministers’ Working Group Responsible for Trade and Labor in Central America and the DR. The Labor Dimension in Central America and the DR—Building on Progress: Strengthening Compliance and Enhancing Capacity. April 2005.

Table 1: CyG Phase 2—Project Components, Immediate Objectives, and Major Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Components</th>
<th>Immediate Objectives</th>
<th>Major Products</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Public Awareness   | Increased awareness among target audiences of workers and employers in each country about national labor laws and norms (and means to access them). | • Public awareness activities in the different countries at national and regional levels  
• Training activities with a multiplier effect executed in the three sectors (public, private, labor)   
• Information mechanisms and/or call centers established and strengthened in the MOLs  
• Interactive webpage established, developed, and promoted. |
| Inspection         | Increased efficiency and trustworthiness of nationwide MOL inspection systems with regard to compliance with national labor laws and norms. | • Electronic case management systems strengthened at central levels and extended to selected regional levels  
• Improved inspection management at central and regional levels  
• Self-evaluation checklists designed and distributed  
• Training module for inspectors developed and in use. |
| Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) | Improved and expanded mediation and conciliation (M/C) services in the resolution of labor conflicts. | • Pilot experiences of ADR in private organizations implemented in some countries  
• Improved M/C management, including electronic case management systems, improvements in workspaces, or improved service  
• Conciliators/Mediators, employers and workers in the capitals trained in collective conflict resolution  
• Conciliators/Mediators in the regional offices trained in the resolution of labor conflicts. |
| Women’s Labor Rights from a Gender Perspective | Strengthened mechanisms to protect and promote women’s labor rights. | • Workers trained on gender discrimination in the workplace and how to exercise their labor rights  
• MOL inspectors trained in the application of labor laws pertaining to gender discrimination and how to utilize inspection instruments to verify compliance  
• Conciliators/mediators sensitized to gender issues in the process of conciliation  
• Strengthened MOL offices that promote women’s labor rights. |

B. Purpose of Evaluation

The purpose of the final evaluation of Phase 2 of the CyG project was to determine whether the project met its goals of increasing labor law compliance and awareness in the targeted countries and to ascertain whether the project succeeded in strengthening mechanisms for promoting and protecting women’s labor rights. Specifically, the evaluation sought to address the following questions as they relate to Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, and Honduras:
1. Were the stakeholders aware of and committed to the project’s objectives, approach, and activities?

2. Did the project achieve its Phase 2 goals of reaching wider audiences, both geographically and with different target groups?

3. Which targeted groups benefited more from the project’s activities and which were less impacted?

4. To what extent were the project objectives of increasing labor inspection systems, promoting awareness of labor laws, improving use of conciliation and mediation, and promoting and protecting labor rights from a gender perspective achieved?

5. Did the project meet its deadlines and produce the deliverables within budget? If not, what were the obstacles?

6. Will the project objectives and initiatives likely be sustainable in each country? If not, what are the barriers?

7. How effective was the system for monitoring project performance?

8. What lessons have been learned from this project that can inform future projects?

C. Evaluation Methods

The evaluation team used three methods to answer the evaluation questions, including interviews with key individuals, field visits to each country, and a questionnaire administered to the country facilitator in Nicaragua (the only country not visited in this evaluation).

As part of their preparation for the evaluation, the evaluators reviewed a number of documents and reports including the project document, the project monitoring plan, technical progress and status reports, data tracking tables, country plans, the two previous midterm and final evaluation reports conducted during Phase 1 and 2, and documents prepared by CyG project staff specifically for the evaluators. In addition, a telephone conference facilitated by Macro International Inc. (Macro) was held with staff from USDOL to clarify the Terms of Reference, determine dates for field visits, and exchange expectations and concerns about the evaluation. The evaluators designed the instruments for data collection during this period.

The evaluators began their field visits with the participating project countries at the end of October 2008. Interviews with project stakeholders took place in the Dominican Republic (October 27-28), Honduras (October 29-31), El Salvador (November 3-4), and Guatemala (November 5-7). Interviews with FUNPADEM project staff were held in Costa Rica on October 24 and 25. A debriefing meeting took place in Costa Rica on November 10, 2008 to present preliminary findings and clarify outstanding issues.
Data collection techniques in the field included—

1. **Individual and group interviews** with vice-ministers of labor, department directors, and supervisors in the Ministries of Labor, inspectors, representatives of worker and employer organizations, NGO representatives, educational institutions, FUNPADEM/Abt project staff in Costa Rica, country facilitators, U.S. Embassy labor attaches, and USDOL project managers.

2. **Stakeholder Meeting:** On November 10, 2008 a debriefing meeting was held with the FUNPADEM/Abt project team in Costa Rica, as well as via a telephone conference call with USDOL project staff, Abt representatives, and country facilitators. During this meeting, the evaluators presented their preliminary findings and conclusions with the objective of clarifying outstanding issues.

3. **Questionnaire:** The evaluators e-mailed evaluation questions to the country facilitator in Nicaragua to integrate her experience into the overall recommendations for the project (see Annex C for Country Facilitator Interview Protocol).

4. **Telephone interviews:** The evaluators conducted two telephone interviews with USDOL/ILAB project staff, former ILAB staff, and the Women’s Labor Rights component coordinator.

A total number of 94 stakeholders, Cumple y Gana project staff, and USDOL/ILAB staff (and former staff) were interviewed (individually or in small groups) in five countries (Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, and the United States), as well as through one electronic survey conducted in Nicaragua. Of these 94, 10 are CyG staff, 50 are MOL officials, 20 are members of workers associations, 4 are members of employer groups, 6 work in collaborating agencies, and 4 are representatives from the U.S. Government. (Please refer to Annex D for a list of persons interviewed, and Annex E for a table of persons interviewed, disaggregated by country and sector represented.)

**LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION**

A constraint for the evaluation was insufficient time to carry out the fieldwork (2-3 working days for each country visited). Considering the dimension of this project (in terms of geographic size as well as number of components and stakeholders), more time in each country (preferably 4-5 complete working days) would have allowed the evaluators to conduct more thorough interviews with stakeholders regarding the evaluation issues, and a more profound technical review of the components, products, and activities. Due to the short notice by which the evaluation interviews were set up, interviews in two of the four countries visited did not include employer representation.

The overall scope of the evaluation focused on an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the project processes (how the project planned, implemented, and evaluated the project activities) in each of the countries visited. It does not include an in-depth technical review (i.e., appropriateness, accuracy, completeness) of project components, educational materials, nor
budgetary matters. As this is a final evaluation, the evaluators gave special emphasis to documenting the sustainability of project activities, as well as lessons learned for future projects.

D. Project Status

The midterm evaluation conducted in September 2005\(^5\) reviewed the Phase 1 project implementation performance. Overall, this was found to be satisfactory, although there had been considerable delays in the execution of key activities that were mostly due to the slowness of labor ministry decisionmaking and approval processes. The midterm evaluation found that the project’s key achievement was in setting up a tripartite approach in all seven countries, forming the foundation for implementing activities in the three project components. One recommendation for improving the project at this stage was in the area of strategic planning and the performance monitoring plan (PMP). As a result of the midterm evaluation, the project agreed to strengthen the project strategy and develop general strategic guidelines and a project plan for each country, which would improve planning and better relate project activities to project objectives. The project also agreed to make specific adjustments to the PMP (such as the definition of targets), which would improve monitoring of progress toward the achievement of project objectives and the evaluation of results.

The final evaluation of Phase 1 and the midterm evaluation of Phase 2 (combined) conducted in September 2007\(^6\) also found the project implementation performance to be satisfactory. The report concluded, “The three components of Phase 1 and the gender discrimination component added during Phase 2 have been successful in quantitative terms, and as far as impact of the project could be measured, they have been well accepted and identified as fulfilling a need by beneficiaries from all three sectors...targeted by the project” (page 4). Moreover, it found significant progress in the area of strategic planning and monitoring, with the support of a monitoring and evaluation consultant. However, the report concluded that the project staff was not using the full potential of these tools, reflected by the fact that the project team focused, for the most part, on measuring quantitative output indicators (the timely and accurate implementation of planned activities) without measuring outcome or impact indicators, and to what extent objectives were being achieved. The report cited the main reason for this was the lack of experience and training of most project staff in this respect. As a result, as was the case in the 2005 evaluation, it was difficult to measure the real impact of the project on the beneficiaries, or the project status in terms of achievement of its immediate objectives.

This third and final evaluation of the CyG project found the project implementation status to be mostly on target, taking into consideration the 5-month no-cost extension awarded from USDOL at the end of Phase 2. Based on evidence from interviews and monitoring tools, the project implemented the activities in accordance with the PMP and country plans. Annex B, Implementation Status of Project Deliverables, summarizes the status of project products during Phase 2. Reasons for not implementing some project deliverables were based on the specific


country plans. There were also delays in the implementation of some activities due to the slowness of labor ministry decisionmaking and approval processes, as well as the political climate within each country.

While the project was very successful in terms of conducting specified activities and meeting its quantitative goals, it still remains difficult to measure the status of progress toward its immediate objectives. The project’s headquarters collected the matrices from each individual country and integrated them into their monitoring tools, the data tracking tables, and the ‘status vs. goals’ tables. These tables are a detailed compilation of outputs for each component offering an overview of project status. It is here that it becomes evident that the project’s status, in terms of implementation of activities, is right on track (except for a few activities that will be completed by the end of 2008). However, and as will be discussed more fully under Monitoring and Evaluation in Section III, the project did not systematically perform outcome monitoring. This would have involved periodic tracking of inputs, outputs (as was done), but more importantly of outcomes. No evidence was provided to the evaluators to verify if performance outcomes were systematically discussed and recorded.
III. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

The following findings, conclusions, and recommendations are based on field work conducted in the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. Additional findings are based on interviews and project documents obtained at the project headquarters in Costa Rica, and a written survey completed by the country facilitator in Nicaragua. The findings reported here are more extensive than the preliminary findings presented at the evaluation debriefing on November 10, 2008.

A. Validity of the Project Strategy, Objectives, and Assumptions

This section examines the validity of the project design, stakeholder buy-in and support of the project, outreach beyond the capital cities, and the impact of the country plans.

FINDINGS

Project Design

The project’s strategy for achieving the development objective of increased labor law compliance through the implementation of four components (public awareness, inspection, alternative dispute resolution, and women’s labor rights), with tripartite participation in each of the five countries, is valid. This is supported by the willingness and commitment of the three sectors to participate in the project, albeit at different levels. The project was designed to primarily focus its efforts on strengthening the institutional capacity of the MOLs in order to increase labor law compliance in each project country. This focus on the MOLs is a valid project design since they are ultimately responsible for labor law compliance in their countries.

A key part of the project design was to have an administrative and technical team, based in Costa Rica, overseeing the project, as well as country facilitators (CF) based in each country’s MOL to ‘facilitate’ the implementation of project activities. The project director in Costa Rica commented that each member of the team complemented the other. The technical team was made up of the project director and the four component coordinators. They worked with each country facilitator to implement the activities, in accordance with that particular country’s needs and interests. Having country facilitators within the MOLs was key to establishing relationships and credibility with the primary target group of this project—the Ministries of Labor. This was confirmed by the interviews held in the MOLs of each of the four countries visited. The country facilitators were seen as the ‘cornerstone’ of the project and in each MOL visited, only positive remarks were heard regarding the interface between the CF and MOL counterparts.

Stakeholders’ Understanding and Support of the Project

While the project design is valid, it has to be acknowledged that each country’s political circumstances are unique; therefore, stakeholder support within each country must be understood on a case-by-case basis. For example, interviews with worker organizations in Guatemala revealed a perceived imbalance in sector participation that affected the overall project buy-in from this sector. Labor representatives in Guatemala commented that the MOL is viewed as a weak organization, plagued by corruption, and that greater participation by worker and employer groups to independently monitor MOL efforts to increase labor law compliance was missing in
the project design. Another CF interviewed also suggested the need for a more balanced project by stating: “The tripartite focus of the project should have had a better balance with the labor sector, which needed more checks and balances to ensure labor laws were being enforced.” Interviews with worker organizations confirmed this mistrust of MOLs and suggested mechanisms for verifying labor law enforcement from worker organizations.

Another issue that emerged with regard to stakeholder support was the perception that the project was initiated to promote CAFTA-DR. CyG project administrative staff were fully aware of this perception and made concerted efforts to meet with stakeholders and explain that this was a technical project, and not part of a political platform. Still, in interviews with stakeholders during this final evaluation, the perception remained in both employer and labor sectors. This association with CAFTA affected the labor sector the most, and some confederations in the Dominican Republic, Honduras, and Guatemala decided to refuse involvement in the project for this reason. The employer sector interviews in Honduras confirmed initial suspicions about the project—analyzing the underlying objectives of a labor project funded by the U.S. Government, but soon concluded that the primary objective was to strengthen the MOLs in order to enforce the national labor laws. They saw the advantages of having a project like CyG provide this technical assistance to the MOLs since they were neither part of the U.S. Government nor part of the MOL.

It is important to document some of the processes by which stakeholder participation was obtained and the sustainability of these efforts. In each of the four countries visited during the evaluation, country facilitators confirmed the process of first working individually with stakeholder groups to obtain input on specific project outputs. The best example is in the case of designing the project’s informational website, leylaboral.com (i.e., labor law.com), and the self-evaluation checklist for employers. Only after meeting with sector representatives individually were they then brought together to facilitate a discussion on final products. This strategic approach was appreciated by both employer and labor representatives interviewed, as it gave a very specific focus to the meetings and tripartite validation of project outputs. Labor and employer representatives in Honduras expressed appreciation for having concrete input placed into the project through a process which helped win their overall confidence in the project goals.

**Outreach to a Wider Audience**

A strategic effort was made to develop and promote each of the four project components beyond the capital cities. Regional initiatives included the following:

- Radio spots, which were part of the public awareness component, reached beyond the capital cities in all five countries.

- Alternative dispute resolution activities and/or improved infrastructures were implemented in regional offices in Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic.

- Electronic case monitoring systems (ECMS) for inspection and ADR departments were established in regional offices in El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua.
- Vehicles were donated to regional MOL offices in all five countries to facilitate inspection activities.

- A mobile inspection/information unit in Honduras reached underserved worker populations throughout the country. This mobile unit essentially “set up shop” at convenient locations and times in remote communities, so that workers in these communities could obtain labor information and file complaints.

- Trainings on women’s labor rights and general labor rights were conducted outside of capital cities in all five countries, with the help of established NGOs and labor groups.

**Country Plans**

Country plans were developed following the 2005 evaluation recommendations. As mentioned under Project Status in Section II, the country plans gave each country their own strategic focus for implementing project activities. Country facilitators agreed that these country plans were the single most useful tool, giving logic to their work. The CF from DR succinctly stated, “The country plan helped me to plan and organize the activities in each of the four components. Moreover, it allowed me to have a clear budget that was discussed and approved by the component coordinators, facilitating my work with stakeholders. The country plan helped optimize resources and time, and establish clear priorities for each project component.”

Other CFs confirmed the utility of the country plans in terms of adapting the activities for the particular cultural, educational, or political peculiarities of their country. The CF from Guatemala noted, “A public awareness campaign in Guatemala is not the same as in the Dominican Republic. We have a large indigenous population who are best served when educational materials or radio programs are sensitive of cultural differences.” He went on to explain that the political support for the project was difficult until this past February when there was a change of administration. This forced him to create a country plan that fit within the political will of that country’s MOL. These findings were validated by the current MOL inspection director and the vice-minister, as well as the Labor Attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Guatemala.

The country plans were useful in planning for all project components that worked closely with the MOLs, allowing for tailored projects that best suited each MOL. This was especially important in countries where ECMS systems were not requested by the MOLs, as was the case in Guatemala and the Dominican Republic. While acknowledging their usefulness, a CF noted an important missing item: “The one thing that wasn’t included in these country plans was a sustainability plan. It would have made a big difference to have this from the beginning.”

**Conclusions**

1. The project appropriately focused on four components that were identified as essential initiatives to help achieve the goal of increased national labor law compliance and awareness. The structure for carrying out these components was effective and efficient.

2. Stakeholders appreciated the project’s commitment to obtaining their input and involvement throughout the project—from the design phase to the final evaluation. These...
efforts, as well as the sensitivity to the political and cultural differences between the countries, served to help establish the relationships necessary to effectively carry out the project.

3. Prioritizing outreach to areas beyond the capital cities was a valid and important decision made by the project planners. The activities developed to meet this goal were appropriate and effective.

4. The introduction of country-specific plans was a successful initiative that allowed the activities to be tailored to each country’s needs and political situation. This helped obtain buy-in from stakeholders within each country and will likely lead to greater sustainability.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the accomplishments of the CyG project, future international projects should include the following elements in the project design and implementation to help ensure success:

1. Provide sufficient funding for staffing to initiate projects, develop activities and products, and identify opportunities for institutionalization.

2. Obtain input from all stakeholder groups in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the project.

3. Provide sufficient funding for the purchase of equipment and infrastructure improvements that can help build efficiency and sustainability.

4. Include multiplier mechanisms to reach remote geographic areas of the targeted country/countries.

5. Ensure that the specific political and cultural needs and experiences are taken into account in the development and implementation of project activities.

**B. Impact of Project Implementation**

This section examines the impact of the activities implemented from each of the four components on its targeted beneficiaries.

1. **Labor Inspection Systems**

This component aimed to increase the efficiency and reliability of Ministry of Labor inspection systems in order to effectively enforce national labor laws. To achieve this goal, the project developed the following products:

- Electronic case management systems for the MOL central and regional inspection departments. This system would enable inspection departments to shift from a paper-bound system to electronic tracking and monitoring of inspection activities, thus increasing the efficiency, effectiveness, and transparency of the inspection process.
• Inspection protocols and checklists for MOL inspection departments to use to document and systematize best practices for carrying out labor inspections.

• Self-evaluation checklists for employers to use in order to determine whether or not they are complying with national labor laws.

• Training for MOL inspectors and supervisors on the ECMS and inspection protocols.

**FINDINGS**

_**Electronic Case Management Systems**_

An ECMS designed by the CyG project was implemented in El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua. One of the primary purposes of the ECMS was to facilitate labor inspectors’ day-to-day work and give inspection supervisors the tools to manage the inspection process. Interviews with MOL inspection personnel in El Salvador and Honduras unanimously agreed that the system has allowed them to carry out their work in a more efficient and effective manner. “The system has allowed us to jump from the stone age of inspection to modern times,” commented the inspection supervisor in El Salvador. He went on to explain that having ongoing input from both inspection supervisors and inspectors throughout the design process was key in creating a system that increases efficiency and has built-in mechanisms for decreasing corruption (the system identifies any changes to the initial inspection reports once findings are entered).

A pilot period in both Honduras and El Salvador was also cited by the inspection supervisors as fundamental in order to “work out the bugs” and obtain the best system possible. In El Salvador, the integration of an Information technology (IT) expert from the MOL was noted by the CF and inspection supervisors as an important factor in the ECMS’s successful implementation and in providing staff with ongoing technical assistance. The successful expansion of the ECMS to regional offices in El Salvador was partially credited to having an in-house IT expert in the region (vs. the capital) that could provide technical support. The regional office director was fully aware of the capacity of the ECMS. He cited that one of the benefits of the ECMS was in forcing the regional office to think systematically. He explained, “If we’re systematized, we have a record of our work; this results in better services to workers and employers. The ECMS was the spark we needed to get organized and modernize.”

The benefit of bringing the inspection department from a manual system to an electronic system was confirmed by seven MOL labor inspectors interviewed in Honduras. They described the initial resistance to the electronic system (many had never used a computer to complete their inspection tasks), but they now recognize how the ECMS has facilitated their work by allowing them to be more efficient. For example, the ECMS enabled inspectors to provide a quicker response to specific complaints (estimated as decreasing from 14 days to the same day). In addition, the inspectors no longer had to deal with the cumbersome manual paperwork. “There is no turning back,” stated one inspector. “The electronic system is here to stay.” They all agreed that the ECMS also added a certain level of pride to their work, which has contributed to their overall identity as inspection professionals.

The two Phase 2 countries that did not implement the CyG ECMS are Guatemala and the Dominican Republic. In the case of the DR, an ECMS is currently being developed with Inter-
American Development Bank (IDB) funding. According to the CF for the DR, the CyG project will continue to provide support (mostly in terms of the purchase of equipment). In Guatemala, an ECMS was developed with USAID funding. During the evaluation interview, the MOL inspection director commented that this system has its limitations and that they are now interested in obtaining the assistance of the CyG project to create a system that allows for the tracking and monitoring of inspections.

In the four countries visited, inspection supervisors were asked about the maintenance of the computers donated by the CyG project and their commitment to maintain and upgrade these computers as necessary for the sustainability of the ECMS. In all four countries, inspection supervisors felt they had the support of the labor minister to provide the necessary maintenance resources. However, the inspectors interviewed in El Salvador were less optimistic and stated that it was up to each inspector to care for the fragile equipment donated.

**General Inspection Protocols**

The project developed general inspection protocols for each of the Phase 2 countries. During the final evaluation, the evaluators focused on verifying the impact that these general inspection protocols had had on carrying out more efficient and effective inspections, the process by which these protocols were developed, and to what extent the verification protocol included items from the self-evaluation checklist (see below), as well as issues related to gender.

