O'BRIEN &
ASSOCIATES
INTERNATIONAL

INDEPENDENT FINAL EVALUATION OF THE EVERYBODY WORKS PROJECT: WORKER RIGHTS CENTERS IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

FEBRUARY 2013

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ADR   Alternative Dispute Resolution
CEFASA *Centro de Formación y Acción Social y Agraria* (Training Center for Social Action and Agriculture)
COP   Chief of Party
CRS   Catholic Relief Services
CSR   Corporate Social Responsibility
CyG   *Cumple y Gana* (Comply and Win project)
DR   Dominican Republic
DR-CAFTA The Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement
EU   European Union
GMIES *Grupo de Monitoreo Independiente de El Salvador* (Independent Monitoring Group of El Salvador)
HIV-AIDS Human Immunodeficiency Virus - Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
IDHUCA *Instituto de Derechos Humanos de la Universidad Centro Americana* (Institute of Human Rights at the University of Central America)
ILO   International Labor Organization
LFA   Logical Framework Approach
M&E   Monitoring and Evaluation
MOL   Ministry of Labor
MOU   Memorandum of Understanding
NGO   Nongovernmental organization
ODHAG *Oficina de Derechos Humanos del Arzobispado de Guatemala* (Office of Human Rights of the Archbishop of Guatemala)
PACT   Private Agencies Collaborating Together
PMS   Performance Monitoring System
TOR   Terms of Reference
TOT   Trainer of Trainers
USAID United States Agency for International Development
USDOL United States Department of Labor
UN   United Nations
SACMIDEL *Sistema de Administración de Casos y Monitoreo de Indicatores de Derechos Laborales* (Case Management and Labor Rights Indicator Monitoring System)
STSS   *Secretaría de Trabajo y Seguridad Social* (Secretary of Labor and Social Security-Honduras)
UNEH *Universidad Nicaragüense de Estudios Humanísticos* (University of Humanistic Studies in Nicaragua)
WRC   Worker Rights Center

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States Department of Labor (USDOL) provided $8,325,000 to the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) to implement the Everybody Works: Worker Rights Centers in Central America and the Dominican Republic for a six-year period. The project started in May 2007 and was initially scheduled to end in April of 2011. USDOL extended Everybody Works twice. The first extension increased the project life through February 2012 while the second extension allowed Everybody Works to function through March 2013.

Everybody Works is commonly divided into two phases. Phase 1 covers the first four years of the project until the extensions (May 2007- April 2011). USDOL allocated additional funds to Everybody Works that account for the extension periods. These extensions are referred to as Phase 2, which enabled the project to enter a new "sustainability" phase for the final 18 months of the project.

In Phase 1, the project aimed to create demand for legal services through broad-based media campaigns and training volunteers to replicate key labor rights messages to co-workers. The demand for legal services was met by the WRCs that provided legal counsel, helped workers prepare and file complaints, and accompanied workers through administrative or legal proceedings until their cases were resolved. The project shifted its focus in Phase 2 to sustaining legal and education services through labor promoters and peripheral WRCs. While WRCs continued to provide legal services, the project trained community volunteers to offer legal and educational services. Many of these labor promoters are based out of resource centers called peripheral WRCs that are located closer to communities of workers.

CRS implements the project through nine local partners. The local partners are responsible for establishing worker rights centers (WRC) and supervising and supporting the WRC teams that, in turn, provide legal and education services to workers. The WRCs in Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic focus primarily on immigrant labor issues.

The focus of this final evaluation is on Phase 2 and the purpose is to provide USDOL and the implementing organizations with an independent assessment of the project's performance and experience. The evaluation results are intended to allow the key stakeholders to determine whether the project achieved its stated objectives and outputs, identify strengths and weaknesses in the project approach and implementation, and provide recommendations based on the project's achievements for future interventions.

The evaluation was conducted between January 7 and February 22, 2013. The fieldwork was conducted from January 14 to February 8 in the six focus countries in the region. The evaluation team interviewed 287 persons including 113 labor promoters, 67 beneficiaries, and 44 WRC team members. The evaluators also interviewed CRS managers, the project's regional management team, local partners, and other key collaborating organizations.

Findings and Conclusions

The findings and conclusions address the key questions listed in the terms of reference and are presented according to the major evaluation categories: project design, impact, effectiveness, coordination and communication, performance monitoring system, and sustainability.

Project Design

The evaluation found the project's design to be logical and consistent. It did, however, have several weaknesses. The development objective does not have indicators to measure impact and the immediate objective is not stated as an impact or outcome objective and does not have impact or effect indicators.

The design of the WRC model was found to be is flexible and replicable. The evaluators noted that local partners adjusted the WRC model to meet local circumstances and needs. The model's success factors include a capable and dedicated WRC team, effective supervision and support, flexibility to adapt the model to local needs, and participation that creates ownership of the model.

Impact

The evaluators found that the project was not designed to measure impact because it does not have impact indicators. In Phase 1, the project focused on counting outputs such as numbers of workers served. It should be noted that the original project design did not require the project to accompany workers through an administrative or judicial procedure. In Phase 2, the focus has been on sustaining legal and education services. The evaluators determined that output #1, cases resolved, is the best measure the project has to assess impact on workers. However, the project is not required to collect data on the number of amounts actually received by the worker, which makes assessing the true impact on the worker difficult.

The evaluators discovered that the most important tangible impact the project has had on workers is economic. The project has assisted 2,059 workers attain favorable settlements valued at $4.9 million. As noted above, it is not possible to say how many workers actually received the amounts in the settlements because the project is not tracking these data. Howver, the workers that the evaluators interviewed that actually received settlements are highly appreciative of the support they received from the WRC teams.

According to the findings on evaluation methodologies, a random controlled experiment evaluation methodology would not have been useful in determining impact for a couple reasons. First, the project did not define the impact it intended to have on workers and develop impact indicators to measure the impact. Second, the WRCs are providing, by far, the most effective legal services in their areas. The use of a random controlled experiment would indicate the obvious: workers assisted by the WRCs attained more favorable settlements in shorter times than workers assisted by other private or public institutions (those in the counterfactual).

Effectiveness of Implementation

The capacity of public institutions such as labor ministries, public defenders, and the courts have both constrained and facilitated the success of the WRC model and its implementation. For example, weak public institutions create more demand for the services provided by the WRCs because they are of higher quality. The increase in demand increases the workload of the WRCs. However, the unmet need for high quality legal services provided by the WRCs is one of the keys to their success.

Only about 20% of workers that consult with WRC teams about labor rights violations decide to take action. Fear was noted as the primary reason why more workers do not demand their labor rights. According to interviewees, workers are afraid of being fired, blacklisted, or physically threatened. Other important reasons mentioned are ignorance about labor rights and mistrust of

public institutions, especially labor ministries and the courts. It should be pointed out that not all workers that consult with WRC teams require administrative or judicial action.

Another factor that negatively affected implementation was changes in local partners and WRC teams and inadequate supervision. CRS Guatemala changed the local partner three times, which caused delays and interruptions in services to workers. The Caritas director fired the San José WRC team twice, which interrupted services to workers. Caritas Honduras also fired the WRC team in El Progresso, which appears to have more of a positive than negative affect on services to workers. The WRC teams in San José and Chimaltenango have received inadequate supervision and support from the local partners, which negatively affected implementation.

Several factors that facilitated implementation were the WRC team and the participation of local partners in Phase 2. The heart and soul of Everybody Works is the WRC team that the evaluators found to be highly dedicated and committed. The WRC model has been successful due largely to the people who comprise the teams. The participation of local partners increased significantly in Phase 2, which helped create cooperation, enthusiasm, and ownership in the project.

The WRC teams have engaged in several good practices that represent innovative approaches to increase effectiveness. These include the placement of WRC lawyers at the STSS mediation office in Honduras; use of Facebook by Labor Promoters in Costa Rica; mediation center established by the Justice and Peace Commission in Nicaragua; and the incorporation of document assistance with legal services in the DR. The collaboration between Everybody Works and the Justice Strengthening Project in Nicaragua is also a good practice.

Coordination and Communication

The evaluators found that internal coordination and communication were ineffective at times. In Phase 1, the coordination and communication among the four local partners in the DR was problematic. This situation improved in Phase 2 when CRS took over the coordination role and appointed a new coordinator. The coordination and communication between the local partners and WRC teams in San José and Chimaltenango have also been ineffective. In addition, the communication between the regional management team and several of the CRS country coordinators has been less than optimal.

The project participated in meetings and shared infomration and materials with other labor proejects. This was expecially true in Nicaragua and El Salvador. However, the project did not collaborate extensively or strategically with other labor projects except Nicaragua. The Nicaraguan University of Humanistic Studies (UNEH, by its Spanish acronym) provided certificate degree courses to the WRC labor promoters and frequent on-going training to the WRC team. Several of the WRC team members earned post graduate and masters degrees in labor rights from UNEH with assistance from the USAID funded Labor Justice Stregthening Project. The evaluators believe the collaboration between the WRCs and UNEH in Nicaragua is a good practice because it is both extensive and strategic.

Performance Monitoring System

The evaluation found the PMS to be well designed. It included the project's strategic framework, performance monitoring plans, and the software program or database. Project staff, however, experienced numerous technical problems using the database. Furthermore, the evaluation team could not determine the reliability and validity of the information generated by the database because there was not a data quality control mechanism in place to verify the data accuracy.

The sustainability of the PMS will depend on whether the local partners decide to continue to use the database, which is predicated primarily on the need that the local partner has to report information to donors and access to technical assistance to resolve software glitches.

Sustainability

The WRC model is difficult to sustain, especially for local organizations that do not have ready access to donor funding. The WRCs, as they are currently configured, will not be sustained in the medium term. A scaled-down version of the WRC in San Miguel will survive into the medium term. WRCs in Dajabón, Santiago, and Santo Domingo will be incorporated into the local partners' legal offices and continue to focus part-time on labor rights. The WRCs in San Salvador, San José, Chimaltenango, San Pedro Macoris, and those in Nicaragua and Honduras will likely not survive in the medium term.

The sustainability of the labor promoters and peripheral WRCs will depend on the supervisory and financial support they receive from the local partners. The local partners that have the political willingness and financial ability to continue to support labor promoters include Solidaridad Fronteriza, Training Center for Social Action and Agriculture, Bono Center, Jesús Peregrino Service Center, and Independent Monitoring Group of El Salvador (San Miguel). It will be difficult for the other local partners to sustain the labor promoters and peripheral WRCs without resources.

Recommendations

The following recommendations, which are based on the findings and conclusions, are intended to inform the design and implementation of future USDOL labor projects, especially WRC-style projects.

1. Project design criteria should be developed based on the Logical Framework Approach and other results management frameworks and grantees should be required to meet these criteria in their proposal submissions. The criteria should include guidelines for identifying and writing impact and outcome objectives and corresponding indicators. It should include a LogFrame and project hypothesis showing the cause and effect logic flow from outputs to outcomes to impact.

2. Project proposals should be required to have impact and outcome objectives with the appropriate indicators. Grantees should be required to have a performance monitoring system that measures and reports on the progress in achieving the indicator targets. Possible impact indictors for WRC-style projects might include settlements executed, time taken to reach settlements, willingness and ability of a worker to file complaints, and resolutions of labor cases using national and international labor laws.

3. USDOL's development objective should be operationally defined and impact indicators developed that project grantees are expected measure. These indicators should be broad enough to encompass typical USDOL labor projects but feasible enough to measure during the life of a project. These impact indicators would also serve to focus midterm and final evaluations.

4. A WRC-style project's PMS should have data quality control mechanisms to ensure the accuracy of the data. Possible data quality control mechanisms might include random spot checks having an objective verifier check the accuracy of the data collected and reported.