Interviews with inspection directors or assistant directors in all four countries visited verified the contribution that the CyG project has had on creating inspection protocols, and appreciated that this was a process in which inspection personnel were consulted on its content. In addition, there was a definite impact on creating a verification protocol that detected problems related to gender issues. The inspection director of the DR stated that the verification protocol developed in conjunction with the project included specific issues on gender and discrimination throughout the inspection verification process. The evaluators obtained a copy of the most recent verification protocol in the DR (developed with the technical oversight of CyG) to confirm this statement. It was found to contain 14 general areas of verification, six of which included issues on gender and discrimination.7 The verification checklists in the other three countries visited were not obtained; however, the CFs and the directors/assistant directors of inspection stated that the verification protocols contained issues related to gender.

**Self-Evaluation Checklists**

The practicability and usefulness of the self-evaluation checklist for use by employers is documented in the final/midterm evaluation conducted in October 2007. For the purposes of the present evaluation, the evaluators sought to verify the integration of the self-evaluation checklist content into the verification protocols. Since protocols for the DR were available at the time of the evaluation, it was verified that the DR’s verification protocol closely followed the content found in the self-evaluation checklist developed for that country.

---

In El Salvador, the inspection director spoke at length about the participatory tripartite process in developing the self-evaluation checklist under the leadership of the CF, and how this self-evaluation checklist for employers served as the basis from which the verification checklist was developed. According to this inspection director, the creation of the self-evaluation checklist for employers and the verification checklist for inspectors served to standardize inspection procedures. He explained that this has helped create a transparent verification process and has increased the reliability of the inspection process.

**Training for MOL Inspectors and Supervisors**

Training was provided to MOL inspection personnel on the ECMS and/or the inspection protocols in the five Phase 2 countries. This training was provided by outside consultants rather than the CF or MOL personnel. In El Salvador and Honduras, it was necessary to provide training on basic computer skills before tackling training on the ECMS because many of their personnel had little experience working with computers. When inspectors in Honduras and El Salvador were asked who would provide training to new inspectors on the use of the ECMS, they all implied that this would simply be done in an informal way (sharing their own knowledge with new staff).

An interactive training module for inspectors was in the process of being finalized by the CyG project at the time of the final evaluation. According to the labor inspection component coordinator, these modules were expected to be completed by November 2008 for each country. The evaluators were given a copy of the interactive training module prototype for Honduras at the evaluation debriefing. The implementation of these modules will be part of the future project (Phase 3). The process by which the interactive computer training modules were developed and piloted could not be verified by the evaluators.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The ability to achieve full implementation of the Labor Inspection Component of the CyG project in Honduras and El Salvador (and Nicaragua) was partly due to the level of political cooperation found in these countries. The fact that Guatemala and the Dominican Republic did not achieve the same level of success can be partly attributed to political, cultural, or historical circumstances that may have created additional barriers, and in no way reflects on the efforts of the CyG project.

The following conclusions are based on the experiences in the four countries visited during the evaluation field work.

**Electronic Case Management Systems**

1. The ECMS is now fully operational and institutionalized in the MOLs of Honduras and El Salvador, and, to a major extent, in Nicaragua. Based on the findings obtained in the evaluation interviews and the inherent design of the system, the ECMS has had a major impact on increasing efficiency and trustworthiness of MOL inspection systems in compliance with national labor laws and norms.
2. The regional offices in Honduras and El Salvador are also committed to institutionalizing the ECMS beyond the capital cities. Based on the interviews with MOL regional office representatives, it can be concluded that the development of the ECMS has led to more efficient and reliable inspections throughout the countries for the same reasons stated above.

3. The key areas that have led to the successful implementation and institutionalization of the ECMS in Honduras and El Salvador include—

   ● A trial (pilot) period for inspectors to use the system and provide input to the IT team responsible for making the adjustments.

   ● An in-house IT expert who was involved in the design and piloting of the ECMS, and who could assume on-going responsibilities for technical assistance (as was the case in El Salvador).

4. The opportunity exists for developing an ECMS in Guatemala and for providing support to the ECMS adopted by the DR. In the case of Guatemala, it is clear that with the change of government, the MOL has a much more cooperative attitude towards accepting technical assistance from CyG. In the case of the DR, the new ECMS developed with funds from the IDB will need to undergo the necessary pilot period before determining how to best work with the ECMS to further the project goals.

5. The MOLs in Honduras and El Salvador are committed to maintaining and upgrading the computer hardware and software necessary to maintain the ECMS. This may be achieved with the help of international donors.

**Inspection Protocols**

6. The development of general inspection protocols has served to document and systematize the inspection procedures. The inclusion of gender as a focus is a positive step towards addressing gender discrimination as part of the standard verification protocol. It is still too early to determine what kind of impact the standardization and modification of inspection protocols will have on creating more efficient and effective inspections or on addressing issues related to gender discrimination. What is important is that the groundwork has been laid for providing follow-up monitoring in these areas.

**Self-Evaluation Checklists**

7. The self-evaluation checklist was verified as having been integrated into at least one of the inspection protocols developed by the CyG project. The movement towards including these checklists into the actual inspection verification protocols serves to increase the transparency and expectations of the inspection process.

**Training**

8. The trainings provided on ECMS and general inspection protocols were not, in themselves, designed to be sustainable within the MOL. No conclusion can be made about the design,
implementation plan, or sustainability of the interactive computer training modules for each country since these had not been completed or piloted at the time of the final evaluation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue to fund and support ECMS initiatives in Phase 3 of the Cumple y Gana project in order to assist Guatemala to fully establish its ECMS.

2. Give the ECMS in the DR a chance to be implemented and piloted, and then look for ways to support the system to further project goals.

3. Continue to provide technical assistance and training to ECMS users in all four countries so that they can obtain the maximum benefits that the system has to offer in terms of data tracking and data analysis.

4. Monitor the impact of the ECMS on providing more efficient and reliable MOL inspections.

5. Monitor the use and effectiveness of the proposed interactive training modules to train new inspection staff.

2. Alternative Dispute Resolution

The objective of the ADR component was to improve and expand alternative mediation and conciliation services for labor conflict resolution in the five targeted countries. To attain this goal, project activities concentrated on the following:

- Establishing electronic case management systems aimed at simplifying and expediting the labor dispute process and providing the means for tracking statistical information.

- Upgrading the physical and technological infrastructure of MOLs to allow for confidentiality and an enhanced environment for proceedings.

- Developing procedures manuals as a way to standardize the methods and steps used by all conciliators.

- Training and capacity building of MOL mediators and conciliators, as well as union and employer groups to increase their competencies for handling labor disputes.

- Pilot-testing the use of ADR within private companies or organizations (Organizational ADR).

FINDINGS

The ADR component began with an informal needs assessment, which was not originally planned. This needs assessment was mentioned as a best practice and had a positive impact on the credibility of the project inside the MOLs. It conveyed openness to learning about each particular ADR system and a willingness to adapt project activities to their requirements.
Electronic Case Management Systems

At the time of the evaluation, an ECMS was operational and being used by conciliators in the capital cities of all countries except the Dominican Republic. It has been fully regionalized in Honduras and Nicaragua and was soon to be extended to one region in El Salvador and two regions in Guatemala. The ECMS was developed with two main goals in mind: (1) to simplify and expedite the conciliation process, bringing more quality to the work of conciliators and better results to users; and (2) to have a system that could provide reliable and timely information.

Before the CyG-funded ECMS, conciliators handled ADR cases manually. As discussed by conciliators in El Salvador and Honduras, managing a case manually was cumbersome for the conciliators and time consuming for users. Interviewees in Honduras and Guatemala expressed appreciation for the increased efficiency that the ECMS provided them. The director of conciliation in Honduras said the ECMS had helped reduce the time it took to schedule a hearing for a worker—from 30 days to around 3 or 4. In Guatemala, a supervisor maintained that the time had been cut in half.

Interviews with conciliators in El Salvador found that ECMS had improved the quality of conciliations as well. “It has been the biggest contribution of the ADR project. Before, if a worker came and needed information on a previous conciliation, we had to go back to big dusty books; it took a long time. With the ECMS we do this in a flash.” The conciliators in Guatemala also mentioned how today they are able to conciliate an average of five cases per day, while before it was about five cases per month. According to the CF from Guatemala, the MOL (MTPS, or Ministerio de Trabajo y Previsión Social) has been able to handle this increase in caseload effectively and efficiently because the increase was gradual—occurring in phases, over a 1-year period of time. Conciliators in El Salvador said they feel comfortable and confident with the ECMS and view a return to the manual handling of cases as undesirable and improbable. Another positive aspect of the ECMS, as expressed by one CF and the ADR component coordinator, was that it lessens the possibility of incorrect handling of files (and potentially of corruption) since the cases are assigned by the system and not arbitrarily. The capacity to update the ECMS and its ability to respond to the needs of the MOL was found to be an additional reason for the degree of enthusiasm with the system.

Complete regionalization of the ECMS, a goal of Phase 2, has not been fully achieved but will likely occur before the end of the year. Reasons for delays in expanding the system throughout each country varied. In some cases, the explanation involved problems with the system itself (El Salvador and Guatemala). In others, the reason related to the political situation or insufficient training (Guatemala).

Infrastructure Improvements

The 2004 ADR needs assessment established that improving mediation rooms was an indispensable first step for the general improvement of conciliation services provided by the MOLs. In all countries visited, interviewees explained that before the project, conciliations were
carried out in open rooms with no privacy or other basic accessories such as chairs or tables. In total, 48 ADR rooms in the capitals and outlying regions were upgraded. This activity continued throughout Phase 1 and 2, with the final improvements in El Salvador taking place in mid-2008. The positive impact of conducting hearings in private was emphasized in all countries visited by the evaluation team.

**Procedure Manual**

By late 2008, procedure manuals had been developed and validated in Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. (They were published in a final version in Honduras and El Salvador.) Before the project, conciliators in the MOLs had no guidelines on which to base the way they handled proceedings. In essence, each conciliator negotiated intuitively. The quality of the service was dependent on the personality and ability of each particular conciliator.

The project sought to address this problem by supporting a process of unifying and standardizing criteria and describing this in a procedures manual. The manual organizes the steps required for conciliation and systematizes the guidelines for conciliation procedures in each country. Using this manual, conciliators can apply a single set of actions, principles, and processes to each case.

As with the ECMS and other CyG project activities, there is variability between countries with regard to implementing their procedures manual. For example, in El Salvador, all conciliators are aware of the manual and use it in their daily work. Its utility was highlighted by a regional director in El Salvador, “Having this manual avoids improvisation on the part of conciliators.” In Guatemala, on the other hand, few conciliators are aware the procedures manual exists, although it has been produced and published. It is not clear why these particular conciliators interviewed during the fieldwork were unaware of its existence. Overall, the procedures manuals have served to unify departmental procedures in most MOLs.

**Training and Capacity Building**

The total number of people in capital cities (MOL staff, employers, workers, and other stakeholders) in all seven countries who were trained in conciliation techniques was 2,229. Training topics included ECMS; individual and collective mediation for conciliators in the MOLs; practical and legal aspects of labor mediation; training for trainers (T4T) on labor laws, mediation and conciliation; and ADR for other stakeholders from the worker sector.

In all but two interviews where training was discussed, the opinion of the trainings was positive. It was repeatedly mentioned that they had been of high quality and were appropriate to the type of audience involved. However, a concern was expressed about whether the training programs could be sustained. This was a particular concern in Guatemala, where the wages for inspectors and conciliators are among the lowest in the region, leading to a high turnover rate. In addition, there is no institutional structure within the MOL (MTPS) for providing ongoing or introductory training for conciliators. A supervisor from Guatemala explained, “There is no structure to train the new people that join and there is no structure for passing on the knowledge from those who

---

9 Includes the five countries for Phase 2: DR, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador; plus Panama and Costa Rica.
10 Data tracking table, PMP, Phase 1 and Phase 2 for the ADR Component.
have already benefitted from the trainings. The conciliators leave and take with them what the project has invested in them.”

A particular success of this project was that the trainings on ADR were aimed not only at MOL staff, but also at other stakeholders who can benefit from better negotiation skills. Two employer groups visited mentioned the excellent quality of the materials, curriculum, and consultants. As explained by a member from Honduras, “People have been trained in this country and can now mediate in a professional and technical manner.”

**Organizational ADR**

In Phase 2, the ADR component piloted an initiative to prevent and resolve minor labor conflicts within workplaces, called Organizational ADR. An Organizational ADR refers to systems established within companies or local organizations to handle small disputes. The rationale behind this initiative was that most conflicts that reach the MOL and the courts are small conflicts that could have been resolved within the workplace.11

The project had three experiences with Organizational ADR. The first was in the Dominican Republic where Organizational ADR was attempted within an individual company. Due to financial problems, the company decided to discontinue the pilot. This experience helped the project decide to explore housing Organizational ADR within employer associations instead. The pilot has been implemented in Honduras with the Honduran Association of Maquiladoras (AHM, or Asociación Hondureña de Maquiladores) and in Guatemala with the Guatemalan Apparel and Textile Industry Commission (VESTEX, or Comisión de la Industria de Vestuario y Textiles de Guatemala).

Because these pilot projects were begun very recently (2008), it is difficult to ascertain their success and impact on labor relations. Representatives from both VESTEX and AHM have expressed that the model shows promise in preventing small conflicts from escalating and reaching the courts. Union representatives are more skeptical about the model, stating that this type of ADR is not ‘win-win’ but one in which the worker most often loses. “The worker is always at a disadvantage. The place to have mediation cannot be inside the same company as the person conducting the mediation.”

**CONCLUSIONS**

**ECMS**

1. The ECMS for ADR is now operational and being used by conciliators in the capital cities of all countries except the Dominican Republic. In El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, the system has had an impact on simplifying the process for conciliators and offering a quicker response for users requesting a conciliation hearing.

2. The ability of the MOLs’ conciliation departments to continue updating the software of the ECMS will help influence their sense of ownership and therefore the survival of the ECMS.

---

ADR Rooms

3. The upgrade of the conciliation rooms, in particular the provisions for privacy, have had an important impact on the quality of the process for users (workers and employers).

 Procedures Manual

4. The development of manuals has helped conciliators in El Salvador, Honduras, and to a lesser extent Guatemala, move toward consistent and uniform conciliations.

Trainings

5. The project’s trainings have played a part in developing conciliators’ skills, including techniques for mediating impartially. Specifically in Guatemala but also in other countries, ongoing training of new conciliators is not institutionalized.

Organizational ADR

6. It is still too early to conclude whether Organizational ADR offers a good alternative for resolving minor labor disputes that is accepted by both workers and companies. The two associations involved in the pilots, AHM and VESTEX, are convinced of its merits and will continue to implement it. Labor unions will continue to question its impartiality and the advantages for workers.

7. Organizational ADR works best within employer organizations, rather than individual companies. Using this model, if one company within the employer organization pulls out of the Organizational ADR program, the entire effort is not jeopardized.

Recommendations

1. Continue to provide support to the ADR ECMS system in Guatemala, which has only very recently been implemented.

2. Include an in-house IT expert that is well-versed in the specific software used by the ECMS and can perform basic updates.

3. Establish institutional mechanisms for training new conciliators on the ECMS.

4. Once more cases have gone through the Organizational ADR in Honduras and Guatemala, monitor the impact it is having on dispute resolution and how it is viewed, particularly by workers.

5. If Organizational ADR is to be considered for future projects, support a model that is implemented through an employer organization rather than an individual company.

3. Public Awareness

This component aimed to increase understanding of national labor laws among target populations in each country. In order to achieve this, the project focused on implementing the following products and activities during Phase 2:
- Public awareness activities conducted in each country at national and regional levels. These general awareness activities included the development and distribution of labor education pamphlets, books, posters, and calendars, and the development and airing of radio spots on a variety of labor issues.

- Training courses and materials. This involved workshops, tripartite meetings, and/or T4T for all three sectors.

- Mechanisms to providing information on national labor laws. The main activity designed to meet this objective was the establishment of call centers in each MOL.

- An interactive website. The leylaboral.com website was set up during Phase 1, but efforts to improve and maintain the website grew in Phase 2. At the time of this evaluation, the number of consultations (hits) was at just over the 3 million mark.

**FINDINGS**

There is no systematic information available about if and how the target groups use the educational materials produced by the project. Efforts were made to measure changes in labor awareness/knowledge in each country through a knowledge study baseline and a follow-up study. Project staff told evaluators that as a mechanism to measure changes, the results are invalid since the baseline survey had methodological flaws. The main flaw cited by the Cumple y Gana staff was that the sample population used for the baseline study was concentrated exclusively in urban areas. It can be assumed that differences exist in labor law awareness between rural and urban populations, and the baseline study did not include rural areas in their sample. Therefore, the following findings relate to the specific activities in the awareness component, as well as from information gathered through interviews in the four countries visited.

**Public Awareness Activities**

The ‘baseline’ study was still useful to help uncover gaps in knowledge regarding basic labor laws, workers’ rights, and the role of the MOLs. Based on this information, priority areas were identified for creating educational materials and radio programs. Strategic decisions were made to develop materials and radio programs targeting different sectors, different educational levels, and different cultural backgrounds (and languages, in the case of Guatemala). The methods for disseminating these materials or radio programs were also planned.

Interviewees representing labor, employers, and the MOL sectors who were involved in the validation of the educational materials agreed that the process of working individually with each sector before bringing the groups together resulted in more productive and focused tripartite meetings. This also helped develop important project relationships with members from all three sectors. “They took our opinions into consideration instead of just giving us the pre-packaged materials,” commented a union confederation member in Honduras.

One CF reflected on the massive amount of work involved in conducting public awareness activities, and how those efforts to sustain these activities were not an integral part of the initial design process. It was only when the project end was in sight (during the final year) that sustainability efforts for awareness activities became a priority for the project as a whole.
Educational materials: Project stakeholders unanimously agreed that educational materials produced by the CyG project were useful for their constituencies. The materials were considered to be of high quality and easy to understand. Dissemination methods included the use of established national government agencies, such as the social security system, to hand out information to employers, unions, and/or NGOs to provide workers with information.

Interviews with labor sector representatives found that there was a high demand for these materials as they were essentially the only labor educational materials available in their countries. The educational materials were very well received by employer groups, as well. Employer groups interviewed in Honduras and Guatemala commented on the impact of the self-evaluation checklist and other informational materials. “The materials added transparency to issues of employers’ labor obligations and workers’ labor rights.”

In the case of El Salvador, efforts to sustain these educational materials included the involvement of the MOL’s Communications Department. The Communications Department was integral to the design and dissemination of these materials (as well as the radio programs) within El Salvador and was given the capability to reproduce the materials and programs as necessary.

Radio programs: The radio programs were highly praised in each country for their simple messages and widespread outreach. Seven radio spots were developed and transmitted on popular radio stations in each country over a 2-year period. Topics included workers’ legal rights, work contracts, maternity rights, work hours, vacations, 13-month bonus pay, and using leylaboral.com as a resource. In all the countries, the MOL had input on the specific content of the radio spots. Popular radio stations in each of the countries were strategically selected to air these radio spots.

Training Courses and Materials

Training courses offered by the project varied in each country. Courses ranged from awareness trainings for the labor and employer sectors to week-long trainings for MOL staff on a variety of topics. Stakeholders who had participated in trainings were interviewed in all four countries. They agreed that the CyG training consultants were well prepared, that training materials were of high quality, and that they appreciated that the training methods were participatory. (The evaluators did not conduct a technical analysis of the training materials.)

In Honduras, information on labor rights and responsibilities were also integrated into the adult education curriculum frameworks for adults completing grades seventh through ninth in the national program known as Educatodos. This information was not provided within a single isolated course; rather, it was integrated into several lessons being taught in math and social studies classes. For example, word problems taught in math used examples from wage and hour laws for the calculations.

Information Mechanisms

Call Centers: The purpose of these call centers is to disseminate accurate labor information to employers and workers and, at the same time, enhance the relationship between the user and the MOL. During Phase 2, the CyG project worked to establish the infrastructure necessary to establish call centers in each MOL. Some countries, such as El Salvador, had to coordinate
efforts with IDB project funding. The process for establishing these centers encountered delays, mostly due to political obstacles within the MOLs. At the time of this final evaluation, call centers had recently been established in Honduras and El Salvador; Nicaragua’s call center was near completion; and the process for establishing call centers for the DR and Guatemala was underway. It is too early to assess what impact the call centers have had on increasing the understanding of the target population regarding national labor laws. Therefore, the findings of this section of the evaluation have primarily focused on the target population’s awareness and perception of the call centers.

Union representatives interviewed in Honduras told evaluators that they had heard about the call center but were not aware of the types of questions that could be handled, nor did they know the telephone number. After obtaining the phone number, interviewees made two separate calls to the call center, allowing evaluators to hear the conversation revealing the following: The call was answered quickly and professionally, and the information given was complete and accurate. Evaluators also phoned the call center in El Salvador. The same results were obtained—courteous and professional service and an accurate response to the question posed.

MOL directors were asked about the sustainability of the call centers. The cost associated with these call centers is significant (e.g., $400/month just to maintain the free phone line in Honduras). In El Salvador and Honduras, the inspection supervisors interviewed were confident that the call centers would be maintained with MOL general funds, possibly in combination with international donor support.

Mobile Unit in Honduras: The MOL mobile unit in Honduras was purchased by the CyG project. The unit was originally conceived for the purpose of carrying out inspections in the maquilas (concentrated in the San Pedro Sula area); however, maquila owners saw these units as threatening and therefore denied them access to the industrial parks. A decision was made between the MOL and the CyG project to bring the mobile unit to Tegucigalpa. There, the unit has primarily served the purpose of providing labor information, and to a lesser degree carried out inspections, in areas where an MOL regional office is not accessible. Inspectors staffing the unit are able to answer workers’ questions, disseminate printed information on labor laws and worker rights (most produced by the CyG project), calculate benefits owed to workers, facilitate the filing of complaints, and discuss other services that are offered in the MOL offices. The unit travels to worksites, or to parks near them, at hours that are convenient to workers (before work, during lunchtime, or after work). Inspection supervisors commented that the unit announces its arrival ahead of time so that workers will know when they can obtain services. It is not clear how these announcements actually reach the workers.