5. Advocacy and psychosocial components should be added to the WRC model. Advocacy initiatives should compliment WRC legal and education services. The WRC team should be trained to provide basic psychosocial support to vulnerable workers. These might include cases of physical, sexual, or verbal abuse; threats to the safety of workers; severe illness such as cancer or HIV/AIDS; or severe economic consequences stemming from the loss of jobs. If resources are available, the WRC should hire a qualified and trained counselor.

6. The WRC model should emphasize alternative dispute resolution strategies and techniques such as direct negotiations with employers and mediation in the labor ministries and other public institutions as applicable. The WRC model should also include an accredited mediation center where feasible and permitted by national legislation so mediated settlements are legally binding and enforceable by law.

7. Future WRC-style projects should formally collaborate with public institutions responsible for protecting worker rights and key employers or employer organizations. One of the strengths of Everybody Works was its mandate to provide legal assistance directly to workers, which should be maintained. However, as demonstrated in Honduras, a formal collaboration mechanism and coordination can facilitate case resolutions.

8. Criteria should be used to select local implementing partners. The selection criteria should include experience and capacity in labor rights and labor law; political willingness and financial ability to host the WRC, supervise the WRC team, and sustain the WRC; and strong networks and linkages with key sectors and workers organizations. The local implementing partners should also have the confidence and trust of workers, which is just as important as having experience and capacity in the field of labor rights.

9. Mechanisms and strategies should be developed during project start-up to ensure the local implementing partners and other key stakeholders participate in strategic and annual planning, budgeting exercises, and performance monitoring. The local implementers should also be given the flexibility to adjust the WRC model to meet local needs early in the life of the project (i.e. Phase 1).

10. Grant applicants should be required to include a section in their proposal describing the sustainability strategy, which is used by USDOL to grade and award grants. Once the grant is awarded, the grantee should be required develop a sustainability plan that is incorporated into annual workplan and the performance monitoring system. The sustainability strategy should address the selection of local organizations and assess their political willingness and financial ability to sustain the WRC. In addition, USDOL should work with the grantees to experiment with cost-recovery models such as including a percentage of settlements as legal fees.

I   PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

The United States Department of Labor (USDOL) provided $8,325,000 to the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) to implement the Everybody Works: Worker Rights Centers in Central America and the Dominican Republic for a six-year period. The project started in May 2007 and was initially scheduled to end in April of 2011. USDOL extended Everybody Works twice. The first extension increased the project life through February 2012 while the second extension allowed Everybody Works to function through March 2013.

Funding for the Everybody Works project originated from funds that USDOL received from the Department of State for labor and environmental capacity-building activities designed to support the implementation of the recommendations established in the report entitled "The Labor Dimension in Central America and the Dominican Republic—Building on Progress: Strengthening Compliance and Enhancing Capacity" (referred to as the "White Paper"). The White Paper reflected the commitments made by trade and labor ministry officials to improve each country's institutional capacity to implement the Dominican Republic and Central America Free Trade Agreement (DR-CAFTA).

CRS implements the project through nine local partners. The local partners are responsible for establishing worker rights centers (WRC) and supervising and supporting the WRC teams that, in turn, provide legal and education services to workers. The following table shows the WRCs by country and the responsible local partner.

Table 1: WRCs by Country and Responsible Local Partner

Country	WRC	Local Partner
Costa Rica	• San José	Caritas Costa Rica
Dominican Republic	• Dajabón • Santiago • Santo Domingo • San Pedro Macoris	Solidaridad Fronteriza CEFASA Bono Center Jesús Peregrine Service Center
El Salvador	• San Salvador • San Miguel	IDHUCA GMIES
Guatemala	• Chimaltenango	ODHAG
Honduras	• Choluteca • El Progreso • San Pedro • Tegucigalpa	Caritas Tegucigalpa (oversees all WRCs)
Nicaragua	• Chinandega • León	Justice and Peace Commission (both WRCs)

Everybody Works is commonly divided into two phases. Phase 1 covers the first four years of the project until the extensions (May 2007- April 2011). USDOL allocated additional funds to Everybody Works that account for the extension periods. The extension periods are referred to as Phase 2, which enabled the project to enter a new "sustainability" phase for the final 18 months of the project. Table 2 compares the development goal, immediate objective, outputs, and strategies/activities for Phase 1 and Phase 2, which are followed by a more detailed discussion of the differences between the phases.

Table 2: Comparison of the Development Objective, Immediate Objective, Outputs, and Strategies for Phases I and II

	Phase 1	Phase 2
Development Goal	Contributed improvement in labor law compliance in Central America and the Dominican Republic	Contribute to improvement in labor law compliance in Central America and the Dominican Republic
Immediate Objective	Workers exercise their labor rights by using appropriate legal mechanisms	Promote the sustainability and defense of labor rights in Central America and Dominican Republic
Outputs	1. Workers receive quality legal assistance about labor rights 2. Workers receive labor rights training and outreach 3. Targeted workers informed on how to exercise their rights regarding specific labor issues	1. WRCs providing quality legal assistance in labor rights 2. Strengthened decentralization of legal services provided by the WRCs 3. Strengthened decentralization of educational services provided for WRCs 4. Promote awareness and advocacy on labor rights

Phase 1 Strategies	Phase 2 Strategies
Output 1 Workers receive quality legal assistance about labor rights -Establish initial dialogue and coordination with MOL -Establish staff and equip WRCs -Adapt and produce educational materials for use by WRCs -Train WRC staff on how to provide services -Train WRC staff to use database tracking system -Design costumer service manual -WRC staff provide legal advice and assistance to workers	**Output 1 Provide quality legal assistance in labor rights** -Mediation training for lawyers -Integrate regional labor rights into training for lawyers -Train lawyers in employment law -Update the PMS -Support labor promoters as they carry out services -Document key labor rights violations in the region
Output 2 Workers receive labor rights training and outreach -Develop curriculum for Training of Trainers (TOT) workshops -Conduct TOT for local labor organizations -Provide follow-up to trainers in educational activities -Provide labor rights education to workers coming to WRC -Implement labor rights outreach activities for workers	**Output 2 Strengthen decentralization of legal services** -Extending coverage to intermediate cities -Promote the WRC model to other organizations -Develop partnerships with partners to provide WRC services -Exchange good practices and lessons -Define and strengthen the referral system of the labor promoters -Documenting the experience of the labor promoters -Encourage labor promoters to manage own cases -Coordinate with the labor ministries
Output 3 Workers informed on how to exercise their labor rights -Contract consultancy to design promotion of WRCs -Design information campaign to promote WRCs and their services -Produce and distribute campaign materials to promote WRCs -Implement information campaign -Contract consultants to design awareness campaign -Design public awareness campaign to educate workers -Produce or adapt existing materials for public awareness campaign -Implement awareness campaign	**Output 3 Strengthen decentralization of education services** -Develop material support (WRC model replica) -Strengthen labor promoters and their networks -Help graduate TOTs to labor promoters -Expand coverage to other community leaders -Continuous training for labor promoters -Document the experience of the labor promoters -Adapt teaching manuals that were prepared by GMIES -Gather materials on labor rights and adapt to each country -Promote the "replication model" to other organizations
	Output 4 Promote awareness and advocacy on labor rights -Institutionalize labor rights within CRS and local partners -Promote educational activities in priority sectors -Media training and campaigns -Establish media network that supports labor rights -Develop media contacts for public service spaces -Develop outreach materials on labor rights -Document sensitive labor cases (domestic, immigrants) -Advocacy initiatives -Training and alliances for business leaders -Incorporate CSR approaches to employers -Joint forums and other promotional activities

The project's development objective of contributing to improvement in labor law compliance in Central America and the Dominican Republic remained the same for Phase 1 and 2. The immediate objective, however, changed from workers exercising their labor rights and using

appropriate legal mechanisms to promoting the sustainability and defense of labor rights. The initial emphasis in Phase 1 was to provide only advice to workers. This approach was eventually modified and WRCs started to provide legal services including legal representation. In Phase 2, the emphasis changed to sustaining the promotion and defense of labor rights among workers using labor promoters to decentralize legal services and more cost-effective education activities.

One of the primary mechanisms in Phase 2 to sustain legal and education services to workers has been labor promoters. The emphasis in Phase 1 was on training volunteers to replicate labor rights messages via short discussions with workers. This was referred to as Training of Trainers (TOT). In Phase 2, the project decided to create labor promoters who are community volunteers trained to provide a limited range of legal services and communicate labor rights messages directly to co-workers. Many of the TOTs in Phase 1 became labor promoters in Phase 2.

Under Phase 2, the project added a fourth output that consisted of advocacy initiatives to support the work of the WRCs and labor promoters and activities aimed at institutionalizing labor rights within the local partners and other organizations.

Table 3 summarizes the number of labor promoters and peripheral WRCs by each WRC. There are 267 accredited labor promoters (active) and 24 peripheral WRCs. In general, the number of labor promoters is based on the demand for labor rights services while the number of peripheral WRCs is based on the need to extend service coverage to areas well outside the reach of the WRCs (increase access of services to workers).

Table 3: Number of Labor Promoters and Peripheral WRCs by Country

Worker Rights Centers	Number of Active Promoters	Number of Peripheral WRCs
San José	10	2
Dajabón	35	3
Santiago	16	2
Santo Domingo	23	4
San Pedro Macoris	23	2
San Salvador	11	0
San Miguel	14	1
Chimaltenango	42	2
Choluteca	14	1
El Progreso	12	2
San Pedro	16	3
Tegucigalpa	22	2
Chinandega	16	0
León	13	0
Total	267	24

For example, the demand for decentralized legal services by Haitian immigrants is high in Dajabón, Santo Domingo, and San Pedro Macoris. The demand for decentralized services is relatively high in San Pedro and Tegucigalpa because they are large manufacturing centers. On the other hand, Chinandega and Leon are smaller towns and do not require the same extension of service coverage. The other factor that determines the number of promoters is the alliances that the WRC has with other organizations. In Guatemala, the project formed an alliance with an indigenous people's organization (Alcaldía Indígena) that requested nearly 40 community

volunteers be trained as labor promoters to provide legal and education services to indigenous communities.

II   EVALUATION PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

2.1   EVALUATION PURPOSE

The overall purpose of the Everybody Works final evaluation is to provide USDOL and the implementing organizations an independent assessment the project's performance and experience. The evaluation results are intended to allow the key stakeholders to determine whether the project achieved its stated outcomes, identify strengths and weaknesses in the project approach and implementation, and provide recommendations based on the project's achievements for future interventions. The evaluation also intended to identify important lessons that could be considered in using the approach as a model for improving worker rights in other contexts.

The evaluation focused on the following areas:

- Determine how and to what extent the project achieved its stated objectives and sustainability and the reasons for its successes and failures;
- Evaluate benefits accrued to target groups and, to the extent possible, any impact or outcomes beyond these outputs;
- Identify best practices and lessons learned, noting in particular what aspects of the project enabled or hindered its success; and
- Provide recommendations on how to successfully use the project model in other contexts, drawing on experience in the scaling of this project and the implementation of the related Campo a Campo Project in Guatemala.

USDOL developed a set of questions to guide the evaluation. The questions address key issues in (1) validity of the project strategy, objectives and assumptions; (2) project impact and sustainability; (3) effectiveness of the project performance monitoring system; and (4) project coordination. The evaluation questions appear in the Terms of Reference (TOR) in Annex A.

2.2   METHODOLOGY

The evaluation used primarily qualitative data collection methods. Quantitative data also were obtained from project documents and reports, to the extent that they were available, and incorporated into the analysis. Data collection methods and stakeholder perspectives were triangulated where possible to increase the credibility and validity of the results. Efforts were made to include the participation of direct project beneficiaries in all six countries. The interviews incorporated some flexibility to allow for additional questions, ensuring that key information was obtained. A consistent protocol was followed for each country and during each interview; modifications were made specific to the particular stakeholders and project activities.

Evaluation Schedule. The evaluation was conducted between January 7 and February 22, 2013. The evaluators reviewed project documents, developed data collection instruments, and prepared for the fieldwork during the week of January 7. Fieldwork was conducted in El Salvador during the week of January 14. Fieldwork in Nicaragua and Costa Rica was conducted during the week of January 21 followed by fieldwork in Honduras from January 28–30. The evaluation team participated in the Everybody Works closure conference in Guatemala on January 31 and February 1 and remained in the country to conduct interviews on February 4. The evaluators travelled to the Dominican Republic and conducted interviews during February 6-8, which ended the fieldwork phase of the evaluation. The bulk of the data analyses and reporting writing

occurred from February 11-22. The complete schedule of evaluation activities appears in the TOR Annex A.

Data Collection and Analysis. USDOL developed a list of evaluation questions that served as the basis for the evaluation. The questions were used to develop guides and protocols for the key informant interviews and document reviews. The key informant interview guides are listed in Annex B. The following methods were employed to gather primary and secondary data.

Document Reviews. The evaluators read a variety of critical project documents and other reference publications. These documents included the cooperative agreement, project documents and strategic frameworks, technical progress reports, contract documents, and training events and materials. Annex C shows the complete list of documents that were reviewed.

Key Informant Interviews. The evaluator conducted 287 face-to-face and group interviews with CRS managers and coordinators, Everybody Works regional management, implementing partners, WRC staff, labor promoters, collaborating organizations, and beneficiaries (workers). The evaluators also interviewed representatives from labor ministries, other labor projects, and US Embassy labor officers.

The document reviews and key informant interviews generated a substantial volume of raw qualitative data. The evaluators used qualitative data analysis methods, including matrix analysis, to categorize, triangulate, synthesize, and summarize the raw data captured from the interview notes. The results of the data analysis provided tangible blocks of information, which the evaluators used to write the evaluation report. The data analysis was driven by the evaluation questions in the TOR.

Sampling Methodology. The evaluators used a purposeful, non-random sampling methodology to select the interviewees. Table 4 summarizes the populations interviewed, the interviewing methodology, the sample size, and characteristics of the sample.

Table 4: Population, Methodology, Sample Size, and Sample Characteristics

Population	Method	Sample Size	Sample Characteristics
CRS Managers	Individual Interviews	10	CRS Country Representatives and Country Coordinators
Regional Team	Individual Interviews	2	Chief of Party and Director of Monitoring and Evaluation
Local Partners	Individual Interviews	11	Directors or program officers for all nine local partners
WRC Team	Group Interviews	44	WRC coordinators, lawyers, and educators
Labor Promoters	Group Interviews	113	Sample of 6-10 labor promoters per WRC
Beneficiaries	Individual Interviews	67	Sample of 5-10 beneficiaries per WRC
Labor Ministries and Courts	Individual Interviews	16	Inspectors, mediators, and judges collaborating with the project in Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica
Universities, Interns, Other	Individual Interviews	14	Representatives of collaborating universities, interns, and other collaborating organizations
Other Projects	Individual Interviews	7	Labor Justice and Cultivar Projects in Nicaragua and the White Paper Verification project in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and El Salvador.
US Labor Officers	Individual Interviews	3	Labor officers in El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica.
Total Interviews		**287**	

The evaluation team interviewed 287 persons including 113 labor promoters, 67 beneficiaries, and 44 WRC team members. These interviews account for 78% of the total interviews. The remaining interviews were conduced with CRS managers, the project regional team, labor ministries, courts, universities, interns, other labor projects, and labor officers at three US Embassies.

Limitations. This final evaluation has various limitations that warrant discussion. The first and most obvious limitation was the sample of beneficiaries. The sample was both small and non-random. The evaluators interviewed 67 beneficiaries, which represent only about 2% of the total number of workers that had their cases resolved by the WRCs. The sample of beneficiaries were selected by the WRC teams and consisted of workers that attained favorable resolutions or that had cases in the process of either an administrative or judicial proceeding. The evaluation team believes interviewing only workers that attained favorable resolutions could have biased the finding that beneficiaries were nearly unanimous in praising the WRCs for their services.

The sample of labor promoters that the evaluators interviewed could also have been biased. The evaluators interviewed 113 or 42% of active promoters, which is a relatively large sample. However, the evaluators did not interview labor promoters that had been accredited by the project but were no longer active. Interviews with inactive labor promoters could have given the evaluation team deeper insight into the reasons they are inactive that, in turn, could be used as a marker for future attrition rates.

Another important limitation was the amount of time the evaluators spent in each country. The evaluators were given two to three days in each country to conduct interviews with local partners, WRC teams, labor promoters, beneficiaries, and key public and private sector actors. The limited number of days available to interview meant that the evaluators were not able to interview key actors in some countries such as labor ministry representatives, judges overseeing labor cases, and representatives of worker organizations (unions).

III   FINDINGS

The following findings are based on the review of key project documents and interviews conducted during the fieldwork phase in each country. The findings address the key questions listed in the TOR and are presented according to the major evaluation categories: project design, impact, effectiveness, coordination and communication, performance monitoring system, and sustainability.

3.1   VALIDITY OF PROJECT DESIGN

This section addresses issues related to the validity of the project design. It begins with an assessment of the project design's internal logical consistency (i.e. cause and effect logic) between the outputs, objectives, and overall goal. This section also examines the flexibility and replicability of the WRC model for other countries and implementing environments.

3.1.1   Project Design's Internal Logical Consistency

USDOL uses the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) for its project designs. Practical Concepts International developed the LFA in 1969 for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The LFA requires programmers to develop a logical sequence of cause-and-effect events that include the goal, purpose, outputs, activities, and inputs. The LFA also calls for programmers to develop assumptions to test the logic in the causal links as well as indicators and means of verification to measure the objectives. These components are organized in a matrix called the LogFrame.

The USDOL project design framework uses the same cause and effect logic as well as the LogFrame to organize the goals, objectives, activities, and indicators. However, USDOL uses slightly different terminology. The hierarchy in the USDOL project design framework consists of an overreaching development objective that is the higher aspiration (goal) that the project's outcomes contribute to but are not expected to attain. The next level is the immediate objectives, which are outcomes or results (policies, knowledge, skills, behaviors or practices) that managers are expected to accomplish. The immediate objective should make a significant contribution to the project's development objective. The outputs are the specific products or services that achieve the outcomes.

The evaluation team analyzed the Everybody Works project design in Phase 2 according to the LFA cause and effect logic. The project's development objective, outcomes, and outputs appear in the project logical framework in Annex E. The results of the analysis are summarized below in Table 5.

Table 5: Logical Integrity of the Project Design

Objectives and Indicators	Analysis
Contribute to improvement in labor law compliance No indicators listed	USDOL uses the same development objective of contributing to labor law compliance for its projects, which provides a unifying framework for USDOL funded projects. The idea is that USDOL funded projects are designed to contribute to labor law compliance but individual projects like Everybody Works are not expected to achieve this objective alone. This is why the Everybody Works project design does not have indicators for the development objective. However, if USDOL does not require its projects to define and measure indicators for the development objective, how will it know if its investment in projects is actually contributing to labor law compliance? This raises the question as to whether USDOL should define a set of indicators for labor law compliance and ensure that its projects measure them.

Promote the sustainability and defense of workers rights • # of workers assisted in workers rights theme • # of worker organizations with an integrated agenda on workers rights • % decrease in workers rights violations reported	According to the LFA, the project objective should be the tangible outcome that directly contributes to the achievement of the goal. Typically, outcome level objectives are written as tangible improvements or changes in conditions, behaviors, and practices. Promoting the sustainability and defense of workers rights is written more like an activity rather than an outcome. In addition, the first two indicators resemble output level indicators. The third indicator, percent decrease in violations, reflects a change in condition and is an appropriate outcome indicator. Given what Phase 2 of the project was attempting to achieve, the evaluation team believes the project objective should be framed in terms of the percent of workers in the targeted geographical area or sector that enjoyed their labor rights and received justice. Two of the primary indicators should the percentage of mediation agreements or court decisions that are fulfilled and the amounts paid to the worker. The concern of the evaluation team is that certain countries in the region have a reputation for employers not honoring the terms of the mediation agreements and sentences. Even though a worker many have achieved a favorable outcome, there will not be an impact on the worker until he or she is fairly compensated for the labor rights violation.
Outputs	**Analysis**
1. Provide quality legal assistance on labor rights • # of workers' cases resolved • # of workers assisted with legal services	The output of the WRCs and labor promoters is the provision of high quality legal assistance on labor rights. While the number of workers assisted and cases resolved reflect the provision of services, the evaluation team believes that the indicator should be written as the number and percentage of cases resolved in favor of the worker, using national or international labor laws, which is a more accurate indicator of quality assistance. The team realizes that the project is collecting information on how cases are resolved and whether they are in favor of the worker and could make this adjustment. In fact, the number of cases resolved in favor of the worker is the best indicator the project has to measure impact on workers. Another indicator that might be used to measure the quality of legal assistance is the reduction in the attrition rate of cases. For example, immigrant and female workers are less likely to take a claim through the process because they are afraid of losing a job or being blacklisted.
2. Strengthen decentralization of legal services • # of labor promoters providing services and remitting cases on labor rights • # of peripheral WRCs providing services on workers' rights • # of networks established for referral of workers' cases	Labor promoters within or outside the peripheral WRCs provide decentralized legal services, which contribute to achieving output #1. Given the focus on sustainability in Phase 2, the output should be written as "sustained" decentralized legal services. The indicators should, in turn, focus on sustainability of the labor promoters and the quality of their support. For example, the percent of active labor promoters is a better indicator of sustainability given the attrition of some promoters observed during the evaluation (i.e. youth volunteers who find employment). This output should also have an indicator that measures the quality and usefulness of the services provided by the labor promoter. The numbers of promoters that remit cases are an important indicator. However, the ability of promoters to actually help negotiate a settlement with an employer, counsel, and accompany the worker during mediation are valuable legal services that help workers. The evaluators understand that some countries are actually tracking resolutions by labor promoters.
3. Strengthen decentralization of education services • # of workers who have received education on workers' rights • % of active labor promoters participating in a community of learning	Decentralized education services are intended to drive the demand for the decentralized legal services (output #2). In addition to legal services, the labor promoters are responsible for imparting labor rights information to workers via talks, meetings, and other activities. Like output #2, "sustained" decentralized education services should be incorporated in the output language. The second indicator measures the percent of active promoters participating in communities of learning, which can provide a relatively accurate picture of sustainability. An indicator should be added that measures the usefulness of the educational activities. Such an indicator might include the percentage of workers who received education that actually acted on the information and requested some form of legal service.
4. Promote awareness and advocacy on labor rights • # of local partners with institutionalized workers rights agenda • # of WRCs with an established political agenda on workers rights	The aim of this output is twofold: to have the local partners make a long term commitment to address labor rights and have WRCs pursue advocacy initiatives that support and compliment their range of labor rights services for workers. The output would benefit by adjusting the language to reflect a result such as labor rights institutionalized and advocacy initiatives implemented. The indicators could be strengthened by clearer and more certain language such as local partners have a plan and budget and WRCs have identified and implemented an advocacy initiative (i.e. pension law advocacy for sugarcane workers in San Pedro de Macoris). The evaluation team realizes some of this information is listed in the Means of Verification section of the LogFrame (i.e. plans, budgets, projects).