The CF in Honduras, as well as MOL inspection supervisors who were interviewed, commented that this unit is doing a great service to reach underserved workers. However, union representatives interviewed in Honduras were wary of the actual impact. They said that workers will not be seen at these mobile units for fear of being fired for inquiring about labor rights. In addition, the CF in Honduras cited insufficient MOL funds for gasoline as a possible impediment for running this unit on a daily basis.
Interactive Website

The website, known as leylaboral.com, was established during Phase 1. Its purpose is to provide information on national labor laws, worker rights, and employer obligations. The process for establishing the website was a tripartite effort—all three sectors provided input into the information and frequently asked questions that appear on the website. While efforts to establish the website were coordinated by CyG, it has always been conceived as an informational tool supported by the MOLs in each country. Masterlex was the website designer and is responsible for updating the website, based on input from CyG staff. Masterlex has committed to updating and sustaining the website for the next 4 years.

Stakeholders interviewed from all three sectors mentioned leylaboral.com as a valuable resource for obtaining accurate labor information for those who have internet access. However, union confederation representatives stated that it is not an accessible source of information for their constituents, as few have access to a computer, much less the internet. Union representatives in Guatemala stated that the radio spots provided valuable information to workers and had the greatest impact on raising awareness levels regarding labor rights as well as the labor movement.

At the time of this final evaluation, the website had received over 3 million consultations (hits). The site has information on the number and nature of the consultations for each country, although this has not been updated since December 2007. The CyG project has recently compiled more detailed statistics relating the number of hits to the specific awareness campaigns in each country. The findings suggest that targeted outreach campaigns increase the number of hits on the website.

Conclusions

Public Awareness Activities—Educational Materials and Radio Programs

1. The educational materials developed for each of the countries addressed a major gap in resources for national labor laws that existed prior to the initiation of the project. It was notable that the beneficiaries viewed these materials as being of high quality.

2. The wide distribution of written materials is a good method for labor information, for those who read.

3. Dissemination mechanisms were most effective when the project cooperated with established organizations serving employers and workers.

4. The participation of the El Salvadoran MOL Communications Department in the design and dissemination/implementation of the project’s educational materials and radio programs provides an important mechanism for creating a sustainable effort.

5. The value of radio programs, in particular, are an essential medium for informing workers about labor laws, especially given the limited access to other systems such as computers, the internet, and call centers.
Training Courses and Materials

6. The training courses were conducted by extremely qualified trainers, using appropriate adult education methods. In addition, the educational materials were found to be of high quality.

7. The inclusion of labor rights information into the adult curriculum frameworks in Honduras is an important step toward sustainability of the project’s awareness component objective.

Information Mechanisms—Call Centers and Mobile Unit

8. The institutionalization of the call centers appears to be extremely promising. It is unclear how widely known this service is and, consequently, how effective it will be as an informational tool.

9. Although the concept of reaching underserved workers in remote areas through a mobile unit is commendable, it is unclear how sustainable and far-reaching this strategy is for disseminating information and making MOL services accessible.

Interactive Website

10. The website provides accurate information on national labor laws and frequently asked questions. Employers and government workers are more likely to have internet access than general workers, thus limiting the website’s overall use for this population.

Recommendations

1. Include staff from MOL Communication Departments (if one exists) in labor education campaigns to increase the likelihood of sustainability.

2. Include strategies for integrating information on labor laws and workers’ rights in adult education programs, especially the integration into the Ministry of Education’s curriculum frameworks.

3. Develop strategies for promoting the call centers more broadly; evaluate its effectiveness on providing labor information to employers and workers.

4. Evaluate the cost effectiveness of using mobile units as a strategy for disseminating labor law information to workers, as well as carrying out labor inspections. Conduct further analysis to determine the annual budget for running the mobile unit, as well as how this unit can provide the greatest benefit for both workers and employers.

4. Women’s Labor Rights from a Gender Perspective

Findings

The Women’s Labor Rights component began its activities in September 2006 and ended 2 years and 3 months later. Its rationale was to support the commitments assumed by Central American countries and the DR in the Vice Ministers’ White Paper. The overall goal of this component
was to strengthen mechanisms that promote and protect women’s labor rights. The component focused on three main areas:

- Raising awareness among the general population on basic labor rights and laws protecting women.
- Training project stakeholders as well as women leaders who can promote and explain women’s labor rights.
- Strengthening existing gender/women’s labor rights offices in the MOLs, providing them with resources, training, and technical assistance to review and reorient their activities.

Despite its short time span, the component achieved important results in all three areas.

**Awareness Raising**

A survey conducted at the start of the project revealed gaps of information regarding maternity leave, pregnancy testing, and sexual harassment. To improve the information and the awareness of women regarding these issues, the component took advantage of established project activities from the Awareness Component such as the *leylaboral.com* website and the radio spots. It also supported the development of user-friendly women’s labor rights manuals.

**Leylaboral.com website:** Questions relating to women’s labor rights were added to the FAQ section of the website. The evaluators checked the site and found questions covering maternity leave, lactation rights, and sexual harassment on the webpages for the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. There were no questions related to these topics on the webpages for Guatemala and Honduras.

**Radio spots:** In all countries, at least four radio spots specific to women’s labor rights issues were produced and are currently airing. Guatemala and Nicaragua have already exceeded the original project goals of airing the spots for 6 months. At the time of the evaluation, El Salvador and the Dominican Republic were on track to at least meet this goal and Honduras was awaiting final approval from its MOL.

The radio spots have addressed the principal themes that concern women in the workplace: illegality of pre-hire pregnancy tests, maternity leave, sexual harassment, and gender discrimination in the workplace. Repeatedly, representatives from all three sectors—MOL, employer, and labor—commended the radio spots for their capacity to reach wide audiences.

**Gender studies:** The Vice Ministers’ White Paper highlighted women’s working conditions as a concern, particularly in countries with a large maquila sector or free trade zones. The project sponsored studies that could contribute baseline information on women working in these areas. Studies were completed, printed, and disseminated to representatives of the MOL, other government institutions, and NGOs dealing with women’s issues, the ILO, employers groups, and labor representatives in all five countries.

---

12 In each country the methods, approach, and title of the study was different.
The investigative process and publication encountered difficulties. Due to the economic importance of free trade zones in terms of employment and investment, employers and the MOLs were apprehensive. They thought the studies might be interpreted as condemning and potentially drive away investment. Despite misgivings, the project was careful not to antagonize employers. A representative of AHM said the study’s approach in his country was impartial.

For stakeholders and project staff, the studies are seen as an important resource for the MOLs, NGOs, and other donors who want to work on the topic. Despite their usefulness, a CF argued that the decision to concentrate on the maquila sector was limited. “There are other economic sectors, such as agriculture, that concentrate more participation of women and are known to have more labor violations.”

**Manuals on women’s labor rights:** These were prepared for the MOLs in all five countries and are currently awaiting publication. The MOLs also plan to distribute them to a wider audience; for example, to union women leaders, NGOs, and employer groups.

### Training and Education

The activities in this area focused on two main areas: (1) Providing trainings on the labor rights of women to unions, employer groups, and other interested stakeholders; and (2) Executing ‘practical experiences’ with local NGOs or educational institutions.

**Trainings on women’s labor rights for stakeholders:** Approximately 2,281 MOL employees, union leaders, and employers participated in the courses, seminars, and workshops held by the project on women’s labor rights, gender, and inspection. The courses were well received by both employers, who had originally dismissed the issue until the project linked gender with corporate social responsibility and women union leaders. In interviews, the union leaders stated that the courses had provided them with the tools and knowledge to expand their understanding regarding the type and extent of discrimination faced by women in the workplace. They emphasized the high quality of the training materials as well as the facilitators.

**Practical experiences:** Each country executed at least one ‘practical experience’ on the promotion and protection of women’s labor rights. The strategy was to partner with a local organization to create training materials, develop a training-for-trainers course, and deliver the trainings. The women reached through these practical experiences included domestic and maquila workers, leaders of civil society organizations, and coordinators of women’s regional government offices.

In each case the organization had the freedom to include additional topics considered to be important for their constituency. In the DR, for example, a module was included on human rights; in Nicaragua the first module focused on leadership and communication skills; and in El Salvador the course closed with a unit on training methods. In total, 25 modules and two

---

In both the DR and El Salvador, interviewees from the executing organization explained it was necessary to further simplify the main ideas from each of the T4T lessons to make these materials more accessible for less-literate trainers. This was also found to be necessary for the modules developed for the MOLs. The adapted materials were not foreseen but appear to have been crucial.

**Institutional Strengthening**

*Strengthening the ‘gender’ offices:* The initial survey found that the MOLs’ women or gender offices are weak units within the institutional structure. The personnel in charge were unsure of their mission and none of the offices had strategic plans guiding their work. Their work was mainly reactive, responding to individual complaints.

All of the MOLs, with the exception of Nicaragua’s, agreed to develop a strategic plan for addressing these weaknesses, under the guidance of an external CyG consultant. At the time of the evaluation, strategic plans had been completed and validated in all four countries. Strategic plans included recommendations to mainstream gender issues throughout all MOL activities. This requires the gender offices to move away from reactive and uncoordinated responses, to seeing themselves as educators both inside and outside the MOL. The evaluators were able to confirm movement in this direction in Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador. In El Salvador, the gender coordinator stated: “We are moving from inspectors to educators.”

The need for continued support from the project to help them implement the recommendations was expressed by all three gender offices visited. “The project is leaving too early; they supported us initially, but we also need support for what lies ahead.”

*Training:* The project provided training to the staff in the gender offices. The gender office coordinator in El Salvador believed these courses had produced changes in attitude among his staff to better assume an educational role but stressed that additional training was needed. The project also organized trainings for the members of the inspection and conciliation offices. Workshops were held to revise the protocols and verification checklists to incorporate gender issues. In an interview with the director of inspection as well as inspectors in El Salvador, it became clear that the ‘message’ had, in fact, reached them.

**Conclusions**

**Awareness Raising**

1. Women’s labor rights were incorporated into several outreach mechanisms including radio spots and the *leylaboral* website.

---

Training for Stakeholders

2. Training for stakeholders on gender issues successfully raised awareness among government, employer, and labor sectors.

Practical Experience

3. The practical experiences reached women working in many sectors, including women in the regional women’s government offices who were able to successfully replicate the T4T.

4. The modules developed for the T4T is material that the executing organizations want to continue to use.

Institutional Strengthening

5. The process of developing strategic plans raised the visibility of the gender offices and helped them initiate the goal of mainstreaming gender issues into MOL offices and activities. The role of the gender office personnel appears to be transforming so that inspectors are taking on more of an educational role.

6. The strategic plans have been embraced by the gender offices but they are unsure if they will have the political support to implement them.

7. Sensitization to gender issues on the part of the inspection departments is in its early stages and is uneven throughout the region. In some countries, inspectors appear to have received the message while in others, they have not.

8. The Women’s Labor Rights component was not given sufficient time to provide the necessary support and follow-up by the CyG project in order to have a measurable and sustainable impact.

Recommendations

1. Conduct additional gender studies in each country to learn about work sectors that employ large numbers of women and that are perceived to discriminate against female employees.

2. When planning practical experiences that include replication, adapt and simplify the material that is developed to reach women with a range of literacy skills.

3. Offer continued financial and technical support to the gender offices as they embark on the process of implementing the strategic plans.

C. Project Management Structure

Findings

Management Structure and Personnel

The CyG project was managed and executed by two organizations, FUNPADEM and Abt. The project director and the component coordinators for Inspection and ADR, as well as the two
financial administrators were all hired as Abt employees. The country facilitators were hired by Abt as independent consultants. The component coordinators for Awareness and Women’s Labor Rights, as well as the project assistants were employed by FUNPADEM. There was also a project advisor and coordinator from Abt based in Bethesda, MD. All direct project staff members were located in Costa Rica at the FUNPADEM offices, with the exception of the CFs who were located in their country’s MOL.

A major source of contention among country facilitators was their employment situation. The CFs, employed under consultant contracts, do not enjoy employee benefits such as paid vacation, maternity leave, or social security (health insurance). This issue was brought up as a concern during the 2005 midterm evaluation, which prompted Abt to conduct a study to assess the legal and financial ramifications of the CFs’ contractual arrangement. Although the study found that hiring them as consultants was appropriate and legal, this evaluation has found that this contractual arrangement is still a concern for the CFs. For example, it was noted that in the 4 years of working for the project, they had not had a single day of paid vacation. They pointed out the paradox between their labor conditions and the labor rights they advocate. One CF commented: “I found it incongruous to vigorously defend the labor rights of women when I did not enjoy these rights myself; we are promoting what we do not have.”

Another concern raised by several stakeholders was the seeming lack of clear authority given to the CFs to direct and coordinate project activities within their country. One example provided to the evaluators was the recent decision by project management to exclude them from the official closing of the project held in the Dominican Republic. The closing had representation from the MOL and the worker and employer sectors in each country, yet the CFs were not included. One labor participant posed the question to the evaluators: “Why wasn’t my country facilitator invited to this meeting? He was the only one with whom I’ve worked!” A vice-minister also commented, “The absence of the CF made me question the position and authority given to him by the project.” The project director explained that this decision was in no way meant to disavow the CFs’ importance but was a response to budgetary restrictions.

Another issue the CFs expressed was the lack of sufficient training in the different technical areas of the project which would have allowed them to feel more confident in coordinating the project activities. One CF expressed that it would have been beneficial to offer an initial training that included basic tenets of labor legislation and labor terminology to ensure everyone on the team had the same knowledge. Most recently, this did occur when the Women’s Labor Rights component was introduced. Upon request, the component coordinator supported the inclusion of the CFs in the project’s initial training.

**Personnel Performance**

*The Project Director:* The main tasks of the project director were the overall management and execution of the project, and reporting to USDOL as required. The project director provided leadership, served as the political face of the project, and performed the more profound strategic and monitoring tasks. His approach brought coherence to a very complex project dealing with different legal and political environments. He was instrumental in communicating to the rest of the staff the importance of moving the project forward, whilst acknowledging the distinct realities and challenges each country faced. He preferred communication to flow directly between the CFs and the coordinators, only stepping in when it was necessary to settle a
disagreement. The director was also credited with making it a priority to have the staff see themselves as part of a team. All five CFs agreed they felt they had bonded with each other as well as with the staff in the Costa Rica office.

However, in terms of interaction, during the course of the project all five CFs described some communication issues with the project director. The problem, in general, centered on long delays in answering and acknowledging e-mails and sending requested information.

Component Coordinators: A positive and effective interaction between the CFs and the component coordinators was stated by all those involved and interviewed, both in Costa Rica and in the countries visited by the evaluators. In particular, the staff mentioned that in the 4 years since the project started, they had forged a work team based on mutual respect and camaraderie. “We worked very well as a team. I did what was my part and each person knew his/her responsibilities. We have a lot of professional respect for each other.” Although each coordinator was naturally concentrated in executing the activities for his/her component, they were patient and sensitive to the fact that the CFs had to implement activities for all components simultaneously.

Country Facilitators: The project director described the main role of the CFs as negotiators, opening doors and establishing amicable working relationships with stakeholders who may have different agendas, political viewpoints, and interests. The need for a CF in each country was unanimously recognized as essential, “It is necessary to have a CF located here in the country. It is not possible to establish relationships and execute this project through visits and phone calls.” A CF also mentioned that she believed the component coordinators valued their knowledge of the local context.

Being based inside the MOLs was considered practical by all five CFs. It allowed them to understand the realities and daily challenges of the institution, to better integrate project activities, and to look for opportunities for sustainability. One CF said that it was also important, however, to clarify from the beginning that she was not an MOL employee. Being separate made it easier to focus on the CyG project activities, and still be seen by sector representatives as independent and not subject to the authorities within the MOL.

Communication with Stakeholders

The project was found to be successful in communicating and establishing coordinated activities with two key stakeholder groups—unions and employers. The project staff learned how to listen to and address the needs and concerns of each group. For example, the project’s linkage with CAFTA risked branding it as a political venture and was closely scrutinized and questioned, particularly by worker groups opposed to CAFTA. The project was successful in transcending this image and portraying itself as a technical project with tangible benefits for all. For employers, in fact, a positive aspect of the project was that it was able to get worker and employer groups together for very concrete activities.

Communication and Coordination on Budgetary and Programmatic Matters

All five CFs agreed that coordination at the start of the project was very difficult but had improved considerably after the 2005 midterm evaluation. “At the beginning we had general
lines of work but we needed a better mechanism for integrating all project activities in a coherent manner.” Key improvements mentioned included the development of country plans, transparency of their country’s budget, and the introduction of management tools. The CFs commented that not knowing the details of their budget during the first year and a half had hindered their work. “We could not plan if we did not know how much money we had.”

**Balance of Staff**

The balance of staff between the coordinating office in Costa Rica and the countries was cited as a concern by the CFs. The CFs expressed that the administrative staff in Costa Rica seemed to grow during the project’s implementation period, while the CFs had no project assistance in their offices. Only after the introduction of the gender component, which expanded the number of activities, was it decided to include an assistant for the CFs. This was crucial and helped to accelerate logistical and administrative activities.

**Support from Abt and from FUNPADEM**

The design of the project established two separate financial systems: Abt managed the accounts for the Inspection and ADR components, and FUNPADEM for Awareness and Women’s Labor Rights. Two of the CFs contended that disbursement response times were different—Abt being much more efficient and timely. The project staff agreed, however, that having financial people from Abt based in the Costa Rica office had been valuable in bringing the two systems in-line. Staff members interviewed indicated that during the 4 years of the project, FUNPADEM had improved its administrative and financial procedures by adopting many of Abt’s guidelines. It was acknowledged that Abt had had a long history of implementing regional projects and had more rigorous guidelines and standards. A coordinator commented, “Abt had very strict rules for administration and finance. This was good because it forced us to live up to these rules.”

**Support from USDOL**

As the funding agency, USDOL offered technical and programmatic support, including guidance on USDOL/ILAB standard operating procedures. Project staff stated that throughout CyG’s implementation, the relationship with USDOL had been both cordial and valuable. USDOL also effectively assumed leadership in communicating with stakeholders when limits needed to be established. For example, USDOL staff explained to stakeholders what CyG, as a USDOL-funded project, could and could not do. A CF also explained that USDOL staff had been sensitive to the differences and specific political obstacles within each country’s reality.

**Project Communication**

The most significant communication problems cited by the CFs involved the delay in the project director’s response or acknowledgement to e-mails (see Section C, Management Structure and Personnel). At the beginning of the project, weekly staff meetings were held between the staff in Costa Rica and the CFs from each country (CFs by conference call). This was useful in understanding the challenges in each country at the onset of the project, but later it was found to be too time consuming once activities were in full swing. As explained by the project director, “With the amount of work involved, the CFs could not spend 1 day out of their week sitting through detailed explanations of difficulties faced in other countries.” It was later decided to have the weekly team meetings without the CFs. The meetings were helpful to both project
director and component coordinators, allowing them to better coordinate activities. Communication between staff in Costa Rica and the CFs was carried out directly, via e-mail and phone calls. According to CFs, this direct communication with component coordinators met their needs. In addition, quarterly project team meetings with all project staff were held in Costa Rica. These meetings were considered to be necessary and very useful.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The current contractual situation among the CFs continues to be an issue that creates dissatisfaction for the key project coordinators in each country.

2. Stakeholders may question the authority of their country facilitator/coordinator if the project does not expressly support their role as the primary project contact within each country. This was the impression given to stakeholders at the closing event in the Dominican Republic when the CFs were not included.

3. The project director is seen as an effective political and strategic manager; however, certain communication issues (i.e., delays in responding to inquiries) still present a barrier.

4. The project director respects the technical knowledge of the component coordinators and the CFs’ understanding of their specific country’s realities, actors, and political challenges.

5. Despite differences in contractual arrangements, all project staff in Costa Rica and the country facilitators work well as a team.

6. The communication with stakeholders was open. The project was able to achieve the participation of unions despite their opposition to CAFTA. They were able to obtain tripartite participation for specific products.

7. The development of country plans and tools for monitoring and organizing helped to make the work more coherent and logical. Providing the CFs with budgetary information improved their capacity to negotiate, coordinate, and execute project activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Explore alternative contractual arrangements with consultants so that the same or comparable salary and benefits structures are enjoyed by all. Similarly, include a clause in the contract indicating that it will respect national legislation with regard to maternity leave.

2. Give country facilitators the support and authority to work with all stakeholders by including them at all regional meetings with stakeholders.

3. Have a more structured plan of induction that includes training on the most important elements of the project: inspection, mediation, and labor legislation.
4. Establish a communication policy that acknowledges receipt of communication and succinctly explains when and by whom the query will be addressed.

5. Integrate country-specific plans into the original project design, supporting the country coordinators with as much programmatic and budgetary information as possible.

D. Monitoring and Evaluation

The performance monitoring plan defines the project’s development and immediate objectives and the indicators used to track progress towards the achievement of the immediate objectives (see Annex F, PMP). In the 2005 evaluation, it was reported that project staff felt the PMP was too complicated to be used for everyday monitoring of activities. For this reason, a number of project monitoring tools were developed—with the help of an evaluation expert—to simplify the overall monitoring process. This was also a recommendation made in the 2007 evaluation. The following is a review of the structure and content of these monitoring tools and how they helped monitor the progress toward achieving the immediate objectives.