3.1.2 Flexibility and Replicability of the WRC Model

At the heart of the Everybody Works project design is the WRC model. The WRC is a simple supply and demand model based on creating demand for labor rights legal services by directly

educating workers about their labor rights by using a trainer of trainers multiplication approach coupled with broader public awareness campaigns. The supply side consists of the WRC, which is staffed by a small team of lawyers and education specialists. In Phase 2, the WRC model was expanded and decentralized to support labor promoters who are community volunteers trained by the project to provide a limited range of legal services and worker rights education.

Although relatively simple, the WRC model has proven to be highly effective at helping workers resolve violations of their labor rights. Everybody Works was one of the few projects in the CAFTA-DR Labor Capacity Building Evaluation[1] that demonstrated its interventions were directly benefiting workers. During this evaluation, the International Labor Organization (ILO) director overseeing the USDOL funded Verification of the White Paper Recommendations Project told that evaluators that it is difficult to determine what impact ILO projects have on workers. This is because the ILO typically focuses on labor policies, laws, and norms through a tripartite approach where policies and laws take years to develop and are often times not implemented. She went on to say that she liked the Everybody Works project because it has such a direct and concrete benefit to workers.

The major weakness of the WRC model is its sustainability. A WRC requires significant resources to pay the salaries of the WRC team and support the legal services and education outreach provided by the labor promoters. The sustainability of the WRC model was noted as an issue in the CAFTA-DR Labor Capacity Building Evaluation and is a major area of concern in this evaluation. The sustainably of the WRC model is discussed in detail under Section 3.6.

Everybody Works has consistently exceeded its targets for legal services for workers, labor rights education, and public awareness. In fact, all of the stakeholders and other collaborating organizations that were interviewed opined that the WRC model was highly effective and successful. One of the primary reasons noted was its flexibility. The WRC teams and local partners commented that they were allowed the flexibility to adjust the model to meet local needs and, at the same time, to achieve their indicator targets. This was especially true in the DR, which is distinctly different from the rest of the Central America countries in several ways including its Caribbean culture, its labor laws and legal system, and the use of Haitian immigrant labor in the agriculture, construction, and domestic services sectors. The directors of all four local partners in the DR told the evaluation team that their ability to adapt the WRC model to meet the needs of the Haitian immigrant workers, both men and women, was one of the keys to success.

The TOR included a couple of questions as to whether the project design took advantage of local capacity and whether the success of the WRC model is based on the model or the personality characteristics of some of the key actors. There was a range of varying responses to the question about building on local capacity. For example, the majority of interviewees thought the choice of Catholic organizations (except in El Salvador) as local partners instilled a sense of confidence and trust in workers seeking legal advice from the WRCs. On the other hand, the same interviewees acknowledged that the local partners did not have previous experience promoting and providing legal services around labor rights and that there were probably other organizations with more experience. However, the evaluation team found that the area of labor rights and labor law is extremely under-developed in all six of the project countries and there is not an abundance of labor rights capacity.

---

[1] DR-CAFTA Labor Capacity Building Evaluation, Management Systems International, August 9 2011

The interviewees did not seem to think that the success of the WRC model was predicated entirely on the personal characteristics of key actors. The common thread running through the responses was that the success of the model is based on a combination of an effective model and competent and dedicated project staff. One manager pointed out that "good project staff can make a bad model work while bad staff can turn a good model into a disaster." With this in mind, the evaluation team believes that the WRC model is highly replicable in other countries and contexts as long as the project employs dedicated and competent staff and they are allowed to adapt the model to meet local needs and circumstances.

The TOR also included a question as to what should be done differently if the project were just beginning. The evaluators rephrased the question as "based on your experience and lessons learned, how would you redesign the project so it would have an even greater impact?" and included the question in all of the interview guides. Below is a sample of the most common and overlapping responses.

- *Add an advocacy component from the beginning of the project to provide an enabling environment for the WRC legal services.*
- *Add a psychosocial component to help workers, especially women, deal with labor rights violations including physical and sexual abuse.*
- *Incorporate Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) into the project including mediation training, ADR accreditations, and establishing sustainable ADR centers.*
- *Form alliances with employers that have demonstrated an interest in addressing the rights of their employees.*
- *Incorporate more national and international laws and conventions into the WRC toolkit to help resolve cases. This should include training on the ILO conventions, especially for countries that have ratified the conventions.*
- *Conduct an up-front diagnostic or needs assessment that can be used to inform and drive country strategies including the modification of the WRC model, selecting sector and geographic focus, and setting targets. The project attempted to conduct a diagnostic assessment but the results were not helpful because there was not a plan to use the diagnostic to inform strategies, sectors, and set targets.*
- *Create a PMS to meet the needs of the project (labor rights) rather than adapt a system that was developed for other needs (human rights).*
- *Base the selection of local partners and the WRC teams on profiles that reflect the level of capacity and skills required to successfully implement the WRC model.*

3.2 PROJECT IMPACT

The TOR asks the evaluation team to describe any benefits and impacts that the project has had on key target groups. It also asks the evaluators to distinguish between benefits that may not have been caused exclusively by the project and verifiable impacts that have been caused exclusively by the project's interventions. Thsese questions are addressed in this section, which begins with a discussion on impact that is followed by a description of the benefits the project has had on key target groups. The section concludes with a discussion on evaluation methodologies to measure impact in future WRC projects.

3.2.1 Project Impact

Impact refers to significant and lasting changes in the well being of large numbers of intended beneficiaries (in this case, workers). It is often the product of a confluence of events for which no single agency or group of agencies can realistically claim full credit.[2] The impact that a project intends to have on the target population is stated in its objectives and measured using impact level indicators. Everybody Works' development objective of contributing to the improvement in

---

[2] Earl, Sarah; Fred Carden; Terry Smutylo. IDRC. 2001. http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-64698-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html
[2] USAID. "USAID Evaluation Policy." January 2011.

labor law compliance fits this definition and could have been used to measure impact. However, it lacks impact indicators.

Another way impact could have been measured is at the immediate objective level. Everybody Work's immediate objective is currently stated as promoting the sustainability and defense of workers rights and includes indicators to measure the project's attempt to sustain legal services and labor rights education thought the labor promoters. It is not, however, written as an impact or outcome objective with impact or effect level indicators that measure an impact on workers. The immediate objective could have been stated in terms of a fundamental change in the condition of workers such as achievement of labor rights or achieving justice as it applies to labor rights. Impact indicators could have been developed to measure these changes such as the receipt of payments resulting from mediation or the successful execution of a sentence. When discussing the measurement of impact with the regional director for monitoring and evaluation (M&E), she said the focus of Phase 2 was sustainability and the project never intended to measure impact.

Given the project's current set of objectives and outputs, the best way to measure impact on workers is through output #1, which is to provide quality legal assistance on labor rights. The output indicators include the number of workers assisted and the number of cases resolved. The project is also capturing the number of cases resolved in favor of the worker, which is a measure more directly linked to impact. Unfortunately, the project's PMS is not tracking the number of cases resolved in favor of the worker that are successfully executed (where the worker actually receives compensation), which is the true measure of impact. An impact on the worker only occurs if the worker actually receives fair compensation for the labor rights violation. Workers that were interviewed in several countries reported that they had not received the settlement amount from the case resolution. This is a problem with the model and its M&E system since the project was not required to track the number of cases that were successfully executed.

3.2.2 Impact on Workers

The evaluation team used two methods to ascertain the impact the project has had on workers. The first is an analysis of the set of indicators for output #1 including the percent of cases resolved and the percent resolved in favor of the worker. The second is a qualitative assessment of the perceived benefits according to the project beneficiaries. Both methods are discussed below.

Output #1 Indicators. The following table provides a summary the analysis of the indicators, which is discussed in more detail below.

Table 6: Summary of Case Resolutions

Measure	Value	Female	Male
Total workers seeking advice at WRCs on potential labor violations (consultations)	20,990	NA	NA
Total workers with resolved cases	4,079	41%	59%
Total individual cases	3,584	39%	61%
Total workers benefiting from collective cases (18)	531	58%	42%
Total workers attaining a favorable resolution	2,059	63%	53%
Workers attaining an unfavorable resolution	1,489	37%	47%
Resolution Methods and Settlement Amounts			

Measure	Number	Percent	Amount
Cases resolved by administrative process	2,952	72%	3,600,567
Cases resolved by judicial process	363	9%	1,234,966
Cases resolved by other processes	764	19%	100,757
Total	4,079	100%	4,936,290

As of December 2012[3], the project reported that 20,990 workers met with WRC teams to seek advice on filing claims. The WRC teams resolved 3,584 individual cases and 18 collective cases that benefited 531 workers. The 4,079 workers that had their cases resolved represents about 20% of the total number of workers that had potential claims to file. Although about half of workers receiving services were women, only 41% had their cases resolved. The total amount recovered for the 4,079 workers is $4,936,290. The Chief of Party noted that this is approximately half of the amount invested by USDOL in the project.

Of the 3,548 individual cases, 58% were resolved in favor of the worker and 42% were resolved in favor of the employer. Although female workers account for only 39% of the resolved individual cases, they attained a favorable resolution 63% of the time compared to 53% for male workers. This finding seems to confirm what WRC teams told the evaluators; men or more likely to take action on a labor rights violation but women are more likely to achieve a favorable outcome.

The second section of Table 6 shows the processes used to resolve cases along with numbers, percent and amounts of the settlements. The administrative process was by far the most common. Administrative processes resolved 72% of the cases; typically by mediation in the labor ministries or other public institutions. Approximately 9% of the cases were resolved by judicial process. The "other" category, according to the project database, includes alternative dispute resolution; mediation by the WRCs; and decisions taken by the labor ministries and courts. The evaluators should point out that countries report differently on resolution processes that fall within the "other" category, which has created inconsistencies in the project database.

The inconsistencies in reporting makes it difficult to determine the exact number of cases that were resolved by the WRC teams negotiating directly with employers. However, the WRC teams told the evaluators that direct negotiation with employers (a recognized ADR method) often provides the most favorable outcome for the worker because the public institution (MOL, public defenders, and the courts in the case of the DR) mediators lack capacity and do not advocate for the worker. The employers are also interested in reaching a quick settlement.

The danger in using ADR methods is that workers might not get a fair settlement. The evaluators discovered in interviews with beneficiaries that some WRC lawyers encouraged workers to accept ADR mediated settlements that fell well below the compensation amount calculated by the MOL. Some beneficiaries thought the WRC lawyers were in a hurry to resolve the case. The WRC lawyers commented that accepting a settlement that falls even 50% below the MOL calculation is more advantageous to the worker than if the case goes to MOL mediation or the judicial system. The same WRC teams told the evaluators that the project does not have negotiation guidelines to help determine what is a fair settlement.

---

[3] 5th Trimester Report for the period October-December, 2012. The numbers reported in Tables 4 and 5 are accumulative for all 6 countries and cover the period September 2011 through December 2012 (15 months).

Table 7 summarizes the impact analysis. According to the project's database, it provided legal consultation to 20,990 workers. This number represents the population of workers that the project had direct contact with and that could have decided to act on a violation of labor rights. The number of workers that actually acted on a perceived labor violation was 4,079 and the number of workers that attained a favorable resolution was 2,059 or 5% of the population that received legal and education services from the project. A WRC, on average, assisted 11 workers achieve a favorable resolution each month over the past 15 months. In addition, the project recovered $4,936,290 in settlements that translates into $2,397 per worker.