FINDINGS

Data tracking tables per component: These tables summarize quantitative results. They are structured in a spreadsheet format that allows for a quantitative assessment of project activities by country and quarter. They are useful for keeping track of all numerical outputs, but by themselves do not measure progress towards achievement of objectives, since there is no analysis of what the numbers represent.

Annual data tracking table: This tool collects the information that is specifically related to the indicators that require information from the Ministries of Labor. It also includes information on the development indicator. This indicator was added in 2005 and is a ‘proxy’ indicator mandated by the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), which deals with the accountability and performance of programs and projects funded by the U.S. Government.

The GPRA indicator approximates the project’s progress toward the development objective through the number of workers impacted by an improved inspection.\(^\text{15}\) Although the information collected by the project shows an increase in this number (from 359,091 workers in 2005 to 1,232,233 in 2007), the evaluation team found no document analyzing what these changes mean in terms of progress toward the development objective.

Status vs. goals tables: These tables condense the status of each planned activity by component. They are meticulous and offer in a relatively short document (3-4 pages) a summary of the project implementation status by activity and by country. The tables helped the coordinators organize their tasks, but they did not serve to analyze progress toward the immediate objectives.

\(^{15}\)\text{“An improved inspection is an inspection conducted by an improved (trained) inspector. An improved inspector is a labor inspector who has received a minimum of 32 hours training, or a regional inspector with 16 hours of training. The number of workers who receive improved inspections [at their workplaces] is the sum of all workers in workplaces inspected by improved inspectors. USDOL developed the GPRA as a common indicator across all labor law compliance projects to measure the larger development objectives.” From Anna Kathyrnn Webb, Midterm Evaluation of the Cumple y Gana Project, Management Systems International (MSI), November 2, 2005.}
A drawback is that each of the four status vs. goals tables used has a different format and terminology. For example, in one table the progress toward implementing a product was given as a percentage, while in another table, it was given as a whole number. This is explained by the fact that the tables were not used to perform overall project monitoring but rather as a planning device for the component coordinators who in turn adapted them to suit their needs.

Strategic country plans and matrices: All CFs unanimously agreed that the development of country plans and matrices after the 2005 evaluation substantially improved the planning and monitoring of their activities. The strategic country plans were developed with the help of a monitoring specialist and allowed each country to strategically plan their activities. The matrices were useful, straightforward tools where the CFs could report the information they collected. The matrices were used on a day-to-day basis to guide the CFs on the execution of monthly activities. As explained by one CF, “The matrices systematized the data collection and made planning and reporting much easier.”

CONCLUSIONS

1. The information found in the monitoring tools was collected in a planned, organized, regular, and routine way. This information was used to help organize and plan project activities, but did not help answer questions regarding progress toward the project’s immediate objectives.

2. The data tracking tables, status vs. goals tables, and country-specific matrices are management—not monitoring—tools. They were used primarily to plan and manage, not to monitor and evaluate.

3. Despite the recommendation made in the 2005 and 2007 evaluations, the project monitoring system still focused, for the most part, on measuring quantitative output indicators without analyzing progress towards the immediate objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Define performance indicators that can realistically be used by the project staff to analyze progress toward achieving the immediate objectives. The performance indicators should be manageable (in terms of the number of indicators and their complexity) and take into account the limitations of the project’s scope and resources.

2. Standardize the format in the status vs. goals tables so that progress toward implementation is comparable.

3. Use the information collected in the monitoring tools to periodically assess progress toward achieving the project’s immediate objectives, and make the necessary changes throughout the implementation period if the project is not on track.

4. Include the support of a monitoring expert from the start of the project and at regular intervals throughout its implementation. This monitoring expert should lead the team in the development of monitoring tools, provide periodic technical assistance to the staff
responsible for collecting monitoring information, analyze the information collected, facilitate periodic ‘evaluation retreats’ that allow the staff to reflect on the overall project progress and direction (as described in recommendation number 3), and document the results of the periodic evaluation exercises.

E. Sustainability of Project Results

FINDINGS

Exit Strategy and Sustainability Plan

A specific sustainability plan was not developed as a project document, even though this was a specific recommendation made in the 2007 midterm evaluation (see Annex I: Principle Recommendations from Midterm Phase 2/Final Phase 1 Evaluation). However, a number of the project activities were found to meet the following definition of sustainability:

- Products developed fill an important gap or need as expressed by stakeholders.
- An infrastructure is in place that supports the ongoing delivery of the project’s products and services.
- Project products fit into an existing institution or system, without a lot of effort.
- Financial commitment is expressed by key institutions for continuing activities.
- Enthusiasm is expressed by staff within existing institutions for continuing project activities.

The products or activities that most meet these criteria are the ECMS and the written inspection protocols from the Inspection component; the ECMS, procedure manuals and infrastructure improvements from the ADR component; the call centers, website, and the written materials from the Public Awareness component; the trainings/T4T offered in the Public Awareness and Women’s Labor Rights components; and the institutionalization of labor information into national educational curricula as part of the Awareness component. How these activities will be sustained is described in more detail below.

Inspection

ECMS: The countries that implemented the ECMS for Inspection included Honduras, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. Interviews with MOL officials in Honduras and El Salvador found a commitment to maintaining the ECMS and upgrading the infrastructure as necessary for its continued use. IT experts trained in the ECMS are currently in place; however, there is always the risk of losing these experts to higher-paying jobs.

Written protocols: Inspection protocols were developed for all five countries. Interviews in four of the five countries revealed that these protocols filled a gap in the standardization of inspection procedures. The MOL stakeholders expressed a deep commitment to institutionalizing and using these protocols.
**Alternative Dispute Resolution**

**ECMS:** The ECMS for ADR are now operational and being used by conciliators in the capital cities of all project countries except the Dominican Republic. MOL stakeholders again expressed a complete commitment to maintaining the ECMS and upgrading as necessary.

**Procedures manuals:** Procedures manuals are being used in El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Guatemala. Interviews in these countries revealed that it has unified the way all conciliators carry out conciliations. Supervisor and directors are convinced of the benefits and are taking steps to institutionalize the manuals.

**Infrastructure improvements:** The ADR component included an important upgrade in the MOL conciliation departments. Aside from the computers to install the ECMS, conciliation departments were reorganized and upgraded to allow for private conciliation services. The MOLs were deeply committed to maintaining these rooms for their designed purpose; moreover, the professionalism that these upgrades brought gave a deeper sense of commitment to the entire mediation services department.

**Public Awareness**

**Call centers:** MOLs in Honduras and El Salvador are committed to maintaining the Call Centers. It is likely that the Call Centers in the other countries will also be sustained by their MOLs in combination with outside donor support.

**Website:** According to the CyG project director, the leylaboral.com website will be maintained and sustained for the next 3 to 4 years by its designer, Masterlex.

**Written materials:** Aside from El Salvador, there is no sustainability plan for replenishing written materials once supplies are diminished; nevertheless, these materials now form part of the informational library in government, labor, and employer sector offices.

**Institutionalization of labor information:** The integration of labor rights information into Honduran adult education curricula approved by the Ministry of Education shows it is now institutionalized. (See Public Awareness under Section III, B for more information.)

**Women’s Labor Rights**

**Training for trainers:** The T4T on women’s labor rights issues has potential for sustainability since trainers are institutionalized within participating government, labor, or employer sector organizations, as well as NGOs. Participating stakeholders expressed their commitment to continue using the T4T materials in future courses.

**Strategic plans:** The strategic plans developed by the CyG project in coordination with the MOL gender offices have tremendous potential for sustainability. However, all gender office coordinators interviewed agreed that additional technical assistance and follow-up is needed by the project to achieve the desired level of institutionalization.
CONCLUSIONS

1. The development of a written sustainability plan early in the project would help focus project efforts on those activities that have a greater possibility of institutionalization. For example, sustainable efforts such as establishing labor education into national adult education curricula require long-term planning to achieve success.

2. Despite the lack of a written sustainability plan, there are a number of activities within each CyG project component that are likely to be sustained by project stakeholders.

3. The activities of the Women’s Labor Rights component had too little time to achieve any sure degree of sustainability. More project time is needed to support interested stakeholders. Specifically, all activities targeting the MOL gender offices still need further technical assistance and project support to ensure the implementation of the strategic plans and the integration and institutionalization of women’s labor rights issues in all MOL activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Develop a written sustainability plan, with the participation of project stakeholders, soon after the first year of the project. Such a plan will allow project staff to focus efforts on those project activities that have a greater likelihood of achieving sustainability.

2. Provide further financial and technical support to the activities started in the Women’s Labor Rights component; in particular, implementation of the strategic plans in the MOL gender offices to ensure a greater likelihood of sustainability.

3. Provide incentives to IT experts trained in the use and support of the ECMS so that they are more likely to remain within the MOLs. If financial incentives are not possible, then look for other career incentives that might provide motivation to remain.

4. Look for additional opportunities to establish labor education curricula into national adult educational curricula in the other project countries.
I. LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

The 5-year Cumple y Gana project offers some broad lessons learned and best practices for developing future regional projects focusing on labor law compliance in Central America and the Dominican Republic. These include the following:

1. A multifaceted approach is the most effective project design. This includes working with government, labor, and employer sectors, and providing a combination of tangible products as well as technical assistance for longer-term institutional change. The tangible products include equipment and infrastructure improvements for the MOLs, as well as educational materials available to government, employer, and labor sectors. Technical assistance leading to longer-term institutional change within the MOLs includes designing and implementing electronic case management systems, establishing internal procedures, and designing and implementing training programs.

2. The tripartite process of designing, validating, and implementing major project activities or products has proven to be a valuable framework by which to create buy-in and develop relationships with project stakeholders.

3. An excellent organizational model for implementing a regional project is to establish an office that can offer regional oversight, coordination, and evaluation of activities among countries, in combination with a local office/representative in each country that can offer leadership in executing the project activities within the local context.

4. Five years is an insufficient amount of time to establish a regional labor law compliance program, implement activities with tripartite stakeholders, and evaluate the impact on national labor law compliance. Regional projects that establish a strategic objective of long-term institutional and social change require no less than 7 years to effectively implement program activities and evaluate their corresponding impact.

5. Two years is a woefully inadequate amount of time to design and implement activities related to strengthening mechanisms that promote and protect women’s labor rights. A complex subject such as this, which has received little attention in the past, requires years of technical support and effort to effectively implement and institutionalize program activities and evaluate their corresponding impact.

6. Curriculum-based labor education activities that are implemented through adult education institutions provide a structure that leads to greater sustainability of project messages.

7. Radio spots are a crucial mechanism for disseminating information broadly, particularly to worker populations who may not receive educational information through any other source. Although the sustainability is difficult to achieve, they are worth the ongoing attention that they require.

8. The development of a standardized electronic case management system enables countries to monitor data and prioritize activities that lead to greater labor law compliance and enforcement.
9. Procedure manuals help Ministries of Labor standardize and unify the services provided to workers and employers.

10. Good working relationships with the employer sector are best established by emphasizing labor obligations and worker rights in combination with corporate social responsibility.

When working with MOLs, begin with infrastructure improvements, which then enable them to make the necessary changes in processes and procedures.
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TERMS OF REFERENCE

FINAL EVALUATION OF THE LABOR LAW COMPLIANCE PROGRAM IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

At the time this project was funded in September 2003, the United States and five Central American countries (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua) were engaged in negotiations toward a comprehensive free trade agreement. In the area of labor, one of the objectives of the United States was to improve labor law compliance in the region by seeking an appropriate commitment from the Central American countries to effectively enforce their laws and to educate employers and workers about their obligations and rights under such laws.

The Central American countries had requested further technical assistance from the U.S. to strengthen the capacity of their labor ministries to enforce labor laws. Among the specific areas identified by the countries for technical assistance are the promotion and dissemination of information on national labor laws and their application throughout the population, particularly among workers and employers; strengthening of labor inspection systems; and developing and strengthening alternative dispute resolution systems.

USDOL provided $6.75 million for a project to support the countries in their drive to improve compliance with their national labor laws. The project was competed and awarded to the Costa Rican-based NGO, FUNPADEM (The Foundation for Peace and Democracy), with the Bethesda-based contractor, Abt Associates as a sub-contractor. The initial project duration was from October 2003 through October 2007. In September 2004, DOL added an additional $2 million to the project to incorporate Panama and the Dominican Republic into the project, following their inclusion in the free trade negotiations.

With the passage of CAFTA-DR, Congress committed additional funding to the U.S. Department of State for projects to improve labor law compliance in CAFTA-DR countries. The funds were intended to support areas outlined in the Vice Ministers’ White Paper. With $6.5 million received from the Department of State, DOL extended the Comply and Win project for an additional year, added a component targeting gender discrimination, and extended activities to additional geographic regions. The phase two extension covers the same countries except Panama and Costa Rica, which are still scheduled to close in September 2007. As the funds for phase two come from the Department of State, they cannot be used to support any country that has not signed article 98, regarding the international criminal court. Therefore, Costa Rica was excluded from phase two. Panama was excluded from phase two because they are not part of CAFTA-DR.
**Development Objective:** Increased compliance with national labor laws and norms in Central America and the Dominican Republic.

Indicator: Due to the lack of accurate data within the MOLs, there is no reliable indicator to measure the Development Objective. Progress will be measured using the immediate objective indicators.

**Immediate objectives:**

1) Increased understanding of target audience in each country about National Labor Laws and Norms.

   Indicators:
   - Number of visits to the website Leylaboral.com
   - Number of requests for information to the Labor Departments concerning national labor laws and standards
   - Increased knowledge of national labor laws and standards with representatives (participants) from target population in workshops
   - Increased contact with target population regarding information about national labor laws in a major city in each country

2) More effective and reliable Ministry of Labor inspection systems to enforce the national labor laws and norms.

   Indicators:
   - Number of inspections requested from the Department of Labor
   - Number of workplaces that implement corrective activities due to labor inspections conducted by Departments of Labor
   - Increase in the level of value of the reliability of the Inspection systems of the Departments of Labor

3) Improved and expanded mediation and conciliation services in the resolution of labor conflicts.

   Indicators:
   - Number of conciliation and mediation of labor conflict cases in the Department of Labor
   - Number and percentage of conciliation and mediation cases resolved by the Department of Labor
• Increase in the knowledge of the participants of the workshops on conciliation and mediation of labor conflicts

4) Strengthened mechanisms to protect and promote women’s labor rights.

Indicators:

• Number of women trained in labor laws and the means to exercise their labor rights.
• MOL inspectors use instruments to verify compliance with gender related labor laws.

Please see full list of indicators, including product indicators, in the attached PMP.

II. SUMMARY OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES TO DATE

As of June 30, 2008, the project has produced the following products:

- Electronic Case Management Systems (ECMS) designed, installed and in use in labor ministries for inspection departments in four countries (El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama). More than 90% of Central Level Inspectors are using them in those countries (except for Nicaragua, only 50%). Electronic Case Management Systems for inspection in use in four regional offices in El Salvador and Honduras.

- Electronic case management systems designed and installed in labor ministries for ADR departments in five countries (El Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, Costa Rica and Honduras). 100% of Central Level Conciliators are using them in those countries. Guatemala’s ADR System is under development.

- Local area networks, including computers and related equipment, donated to seven Ministries of Labor central inspection offices and the regional offices of five countries (El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic – Phase II). About 150 to 250 units of computer equipment were donated by the project in each. In the cases of Costa Rica and Panamá, more than 60 units were donated per country under Phase I.

- The project already opened the Call Centers in El Salvador and Costa Rica. It is at the final stages for opening Call Centers in Honduras. Nicaragua is under progress. In Guatemala it did get the approval and commitment of the Ministry of Labor. In the Dominican Republic the project is working on enhancing and reshaping the current Call Center. The project’s supports, includes training, technical, equipment, furniture, public awareness campaigns, and follow up.

- Designed, approved, published, and launched the Self Evaluation Check Lists for 7 countries. More than 240,000 Self Evaluation Check Lists have been published, most of them distributed throughout the region, including the publication in newspapers in six countries (reaching about 460,000 people). In some countries, the inspectors are distributing the Self-evaluation Check Lists to employers, as a way to prevent (voluntarily) the violations in their countries. In Guatemala and El Salvador, the Social Security Institutions distributed the Self-Evaluation Check lists to more than 45,000 employers.

- Remodeling and equipment purchases for mediation and conciliation environments in five Ministries of Labor’s headquarters, including two regional offices in the Dominican Republic and the ADR Center in Guatemala, as well as three regional offices: Choluteca, San Pedro Sula in Honduras and Santa Ana in El Salvador.
Training courses for Labor Inspectors and Mediators on basic computers and computer software in six countries;

More than 90 percent of central-level Labor Ministries’ Mediators and regional specialized mediators trained to apply mediation and conciliation techniques, including those applied to collective bargaining. These efforts have enhanced the quality and capacity for labor conciliation and mediation and have helped hundreds of thousands of workers in the seven countries.

Interested stakeholders trained in labor conflict mediation and conciliation mechanisms in the seven countries. Total 1,231 Stakeholders (employers, union leaders, labor advisors, legal advisors).

Preparation and approval of labor inspection manuals and mediation and conciliation services procedures manuals in six countries (Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic and Guatemala). Two of them already printed in Costa Rica and Honduras.

Developed and maintained a free Web Site, www.Leylaboral.com, for Frequently Asked Questions for Labor Rights for Employers and Workers including the complete information on Labor Laws in the seven countries and a tool for Severance Payment Calculations on line in the seven countries. As of July 30, 2008, there were more than 2,593,268 consultations to the web page.

More than five tripartite meetings in every country (four for Costa Rica and Panama). The meetings promoted social dialogue and helped to validate the original Leylaboral.com FAQs (2004 and 2005) and the new FAQs. (2007); the Self Evaluation Check Lists (2006), as well as the original Plans (2004 and 2005) for Phase I, the Public Awareness Materials (2006) and the Gender Studies (2007, only for Phase II countries).

The Public Awareness Component has produced and distributed 3,790.00 units of materials on labor rights and obligations in the 7 countries (manuals, labor rights guides, registration manuals, publications on ILO conventions, labor law publications, road signs, bus stop signs, posters, calendars, leaflets, CDs. on labor rights) in the 7 countries. These numbers include the Publication of the Self-Evaluation Check Lists but don’t include publications from other components and they do not include the impact of newspaper publications on Labor rights (2 to 3 times in 7 countries), nor the people covered by the same publications for the Self Evaluation Check List (one or two times in the seven countries). The daily readers of those newspapers cover about than 1,000,000 people throughout the Region.

Public awareness activities in seven countries including the production, validation and airing of radio spots (in all 7 countries and TV spots in 2 countries). 22 radio or TV stations, about 75 topics (including gender and ADR components) and around 2.000 spots every month for the last 2 years (2.807 radio spots for the last quarter of 2007, 1.902 for the first Quarter, and 1.459 for this Quarter).

17 vehicles have been donated to the MOLs. Most of them for Inspection and Gender Departments.

The project has carried out and developed national studies on Women Labor Rights from a gender perspective in the five countries. These studies included surveys and focus groups techniques in the five countries (focused on Maquila Sector). Four of them have been published and launched.

The project has developed training materials to be used in the T4T courses for ADR (ready to be validated in the five countries), for labor rights (only for three countries), and for the Gender component (for five countries). The T4T courses have been replicated in five countries (Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras), reaching more than 1.500 people (including those from the Gender Component). In the case of the
Gender component, the Practical Experiences includes T4T courses and replicas in five countries and aims to reach about 1,200 people.

- The project equipped and improved the Ministries of Labor Gender Offices in 5 countries and helped them to improve their skills and knowledge.
- 1,970 Labor Ministries’ employees, union leaders and employers already participated in the courses, seminars of workshops held by the project on women labor rights and gender’s inspection.
- More than 90% of central level Labor Ministries’ Inspectors trained to apply better inspection techniques. More than 60% of Regional Inspectors trained to apply better inspection techniques. Most of those labor inspectors attended courses on labor law, inspections skills, OSH, basic computers and/or computer software (some of them, attended more than one course, seminar or workshop). Their inspections, which cover around 1,500,000 workers a year, helped to protect workers’ rights throughout the seven countries.
- The Midterm/Final Evaluation Report was sent in October 2007. The Report was very positive for the project: In general, the Evaluation Report “the three components of Phase 1 and the gender discrimination component added during Phase 2 have been successful in quantitative terms, and as far as impact of the project could be measured, they have been well accepted and identified as fulfilling a need by beneficiaries from all three sectors (Ministry of Labor, employers’ and workers’ organizations) targeted by the project.” (See page 4). The project agreed with the two main recommendations made by the Evaluator: to improve the sustainability and to simplify the monitoring tools of the project. It also accepted the recommendation to improve the visibility and the quality indicators.
- The project has also achieved good relations with the government, labor, and business sectors, as well as with the Ministries of Labor in the seven countries, despite the change of governments in five countries and the high expectancy and demands from the Ministries of Labor.

III. MIDTERM EVALUATION

A midterm evaluation for phase one was conducted in September 2005. A combined final evaluation for phase one and midterm evaluation for phase two was conducted in August 2007. Below is an excerpt from the 2007 evaluation report.