Table 7: Summary of Impact Analysis

Measure	Values
Total number of workers receiving legal and education services and that have a potential labor violation case	20,990
Total number of workers with resolved cases	4,079
Total number of workers attaining a favorable resolution	2,059
Average number of workers attaining a favorable resolution per WRC	149
Total amount recovered for workers and the	$4,936,290
Average amount per worker attaining a favorable resolution	$2,397

3.2.3 Perceived Benefits to Key Target Populations

Given the lack of indicators to measure impact on the key target populations, the evaluation team decided to include questions in the interview guides that asked these target populations whether they benefited from the project, what these benefits were, and how it affected their work or, in the case of the workers, their lives. The responses were analyzed and a summary of the responses is presented below according to the four main target groups: workers, labor promoters, local partners, and labor ministries.

Workers. The project's primary target population is workers that are vulnerable and at risk for labor rights violations. The evaluators interviewed 67 beneficiaries that had either attained a favorable resolution or their case was in the process of resolution. The beneficiaries, with one exception, praised the support they received from the WRCs. The most common benefit mentioned was monetary. The beneficiaries told the evaluators that the WRC was responsible for helping them recover compensation owed by former employers. Another common benefit mentioned by workers was the knowledge they gained about labor laws and worker rights. Emotional support was another benefit noted by especially female workers who said the WRC team was respectful, caring, and responsive to their needs. Following are several vignettes taken from the interview notes with the beneficiaries.

- *I worked at a bakery for 20 years and developed arthritis. I had to retire but my employer did not want to pay my benefits. I went to the doctor who said the work I did at the bakery caused the arthritis. I found out about the WRC from a friend. The WRC lawyer helped me file a complaint with the Ministry of Labor and helped me negotiate. I was awarded $6,500 that I am using to buy arthritis medicine so I can function.*

- *I was infected with HIV a few years ago. I worked at the Mayors office for 16 years. He knew about my HIV positive status and allowed me to keep my job. Last year he lost the election. The new mayor found out about my condition and fired me. She refused to pay the last 9 months of my salary and my pension benefits. A friend told me about the WRC. I went to the office and explained my case. The lawyer filed a legal complaint at the court and negotiated a settlement. The judge awarded me my back pay and $800 per month in pension payments that I use to live on since I cannot work any longer.*

- *I worked for a local security company. The company contracted me and agreed to pay $1,200 per month for an 8-hour day. After I started, the company forced me to work long hours including several 24-hour shifts. I decided to quit and file a complaint with the Ministry of Labor. My friends told me that the ministry could not help and that I would be better off going to the WRC. I scheduled an appointment. The lawyer helped me negotiate $1,200 in overtime pay but the company has not paid me yet.*

- *My husband worked for a national restaurant chain for 6 years. He developed an illness in his throat and had trouble talking. The restaurant pressured him to resign. He died several months later. I went to the Ministry of Labor to see if they could help me negotiated back pay and benefits with the company but the company refused to pay. The ministry referred me to the WRC where the lawyers helped me file a complaint with the local court. After one year, the judge heard the case and ruled in my favor. I was awarded $2,400. The company paid and I am using the money to buy food.*

Labor Promoters and Interns. The project has relied heavily on volunteers that include the labor promoters and university interns finishing their studies in judicial sciences. The labor promoters participated in 40-hour short courses typically organized by universities. In Honduras and the DR, the project organized and conducted the certificate courses because it did not have formal agreements with universities.

The evaluators interviewed 113 active labor promoters. The promoters told the evaluation team that the training they received was appropriate and has helped them provide a range of services to workers such as compensation calculations, negotiations with employers, and referrals to private lawyers or public defenders. Labor promoters in every country told the evaluators they have learned much about labor rights and the law but would like to have more training and expressed concern that once the project ended they would not have access to the level of training and support they currently receive.

All six countries have used university interns to a certain degree. Many universities require law students to spend 150-250 hours in an internship before graduating. In theory, this requirement provided an opportunity for the project to provide internships at the WRC and use the interns to support the WRC team. In practice, however, the internship program has had mixed results for several reasons. The project has found it difficult to attract law students to labor law because it is not considered as prestigious as penal or mercantile law. Another reason is that some universities only require interns to volunteer up to two hours per day, which some WRCs found to be inadequate.

Local Partners. The regional partner, Independent Monitoring Group of El Salvador (GMIES, by its Spanish acronym), was the only partner to have experience working in the area of labor law. The other partners, including CRS, did not have prior experience in the area of labor rights and labor law. In this regard, the project provided fertile ground for the local partners to learn, engage in labor rights activities, and build credibility to continue working on labor rights once the project ends.

During interviews, the local partners told the evaluators that they gained institutional knowledge and experience on labor rights that could position them to continue in the labor rights arena. The Institute for Human Rights at the University of Central America (IDHUCA, by its Spanish acronym) and the Office of Human Rights of the Archbishop of Guatemala (ODHAG, by its Spanish acronym) are the only partners that do not plan to continue. The others told the evaluation team that, at least in the short-term, they will use their experience to look for resources to continue to provide legal services and education to workers but that the lack of funding could force them out of the labor rights area. The continuity of services is discussed in detail under the sustainability section.

Labor Ministries. The most important and frequently mentioned benefit to the MOL that surfaced during interviews was that the WRCs are an excellent resource for legal advice and services on labor disputes that takes pressure off the labor ministries, which are seriously understaffed in all six countries. This support, according to the Secretary of Labor and Social Security (STSS, by its Spanish acronym) representatives in Honduras and Nicaragua where collaboration has been the closest, allowed the ministries to process cases and serve more workers. They went on to say that when the project ends, the workers would suffer because the MOL does not have the capacity to provide the level of support that the WRCs are providing.

3.2.3 Measuring Impact in Future WRC Projects

The TOR asks the evaluation team to assess whether a different evaluation methodology could have been used to more accurately and effectively respond to the evaluation question on impact. It refers specifically to a random controlled experiment using a counterfactual. Investigators typically use a random controlled experiment to objectively demonstrate that a desired outcome is due to a planned intervention rather than chance.

The evaluation team opines that a random controlled experiment would not have been an appropriate evaluation methodology for this particular evaluation for at least two reasons. As discussed previously, the project's development objective does not have indicators and the immediate objective is stated in terms of sustaining legal and education services via the labor promoters. There is not a defined impact on workers that can be measured.

The second reason has to do with the nature of labor rights in the region and the role of the WRCs. Labor rights and labor law is weak in all six countries. The WRCs have gained the reputation as the primary reference point for labor issues and one of the most effective providers of legal services for labor disputes in each country. The closest impact level indicator that the project has is the number of cases resolved. If the evaluation team used a random controlled experiment to compare cases in the project's target population to a counterfactual, it would discover the obvious: workers that received legal services from the WRC teams were significantly more likely to attain a favorable resolution in a shorter period of time. This is because workers comprising the counterfactual would not have access to at least average legal services. Conducting a random controlled experiment, which can be rather expensive, was not necessary and definitely would not have been a wise use of USDOL funds.

The use of a random controlled experiment in future WRC-style projects could be an effective evaluation methodology depending on how the impact on workers is defined. As discussed previously, it would not be a useful methodology to attribute resolved cases to project interventions because the answer is obvious. However, if a WRC-style project were to adapt an empowerment indicator such as increasing the probability of workers demanding labor rights on their own after some sort of intervention (i.e. training, wining a case, etc.), the answer is less obvious. For example, the willingness and ability of a worker to take legal action on a labor violation might be based more on personality traits than on project interventions. In this case, a random controlled experiment could be a useful methodology to help determine if an increase in demanding labor rights resulted from a project intervention or another variable such as personality traits.

3.3 EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

This section examines the effectiveness of the project implementation. It begins with an analysis of the achievement of the project's outputs followed by a discussion of a range of institutional and operational constraints that have affected output achievement. This section also examines stakeholder support to ensure the success of the WRC model. The section ends with a summary of the WRC success factors and good practices that were identified during the evaluation.

3.3.1 Achievement of the Project Outputs

Table 8 shows the progress the project has made in achieving the outputs. The information in the table is a consolidation of the six countries and was taken from the Everybody Works' 5th quarterly report covering the period October-December 2012. The following discussion is organized according to each output.

Output #1. The provision of legal assistance on labor rights has two indicators; number of cases resolved and number of workers assisted with legal services. The targets for these two indicators are 2,605 and 12,600, respectively. As of December 31, the project significantly exceeded these targets by more than 150%. Guatemala was the only country not to exceed these targets (84% achievement). The DR did not meet its target for workers assisted with legal services (90% achievement).

Output #2. This output has three indicators focused on labor promoters and peripheral WRCs. The project exceeded its target for promoters providing services and remitting cases by 252%. All countries exceeded their targets. Worth mentioning, however, is that El Salvador planned to provide services to 608 workers but ended up providing services to 6,475 workers (1,065% achievement). All countries also met or exceeded their targets for establishing peripheral WRCs except Nicaragua, which has decided not to establish them. Everybody Works did not meet its regional target of establishing 31 referral networks for labor promoters. However, four of the six countries met or exceeded their network targets. Costa Rica and Honduras were the two countries that fell short of their targets.

Table 8: Achievement of Outputs Summary

Outputs and Indicators	Target	Actual
1. Provide quality legal assistance on labor rights		
# of workers' cases resolved	2,605	4,097
# of workers assisted with legal services	12,600	20,954
2. Strengthen decentralization of legal services		
# of labor promoters providing services and remitting cases on labor rights	4,848	2,226
# of peripheral WRCs providing services on workers rights	16	24
# of networks established for referral of workers cases	31	27
3. Strengthen decentralization of education services		
# of workers who have received education on workers rights	15,016	27,756
% of active labor promoters participating in a communities of learning	79	290
4. Promote awareness and advocacy on labor rights		
# of local partners with institutionalized workers rights agenda	9	6
# of WRCs with an established political agenda on workers rights	14	9

Output #3. The decentralization of education services output has two indicators that include the number of workers receiving education and the percent of promoters participating in communities of learning. Once again, the project significantly exceeded its targets. It surpassed the education and communities of learning targets by 185% and 367%, respectively. El Salvador was the only country not to meet its education target (91% achievement).

Output #4. The project developed two indicators to measure increases in awareness and advocacy on labor rights. These consist of the number of local partners with institutionalized worker rights agendas and the number of WRCs with a labor rights advocacy agenda. The countries reported that six of the nine local partners have institutionalized worker rights agendas. In addition, nine of the 14 WRCs have reported establishing advocacy agendas on workers rights. Interestingly, the four WRCs in Honduras have not established advocacy agendas. Based on observations made by the evaluation team, the WRC in San Pedro Macoris is by far the most advanced in addressing advocacy. In partnership with the National Human Rights Commission, it is advocating for Law 1896 (Dominican Social Security Institute) that would guarantee retirement pensions for thousands of sugar cane workers.

With few exceptions, the project is significantly exceeding its targets for the output indicators, often times by 200% and 300%. It was beyond the scope of this evaluation to verify the accuracy of the indicator values the project is reporting. Assuming the values are accurate, the evaluators believe there are several explanations. If a project is consistently exceeding its indicator targets by two and three times, it is likely that the targets are not as ambitious as they could be to "stretch" the WRC teams to achieve more. On the other hand, evaluators found the WRC teams and labor promoters to be highly committed and motivated. It is plausible that such a high degree of commitment and motivation can translate into exceeding the indicator targets, especially if they are not as ambitious as they could be. Finally, there is an extremely high and unmet demand for competent legal and education services on labor rights. The WRCs is one of the only options workers have to address violations of their labor rights.

3.3.2 Constraints to Implementation

One of the primary constraints to implementation has been weak public institutions responsible for protecting worker rights. The labor ministries in the region have the smallest budgets and are considered among the weakest ministries. This was documented in the midterm evaluation of the White Paper Verification Project.[4] The evaluators discovered that the offices of public defenders in all six countries have few labor attorneys with extraordinary high caseloads. In the USDOL funded Labor Justice Project, the ILO documented that the legal system in the region is exceptionally slow; it is often biased towards employers; and that labor laws are lacking or are not implemented.

The evaluators asked the WRC teams whether weak institutions hampered or facilitated the success of the WRC model. A WRC team member in Nicaragua commented that weak public institutions are definitely a constraint but added that if the MOL, public defenders, and court system were competent, there would not be a need for the WRCs. Several WRC team members

---

[4] Midterm Evaluation: Verification of the Implementation of the White Paper Recommendations in Central America and the Dominican Republic Project, International Labor Organization, July 2009

in the DR, Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador made similar points. They told the evaluators that while weak public institutions have been a constraint; they actually facilitated the success of the WRCs because these institutions cannot come close to meeting the high demand for competent legal assistance. This is especially true in the DR where the WRCs are dedicated to assisting Haitian immigrants who have very few options for assistance with labor rights violations.

The unwillingness or inability of workers to demand their labor rights surfaced as another important constraint to implementation. The WRC teams and labor promoters identified several reasons they believe workers do not report and take action on labor violations. The most frequently noted reason is fear. Workers still employed are afraid they will be fired if they report violations and workers who have been fired are afraid they will be placed on a blacklist, which would make it difficult to find other work. Some employers, especially in Guatemala, threatened workers who sought legal assistance at the WRCs. Other reasons commonly mentioned were ignorance about labor rights and laws and mistrust of the labor ministries, public defenders, and courts. Many of the labor promoters told the evaluators that workers believe the labor ministries and courts are corrupt.

When asked what the project is doing to address the reasons that workers do not demand their labor rights, the WRC teams and labor promoters were nearly unanimous in their responses. They said that education on labor rights and legal assistance that includes accompanying the worker through an administrative or judicial procedure have been effective interventions. They also noted that many workers who have had their labor rights violated do not take action. The director of the WRC in San Pedro Macoris said that due to their illegal status, many Haitian immigrant workers are afraid to report labor violations.

The choice of local partners surfaced as both a constraint and facilitating factor during the interviews. Some interviewees commented that while the local partners had some degree of experience with human rights, they did not have experience and capacity to engage in labor rights, which proved to be an important constraint. These interviewees opined that the project should have developed and used a set of criteria to select local partners based on labor capacity. Other interviewees told the evaluators that the local partners are highly effective because they are, in most cases, committed religious organizations that have the trust of workers as well as strong networks of volunteers in the communities. These attributes, according to the interviewees, make these local partners effective and able to sustain the interventions once the project ends.

3.3.3 Stakeholder Support
The TOR asks the evaluation team to assess the support provided and received by the key stakeholders and the affect the support had on implementation. The primary stakeholders include CRS, the local partners, WRC teams, labor promoters, and beneficiaries. While the labor ministries and courts are key actors, the project was not designed for them to be considered primary stakeholders.

To facilitate the assessment, the evaluators asked the stakeholders to define their roles and responsibilities in the project and what they expected from other stakeholders in terms of support. The results of the assessment are presented below in Table 9.

Table 9: Stakeholder Support Assessment Results

Stakeholders	Roles and Responsibilities	Assessment
CRS	• Grant management and relations with USDOL • Technical and financial reporting • Regional management team • Country coordination and supervision • Technical assistance to local partners	The responses from interviewees as to whether CRS fulfilled its roles and responsibilities were mixed. Generally, the local partners were satisfied with the level of support they received from CRS. Partners in the DR thought CRS could have provided more leadership in Phase 1 but this improved in Phase 2. Some partners in El Salvador and the DR said CRS added little value to the project and in the future USDOL should provide grants directly to local organizations. The regional management team also opined CRS could have provided more leadership and technical support to local partners.
Local Partners	• Establish WRCs • Hire, supervise, and support WRC teams • Use local influence and networks • Sustain labor rights interventions	The responses regarding the support of the local partners also varied. Most of the local partners were critical of IDHUCA and GMIES, the regional partner. They thought the regional partner fell short of the technical assistance they were supposed to have provided. Several WRC teams were also critical of their local partners. The WRC teams in Guatemala and Costa Rica said they have received very little support from their local partners. In El Salvador, Nicaragua, and the DR, the WRC teams reported that they were very satisfied with the support they received from their local partners.
WRC Teams	• Provide legal assistance to workers • Implement education initiatives • Train and support labor promoters • Coordinate with MOL and courts	The labor promoters and beneficiaries that the evaluation team interviewed reported that they are highly satisfied with the level of assistance and support they received from the WRC teams. The exceptions were Costa Rica and Guatemala. In Costa Rica, the director of Caritas fired the WRC team members on two occasions that, according to several labor promoters and beneficiaries, caused delays and some confusion. In Guatemala, CRS decided to change the local partner twice. The second change caused a long transition period in which the WRC was not providing services. Several beneficiaries complained about delays.
Labor Promoters	• Provide limited legal assistance* • Educate workers on labor rights • Refer workers to public defenders	The evaluation team asked beneficiaries if they were satisfied with the level of legal assistance and education services that they received from the labor promoters. In general, the responses were positive. Most of the beneficiaries appreciated the support they received. However, some of the beneficiaries noted that the promoters' level of knowledge about labor rights is much lower than that of the WRC lawyers. Several beneficiaries also noted that the promoters are not able to represent them in administrative and judicial procedures.
Beneficiaries	• Provide required information/documents • Attend mediation meetings and judicial hearings	The evaluators asked the WRC teams whether beneficiaries were responsive in providing information and the necessary documents and attending mediation meetings and judicial hearings on their own when the WRC lawyer could not accompany them. The WRC teams commented that in most cases the beneficiaries have fulfilled these responsibilities. A couple of WRC lawyers noted that some of the beneficiaries have learned to rely too much on the lawyers. They suggested that the project should encourage beneficiaries to be more independent.

* Labor promoters are generally not lawyers and can only provided a limited range of legal services to workers

The evaluators also examined mechanisms the project implemented to involve local partners and create ownership. In Phase 1, according to interviewees, there were not appropriate mechanisms in place that facilitated participation. The project's regional management team noted this as a major weakness. Several local partners said they felt they were given the WRC model and a set of targets to achieve with little say in the implementation. As the project unfolded, the COP told the evaluators that he began to look for ways to increase the participation of local partners including adapting the WRC model to local situations.

The major shift in participation came in Phase 2. The local partners and WRC teams told the evaluators that they played a major role in designing Phase 2. They were involved in shaping the outputs, indicators, and strategies including the shift to preparing labor promoters to continue some of the legal and education services. The other major shift came in the DR where the Jesús Peregrino Service Center in San Pedro Macoris separated from the Jesuit Refugee Services partners. The director told the evaluators that since the separation she has had access to much

more information and has more control over WRC activities, which has helped increase ownership.

3.3.4 Success Factors and Good Practices

The evaluators included several questions in the interview guides designed help identify key factors that make WRCs successful as well as good practices. The success factors most commonly mentioned by the interviewees are listed and explained below.

Competent and dedicated team. The most commonly noted success factor was the WRC teams. The evaluation team observed, with very few exceptions, that the personnel comprising the WRC teams are highly competent and dedicated. This observation was confirmed by most of the local partners, labor promoters, and beneficiaries who consistently complimented the teams for their level of commitment to protecting the rights of the workers they serve.

Strong and committed supervision and support. The WRC teams attribute their success to the supervision and support they receive. For example, the WRC teams in Nicaragua and San Pedro Macoris praised their supervisors their strong support. In Guatemala, the WRC team said that they received support from the CRS country coordinator who took on a direct supervisory role once he realized the local partners were not providing the level of supervision and support the team needed.

Flexibility to adjust the WRC model. Many of the local partners and nearly all of the WRC teams mentioned that their ability to adjust the WRC model to meet local needs was an important success factor. The evaluation team noted that the WRC model is being implemented differently in each WRC due to the different operating environments.

Participation and ownership. The effort to involve the local partners and the WRC teams in the redesign of the project and allow them to adjust the WRC model and pursue complimentary labor rights activities have seemed to created a high degree of ownership and commitment. The only countries where the evaluators did not observe a high degree of ownership are Guatemala and Costa Rica. In Honduras, Caritas's sense of ownership is stronger at the national level than in the dioceses where the Caritas offices are hosting the WRCs. However, more could have been done to involve other local partners such as the universities.

It was more difficult to identify truly good practices based on the interviews. Many of the responses from interviewees described successful project strategies or activities that are part of the project design and implementation efforts. The evaluation team tried to identify innovative and effective initiatives that the project developed to have a greater impact but that were not planned strategies or activities. The evaluators identified the following good practices that meet these criteria.

The placement of WRC lawyer at the STSS in Honduras. CRS and Caritas signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the STSS in Honduras that paved the way for the WRCs to place lawyers in the STSS offices to assist workers negotiate settlements using the STSS mediation mechanism. The WRC lawyers represent workers during the mediation process to help them attain the most favorable settlement possible. According to the STSS mediation team, workers represented by the WRC lawyers were significantly more successful in negotiating settlements for their clients than workers who used other public defenders or who did not have legal representation.

The use of Facebook by labor promoters in Costa Rica. A group of 14 labor promoters in Costa Rica have decided to create their community of learning around the Facebook platform to facilitate communication. The promoters told the evaluators that they use Facebook to post information and other labor news and good practices. They also use Facebook to post issues and problems that the community can help solve.

Mediation center established by the Justice and Peace Commission in Nicaragua. The Justice and Peace Commission established an accredited mediation center in León as part of its sustainability strategy. The mediation center has been incorporated into the WRC. The center's accreditation status legally binds the employer to settlements reached through the mediation process.

WRC embedded at the Gerardo Barrios University in San Miguel. In El Salvador, GMIES decided to establish a WRC in San Miguel at the Gerardo Barrios University. The WRC is embedded in the University's legal clinic that, according to the WRC coordinator, had two intensions. The first was to introduce labor rights into the legal clinic and build its capacity to be an actor in the arena of labor law. The second was to convince the University to agree to employ at least one of the WRC lawyers that would continue providing legal services to workers.

The incorporation of document assistance with legal services in the DR. The WRCs in the DR discovered that one of the major obstacles to assisting Haitian immigrants with labor disputes was their illegal status in the DR. To increase the effectiveness of the legal services, local partners decided to assist Haitian immigrants acquire the necessary legal documents as part of the WRC's package of services. One of the local partners told the evaluators that providing effective legal services is greatly facilitated by having legal documents.

3.4   PROJECT COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION
This section examines internal and external coordination and communication. It specifically addresses the effectiveness of communication and coordination between the project and the stakeholders. It also assesses the coordination with labor ministries, courts, and other projects addressing labor rights, especially those funded by the US Government.

3.4.1   Internal Coordination and Communication
The evaluation team included a range of questions regarding the effectiveness of coordination and communication between the key stakeholders. These questions elicited a range of responses that suggested that the project started with coordination and communication problems that were, for the most part, eventually resolved. Coordination and communication issues that surfaced during the interviews are summarized below according to key stakeholder relationships.

Regional Project Management and CRS Country Coordination. The regional management team told the evaluators that it was required to communicate through the CRS country coordinators, which resulted in limited direct contact with the local partners and WRC teams. The COP thought this was problematic because it caused bottlenecks in information flows and limited the access of WRC teams to technical assistance. He pointed out that the CRS country coordinators and local partners were not lawyers and, in most cases, did not have prior labor rights and labor law experience. The regional management team also noted that some of the country coordinators seemed less interested in Everybody Works than some of the other projects they were overseeing.