A midterm evaluation was conducted for Phase 1 in September 2005. The evaluation indicated that project implementation performance was satisfactory, although there had been considerable delays in the execution of key activities, which were mostly due to the slowness of labor ministry decision-making and approval processes. It also found that with two years remaining, the project had not given sufficient attention to how it would achieve the objective of increased labor law compliance and what the project’s impact would be because the project had no clear strategic guidelines of how results were to be reached, especially in the case of the public awareness component, which is the weakest component and in the most need of improvement. At the same time, the evaluation pointed out that the public awareness component had the most promise of the three components due to its broader scope and the possibility of greater impact.
This report outlines the main findings and recommendations of the final evaluation (Costa Rica and Panama) and the midterm evaluation (Honduras, Nicaragua, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, and El Salvador) of the project. It was found that after the midterm evaluation the project developed strategic guidelines that have made the planning and monitoring process more decentralized, visible, and structured. A key development in this respect has been that the project team with the support of a monitoring and evaluation expert, designed country planning, and monitoring tools (matrices) that, if properly used, allow component coordinators and country facilitators to measure if the strategy and activities are leading to the desired results.

However, it was also found that the project staff is not using the full potential of these tools as they are used mainly as ends in themselves, rather than as means to an end. This is reflected in the fact that the project team focuses for the most part on measuring quantitative output indicators (the timely and accurate implementation of planned activities) without measuring outcome or impact indicators and if and to what extent objectives are being achieved. According to staff interviewed, the main reason for this is the lack of experience and training of most project staff in this respect. As a result, as was the case in the midterm evaluation, it has been difficult to measure the real impact of the project on the beneficiaries and the project status in terms of achievements of its immediate objectives.

Based on evidence from interviews and monitoring tools, the project implementation is generally on track. Delays that exist in the execution of key activities are due mostly to the slowness of labor ministry decision-making and approval processes (for example the implementation of the Call Centers has suffered delays as a result of this), as well as in some cases due to cumbersome internal administrative procedures. In Phase 2 countries the Promotion y Protection of Women Labor Rights from a Gender Perspective was introduced. The component has been well received by all stakeholders.

Phase 1 of the project officially ends in September 2007. However, Cumple y Gana received a no-cost extension from DOL until February 2008 for Panama and Costa Rica. During this extended period Cumple y Gana plans to assist the MOLs of both countries to set up Call Centers. This component was originally only planned for Phase 2 countries.

IV. Evaluator

The evaluation team will be comprised of:

- An independent evaluator with specific skills in international project evaluation, familiarity with labor law compliance project implementation, experience in Latin America, and Spanish fluency is needed to carry out the evaluation.
- A technical expert with expertise working with Ministries of Labor in Latin America, including significant experience with inspection systems.

V. Purpose of Evaluation

The purpose of the final evaluation for the project and the phase two countries (Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, and Honduras) is to:
1. Determine if the project achieved its stated objectives and explain why or why not.
2. Evaluate
   a. benefits/impact accrued to target groups
   b. likelihood of sustainability
   c. project management
   d. performance monitoring.
3. Provide recommendations on how to build on the achievements of the project and ensure that it is sustained by the national stakeholders and by any new projects.
4. Document lessons learned, success stories, and best practices in order to maximize the experiences gained through project implementation. The evaluation findings should take into consideration the project duration, existing resources, and political and environmental constraints.
5. Identify needs that may not have been addressed or fully met either because of inadequate project design, or insufficient resources or lack of time.

The Evaluation Team Leader is responsible for conducting the evaluation according to the terms of reference (TOR). She will:

- Review the TOR and provide input, as necessary
- Review project background documents
- Review the evaluation questions and refine the questions, as necessary
- Develop and implement an evaluation methods (i.e., surveys, conduct interviews, review documents) to answer the evaluation questions
- Conduct Team Planning Meeting with USDOL and implementing organization
- Decide composition of field visit interviews to ensure objectivity of the evaluation
- Present verbally preliminary findings to project field staff
- Prepare an initial draft of the evaluation report
- Prepare final report
- Participate in Post-Trip Debriefing
- Include USDOL Program Office on all communication with USDOL Project Manager

The USDOL Project Manager is responsible for:

- Drafting the TOR
- Finalizing the TOR with input from the implementer and the evaluator
- Reviewing proposed evaluator
- Reviewing proposed evaluation budget
- Providing project background documents to evaluator
- Obtaining country clearance
- Organizing and participating in Team Planning Meeting
- Briefing project field staff on upcoming visit and work with them to ensure coordination and preparation for evaluator and technical expert
- Assisting in the implementation of the evaluation methods, as appropriate and as approved by the Team Leader (i.e., participate in interviews, review documents, observe committee meetings) and in such a way as to minimize bias in evaluation findings
- Reviewing and providing comments of the draft evaluation report
- Approving the final draft of the evaluation report
- Organizing and participating in the Post-Trip Debriefing
Implementing Organization is responsible for:

- Reviewing the TOR and providing input, as necessary
- Providing project background materials to evaluator
- Reviewing the evaluation questions and working with the evaluator to refine the questions, as necessary
- Participating in Team Planning Meeting
- Preparing a list of recommended interviewees
- Scheduling all meetings for field visit and coordinating all logistical arrangements
- Assisting in the implementation of the evaluation methods, as appropriate and as approved by the Team Leader (i.e., participate in interviews, review documents, observe committee meetings); and in such a way as to minimize bias in evaluation findings
- Reviewing and providing comments on the draft evaluation report
- Participating the Post-Trip Debriefing
- Including USDOL Program Office on all communication with USDOL Project Manager and/or evaluator

VI. **KEY EVALUATION ISSUES**

The Final Evaluation will examine the following seven key issues:

**A. Validity of the project strategy, objectives and assumptions**

1. **Relating to the original design of the project (relevance)**
   - If you were to design a new project, what would you do differently? Why do you think this design would have made a difference to the project’s results?

2. **Relating to the input and commitment of stakeholders to the design process and project implementation**
   - Did the project stakeholders – MOLs/employers/unions/project advisory committee members – understand the project’s objectives and approach?
     - If yes, how was this understanding achieved?
     - How was this understanding measured?
   - Have they continued to support the project’s objectives throughout the life cycle of the project? Were project stakeholders involved in the development and implementation of activities? In what ways?
   - Were there any problems with groups who see the project as promoting CAFTA-DR? How were these problems addressed?
   - Overall was the project able to achieve a sense of ownership between the various stakeholders? Do you think their interest will continue beyond the scope of this project?

3. **Relating to the recommendations of the midterm evaluation**
• The midterm evaluation recommended outreach to wider audience, both geographically and with different target groups. Did this happen? If so, how, and if not, why not? (Note country differences.)
• The midterm evaluation recommended drafting country plans. What impact have these plans had on the project? Have these plans been used to their fullest extent? Why or why not?

B. Benefits/impact accrued to target groups

1. Impact to project beneficiaries/target groups
• Which of the targeted groups had the most immediate benefit from the project?
• Which of the groups was impacted the least by the project?
• The newest component of the project is the “Promotion and Protection of Labor Rights on Women from a Gender Perspective.” Has this component had an impact for women workers? What impact? How has this been measured?

2. Impact of project implementation on the project components
   a. Labor inspection systems
• Has the project helped to make inspection systems more efficient and reliable? How?
• If yes, how has this been measured?
• If you think inspection systems are more efficient and reliable, what activities (training, ECMS, etc.) have contributed to this improvement? To what extent?
• What have been the major problems with the project’s approach to labor inspection systems?
• What have been the best practices with the project’s approach?

   b. Awareness of Labor Laws
• Has the project helped to improve the level of awareness and information on labor laws among workers and employers?
• If yes, how has this been measured? Have follow-up studies been conducted (which can be compared to the baseline)
• If you think awareness has improved, what activity(ies) have had the most impact in this improvement?
• How much of the improvements in awareness can be at least partly attributed to the project?
• What have been the major problems with the project’s awareness approach?
• What have been good practices of the awareness approach?

   c. Improved Use of Conciliation and Mediation
• Has the project helped to improve conciliation and mediation of labor conflicts by the MOLs? Has the project helped to develop new conflict resolution methods?
• If the project has helped improve conciliation how has this been measured?
• If you think conciliation and mediation have been improved, what activities have had the most impact?
• How much of the improvements in conciliation and mediation can be at least partly attributed to the project?
• What have been the major problems with the project’s approach for this component?
• What have been the best practices of the approach?

d. Greater understanding of conciliation and mediation among interested stakeholders
• Has the project helped to improve the understanding about conciliation and mediation on the part of the stakeholders?
• How has this been measured?
• How much of enhanced knowledge of conciliation and mediation can be at least partly attributed to the project?
• What have been the major problems with the project’s approach for this component?
• What have been the best practices of the approach?

e. Promotion and Protection of Labor Rights from a Gender Perspective.
• Has the project helped to improve the mechanisms to deal with gender discrimination cases within the different labor inspection systems?
• Has the project helped to enhance awareness among workers of the specific rights protecting women from discrimination in the workplace?
• How has this been measured?
• If you think there have been improvements, what activities have had the greatest impact?
• How much can improvements in labor inspection and awareness be at least partly attributed to the project?
• What have been the major problems with the project’s approach for this component?
• What have been good practices of the approach?

C. Implementation status, specifically as concerns planned activities, materials, schedule and budget

1. To what extent have planned activities been implemented on time and within budget to the target audiences, in relation to the original project document and to subsequent work plan(s)?
   • How satisfied were you with the project’s progress?
   • Were you “on track” in terms of your timeline and budget? Why, or why not?
   • Did you have to adjust your workplan? How?
2. What obstacles were encountered during the project that prevented you from meeting the project objectives?
3. Were training programs, manuals and other project materials adapted to project needs and the country situation?
   • Were they coordinated with other government, donor, or private sector activities where appropriate?
   • Did they incorporate existing materials where appropriate?
   • Were they well received and well produced?
4. In hindsight, what changes in timing, schedule and budget would have helped with the implementation of the project?
D. Sustainability of project results

1. Exit strategy and sustainability plan
   - Has this been developed?
   - Who was involved in the development of the strategy?
   - Overall what do you think of the strategy?
   - Was the strategy developed for each component or major activity or by country?

2. What project components are now self-sufficient and which components still rely on outside assistance? What has made certain components more sustainable than others?

3. Have national stakeholders expressed specific commitments in terms of adopting and sustaining activities?

4. What capabilities do you see in each country’s national stakeholders (specifically the MOLs) to maintain and further develop the outcomes produced with the project’s support?

E. Management performance by USDOL, Funpadem/Abt and MOLs, specifically as concerns project staffing and communications

1. How well does the project manage its personnel? Evaluate the performance of:
   a. The Project Director—was he effective? How well did he interact with the other members of the project team, both in-country and international? What did he do well? Where are areas for improvement?
   b. FUNPADEM—was the relationship between FUNPADEM and the project effective? Was interaction between FUNPADEM, the Costa Rica-based staff, and the country facilitators effective, that is, is this a good set up for a project like this one? How was FUNPADEM viewed by outside stakeholders, especially by those outside Costa Rica?
   c. The Component Coordinators—were they effective? did they coordinate with each other to ensure resources were best used, that is, did they work together to make sure their efforts were not contradictory and overburdening for the country facilitators? Is the design of component coordinators and country facilitators effective and useful for a project like this? What did they do well? Where are areas for improvement?
   d. The Country Facilitators—were they effective? How well did they interact with the component coordinators/the project director/other facilitators? What did they do well? Where are areas for improvement? Was having a facilitator in each country effective?

2. How well does the project communicate with stakeholders?

3. Did communication and coordination between FUNPADEM staff in Costa Rica and country facilitators improve regarding programmatic and budgetary matters? If so, how? If not, why not?

4. Is there an adequate balance of staff between headquarters in Costa Rica and the countries? If not, how can this be improved?

5. How would you describe the support from Abt and from FUNPADEM during the project planning and implementation? In what ways could this have improved?

6. How would you describe the support from USDOL? In what ways could this have improved?

7. What were the biggest communication problems within the project?

8. What were the best practices in terms of communication?
F. Effectiveness of project performance monitoring

1. How did the project address the concerns raised in the midterm evaluation about monitoring and evaluation tools?
2. One of the recommendations of the 2007 evaluation was to change the focus from activities to an analysis of progress towards achievement of objectives. Were the indicators reviewed and adjusted in the PMP to accomplish this? If so, which ones?
3. What data was collected for monitoring of results and objectives?
4. A consultant was hired to review the monitoring tools. How useful was this for the everyday monitoring of the project?
5. Was the performance monitoring system practical, useful and cost effective for project management?
   - What problems were encountered with project indicators? Collection of data? Reporting?
   - Did project staff increase their knowledge and use of the monitoring and evaluation tools? If so, how? If not, why not?
6. How was the gathered data used to guide project activities as opposed to used simply for reporting?

G. Lessons learned

1. If there were a new, regional project focusing on labor law compliance in Central America and the Dominican Republic,
   - What target groups would require more attention?
   - What other topics would need to be incorporated?
   - What changes in implementation would produce better results?
2. What are the lessons learned from Cumple y Gana and how can they be taken into account for future projects?

VII. Evaluation Methods

Document Review: The evaluator will review the following documents before conducting any interviews or trips in the region.

- The Project Document
- Quarterly Reports
- Reports on specific project activities
- Training materials
- Trip reports
- Strategic Framework and PMP
- Work plans/Plan of Action
- Midterm Evaluations (2005 and 2007)
- Any other relevant documents

Team Planning Meeting: The evaluator will have a Team Planning Meeting (TPM) with the USDOL Project Manager, USDOL Evaluation Specialist, evaluation services contractor representative and project
field staff (via conference call) and Washington, DC staff. The objective of the team planning meeting is to reach a common understanding among the evaluator, stakeholders and project implementers regarding the status of the project, the priority evaluation questions, the available data sources and data collection instruments, and an outline of the final report.

The following topics will be covered: status of evaluation logistics, project background, key evaluation questions and priorities, data sources and data collection methods, roles and responsibilities of evaluation team, outline of the final report.

**Individual Interviews:** Interviews will be conducted with the following individuals:

a. Abt project staff in Bethesda  
b. Funpadem project staff in Costa Rica  
c. Funpadem country facilitators in participating countries  
d. USDOL project manager and other relevant USDOL staff  
e. Selected individuals from the following groups:
   - Project Advisory Committee or tripartite technical committee  
   - Inspectors who have received training  
   - Mediators who have received training  
   - Ministry of Labor staff who have policy and decision-making authority over project focus areas (mediation, inspection, public awareness)  
   - Employer groups, unions, NGOs that have worked with the project, as well as employer groups, unions, and NGOs that have not or that have refused to work with the project  
   - U.S. Embassy Labor Attachés (those at post for at least 3 months)  
   - Other donor groups who have been involved with the project (possibilities include Spanish cooperation, IDB, ILO, USAID)

**Field Visit:** Four countries will be visited from the five participating project countries. The trip is currently scheduled for the month of October. The trip will begin in the Dominican Republic and continue through Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. The exact itinerary will be determined later based on scheduling and availability of interviewees. The project staff based in Costa Rica will participate in interviews where and when appropriate in-person or via phone.

Meetings will be scheduled in advance of the field visits by the Comply and Win project director and Country Facilitators, in accordance with the evaluator’s requests and consistent with these terms of reference. *The evaluator should conduct meetings without the participation of any project staff.*

**Questionnaire:** The Evaluator will administer a questionnaire for the Ministry of Labor in Nicaragua. The questionnaire should contain 3-4 questions that address areas included in section VI. The Evaluator may choose to conduct follow up phone interviews with representatives of the Ministry of Labor to seek additional information. The country facilitator in Nicaragua will provide assistance in setting up phone interviews and administering the questionnaire.

**Debrief in Field:** The evaluation team will conduct a debrief in Costa Rica upon their return.

**Post Trip Meeting:** Upon completion of the report, the evaluator will provide a debriefing to relevant USDOL staff on the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations as well as the evaluation process.
VIII. **DURATION AND MILESTONES OF EVALUATION**

The following is a schedule of tasks and anticipated duration of each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory Research</td>
<td>October 8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial DOL Briefing</td>
<td>October 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Research</td>
<td>October 27-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-trip debrief</td>
<td>November 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Draft Report</td>
<td>November 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from USDOL on draft</td>
<td>November 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of Document</td>
<td>December 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. **DELIVERABLES**

A. Team Planning Meeting by October 13, 2008.

B. Evaluation protocols based on Team Planning Meeting with USDOL project manager and project staff, by October 15, 2008.

B. Interviews with Washington staff prior to October 17, 2008.

E. Post-Trip Debriefing (via conference call) with USDOL by November 10, 2005


D. Final Report, original plus 5 copies, will be submitted to USDOL within five days after receiving final comments from USDOL and implementing organization. The final report should also be sent electronically to USDOL and the implementing organization.

X. **REPORT**

The evaluator will complete a draft report of the evaluation following the outline below, and the Macro International representative will share it with the USDOL Program Office, USDOL project manager, and implementing organization who will review the report. USDOL and the implementing organization will
have 5 days to provide comments on the draft report. The evaluator will produce a re-draft incorporating
the USDOL and implementing organization comments where appropriate, and provide a final version
within three days of having received final comments.

The final version of the report will follow the format below (page lengths by section illustrative only) and
be no more than 30 pages in length, excluding the annexes:

Report

1. Title page (1)
2. Table of Contents (1)
3. Acronyms (1)
4. Executive Summary (2)
5. Background and Project Description (1-2)
6. Purpose of Evaluation (1)
7. Evaluation Methods (1)
8. Project Status (1)
9. Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations (no more than 20 pages)
   This section should be organized around the TOR key issues and include findings, conclusions
   and recommendations for each.

Annexes

1. Terms of reference
2. Strategic Framework
3. Project PMP and data table
4. Project Document
5. Project Workplan
6. List of Meetings and Interviews
7. Any other relevant documents including (baseline survey, new indicator memo, project update)
### Annex B: Implementation Status of Project Deliverables: Cumple y Gana Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Product</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>El Salvador</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>The Dominican Republic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO 1: Increase awareness among target audiences of workers and employers in each country about national labor laws and norms (and means to access them)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 1.1</strong> Public awareness activities in the different countries at national and regional levels</td>
<td>- Informative material produced and distributed-33,080</td>
<td>- Informative material produced and distributed-7,000</td>
<td>- Informative material produced and distributed-3,000</td>
<td>- Informative material produced and distributed-17,000</td>
<td>- Informative material produced and distributed-24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transmitted radio spots (number of times on air)-4662</td>
<td>- Transmitted radio spots (number of times on air)-3678</td>
<td>- Transmitted radio spots (number of times on air)-3510</td>
<td>- Transmitted radio spots (number of times on air)-7380</td>
<td>- Transmitted radio spots (number of times on air)-3394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Trained stakeholder on labor rights-275</td>
<td>- Trained stakeholders on labor rights-157</td>
<td>- Trained stakeholders on labor rights-399</td>
<td>- Trained stakeholders on labor rights-451</td>
<td>- Trained stakeholder on labor rights-721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 1.2</strong> Training activities with a multiplier effect executed in the 3 sectors (public, private, labor)</td>
<td>- Training modules T4T (since July 2006)-0</td>
<td>- Training modules T4T (since July 2006)-3</td>
<td>- Training modules T4T (since July 2006)-2</td>
<td>- Training modules T4T (since July 2006)-2</td>
<td>T-training modules T4T (since July 2006)-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Trained persons (since July 2006)-0</td>
<td>- Trained persons (since July 2006)-70</td>
<td>- Trained persons (since July 2006)-44</td>
<td>- Trained persons (since July 2006)-0</td>
<td>Trained persons (since July 2006)-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Completed courses or workshops provided by people trained with the project’s modules-0</td>
<td>- Completed courses or workshops provided by people trained with the project’s modules-0</td>
<td>- Completed courses or workshops provided by people trained with the project’s modules-30</td>
<td>- Completed courses or workshops provided by people trained with the project’s modules-273</td>
<td>- Completed courses or workshops provided by people trained with the project’s modules-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 1.4</strong> Interactive web page established, developed and promoted</td>
<td>- Hits to leylaboral (since July 2006)-334,496</td>
<td>- Hits to leylaboral (since July 2006)-491,771</td>
<td>- Hits to leylaboral (since July 2006)-312,973</td>
<td>- Hits to leylaboral (since July 2006)-272,107</td>
<td>- Hits to leylaboral (since July 2006)-375,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 1.5</strong> Outreach activities conducted in each country</td>
<td>- Outreach activities (since July 2006)-56</td>
<td>- Outreach activities (since July 2006)-24</td>
<td>- Outreach activities (since July 2006)-44</td>
<td>- Outreach activities (since July 2006)-18</td>
<td>- Outreach activities (since July 2006)-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO 2: Increased efficiency and trustworthiness of MOL inspection systems in compliance with national labor laws and norms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 2.1</strong> Electronic case</td>
<td>- ECMS Capital-26 inspectors using the system</td>
<td>- ECMS Capital-100% inspectors using the system</td>
<td>- ECMS-100% inspectors using the system</td>
<td>- ECMS-80% inspectors using the system</td>
<td>- Equipment for regional offices 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Table prepared by evaluation team, Michele Gonzalez and Claudia Ibarguen from: Annual Data tracking table, component data tracking tables and status vs. goals component tables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Product</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>El Salvador</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>The Dominican Republic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management systems strengthened at central levels and extended to selected regional levels</strong></td>
<td>- ECMS Regional-0 Equipment for regional offices-4</td>
<td>- ECMS Regional-4 Equipment for regional offices 4</td>
<td>- ECMS Regional-2 Equipment for regional offices 2</td>
<td>- ECMS Regional-3 Equipment for regional offices 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 2.2 Improved inspection management at central and regional levels</strong></td>
<td>- Inspection and investigative protocols-3 protocols validated. Ready to print. 80% of inspectors trained - Process analysis and action plan validated. No follow up visits programmed.</td>
<td>- Procedure Manual printed and distributed. - Inspection and investigative protocols-3 protocols validated. Ready to print. 80% of inspectors trained - Process analysis and action plan validated.</td>
<td>- Procedure Manual-In press. - Inspection and investigative protocols-3 protocols validated. 80% of inspectors trained - Process analysis and action plan validated. Distributed to the new authorities.</td>
<td>- Inspection and investigative protocols-3 protocols validated. Ready to print. 80% of inspectors trained</td>
<td>- Inspection and investigative protocols-3 protocols validated. Ready to print. 80% of inspectors trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 2.3 Self-evaluation checklists designed and distributed</strong></td>
<td>- Self-evaluation checklist-validated with sectors. Distributed through Social Security System - 40,000 checklists printed</td>
<td>- Self-evaluation checklist-validated with sectors. Distributed among inspectors. - 2 events with employers - 22,000 printed checklists</td>
<td>- Self-evaluation checklist-validated with sectors and distributed among inspectors and employers. - 2 events with employers - 40,000 printed checklists</td>
<td>- Self-evaluation checklist-reviewed includes new Health and Security by-law chapter. - 10,000 printed checklists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 2.4 Training module for inspectors developed and in use</strong></td>
<td>- 1 electronic and interactive training module for inspectors developed</td>
<td>- 1 electronic and interactive training module for inspectors developed</td>
<td>- 1 electronic and interactive training module for inspectors developed</td>
<td>- 1 electronic and interactive training module for inspectors developed</td>
<td>- 1 electronic and interactive training module for inspectors developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO 3: Improved and expanded mediation and conciliation (M/C) services in the resolution of labor conflicts</strong></td>
<td>Pilot experience with VESTEX functioning</td>
<td>Pilot experience with ECMS Capital 1</td>
<td>Pilot experience with AHM functioning</td>
<td>Pilot experience with ECMS Capital 0</td>
<td>Pilot experience with ECMS Regional 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 3.1 Pilot experience in ADR in private organizations</strong></td>
<td>- ADR Rooms 10 (phase 2) - ECMS Capital 1 - ECMS Regional Testing 2</td>
<td>- ADR Rooms 10 (phase 2) - ECMS Capital 1 - ECMS Regional 5</td>
<td>- ADR Rooms 8 (phase 2) - ECMS Capital 1 - ECMS Regional 1</td>
<td>- ADR Rooms 4 (phase 2) - ECMS Capital 0 - ECMS Regional 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 3.2 Improved M/C management including ADR rooms, the ECMS, and improved service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/ Product</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>The Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 3.3</strong></td>
<td>Individual and collective M/C-7 trained</td>
<td>Individual and collective M/C -20 trained</td>
<td>-Individual and collective M/C 72 trained</td>
<td>Individual and collective M/C -26 trained</td>
<td>Individual and collective M/C -43 trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation/mediators, employers and workers in capitals trained in labor conflict resolution (Since July 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 3.4</strong></td>
<td>Individual and collective M/C course-0 trained</td>
<td>Individual and collective M/C course-20 trained</td>
<td>Individual and collective M/C course-57 trained</td>
<td>Individual and collective M/C course-0 trained</td>
<td>Individual and collective M/C course-7 trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliators/Mediators in the regional offices trained in the resolution of labor conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 3.5</strong></td>
<td>77 trained</td>
<td>83 trained</td>
<td>32 trained</td>
<td>78 trained</td>
<td>56 trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders trained in ADR (since July 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO 4: Strengthened mechanisms to protect and promote women’s labor rights</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 4.1.: Workers trained on gender discrimination in the workplace and how to exercise women's labor rights.</strong></td>
<td>-Women’s labor rights Manual 1 In progress, text validated, with OK of MOL -Practical experience course-1 done AMES 23 women trained 200 replicas -Radio spots 4 -Gender country study 1 -Gender questions in leylaboral No -T4T-21 MOL representatives trained -Courses for employers-2 courses, 27 participants -Courses for workers-1 course, 12 participants</td>
<td>-Women’s labor rights Manual 1 In progress, text validated, with OK of MOL -Practical experience course-2 done FUNDECAS 23 women trained 123 replicas. ANDAR 24 women trained, 151 replicas -Radio spots 4 -Gender country study 1 -Gender questions in leylaboral No -T4T-22 women leaders trained -Courses for employers-2 courses, 85 participants -Courses for workers- 2</td>
<td>-Women’s labor rights Manual 1 In progress, text validated, with OK of MOL -Practical experience course-1 done Mujeres Transformando 23 women trained 127 replicas -Radio spots 4 -Gender country study 1 -Gender questions in leylaboral -Yes -Courses for employers-1 course, 16 participants -Courses for workers-3 courses, 66 workers trained and 29 union women -Tripartite forum-1</td>
<td>-Women’s labor rights Manual 1 In progress, text validated, with OK of MOL -Practical experience course-2 done. INTI 25 women trained 100 replicas. INEH 23 women trained, 240 replicas -Radio spots 4 -Gender country study 1 -Gender questions in leylaboral -Yes -T4T-25 women leaders trained -Courses for employers-1 course, 16 participants -Courses for workers-3 courses, 21 workers trained</td>
<td>-Women’s labor rights Manual 1 In progress, text validated, with OK of MOL -Practical experience 1 done, INTEC training and replica process in progress. -Radio spots 4 -Gender country study-1 -Gender questions in leylaboral -Yes -T4T-14 women leaders trained -Courses for employers-1 course, 22 participants -Courses for workers-2 courses, 47 workers trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/ Product</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>The Dominican Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 4.2.: Ministry of Labor inspectors trained in labor laws pertaining to gender and utilize instruments to verify compliance.</strong></td>
<td>-Tripartite forum-1 strategies against gender discrimination</td>
<td>courses, 46 participants</td>
<td>Promoting culture of compliance, competitiveness &amp; employment</td>
<td>and 49 women leaders.</td>
<td>-Tripartite forum-1 Corporate social accountability and gender issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Course on LDG- 3 courses 51 inspectors trained</td>
<td>-Course on LDG-2 courses 58 inspectors trained</td>
<td>-Course on LDG-2 courses 66 inspectors trained</td>
<td>-Course on LDG-1 course 28 inspectors trained</td>
<td>-Course on LDG-1 course 26 inspectors trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Course on methods and techniques of gender sensitive investigation-1 course 70 persons trained</td>
<td>-Course on methods and techniques of gender sensitive investigation-1 course 53 persons trained</td>
<td>-Course on methods and techniques of gender sensitive investigation-1 course 76 persons trained</td>
<td>-Course on methods and techniques of gender sensitive investigation-80 persons trained</td>
<td>-Course on methods and techniques of gender sensitive investigation-72 persons trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Validation workshop-17 inspectors</td>
<td>-Validation workshop-15 inspectors</td>
<td>-Validation workshop-24 inspectors</td>
<td>-Validation workshop-20 inspectors</td>
<td>-Validation workshop-2 wkslhs, 20 inspectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Using new instruments with gender variables-2 courses 54 inspectors trained</td>
<td>-Using new instruments with gender variables-2 courses 54 inspectors trained</td>
<td>-Using new instruments with gender variables-1 course 73 inspectors trained</td>
<td>-Using new instruments with gender variables-pending</td>
<td>-Using new instruments with gender variables-51 inspectors trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-LDG Regional Workshop-17 inspectors</td>
<td>-Challenges of inspection on women’s labor rights, international workshop-1 member of women’s office</td>
<td>-Challenges of inspection on women’s labor rights, international workshop-19 inspectors</td>
<td>-Challenges of inspection on women’s labor rights, international workshop-1 inspector</td>
<td>-Challenges of inspection on women’s labor rights, international workshop-1 inspectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-LDG Regional Workshop-1 inspector</td>
<td></td>
<td>-T4T-8 inspectors trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 4.3.: Conciliators/mediators are sensitive to gender issues in the process of conciliation.</strong></td>
<td>-Course on LDG-1 21 mediators trained</td>
<td>-Course on LDG-in process</td>
<td>-Course on LDG-21 mediators trained</td>
<td>-Course on LDG-in process</td>
<td>-Course on LDG-in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-T4T-6 mediators trained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product 4.4.: Strengthened Labor Ministries offices that promote women’s labor rights</strong></td>
<td>-Operative framework and strategic plan-Validated and with OK of MOL, printed.</td>
<td>-Operative framework and strategic plan-In progress, validated but pending the OK of the MOL</td>
<td>-Operative framework and strategic plan-Validated and OK of MOL will be printed shortly</td>
<td>-Operative framework and strategic plan-No, MOL rejected consultancy</td>
<td>-Operative framework and strategic plan-In progress validated but pending OK of the MOL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-LDG Regional Workshop-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-LDG Regional Workshop-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labor Law Compliance Program in Central America and the Dominican Republic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Product</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
<th>Honduras</th>
<th>El Salvador</th>
<th>Nicaragua</th>
<th>The Dominican Republic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                | from women’s office  
- Challenges of inspection on women’s labor rights, international workshop-1 member of women’s office | -LDG Regional Workshop-1 member of women’s office  
- Challenges of inspection on women’s labor rights, international workshop-1 member of women’s office | -LDG Regional Workshop-1 member of women’s office  
- Challenges of inspection on women’s labor rights, international workshop-1 member of women’s office  
- T4T-1 representative from women’s office trained | member of women’s office  
- Challenges of inspection on women’s labor rights, international workshop-1 member of women’s office | -LDG Regional Workshop-1 member of women’s office inspectors  
- Challenges of inspection on women’s labor rights, international workshop-1 member of women’s office |
Annex C: Interview Protocols

Guía de Preguntas, Facilitadores de País

Diseño del Proyecto

1. Con lo que se ha aprendido, si el proyecto se diseñara nuevamente ¿qué se debería de hacer diferente? ¿Y esto cómo favorecería la obtención de buenos resultados?

2. ¿Qué grupo(s) se beneficiaron más por el proyecto y cuáles menos?

Componentes del Proyecto

Inspección Laboral

1. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG cual era la condición del sistema de inspección laboral en país?

2. ¿Cuál es la condición del sistema de inspección laboral hoy en día en País?

RAC

1. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG cual era la condición del sistema de resolución de controversias laborales en País?

2. ¿Cuál es la condición del sistema de resolución de controversias laborales hoy en día en País?

Difusión

1. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG cuál era el nivel de conocimiento y concientización de las leyes laborales en País?

2. ¿Cuál es el conocimiento y la concientización de las leyes laborales hoy en día en País?

Género

1. El componente de género es el más nuevo del proyecto. ¿Considera que ha tenido un impacto para las mujeres trabajadoras? ¿Cuál? ¿Cómo se ha medido este impacto?

2. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG en qué medida se tomaba en cuenta el elemento de género en la aplicación de leyes laborales en País? ¿Hoy en día? ¿El proyecto ha contribuido a estos cambios?
3. ¿Cuáles han sido las actividades que han tenido un mayor impacto positivo en el componente de género?

4. ¿Cuáles han sido las principales dificultades en el abordaje del componente de género?

5. ¿Cómo podría haberse mejorado el proyecto para beneficiar más a las mujeres trabajadoras?

Administración del proyecto

1. ¿En qué medida se han implementado las actividades a tiempo y dentro del presupuesto?

2. ¿Qué obstáculos se confrontaron durante el proyecto que impidieron cumplir algunos de sus objetivos en País?

3. Evalúe el desempeño de los coordinadores de componente y director del proyecto
   - ¿Fueron efectivos/eficaces?
   - ¿Cómo se desarrolló la interacción y la comunicación con los facilitadores de país?
   - ¿Qué hicieron bien?
   - ¿Qué elementos se podrían haber mejorado?

4. ¿Cuál ha sido la dinámica de comunicación con las contrapartes del proyecto? ¿Cómo ha funcionado?

5. ¿Cuáles fueron los principales retos de comunicación al interior del proyecto?

6. ¿Cuáles considera que han sido buenas prácticas en términos de comunicación y de personal?

Sostenibilidad del Proyecto (Sostenibilidad de Resultados)

1. ¿Se ha desarrollado una estrategia de salida y un plan de sostenibilidad para País? ¿Cuáles son sus fortalezas? ¿Debilidades?

2. ¿Por qué algunos componentes han resultado ser más autosuficientes/sostenibles que otros?

3. ¿Qué compromisos específicos han ofrecido las contrapartes para adaptar y mantener las actividades?
4. ¿Qué capacidades observan en el MT de País para mantener y desarrollar los resultados del proyecto CyG?

**Eficacia del seguimiento de resultados**

1. ¿Qué datos fueron recolectados en País para el seguimiento de resultados y objetivos?

2. Un consultor externo fue contratado para revisar las herramientas de seguimiento/monitoreo. ¿Qué tan útil fue esto para el seguimiento/monitoreo cotidiano del proyecto?

3. ¿El sistema de seguimiento/monitoreo de resultados ha resultado ser práctico, útil y eficaz en términos de costo-beneficio para la administración del proyecto?

4. ¿Se logró recolectar datos para guiar decisiones del proyecto o la recolección de datos ha sido utilizada básicamente para cumplir con los requisitos de los informes?

**Lecciones Aprendidas**

1. Si hubiera un nuevo proyecto de cumplimiento de leyes laborales en País,
   - ¿Qué grupos meta requieren de mayor atención?
   - ¿Qué otros temas necesitarían ser incorporados?
   - ¿Qué cambios en la implementación producirían mejores resultados?

2. ¿Cuáles son las lecciones aprendidas de Cumple y Gana en País que tendrían que ser incorporadas para proyectos futuros?
Guía de Preguntas
Director de Proyecto, Coordinadores de Componente

A. Validez/Diseño

Diseño original del proyecto-
1. Con lo que se ha aprendido, si el proyecto se diseñara nuevamente ¿qué se debería de hacer diferente? ¿Y esto como favorecería la obtención de buenos resultados?

Compromiso de las contrapartes en el diseño e implementación-
2. ¿Cree que las contrapartes (MT, grupos de empleadores, sindicatos, comité de asesoramiento) comprendieron los objetivos y abordaje del proyecto (y de cada uno de los componentes)? ¿Si, sí cómo se logró esta comprensión?
3. ¿Han continuado apoyando el proyecto? ¿Cómo? (ejemplos específicos)
4. ¿Cuál ha sido el rol/papel de las contrapartes en la implementación del proyecto (componentes)? ¿Diferencias entre países?
5. Han habido dificultades con contrapartes que perciben a CyG como promotor de CAFTA? ¿Cuáles y cómo se han manejado?
6. ¿En general considera que el proyecto logró generar un sentido de pertenencia con las contrapartes? Recomendaciones de las evaluaciones pasadas
7. Se recomendó generar un mayor alcance en términos geográficos y con distintos grupos. ¿Esto sucedió? ¿Diferencias entre los países?
8. Se recomendó desarrollar planes de país. ¿Se han utilizado estos planes? ¿Qué impacto tuvieron estos planes en la implementación del proyecto?

B. Beneficios/impacto del proyecto (general y en grupo meta)

Impacto a grupos
1. ¿Qué grupo(s) se beneficiaron más por el proyecto y cuáles menos? ¿Diferencias entre los países?
2. El componente de género es el más nuevo del proyecto. ¿Considera que ha tenido un impacto para las mujeres trabajadoras? ¿Cuál? ¿Cómo se ha medido este impacto?
3. ¿Cómo podría haberse mejorado el proyecto para beneficiar más a las mujeres trabajadoras?
4. ¿Qué componente(s) del proyecto consideran que tendrán mayores impactos de largo plazo?

Inspección Laboral Alfonso Carro-Coordinador del Componente de Inspección Laboral
5. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG cual era la condición del sistema de inspección laboral en los distintos países?
6. ¿Cuál es la condición de los sistemas de inspección laboral hoy en día?
7. Si ha habido cambios, ¿en qué medida se pueden atribuir al proyecto CyG? ¿Cómo se ha medido esto? Diferencias entre países.
8. ¿Cuáles han sido las actividades que han tenido un mayor impacto positivo los sistemas de inspección laboral?
9. ¿Si hubiera otro proyecto similar a CyG que actividades recomendaría incluir para continuar mejorando el sistema de inspección laboral?
10. ¿Cuáles han sido las principales dificultades en el abordaje del componente de inspección laboral?
11. ¿Cuáles han sido las buenas prácticas en el componente de inspección laboral? ¿Diferencias entre los países?

Resolución Alternativa de Conflictos  Randall Arias-Coordinador del Componente de RAC

12. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG cual era la condición del sistema de resolución de controversias laborales?
13. ¿Cuál es la condición de los sistemas de resolución de controversias laborales hoy en día?
14. ¿Si han habido cambios positivos, ¿en qué medida se pueden atribuir al proyecto? ¿Cómo se ha medido esto? Diferencias entre países.
15. ¿Cuáles han sido las actividades que han tenido un mayor impacto positivo en los sistemas de resolución de controversias?
16. ¿Si hubiera otro proyecto similar a CyG que actividades recomendaría incluir para continuar mejorando el sistema de resolución de controversias?
17. ¿Cuáles han sido las principales dificultades en el abordaje del componente de resolución de controversias?
18. ¿Cuáles han sido las buenas prácticas en el componente de resolución de controversias? ¿Diferencias entre los países?

Difusión  Natalia Álvarez Coordinadora del Componente de Difusión

19. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG cuál era el nivel de conocimiento y concientización de las leyes laborales en los distintos países?
20. ¿Cuál es el conocimiento y la concientización de las leyes laborales hoy en día?
21. Hay diferencias de conocimiento entre la población en general y los trabajadores. Diferencias entre grupos de trabajadores (urbanos/rurales por ejemplo)
22. Si ha habido cambios, ¿en qué medida se pueden atribuir al proyecto CyG? ¿Cómo se ha medido esto? Diferencias entre países.
23. ¿Cuáles han sido las actividades que han tenido un mayor impacto positivo en el conocimiento y concientización?
24. ¿Cuáles han sido las principales dificultades en el abordaje del componente de difusión?
25. ¿Cuáles han sido las buenas prácticas en el componente de difusión? ¿Diferencias entre los países?

Género  - María Leiton-Coordinadora del Componente de Género

26. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG en qué medida se tomaba en cuenta el elemento de género en el diseño y aplicación de leyes laborales?
27. ¿Hoy en día se ha incorporado una visión de género?
29. ¿Cuáles han sido las actividades que han tenido un mayor impacto positivo en el componente de género?
30. ¿Cuáles han sido las principales dificultades en el abordaje del componente de género?
31. ¿Cuáles han sido las buenas prácticas en el componente de género? ¿Diferencias entre los países?
32. ¿Si hubiera otro proyecto similar a CyG que actividades recomendaría incluir para continuar mejorando la incorporación de una visión de género en la aplicación de las leyes laborales?
C. Estado de la implementación en lo concerniente a actividades planeadas, materiales, cronograma y presupuesto.

1. ¿En qué medida se han implementado las actividades a tiempo y dentro del presupuesto?
   • ¿Si hubo retrasos a qué se debieron?
   • ¿Se tuvo que ajustar el plan de trabajo? ¿Cómo? ¿Esto mejoró la implementación?
   • ¿Cuál ha sido su (como personal de FUNPADEM) grado de satisfacción con el progreso del proyecto?

2. ¿Qué obstáculos se confrontaron durante el proyecto que impidieron cumplir algunos de sus objetivos?

3. Los programas de entrenamiento, manuales y otros materiales
   • ¿fueron adaptados a las necesidades de cada país?
   • ¿fueron coordinadas con materiales y actividades de los gobiernos, otros donantes y/o el sector privado?
   • ¿En general, como se han recibido los materiales? ¿En qué medida se han utilizado y se siguen utilizando?

4. ¿Cuáles han sido las buenas prácticas en términos de las actividades, el cronograma de implementación y el presupuesto?

5. En retrospectiva, ¿qué cambios en el cronograma y presupuesto habrían favorecido la implementación del proyecto?

D. Sostenibilidad del Proyecto (Sostenibilidad de Resultados)

1. ¿Se ha desarrollado una estrategia de salida y un plan de sostenibilidad?
   • ¿Se desarrolló para cada componente o por país?
   • ¿Quien estuvo involucrado?
   • ¿Qué piensan de la estrategia de salida? ¿Cuáles son sus fortalezas? ¿Debilidades?

2. ¿Qué componentes del proyecto son, hoy en día, autosuficientes? Qué componentes dependen aun de la asistencia externa? (Diferencias entre los países)

3. ¿Por qué algunos componentes han resultado ser más autosuficientes/sostenibles que otros?

4. ¿Qué compromisos específicos han ofrecido las contrapartes para adaptar y mantener las actividades?

5. ¿Qué capacidades se observan en cada país y las contrapartes de cada país (específicamente de los MT) para mantener y desarrollar los resultados del proyecto CyG?

E. Desempeño administrativo de USDOL, FUNPADEM, Abt y MT (especificamente en cuanto a decisiones de personal y comunicación)

1. Evalúe el desempeño de los Facilitadores de País.
   • ¿Fueron efectivos/eficaces?
   • ¿Cómo se desarrolló la interacción y la comunicación entre ellos? ¿con los coordinadores de los componentes? ¿con el director del proyecto?
   • ¿Fue útil tener un facilitador en cada país?
   • ¿Qué hicieron bien?
   • ¿Qué elementos se podrían haber mejorado?

2. ¿Cuál ha sido la dinámica de comunicación con las contrapartes del proyecto? ¿Cómo ha funcionado?