The CRS country representatives were measured in their responses. Several told the evaluators since they were responsible for the effective implementation of projects in their portfolios; they required that information pass through them. The country coordinators did not seem to think that information bottlenecks and the lack of access to technical assistance was a problem. For example, the country coordinator in Nicaragua told the evaluation team that while the coordinator for the two WRCs was not a labor specialist, he had been extremely effective at linking his teams to labor rights resources and technical assistance.

CRS Country Coordination and Local Partners. In general, CRS country coordinators believe the level of coordination and communication with the local partners has been effective and that they have been sufficiently engaged in the project. The possible exception is in El Salvador where the country coordinator acknowledged he has had limited contact with GMIES.

The responses from local partners were more varied depending on the country. The local partners in Costa Rica, Honduras, and Nicaragua believe the level of coordination and communication with the CRS country coordinators has been adequate. The local partner in Nicaragua commented that he thought CRS should have allowed direct communication with the project's regional management team in El Salvador. Local partners in the DR told the evaluators that the level of communication with CRS in Phase 1 was less effective than they expected. In Phase 2, CRS changed the coordinator, which according to the local partners, greatly improved the level of coordination and communication.

Local Partners and WRC Teams. The effectiveness of coordination and communication between the local partners and WRC teams has varied among countries. Where the local partners and WRC teams are well integrated, coordination and communication has been highly effective. This is true in Nicaragua, El Salvador, Honduras, and the DR where the WRC coordinators and local partners are intrinsically linked. For example, the directors of the local partners in Nicaragua and El Salvador also serve as WRC coordinators. In Honduras, the program manager for the local partner previously served as the WRC coordinator. On the other hand, coordination and communication between the WRC teams in Guatemala and Costa Rica have not been effective. Teams in both countries complained about the lack of interest and support from the local partners.

The situation in the DR is unique. A different local partner is responsible for each of the four WRCs. In Phase 1, the Training Center for Social Action and Agriculture (CEFASA, by its Spanish acronym) was responsible for coordinating the local partners and reporting to CRS. The CRS country coordinator, local partners, and WRC teams told the evaluators that communication in Phase 1 was neither effective nor transparent and coordination was strained. In Phase 2, CRS became responsible for coordinating the local partners, which has greatly improved coordination and communication.

WRC Teams and Labor Promoters. Interviews with the WRC teams and the labor promoters suggest that coordination and communication between the two has been highly effective. Interviewees did not express any concerns or areas where coordination and communication could be improved.

3.4.2 Coordination with Labor Ministries and Courts
The original project design called for the project to provide legal counsel to workers, prepare cases, and turn the cases over to labor ministries or public defenders. According to the COP, direct collaboration and coordination with labor ministries and courts were not part of the design.

The evaluation team noted some degree of coordination with the labor ministries on case referrals and where ministry representatives made presentations at training events in El Salvador, Costa Rica, and Guatemala. However, the coordination with labor ministries was not formal and minimal. CRS and the four partners in the DR actually signed a MOU with the Ministry of Labor (MOL) in 2011 but it was suspended after the recent presidential elections.

A couple of countries, however, made collaboration with labor ministries a cornerstone of their strategy. In Honduras, CRS and Caritas signed a MOU with the STSS that helped the WRC teams embed a lawyer in the STSS offices to provide information, counsel, and accompany workers through the ministry's ARD process. Although less formal, the WRC teams in Nicaragua have developed close working relationships with local MOL personnel in León and Chinandega that frequently refer cases to the WRCs. The WRC team in San Pedro Macoris has developed an effective relationship with the magistrate in the district court responsible for labor cases. According to the WRC team, the magistrate often resolves cases in less than a week compared to other district courts where labor cases often take months and even years to resolve.

3.4.3 Coordination with Other Labor Projects

In general, Everybody Works has not collaborated extensively with other labor projects. The most common form of collaboration noted was the exchange of labor rights education materials with projects such as Cumple y Gana (CyG) and the White Paper Verification project, both funded by USDOL. In El Salvador, the WRC coordinator told the evaluators that Everybody Works had collaborated on materials production with the USAID funded Access to Labor Justice Project implemented by Private Agencies Collaborating Together (PACT).

Nicaragua had the highest level of collaboration with other labor projects. The ILO country coordinator for the White Paper Verification project said she often shared education materials and participated with Everybody Works on the national labor roundtable. The former director of the USDOL funded Cultivar project told the evaluators that Cultivar shared education materials with Everybody Works and referred labor cases to the WRC in Chinandega that helped increase the effectiveness of Cultivar. The evaluators found the deepest level of collaboration between the WRCs and the Nicaraguan University of Humanistic Studies (UNEH, by its Spanish acronym). UNEH provided certificate degree courses to the labor promoters and frequent on-going training to the WRC team. Several of the WRC team members earned post graduate and masters degrees in labor rights from UNEH with assistance from the USAID funded Labor Justice Stregthening Project. The evaluators believe the collaboration between the WRCs and UNEH in Nicaragua is a good practice.

The evaluation team also examined the extent to which US Embassies and their labor officers helped coordinator the range of labor projects funded by the US Government under the DR-CAFTA Free Trade Agreement. The CAFTA-DR Labor Capacity Building Evaluation discovered that Nicaragua and Costa Rica were the only US Embassies in the region that took an active role in coordinating labor projects. The evaluation team met the US labor officer and her assistant in Nicaragua who acknowledged the role the Embassy has played in coordinating labor projects and expressed an interest and willingness to continue to coordinate future projects. They did, however, suggest that USDOL share project documents and other information that would help facilitate coordination. The evaluators also interviewed labor officers in Costa Rica and Guatemala who were new and did not know about Everybody Works and the other DR-CAFTA

labor projects. Since the labor officers in the other countries were also relatively new, the evaluation team, in consultation with USDOL, decided not to interview them.

3.5 PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM

This section examines the project's PMS. It specifically assesses the effectiveness of the PMS in measuring project objectives and providing useful information to managers. It also identifies problems managers have had implementing the PMS database and discusses the prospects for sustaining the PMS once the project ends.

3.5.1 Overview of the Performance Monitoring System

The project's PMS consists of the strategic or logical framework, performance monitoring plan, and the software used to enter and manage data. The strategic framework defines the project objectives, outputs, indicators, means of verification, and assumptions. The monitoring plan describes the specific activities to collect, analyze, and report on the progress in achieving the objectives and outputs.

The software the project uses to management data is called Cases and Monitoring Indicators Management System (SACMIDEL, by its acronym in Spanish). SACMIDEL is a software program that was developed and used by IDHUCA to manage human rights cases. In negotiations with CRS, IDHUCA agreed to allow CRS to adapt and use its software in the Everyone Works project. SACMIDEL allows the software programmer to create fields appropriate for the project's information needs. Once data are entered into the corresponding fields, queries can be run and reports generated.

3.5.2 Quality and Effectiveness of the Information

The regional director of M&E explained to the evaluators that SACMIDEL was used primarily in Phase 1 to track the achievement of service outputs based on the original design and help prepare quarterly reports. In Phase 1, local partners and the WRC teams were more focused in counting numbers than trying to understand what the numbers meant and that the information generated by SACMIDEL was not used to make decisions.

The quality of the data and the calculation of indicators were other problems that occurred in Phase 1. The midterm evaluation of Everybody Works identified several errors in calculating indicator values and questioned the quality of the data.[5] The regional director for M&E believes that careless data entry by WRC teams actually caused many of the data quality issues, which was eventually resolved by conducting quality audits. The midterm evaluation noted that some WRC teams complained that data entry should not be their job and that it took time and effort away from providing legal and education services. This could explain the carelessness in data entry.

The terms of reference for this evaluation did not request the evaluators to verify the reliability and validity of the information the project reports to USDOL. While the quality audits addressed the quality of data entered into the system, it did not assess the quality of data collected and reported by labor promoters and WRC teams. During interviews with labor promoters, the evaluators discussed how they report on the numbers of workers they assist with legal and education services. The evaluators identified several situations where the promoters liberally estimated the number of workers reached that could lead to over-reporting. Since the project

---

[5] Independent Midterm Evaluation of Todos y Todas Trabajamos: Worker Rights Centers in Central America and the Dominican Republic, IFC Macro, July 2009

lacks formal quality control mechanisms, such as spot checks, to validate information that is inputted into SACMIDEL, the evaluators can neither confirm nor refute the accuracy of the information generated by SACMIDEL.

According to the regional management team, the effectiveness of the PMS increased significantly in Phase 2. The local partners and WRC teams participated in the redesign of the project and helped modify the immediate objective, outputs, and indicators. Apparently, their participation in the redesign helped increase ownership, which generated more interest in using the information beyond the preparation of quarterly reports.

The PMS, especially SACMIDEL, was one of the more controversial issues that surfaced during the evaluation. The former WRC coordinator in Honduras called it the Achille's Heel of the project. Nearly all of the local partners and WRC teams recalled having some degree of technical difficulty with SACMIDEL. Nicaragua seemed to have the most problems. The CRS country coordinator, local partner, and WRC teams were highly critical of SACMIDEL. The evaluation team observed that the WRC teams that were less critical of SACMIDEL had at least one team member that was familiar with managing databases.

The regional director for M&E told the evaluation team that she thought it was a mistake to adapt the IDHUCA database for the Everybody Works project because the IDHUCA database was designed to manage human rights cases, not labor cases. She said that adapting the software for Everybody Works was a tedious process that wasted valuable time. She thought it would have been more effective and efficient to develop a monitoring software program tailored to the needs of the project.

3.5.3 Sustainability of the Monitoring System

To assess the sustainability of SACMIDEL, the evaluators asked regional management, CRS country coordinators, and local partners what they thought would happen to SACMIDEL when the project ended. The regional director for M&E said the project intends to provide training and coaching to local partners so they are more able to continue to adjust and use the information system. She noted, however, that it would depend on the willingness of the local partners to use the system. She thought some would and others would not use it.

The CRS country coordinators said the decision to use SACMIDEL is up to the local partners. The local partners in every country except Guatemala said they would try to use SACMIDEL but expressed concern that they would not have the technical support of the project to help resolve problems. Based on its observations, the evaluation team believes that two primary factors will determine the extent to which SACMIDEL is sustained. The first factor is need. If local partners are able to attract donor funding for WRC-style projects that require the partner to report on labor rights indicators, they are likely to continue to use SACMIDEL because it will help them meet this need. The other factor is access to technical assistance to resolve software problems that SACMIDEL has presented over the past six years. Relatively well-resourced local partners like the Bono Center and CEFASA in the DR and GMIES in El Salvador have access to this sort of technical assistance. It will be more difficult for other local partners like the Justice and Peace Commission in Nicaragua and Caritas in Costa Rica.

3.5.4 Improvements to the PMS

The evaluators spent considerable time discussing improvements in the PMS with regional managers, CRS country coordinators, and local partners. These discussions identified three major suggestions to improve the PMS for future WRC-style projects. The first is to ensure the project

design, specifically the strategic or logical framework, includes impact and outcome or affect level indicators. Interviewees thought the project focused too heavily on counting outputs rather than measuring outcomes and impact. The second suggestion is to invest in developing a user-friendly monitoring system that is streamlined and focused on the project's indicators and information needs. The last suggestion mentioned by the interviewees is to involve the users of the information system in its development and then invest in training and technical support, including quality audits. Each country should have a full-time dedicated person to backstop and resolve technical problems and ensure data quality.