3. ¿Ha mejorado la comunicación entre FUNPADEM en CR y los facilitadores de país sobre temas programáticos y de presupuesto? ¿Cómo? Si no, ¿por qué?
4. ¿Cuál es el balance más adecuado entre personal en las oficinas centrales de CR y los otros países? ¿En retrospectiva qué cambios habrían propuesto?

5. ¿Cuál fue la relación de FUNPADEM y Abt?

6. ¿Cómo describiría el apoyo de Abt? De USDOL? ¿En qué manera se podría haber mejorado?

7. ¿Cuáles fueron los principales problemas de comunicación al interior del proyecto?

8. ¿Cuáles considera que han sido buenas prácticas en términos de comunicación, y de personal?

F. Eficacia del seguimiento de resultados (Project performance monitoring)

1. ¿Cómo enfrentó el proyecto las inquietudes expresadas en la evaluación de medio término, sobre las herramientas de seguimiento y evaluación?

2. Una de las recomendaciones de la evaluación de 2007 fue cambiar el enfoque de un seguimiento de actividades a una medición de progreso hacia logro de objetivos. Se revisaron los indicadores y se ajustaron en el PMP? ¿Cuáles?

3. ¿Qué datos fueron recolectados para el seguimiento de resultados y objetivos?

4. Un consultor externo fue contratado para revisar las herramientas de seguimiento/monitoreo. ¿Qué tan útil fue esto para el seguimiento/monitoreo cotidiano del proyecto?

5. ¿El sistema de seguimiento/monitoreo de resultados ha resultado ser práctico, útil y efectivo/eficaz en términos de costo-beneficio para la administración del proyecto?

6. ¿Qué problemas se confrontaron con los indicadores del proyecto? ¿Con la recolección de datos? ¿Con los informes regulares?

7. ¿El personal del proyecto ha incrementado su conocimiento de herramientas de seguimiento/monitoreo y evaluación? ¿Si sí, cómo? ¿Si no, por qué no?

8. ¿Se logró recolectar datos para guiar decisiones del proyecto o la recolección de datos ha sido utilizada básicamente para cumplir con los requisitos de los informes?

G. Lecciones Aprendidas

1. Si hubiera un nuevo proyecto de cumplimiento de leyes laborales en América Central y RD
   - ¿Qué grupos meta requieren de mayor atención?
   - ¿Qué otros temas necesitarían ser incorporados?
   - ¿Qué cambios en la implementación producirían mejores resultados?

2. ¿Cuáles son las lecciones aprendidas de Cumple y Gana (componentes) que tendrían que ser incorporadas para proyectos futuros?
Guía de Preguntas
Ministerios del Trabajo

A. Validez/Diseño
   Diseño original del proyecto-
   1. Con lo que se ha aprendido, si el proyecto se diseñara nuevamente ¿qué se debería de hacer diferente’ ¿Y esto como favorecería la obtención de buenos resultados?

   Compromiso de las contrapartes en el diseño e implementación-
   2. ¿Cree que el Ministerio y otras contrapartes (grupos de empleadores, sindicatos, comité de asesoramiento) comprendieron los objetivos y abordaje del proyecto? ¿Si, si cómo se logró esta comprensión?
   3. ¿Han continuado apoyando el proyecto? ¿Cómo? (ejemplos específicos)
   4. ¿Cuál ha sido el rol/papel del MT en la implementación del proyecto?
   5. Han habido dificultades con contrapartes que perciben a CyG como promotor de CAFTA? ¿Cuáles y cómo se han manejado?
   6. ¿En general considera que el proyecto logró generar un sentido de pertenencia en el MT?

Recomendaciones de las evaluaciones pasadas
7. Se recomendó generar un mayor alcance en términos geográficos y con distintos grupos. ¿Esto sucedió?

B. Beneficios/impacto del proyecto (general y en grupo meta)
   Impacto a grupos
   1. ¿Qué grupo(s) se beneficiaron más por el proyecto y cuáles menos?
   2. El componente de género es el más nuevo del proyecto. ¿Considera que ha tenido un impacto para las mujeres trabajadoras? ¿Cuál? ¿Cómo se ha medido este impacto?
   3. ¿Cómo podría haberse mejorado el proyecto para beneficiar más a las mujeres trabajadoras?
   4. ¿Qué componente(s) del proyecto consideran que tendrán mayores impactos de largo plazo?

   Inspección Laboral Inspecionadores, directores de la oficina de inspección
   1. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG cual era la condición del sistema de inspección laboral?
   2. ¿Cuál es la condición de los sistemas de inspección laboral hoy en día?
   3. Si ha habido cambios, ¿en qué medida se pueden atribuir al proyecto CyG? ¿Cómo se ha medido esto?
   4. ¿Cuáles han sido las actividades que han tenido un mayor impacto positivo en el sistema de inspección laboral?
   5. ¿Si hubiera otro proyecto similar a CyG que actividades recomendaría incluir para continuar mejorando el sistema de inspección laboral?
   6. ¿Cuáles han sido las principales dificultades en el abordaje del componente de inspección laboral?
   7. ¿Cuáles han sido las buenas prácticas en el componente de inspección laboral?

   Resolución Alternativa de Conflictos (mediadores, directores de la oficina de conciliación)
1. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG cuál era la condición del sistema de resolución de controversias laborales?
2. ¿Cuál es la condición del sistema de resolución de controversias laborales hoy en día?
3. ¿Si han habido cambios positivos, ¿en qué medida se pueden atribuir al proyecto? ¿Cómo se ha medido esto?
4. ¿Cuáles han sido las actividades que han tenido un mayor impacto positivo en los sistemas de resolución de controversias?
5. ¿Si hubiera otro proyecto similar a CyG que actividades recomendaría incluir para continuar mejorando el sistema de resolución de controversias?
6. ¿Cuáles han sido las principales dificultades en el abordaje del componente de resolución de controversias?
7. ¿Cuáles han sido las buenas prácticas en el componente de resolución de controversias?

**Difusión** (personal de comunicación)
1. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG cuál era el nivel de conocimiento y concientización de las leyes laborales en país?
2. ¿Cuál es el conocimiento y la concientización de las leyes laborales hoy en día?
3. ¿Hay diferencias de conocimiento entre la población en general y los trabajadores? Diferencias entre grupos de trabajadores (urbanos/rurales por ejemplo)
4. Si ha habido cambios, ¿en qué medida se pueden atribuir al proyecto CyG? ¿Cómo se ha medido esto?
5. ¿Cuáles han sido las actividades que han tenido un mayor impacto positivo en el conocimiento y concientización?
6. ¿Cuáles han sido las principales dificultades en el abordaje del componente de difusión?
7. ¿Cuáles han sido las buenas prácticas en el componente de difusión?

**Género** (personal de las oficinas de género)
1. ¿Antes del inicio del Proyecto CyG en qué medida se tomaba en cuenta el elemento de género en el diseño y aplicación de leyes laborales?
2. ¿Hoy en día se ha incorporado una visión de género?
3. Si ha habido cambios, ¿en qué medida se pueden atribuir al proyecto CyG? ¿Cómo se ha medido esto?
4. ¿Cuáles han sido las actividades que han tenido un mayor impacto positivo en el componente de género?
5. ¿Cuáles han sido las principales dificultades en el abordaje del componente de género?
6. ¿Cuáles han sido las buenas prácticas en el componente de género?
7. ¿Si hubiera otro proyecto similar a CyG que actividades recomendaría incluir para continuar mejorando la incorporación de una visión de género en la aplicación de las leyes laborales?

**C. Estado de la implementación en lo concerniente a actividades planeadas, materiales, cronograma y presupuesto.**
1. ¿En qué medida se han implementado las actividades a tiempo y dentro del presupuesto?
   - ¿Si hubo retrasos a qué se debieron?
   - ¿Se tuvo que ajustar el plan de trabajo? ¿Cómo? ¿Esto mejoró la implementación?
   - ¿Cuál ha sido su grado de satisfacción con el progreso del proyecto?
2. ¿Qué obstáculos se confrontaron durante el proyecto que impidieron cumplir algunos de sus objetivos?

3. Los programas de entrenamiento, manuales y otros materiales
   • ¿fueron adaptados a las necesidades de país?
   • ¿fueron coordinadas con materiales y actividades del Ministerio, otros donantes y/o el sector privado?
   • ¿En general, cómo se han recibido los materiales? ¿En qué medida se han utilizado y se siguen utilizando?

D. Sostenibilidad del Proyecto (Sostenibilidad de Resultados)
1. ¿Se ha desarrollado una estrategia de salida y un plan de sostenibilidad?
2. ¿Qué componentes del proyecto son, hoy en día, autosuficientes? Qué componentes dependen aun de la asistencia externa?
3. ¿Qué compromisos específicos ha ofrecido el MT para adaptar y mantener las actividades?

E. Desempeño administrativo de USDOL, FUNPADEM, Abt y MT (específicamente en cuanto a decisiones de personal y comunicación)
1. Evalúe el desempeño de los Facilitadores de País.
   • ¿Fueron efectivos/eficaces?
   • ¿Cómo se desarrolló la interacción y la comunicación entre ellos?
   • ¿Qué hicieron bien?
   • ¿Qué elementos se podrían haber mejorado?
2. ¿Cuál ha sido la dinámica de comunicación con el proyecto? ¿Cómo ha funcionado?
3. ¿Cuáles fueron los principales problemas de comunicación al interior del proyecto?
4. ¿Cuáles considera que han sido buenas prácticas en términos de comunicación, y de personal?

F. Eficacia del seguimiento de resultados (Project performance monitoring)
1. ¿El MT ha hecho seguimiento de los logros del proyecto?
2. ¿Qué datos fueron recolectados para el seguimiento de resultados y objetivos?

G. Lecciones Aprendidas
1. Si hubiera un nuevo proyecto de cumplimiento de leyes laborales en América Central y RD
   • ¿Qué grupos meta requieren de mayor atención?
   • ¿Qué otros temas necesitarían ser incorporados?
   • ¿Qué cambios en la implementación producirían mejores resultados?
2. ¿Cuáles son las lecciones aprendidas de Cumple y Gana (componentes) que tendrían que ser incorporadas para proyectos futuros?
Annex D: List of Persons Interviewed

Costa Rica:
1. Randall Arias, Coordinator ADR, CyG
2. Natalia Alvarez, Coordinator Outreach and Awareness, CyG
3. Alfonso Carro, Coordinator Compliance and Inspection, CyG
4. María Leitón, Coordinator Labor Rights for Women, CyG
5. Rodolfo Piza, Director, CyG

The Dominican Republic:
1. Gavino Severino, CF The Dominican Republic, CyG
2. Virgilio de Jesús Baldera, Vice-Minister, SET
3. Andrés Valentín Herrera, Asst. Director of Labor Division, SET
4. Federico Gomera, Director of Labor Inspection, SET
5. Luis Francisco Regalado, Director of Mediation and Arbitration, SET
6. Aracelis Paulino, Supervisor, Regional Office in Santo Domingo Province, SET
7. Daniel Jiménez Valenzuela, Labor Inspector, SET
8. Gregorio Santana, Education Coordinator, CNDT
9. Gertrudis Santana, Secretary of Finance and Women’s Issues, CNTD
10. Gabriel Antonio del Rio, General Secretary, CASC
11. José Luis León, Executive Committee, CASC
12. Lourdes Contreras, Director of Gender Studies, INTEC
13. Magaly Pineda, Executive Director, CIPAF
14. Drew Hoster, Labor Attaché, U.S. Embassy The Dominican Republic

Honduras:
1. Mirta Maradiaga, CF Honduras, CyG
2. Ana Lourdes Pérez, Curriculum Consultant, CyG
3. Ana Leonor Avila, Coordinator, Women Workers’ Program, STSS
4. Griselda Zelaya, Director, Social Programs Division, STSS
5. Gina Hernández, Director, Labor Division, STSS
6. Salomón Batres, Assistant Director, Labor Division, STSS
7. Donaldo Israel Martinez, Assistant Director, Labor Division, STSS
8. Oscar Alberto García, Supervisor, Conciliation in Labor Division, STSS
10. Wendy Maricela Murillo, Labor Inspector, STSS
11. Mirna Mayela Nieto, Labor Inspector, STSS
12. Cristina Moreno Varela, Labor Inspector, STSS
13. Hamilton R. Vasquez, Labor Inspector, STSS
14. Lídea Judith Sereno, Labor Inspector, STSS
15. Onelda Yamira Martinez, Labor Inspector, STSS
16. Amanda Mejía, Legal Counsel, COHEP
17. Guillermo Matamoros, Regional Operations Manager, AHM
18. Candida Cortez, Member, FUTH
19. Olga Marina Romero, Member, FUTH
20. Dunia del Carmen Ruiz, Secretary of Women’s Issues, FUTH
21. Maria Santos Vasquez, Member, FUTH
22. Brenda Claudette Andino, Member, FUTH
23. Lidia Oneida Orellana, Member, FUTH
24. Ramón García, Secretary, FITH
25. José Luis Baquedano, Financial and Legal Advisor, CUTH
26. Marcos Nieto Posada, Member, CGT
27. Benjamin Vasquez Gutierra, Member, CGT
28. Marcial Reyes Caballero, Member, CGT
29. Humberto Lara, Member, CGT
30. Daniel Lara, Secretary General, CGT
31. Fany Alvarado, Coordinator of Curriculum Review for Educatodos

**El Salvador:**
1. Sandra Dueñas, CF, El Salvador, CyG
2. Carmen Elisa Sosa, Vice Minister, MTPS
3. Claudia Alfar de Guevara, Assistant Director of International Relations, MTPS
4. Ronoel Vela, Coordinator, Office of Gender and Labor Discrimination, MTPS
5. Javier Rivas, Director of Labor Inspection, MTPS
6. Reyna Velasco, Labor Inspector, Office of Gender and Labor Discrimination, MTPS
7. Amadeo Ernesto Rodriguez, Labor Inspector, Office of Gender and Labor Discrimination, MTPS
8. Marlene de Jesús Mejía, Labor Inspector, Office of Gender and Labor Discrimination, MTPS
9. Fernando Enrique Castro, Labor Inspector, MTPS
10. Carolina Morán, Director of Labor Division, MTPS
11. Daniela Patricia Garcia, Asst. Director of Labor Division, MTPS
12. Emigdia Mayari Marino, Supervisor, Individual Conciliation, MTPS
13. Jorge Alberto Villarán, Supervisor, Collective Conciliation, MTPS
14. Carla Marina Abrego, Conciliator, MTPS
15. Cristina Alejandra Solorzano, Legal Advisor, Labor Division, MTPS
16. Hernán Guerra, Western Regional Office Director, Santa Ana, MTPS
17. Montserrat Arévalo, General Coordinator, Asociación Mujeres Transformando
18. Germán Emilio Muñoz, Asst. Public Attorney, Attorney General Office

**Guatemala:**
1. Gustavo Campos, County Facilitator of Guatemala, CyG
2. Mario Illescas, Vice-Minister, MTPS
3. Guillermo Gandara, Director of International Relations, MTPS
4. Ingrid Miranda, Regional Office Director, Esquintla Office, MTPS
5. Elsa Hernandez, Regional Office Director, Quetzaltenango Office, MTPS
6. Giovanni Soto, Director of Inspection, MTPS
7. Loida Garcia, Supervisor, Labor Inspection, MTPS
8. Cesar Gatica, Assistant Director, Labor Inspection, MTPS
9. Susana López, Labor Inspector, MTPS
10. Vinicio De León, Supervisor, Conciliation Unit, MTPS
11. Arturo Mazariégos, Conciliator, MTPS
12. Ixmucane Godoy, Conciliator, MTPS
13. Patricia Morales, Conciliator, MTPS
14. Brenda Lima, Conciliator, MTPS
15. Maria de los Angeles Quesada, Conciliator, MTPS
16. Laura Estela Cárcamo, Coordinator, National Women’s Office, MTPS
17. Lilia Maria Solis, Coordinator, Women Workers’ Program, MTPS
19. Guido Ricci, Legal Advisor, CACIF
20. Alicia Valenzuela, Labor Commission, VESTEX
21. Imelda López, Adjunct General Secretary, CGTG
22. Juan Francisco Mendoza, Director, Mario López Larrave Foundation, CCSG
23. Raúl Gustavo Moreno, President, Coordinadora 1 de Mayo
24. Lucy Chang, Labor Attaché, U.S. Embassy Guatemala

United States:
1. Brenna Dougan, International Relations Specialist, USDOL/ILAB
2. Laura Buffo, Former Project Manager, USDOL/ILAB
### Annex E: Distribution of Persons Interviewed

*Disaggregated by Country and Sector Represented*

*(October 14-November 10, 2008)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Cumple y Gana Staff (FUNPADEM/Abt staff, Project Consultants)</th>
<th>Ministry of Labor (Political Appointees, Directors, Supervisors, Staff)</th>
<th>Worker Organizations (Union Confederations, Federations and Labor Centers)</th>
<th>Employer Associations</th>
<th>Collaborating NGO, Institutions, or other Donors</th>
<th>U.S. Gov’t Reps. (USDOL, U.S. Embassy Labor Attaché)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>10 Project Staff</td>
<td>50 MOL</td>
<td>20 Workers Associations</td>
<td>4 Employer Associations</td>
<td>6 Collaborating Organizations</td>
<td>4 Reps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Equipo Consultor, Desarrollo y Género, Equidad e igualdad de género en el trabajo de las mujeres un compromiso de todos y todas, Estudio nacional sobre discriminación laboral femenina por razones de género, con énfasis en la maquila, 2008.

FUNDECAS, Sistematización del Proyecto Promoviendo el ejercicio de los Derechos Laborales de las Mujeres, en el Municipio de Marcovia, 2008.
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### Annex G: Performance Monitoring Plan

**Proyecto Cumple y Gana, PMP Phase II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development objective: Improved compliance with national labor laws in Central America and the Dominican Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| GPRA: Number of workers benefiting from improved inspections | Use of "improved inspections" as a substitute for "compliance with labor laws."

**“Improved inspection”** is an inspection that is undertaken by an improved inspector.

**“Improved inspector”**: is an inspector/a that has received a minimum of 32 hours of training on behalf of the program and is part of the pilot group or has received a minimum of 16 hours of training by the program if he/she is not part of the pilot group.

**“Number of workers”**: is calculated by adding the number of employees in the factories that have been inspected by “improved inspectors”.

<p>| Facilitators, lists of inspectors in the respective ministries and work sites inspected by improved inspectors, information or approximation of the number of employees at inspected work sites. | Annual. It is reported on August 30th of each year. | Facilitators | Annual | USDOL |
| GPRA Tracking Table | | |
| 1. Number of Employers in compliance with national | NB: Reliable data does not exist | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>labor laws and norms, including women’s labor rights</td>
<td>to measure this indicator. Following the implementation of the case management systems, the project will measure this indicator with the data from the systems, understanding that the baseline will not reflect the first three years of project implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N. Alvarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of workers who comply with national labor laws and norms, including women’s labor rights</td>
<td>NB: Reliable data does not exist to measure this indicator. The project expects to reach this objective by following the immediate objectives and their respective indicators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 1.1.: INCREASE UNDERSTANDING OF TARGET POPULATION IN EACH COUNTRY ABOUT NATIONAL LABOR LAWS**

Better knowledge by the target population on labor rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increments by percentage of knowledge in the target group: refers to the increment in the percentage of workers, employers and general public that know their labor rights and the laws that guarantee them.</th>
<th>Labor rights knowledge surveys in each Country.</th>
<th>When the survey is conducted (mid 2007 and mid 2008)</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Bi-annual</th>
<th>N. Alvarez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit: percentage point</td>
<td>Labor rights knowledge surveys in each Country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Product 1.1 Public Awareness activities taken place in different countries at national and regional levels**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informative material that is produced and distributed</td>
<td><strong>Number of informative material:</strong> refers to the number of flyers, booklets and manuals and other printed material produced and distributed by the project. Unit: a flier, booklet, manual, poster or other printed material</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>By activity</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>N. Álvarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmitted radio guidelines/message</td>
<td><strong>Number of guidelines transmitted:</strong> refers to the number of times that a radio message or guideline is transmitted. Unit: saying or spot that is transmitted.</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Contract or work order</td>
<td>Monthly (by contract)</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>N. Álvarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained stakeholders on labor rights and means to protect them</td>
<td><strong>Number of trained persons:</strong> refers to the number of persons that have attended a workshop or course supported by the project. Unit: a person Note: This indicator does not include persons trained reported under other indicators.</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Course or workshop registry</td>
<td>By course or Workshop</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>N. Álvarez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Product 1.2.: Training activities with a multiplier effect in the three sectors (public, private, labor)**

<p>| Training modules that are designed and implemented by country (Train the | <strong>Number of modules:</strong> refers to the number of courses designed | Project | Course registry | By course | Facilitator | Quarterly | N. Álvarez |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained persons</td>
<td>Number of trained persons: refers to the number of persons that have attended an eight hour workshop or course. Unit: a module</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Workshop registry</td>
<td>By workshop</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>N Alvarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed courses or</td>
<td>Number of completed courses: refers to the number of courses delivered by a trainer who was trained by the project. Unit: Number of courses</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Course work registry</td>
<td>By course</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>N Alvarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshops provided by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people that were</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trained using the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects modules (</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train the trainers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product 1.3.:</td>
<td>Information mechanisms and/or call centers, established and/or strengthened in the Ministries of Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received inquiries by</td>
<td>Number of inquiries: refers to the number of calls that are attended to by call center personnel in MT call centers. Unit: Number of attended calls</td>
<td>Software at the call center</td>
<td>Summaries by MT personnel</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>N. Alvarez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the call center and/or information centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained Officials</td>
<td>Number of trained officials: refers to the number of people who have received training in communications skills, FAQs of labor rights, design and/or customer service, etc. Unit: Trained officials</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Course registry</td>
<td>By course</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>N. Alvarez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labor Law Compliance Program in Central America and the Dominican Republic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultations received by the Ministries of Labor</td>
<td><strong>Number of requests to the Ministries of Labor:</strong> refers to the number of consultations that are received by the Ministries of Labor, by persons or interested entities, in conflict resolution and to obtain information on a specific subject. Includes those realized by the call center. Unit: a consultation realized by any route including those made to the call center.</td>
<td>MT statistics</td>
<td>Reports by the MT</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>N. Alvarez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Product 1.4.: Interactive web site: [www.leylaboral.com](http://www.leylaboral.com) established, developed and promoted**

| Web site Leylaboral.com visits and consultations | **Number of visits:** refers to the number of times that a person enters or consults the web page: leylaboral.com Unit: number of “hits” and number of consultations | MasterLex or direct consultation | On site counter | Quarterly | Master Lex and N.Alvarez | Quarterly | N. Alvarez |

<p>| Web site: Leylaboral.com, customer satisfaction | <strong>Percentage of satisfaction:</strong> refers to the input and grading that customers give the web page: leylaboral.com, under the guidelines of a module designed to meet these ends Unit: percentage of responses for | MasterLex or direct consultation | Customer satisfaction module at the site. | Quarterly | Master Lex and N.Alvarez | Quarterly | N. Alvarez |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 2: MAJOR EFFICIENCY AND RELIABILITY OF INSPECTION SYSTEMS IN LABOR MINISTRIES IN COMPLIANCE WITH NATIONAL LABOR LAWS AND NORMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspections requested of the Labor Ministries</td>
<td>Number of inspections requested: number of interventions requested of and registered at the Labor Ministries Unit: A registered petition</td>
<td>Notes by Inspection Departments</td>
<td>Requests to the Inspection Departments</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work sites that implement corrective actions due to labor inspections by the Ministries of Labor</td>
<td>Number of work sites: refers to the number of work sites reporting corrective actions Unit: Workplaces</td>
<td>Notes by inspection Departments</td>
<td>Requests to the Inspection Departments</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in levels of appreciation and reliability of inspection systems of the Ministries of Labor</td>
<td>Increase in levels of appreciation: is determined by the average score given by target population via a survey, using scales of 1 to 5 (low to high) Unit: Scale points</td>
<td>Surveys in countries utilizing 50% employers and 50% labor unions</td>
<td>Handwritten or on-line survey sent to participating groups</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product 2.1: Electronic Case Management Systems strengthened at central offices and extended to selected regional offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors that use the new Case Management System by country</td>
<td>Number of inspectors: refers to the number of inspectors using the new system in each Ministry of Labor Percentage of inspectors: refers to the total number of inspectors that utilize the new case management system, divided by the total number of inspectors in the Ministries of Labor Unit: An inspector</td>
<td>Directors in the Inspection Departments</td>
<td>Interview or note by the facilitator to the Inspection Department heads</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases administrated by the new case management</td>
<td>Number of cases: refers to the number of cases administrated by</td>
<td>Notes by Inspections</td>
<td>Written request by the facilitator</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
<td>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Data collection methods</td>
<td>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system by country</td>
<td>the new case management system <strong>Percentage of Cases</strong>: refers to the number of cases administered by the new system divided by the total number of cases Unit: A case</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>to the person in charge of inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional office inspectors using the Case Management system</td>
<td><strong>Number of regional inspectors</strong>: refers to the quantity of regional inspectors who use the new case management system in Ministries of Labor <strong>Percentage of regional inspectors</strong>: refers to the number of regional inspectors utilizing the new system divided by the total of regional inspectors for the selected regional offices. Unit: An inspector</td>
<td>Directors of Inspection Departments</td>
<td>Interview or note by the facilitator to Inspection Department directors</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Office cases administered by the case management system</td>
<td><strong>Number of cases</strong>: refers to the number of cases in regional offices administered by the new case management system <strong>Percentage of cases</strong>: refers to the number of cases in regional offices that are administered by the new case management divided by the total number of charts in the same regional offices Unit: A chart</td>
<td>Inspection Department notes</td>
<td>Written request by the Facilitator to the person in charge of inspection</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Product 2.2.: Improved Management of inspections at central and regional levels**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained inspectors</td>
<td>Number of trained inspectors: number of inspectors that have been trained in central and regional offices. Training results are reflected in GPRA. Unit: an inspector</td>
<td>Post training questionnaires</td>
<td>Direct observation by the facilitators</td>
<td>By event</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product 2.3.: Development and distribution of Self Evaluation Check List</td>
<td>Number of activities: refers to the total activities executed to promote the Self Evaluation Check Lists by country Type of activities: refers to the type of public awareness activity, or the times that the Check List is visited at Leylaboral.com or at Ministries of Labor web pages. Unit: An activity</td>
<td>Public Awareness activity reports</td>
<td>Direct observation by the Facilitator and data collected by Leylaboral.com</td>
<td>By event</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product 2.4.: Training module for inspectors developed and in use</td>
<td>Formulated training module for inspectors in current use Training module: refers to a complete induction module that is utilized to train new inspectors, which has been validated by authorities of the Ministries of Labor Unit: A module</td>
<td>Report by the Facilitator</td>
<td>Report by the Facilitator</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 3: IMPROVED AND EXPANDED MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICES FOR LABOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION</td>
<td>Requests for Conciliation and mediation of individual conflict cases presented to the Ministries Number of cases: refers to the number of requests for conciliations or mediation of individual conflicts that have been presented to the Ministries of</td>
<td>Notes from the offices of mediation and/or</td>
<td>Written request from the facilitator to directors of</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>R. Arias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
<td>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Data collection methods</td>
<td>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Labor</td>
<td>Labor Unit: request for conciliation</td>
<td>conciliation</td>
<td>mediation and reconciliation departments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Arias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation / conciliation of individual conflict cases resolved by the Ministries of Labor</td>
<td><strong>Number of cases:</strong> refers to the number of mediation and conciliation of individual conflict cases finalized by mutual accord by the parties. <strong>Percentage of cases:</strong> refers to the number of cases with petitions for mediation/conciliation of individual conflicts that end by mutual accord by the parties, divided by the total number of petitions for conciliation Unit: Petition for conciliation</td>
<td>Notes of offices in charge of conciliation and/or mediation of individual conflicts in the ML</td>
<td>Written request by the facilitator to the people in charge of conciliation and mediation</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>R. Arias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation and mediation of collective conflicts conducted by the ML</td>
<td><strong>Number of cases:</strong> refers to the number of requests for conciliation and mediation of collective conflicts that have been presented to the ML’s Unit: Request for conciliation</td>
<td>Note from the office of Mediation / Conciliation of collective labor conflicts</td>
<td>Written request by the facilitator to the people in charge of conciliation and mediation</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>R. Arias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product 3.1.: Pilot experiences in ADR in private organizations implemented in some countries</td>
<td><strong>Number of pilot systems of private sector organizational ADR that are functioning:</strong> refers to systems installed internally in a non-governmental organization that is accessible and in use by</td>
<td>Facilitator reports</td>
<td>Direct observation of systems that are functioning</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>R. Arias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Labor Law Compliance Program in Central America and the Dominican Republic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| workers in the organization  
Unit: a system installed in an organization | | | | | | | |

**Product 3.2.: Improved M/C management including ADR’ rooms, the Electronic Case Management Systems and improved service**

| M/C (ADR) rooms | Preparation of M/C rooms: The preparations of rooms where M/C audiences are held privately that are soundproofed and are comfortable and adequately equipped (work tables and chairs). | Facilitator reports | Mediation and Conciliation Office | Annual | Facilitator | Annual | R. Arias |
| Processes of Mediation / Conciliation improved by an electronic case management system | Number of offices that apply Case Management systems:  
1. Offices of M/C that apply an M/C proceeding with fewer steps or requirements due to use of an electronic case system.  
2. Number of cases entered into the System  
3. The number of mediators using the system | Facilitator reports | M/C Office of the ML | Annual | Facilitator | Annual | R. Arias |

**Product 3.3.: Conciliation / mediators, employers and workers in the Capitals, trained in collective conflict resolution**

| Mediators / conciliators, employers and workers in the Capital, trained in the solution of individual  
Number of persons trained: people who have received at least 8 hours of training on the solution of individual conflicts. | Course registry | Course registry | By course | Facilitator | Quarterly | R. Arias |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conflicts.</td>
<td>Unit of measurement: a mediator / conciliator, an employer, a worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant knowledge about courses for the individual conflict resolution of the conciliators / mediators, employers and workers</td>
<td>Increment in knowledge: change in pre-test to post-test examination scores. Unit of measurement: percentage points</td>
<td>Pre-test and post-test on participant knowledge</td>
<td>Facilitators apply the exams, accrue the grades and report the information</td>
<td>By course Facilitator</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>R. Arias.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediators / conciliators, employers and workers in the Capital trained in the resolution of collective conflicts</td>
<td>Number of trained people: refers to the quantity of people who have received at least 24 hours of training in the solution of collective conflicts. Unit of measurement: a mediator / conciliator, an employer, a worker</td>
<td>Course registry</td>
<td>Registry of courses</td>
<td>By course Facilitator</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>R. Arias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment in participant knowledge about collective conflict resolution on behalf of the conciliators / mediators, employers and workers.</td>
<td>Percentage of increment in knowledge: percentage change in median scores on post-test in relation to pre-test scores Unit of measurement: Percentage points</td>
<td>Pre-test and post-test examinations</td>
<td>Facilitators apply examinations, compile and reports.</td>
<td>By course Facilitator</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>R. Arias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Produced 3.4.: Conciliators / mediators in regional offices that are trained in labor conflict resolution**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mediators / conciliators of regional offices trained in the resolution of individual conflicts | Number of trained mediators / conciliators in regional offices: the number of M/C that have received at least 8 hours of training in the solution of labor conflicts  
Unit of measurement: a mediator / conciliator                                               | Course registry              | Course registry          | By course                  | Facilitator       | Quarterly                                      | R. Arias          |
<p>|                                                                                      | Increment in participant knowledge in regional offices of courses about individual conflict resolution by the conciliators / mediators, employers and workers | Pre-test and post-test exams | Facilitators apply the exams, compile the scores and report the data. | By course                  | Facilitator       | Quarterly                                      | R. Arias          |
|                                                                                      | Trained Mediators / conciliators in regional offices in collective conflict resolution | Course registry              | Course registry          | By course                  | Facilitator       | Quarterly                                      | R. Arias          |
|                                                                                      | Percentage in the increment of knowledge: percentage change in the median of pre-test in respect to pre-test scores.       | Pre-test and post-test exams | Facilitators apply exams, compile scores | By course                  | Facilitator       | Quarterly                                      | R. Arias          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/ mediators, employers and workers</td>
<td>post-test scores. Unit of measurement: percentage points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and report them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE 4: STRENGTHENED MECHANISMS TO PROMOTE AND PROTECT WOMEN’S LABOR RIGHTS**

**Better knowledge by the target population on women’s labor rights and protection mechanisms.**

Increments by percentage of knowledge in the target group: refers to the increment in the percentage of workers, employers and general public that know about women’s labor rights and the protections mechanisms for them. Unit: percentage point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product 4.1.: Workers trained on gender discrimination in the workplace and how to exercise women’s labor rights.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information units produced and distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People trained in topics pertaining to labor discrimination due to gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increment in effective knowledge (Δ of knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical experience to improve knowledge and means to exercise women’s labor rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s trained as trainers for women’s labor rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons trained on women’s labor rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Product 4.2.: Minister of Labor inspectors trained in labor laws pertaining to gender and utilize instruments to verify compliance.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors that are trained in themes relating to gender discrimination against women workers.</td>
<td><strong>Number of trained inspectors</strong>: refers to the number of inspectors who complete 16 hours of training in women’s labor legal rights. Unit: An inspector</td>
<td>Pre and Post test Direct observation by facilitators</td>
<td>By event Country Facilitator</td>
<td>Quaterly</td>
<td>M. Leitón</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection instruments revised with variables to</td>
<td><strong>Number of revised inspection instruments</strong>: refers to inspection</td>
<td>Modified Collected by the facilitators</td>
<td>Each Facilitator</td>
<td>Quaterly</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
<td>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Data collection methods</td>
<td>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigate gender issues</td>
<td>guides, case management systems, auto-evaluation check lists and other instruments that have been revised to include gender variables. Unit: Inspection instrument</td>
<td>instruments</td>
<td>requested to the Ministries of Labor</td>
<td>instrument</td>
<td>each country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors that utilize instruments for inspections that include gender variables</td>
<td><strong>Number of inspections:</strong> number of visits to work sites where the inspectors have used revised instruments that include gender variables. Unit: inspections to work sites</td>
<td>Directors of inspection departments</td>
<td>Written solicitation from the facilitator to the person in charge of inspection</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Facilitator in each country</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>A. Carro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediators / Conciliators trained in gender issues regarding conciliation</td>
<td><strong>Number of Mediators / conciliators trained in woman gender issues:</strong> mediator / conciliators who have received 8 hours of training that apply to the process of conciliation Unit: A mediator / conciliator</td>
<td>Course registry</td>
<td>Course registry</td>
<td>By course</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>R. Arias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministries of Labor Offices that work on protection of women’s labor rights strengthened</td>
<td><strong>Number of empowered offices:</strong> refers to offices or operational areas in the Ministries of Labor (that are not part of inspection or mediation/ conciliation departments) that have implemented at least 3 of the</td>
<td>Reports by the facilitator and the departments that consult Billing</td>
<td>The facilitator compiles the documents</td>
<td>By office</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>M. Leitón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance indicator</td>
<td>Operative definition of the indicator and the unit of measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>following activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity of gender offices have and work under operational plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic plan for the gender unit approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Gender units' personnel promote, train and give technical advise on themes pertaining to women's labor rights.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Gender units' personnel use the equipment donated by the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Coordination mechanisms (within MOL and external) established.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit: An office or training unit in the Ministries of Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data acquisition timetable / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Analysis and use of information Type / frequency</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Date: December 14, 2008 |
Annex H: Project Strategic Framework

**Development Objective**

Improved compliance with national labor laws in Central America and the Dominican Republic

**Immediate Objective 1**

Increased understanding of target population in each country about National Labor Laws

**Product 1.1**

Public awareness activities in the different countries at national and regional levels

**Product 1.2**

Training activities with a multiplier effect executed in the 3 sectors (public, private, labor)

**Product 1.3**

Information mechanisms and/or call centers, established and strengthened in the Ministries of Labor.

**Product 1.4**

Interactive Web Page www.leylaboral.com, established, developed and promoted

**Immediate Objective 2**

Increased efficiency and trust in inspection systems in Labor Ministries in enforcing compliance of national labor laws and norms

**Product 2.1**

Electronic case management systems strengthened at central levels and extended to selected regional levels

**Product 2.2**

Improved inspection management at central and regional levels

**Immediate Objective 3**

Improved and expanded mediation and conciliation services for the labor conflicts

**Product 3.1**

Pilot experiences in ADR in private organization implemented in some countries

**Product 3.2**

Improved M/C management including electronic case management systems, improvements in workspaces or improved service

**Immediate Objective 4**

Strengthened mechanisms to promote and protect women’s labor rights.

**Product 4.1**

Workers trained on gender discrimination in the workplace and how to exercise their labor rights

**Product 4.2**

MT inspectors trained in labor laws pertaining to gender discrimination and utilizes instruments to verify compliance

**Product 4.3**

Conciliators/mediators are sensitive to gender issues in the process of conciliation.

**Product 4.4**

Strengthened Labor Ministries offices that promote women’s labor rights in the workplace
## Annex I: Main Recommendations from Midterm Phase 2/Final Phase 1 Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tema de Evaluación / Monitoreo</th>
<th>Recomendación</th>
<th>Acción Concreta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simplificar los instrumentos de monitoreo/seguimiento</td>
<td>Utilizar el Cronograma como base de una matriz y mantener el Data Tracking Table para el PMP Roxana y Director plantearán la versión para oír sugerencias a los coordinadores, facilitadores, asesores y otros. Fecha: Septiembre 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mejorar el entendimiento del personal sobre terminología, significado, funciones de los instrumentos existentes de M&amp;E para que estén en mejor capacidad de aprovechar los diferentes usos de los instrumentos (más allá que cumplimiento de actividades o productos)</td>
<td>A partir de esos documentos preparar una guía sencilla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crear una base de datos de conocimiento interna para fácil acceso a informes, documentos, materiales etc. y para futuro uso por otros proyectos</td>
<td>Actualizar y hacer accesible la base de documentos básicos del Proyecto. Únicamente los necesarios para el usuario final. Considerar qué opciones hay para avanzar hacia un sistema de automatización y acceso de documentos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para futuros proyectos, incorporar en el diseño y en el presupuesto una persona dedicada al tema de M&amp;E tiempo completo.</td>
<td>Para este Proyecto, no estamos de acuerdo, sin perjuicio de mejorar la eficiencia del sistema de Monitoreo. Para futuros proyectos, dependerá del tipo y amplitud de ellos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrategia, Objetivos, Riesgos</td>
<td>En este último año del proyecto, cambiar el enfoque de concentrarse en cumplimiento de las actividades, hacia los outcomes y objetos que el proyecto ha planteado lograr.</td>
<td>Estamos de acuerdo porque ya lo estamos haciendo. Hay que visibilizarlo más.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                               | Encontrar métodos alternativos (sin cambiar los indicadores) para rescatar de mejor forma los indicadores de impacto para poder medir si, y cómo, el proyecto está logrando sus objetivos | Explorar fórmulas para hacerlo más efectivamente rescatando y resaltando la relación de las acciones del Proyecto con los indicadores de impacto, sin afectar el desarrollo de los indicadores existentes. Contratar una consultoría o solicitarle a la URE que prepare y sistematice esa información con el apoyo de Facilitadores, Coordinadores y Dirección. Septiembre se prepara método y se desarrolla a partir de octubre de 2007. Analizar la posibilidad de aplicar cuestionarios con Conciliadores e Inspectores, sobre impacto de las acciones y producto del Proyecto en sus objetivos del mismo. Coordinador de Inspección tratará de realizar, de acuerdo con los inspectores de cada país, visitas conjuntas para verificar utilización de las acciones y productos del
### Estudios de Implementación

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proyecto.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asegurar que los tres sectores mantengan el interés en participar en el proyecto y que se apropien del mismo, especialmente el sector de empleadores</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seguir mejorando la coordinación con proyectos que trabajan el tema para poder coordinar esfuerzos y para evitar duplicidades y lograr mejores resultados.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encontrar métodos alternativos (sin cambiar los indicadores) para rescatar de mejor forma los indicadores de impacto para poder medir si, y cómo, el proyecto está logrando sus objetivos.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impacto para Beneficios de Grupo Meta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Para los 4 componentes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encontrar métodos alternativos (sin cambiar los indicadores) para poder medir el impacto de las actividades, y los productos que el proyecto desarrolla para poder medir si, y cómo, el proyecto está logrando sus objetivos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desarrollar un plan concreto involucrando a todos los actores claves sobre roles y responsabilidades para el seguimiento y el mantenimiento de leylaboral.com y otros productos de Difusión.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seguir desarrollando estrategias “flexibles” que se adapten a las necesidades locales y características específicas de la población meta de cada país</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinar si, y cómo, las personas capacitadas utilizan el conocimiento y las técnicas aprendidas en su trabajo diario.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Difusión</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>De acuerdo.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Para leylaboral.com, se desarrollará el Plan para lograrlo junto con Master Lex y los Ministerios: enero 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Para Call Center, se desarrollará…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Para capacidad instalada en los Ministerios para la difusión…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Para los productos de capacitación en derechos y obligaciones laborales…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Para otros productos… VER PLAN DE SOSTENIBILIDAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mediación / Inspección</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>De acuerdo. Tratar por medio de entrevistas, cuestionarios u otros métodos válidos, captar la utilidad para los “clientes”, participantes u organizaciones de las capacitaciones.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apoyar a los Ministerios para que aprendan la importancia de usar los datos que arrojan el sistemas electrónicos de casos para efectos preventivos y de planificación</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinar si, y cómo, las personas capacitadas utilizan el conocimiento y las técnicas aprendidas en su trabajo diario.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seguir desarrollando estrategias “flexibles” que se adapten a las necesidades locales y características específicas de la población meta de cada país</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinar si, y cómo, las personas capacitadas utilizan el conocimiento y las técnicas aprendidas en su trabajo diario.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seguir mejorando la coordinación con proyectos que trabajan el tema para poder coordinar esfuerzos y para evitar duplicidades y lograr mejores resultados.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encontrar métodos alternativos (sin cambiar los indicadores) para rescatar de mejor forma los indicadores de impacto para poder medir si, y cómo, el proyecto está logrando sus objetivos.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derecho Laboral de las Mujeres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compartir la información y materiales desarrollados para los otros países con Panamá y Costa Rica (en leylaboral.com, con facilitadores/as etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinar si, y cómo, las personas capacitadas utilizan el conocimiento y las técnicas aprendidas en su trabajo diario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestión</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seguir mejorando la comunicación y coordinación entre los y las coordinadores/as de componentes y los y las facilitadores/as en cuanto a información sobre la disponibilidad de fondos y la actualización de los presupuestos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promover el intercambio de experiencias exitosas, lecciones aprendidas y problemas encontrados entre los y las facilitadores/as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sostenibilidad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>