3.6 SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability can be defined as the capacity of an organization to achieve long-term success and stability and to serve its clients and consumers without the threat of loss of financial support and quality of services.[6] This section provides an assessment of the sustainability of the 14 WRCs and the likelihood the WRCs and labor promoters will be sustained in the medium term. The section ends with a discussion about the scalability of the WRC model and how its design might be improved to increase the chances of sustainability in future WRC-style projects.

3.6.1 Assessment of WRC Sustainability

The TOR asks the evaluation team to assess the sustainability of the WRCs in terms of institutional, financial, political, and community level sustainability. The evaluators discussed sustainability with a wide range of stakeholders. The results of these discussions are summarized and presented in Table 10 for each WRC.

Table 10: Assessment of WRC Sustainability

WRC	Sustainability Assessment
San José	The key to sustainability in Costa Rica is Caritas' commitment to the WRC. The WRC team thinks the WRC will be closed once the project ends because Caritas has not demonstrated an interest in the WRC. The Caritas director, on the other hand, says his organization is committed to maintaining the WRC but will have to rely on volunteers including and students from La Salle University because Caritas does not have funding. GMIES acquired funding from the Open Society Foundation (OSF) to work on labor rights with immigrants in Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Belize. GMIES asked Caritas to be the Costa Rica partner. The director said he could not accept the offer because OSF supports reproductive health projects with abortion components.
Dajabón	Once the project ends, the WRC in Dajabón will cease to function as it is currently configured. However, one of the WRC lawyers previously worked for Solidaridad Fronteriza and will return once the project ends. He told the evaluators that he has already incorporated visits and support to the peripheral WRCs and labor promoters in his workplan. He acknowledged that Solidaridad Fronteriza does not have the funding to continue to maintain the WRC but its legal office will continue to focus on Haitian immigrant labor rights and support the labor promoters.
Santiago	CEFASA had made a commitment to continue to employ the WRC team for one year with funding it has received from the European Union (EU) for a human rights project focused on Haitian immigrants. However, the WRC name and brand will not be continued. The WRC team will be incorporated into CEFASA's legal assistance office that will support broader immigrant rights and include a labor rights component. The director for CEFASA said his organization would also continue to support the labor promoters. However, he acknowledged he was not sure what would happen after EU funding ended but said CEFASA is relatively well resourced and has a commitment to support Haitian immigrants.
Santo Domingo	The director of the Bono Center told the evaluators he is committed to funding one lawyer at the WRC for 3 months after the project ends. He said this would buy time to try to find other funds. If he cannot find alternative funds, he plans to incorporate the WRC lawyer into the Center's legal department where she would continue to spend part of her time working on labor rights and supporting labor promoters. He said this organization has limited funds to continue to support the labor promoters.
San Pedro Macoris	The Jesús Peregrino Service Center is committed to serving Haitian immigrants and considers labor rights an important issue. The Center has short term funding from the United Nations (UN) funded Diversified Immigrant Project ($200,000). The Center plans to use some of the funds to support labor promoters in the two peripheral WRCs but does not have funding to pay for the WRC legal team. The director of the Center said that the labor

---

[6] USAID Sustainability Toolkit, www.usaid.gov/our_work/global_partnerships/fbci/sustainability.html

	promoters are able resolve a limited number of cases but not nearly as many as the WRC legal team. The director would like to try is to negotiate a percent of a case's settlement as a fee for her legal team that could help sustain them.
San Salvador	The IDHUCA director told the evaluation team that his organization does not intend to continue to support the WRC legal team and volunteers once the project ends without more funding. He said IDHUCA's funding is limited and he does not have the money to invest. Without IDHUCA and the WRC team, there will not be a structure in place to support the labor promoters. However, many of labor promoters in San Salvador belong to relatively strong unions and NGOs that appear to be committed to supporting the promoters.
San Miguel	The chance of sustaining some of the WRC activities in San Miguel exists because the Gerardo Barrios University legal clinic has agreed to continue to host the WRC and pay for one lawyer as well as some support to labor promoters. GMIES has acquired $450,000 from the OSF Soros to support immigrant labor issues in three countries. It will work with Caritas to focus on Nicaraguan immigrants working in the San Miguel area. While the OSF grant is not intended to directly support the WRC, the GMIES director hopes to use project resources to continue to support those labor promoters assisting immigrant workers.
Chimaltenango	Sustainability in Guatemala is critical because the WRC has more than 200 cases in the court system. The former local partner decided to aggressively pursue judicial resolutions. This combined with the delays in Guatemala's judicial system accounts for the backlog. ODHAG and CRS do not have a clear strategy to support these cases once the project ends, which is a great concern to the workers that the evaluators interviewed. ODHAG has indicated it will not continue to support the WRC. The COP is considering requesting a no-cost extension to use remaining funds in ODHAG's budget to continue paying the salaries of two lawyers so they can clear some cases and migrate others to local organizations. Regarding continuity of the WRC, the Defenders of Indigenous Peoples organization have agreed to continue to host the WRC but do not have funds to pay lawyers or support labor promoters.
Choluteca El Progreso San Pedro Tegucigalpa	The four WRCs in Honduras have been clustered in the assessment because they are supported by national Caritas office (the Archbishop) in Tegucigalpa. The Archbishop has encouraged the four dioceses to support the WRCs that, in turn, have agreed to host the WRCs and help support the labor promoter, many whom are church volunteers. However, neither the national nor the local Caritas offices have funds to pay for lawyers and direct support for the labor promoters.
Chinandega León	The chance of sustaining the WRCs in Nicaragua is limited. In the short-term, CRS intends to invest some of its unrestricted funds to pay for the WRC teams to continue to process cases and clear backlogs. The Peace and Justice Commission is committed to working on labor rights and plans to host the WRC in León. However, it does not have funds to pay the legal teams. CRS has been its only donor and CRS, according to the country representative, does not intend to invest CRS resources in labor rights in the future. The director of the Commission told the evaluators he will try to arrange for donated office space in Chinandega and operate the WRCs with volunteers and university law students.

In summary, it appears that several WRCs will receive short-term "bridge" funding to allow them to clear backlogs of court cases and buy time to acquire other funding. This is the case for the WRCs in Santo Domingo, Chinandega, and Chimaltenango, if a no-cost extension is granted.

The WRC in San Miguel has medium range funding from the Gerardo Barrios University to provide legal services. The WRCs in Dajabón and Santiago will be incorporated into the local partners' legal offices that address broader human rights issues. If the Bono Center is unable to find funding, the WRC in Santo Domingo will be incorporated into the Center's legal office that addresses broader Haitian immigrant issues. However, these WRCs will not continue as separate entities focused exclusively on labor rights.

The WRCs in San José, San Salvador, San Pedro Macoris and those in Honduras and Nicaragua are likely not to survive into the medium term. The local partners do not have the financial resources to pay lawyers and the other operating costs associated with effective WRCs.

The project realized that it would be extremely difficult to sustain the WRCs as they are currently configured. This realization led to the redesign of the project in 2011 that focused on sustainability of at least some of the legal and education services through labor promoters and peripheral WRCs. It is the opinion of the evaluation team that, overall, the labor promoters are highly committed and willing to work as volunteers to assist workers. However, their productivity and longevity will depend on the level of supervisory and financial support the local partners are able and willing to provide.

The local partners that have demonstrated the most willingness to support the promoters and that have access to financial resources to continue to conduct training, provide education materials, and pay for transportation include GMIES (San Miguel), Solidaridad Fronteriza, Bono Center, and the Jesús Peregrino Service Center. Those that do not have the financial resources to continue to support promoters include Caritas San José, Caritas Honduras, the Peace and Justice Commission, IDHUCA, and ODHAG. The fact that partners have adopted labor as one of their strategic areas does not guarantee sustainability if they do not have the resouces to invest in supporting the labor promoters and their activities. The evaluators are concerned that, over time, the lack of resources to pay for training, supervision, and transportation will decrease the effectiveness of the promoters and eventually cause high rates of attrition.

The long-term sustainability (more than 5 years) of the labor rights interventions is questionable. The local partners depend on donations to implement their social programs. They will require financial resources to continue to provide legal and education services to workers and the labor promoters will require training, supervision, education materials, and transportation support. To the extent that the local partners are successful at attracting donor funds, the interventions have a chance of being sustained. However, if donors decide to stop funding labor rights projects, the chances of sustainability will dramatically decrease.

3.6.2 WRC Design and Scalability
The scalability of the WRC model and its design are interrelated. Successful scaling up of the WRC model, according to interviewees, depends on two factors: flexibility and resources. The WRC model can be highly effective in a variety of operating environments if the implementers are given the flexibility to adjust the model to meet local circumstances and needs. This was discussed in the project design section. The other key to successful scalability is funding. The WRC model, as it is currently designed, relies on legal teams comprised mostly of lawyers who

provide legal services to workers. It is difficult for development organizations, especially local ones, to find the resources to continue to pay legal teams once the project ends.

In its discussions with project staff, the evaluation team noted at least three strategies that could be incorporated in a redesign of the WRC model to help ensure sustainability and, thus, scalability. The first is to select implementing partners that have a relatively secure source of funds that they are willing to invest in operating a WRC. These might include religious organizations, development NGOs, or worker organizations that receive regular unrestricted donations or membership dues. The second is to identify local organizations that have the fundraising capability and willingness to establish a WRC and attract public and private financing to sustain the WRC. This would be the equivalent to free legal aid societies in the United States. The third idea is to develop a cost-recovery mechanism where the WRC charges a percentage of the amount paid to workers from direct negotiations, administrative settlements, and judicial sentences. A combination of the three would probably make for the optimal strategy.

IV   CONCLUSIONS

4.1   VALIDITY OF PROJECT DESIGN

• The project design is logical and consistent but does not fully meet LFA criteria. The development objective does not have indicators to measure impact. The immediate objective is not stated as an impact or outcome objective and does not have impact or effect indicators. Some of the output indicators meet LFA criteria but others lack specificity.

• The design of the WRC model is flexible and replicable. The local partners have adjusted the WRC model to meet local circumstances and needs. The success of the model is not based on personality characteristics. However, success factors include a capable and dedicated WRC team, effective supervision and support, flexibility to adapt the model to local needs, and participation that creates ownership of the model.

4.2   PROJECT IMPACT

• The project was not designed to measure impact; it does not have impact indicators. In Phase 1, the project focused on counting outputs such as numbers of workers served. In Phase 2, it has been focused on sustainability of the legal and education services.

• Output #1, cases resolved, is the best measure the project has to assess impact on workers. Data collected and reported under this output include number of cases resolved, cases resolved in favor of the worker, and amounts of the settlements. The project is not collecting data on the number of settlements executed and the amounts actually received by the worker, which makes assessing the true impact on the worker difficult.

• The most important tangible impact the project is having on workers is economic. It has helped 2,059 workers attain favorable settlements valued at $4.9 million. The workers benefiting from these settlements are highly appreciative of the support they received from the WRC teams. More than 70% of cases were resolved by administrative procedures using ADR techniques while approximately 9% of the cases were resolved by judicial process.

• Direct negotiation with employers has become an important ADR technique for some WRCs. The danger with direct negotiation and other ADR techniques, such as MOL mediation, is that workers might not get fair settlements. Sometimes workers are encouraged to accept settlements that fall well below what they are entitled to receive. The project has not developed negotiation guidelines to help WRC lawyers determine what is a fair settlement.

• A random controlled experiment evaluation methodology would not have been useful in determining impact for a couple reasons. First, the project did not define the impact it intended to have on workers and develop impact objectives and indicators to measure the impact. Second, the WRCs are providing, by far, the most effective legal services in their areas. The use of a random controlled experiment would indicate the obvious: workers assisted by the WRCs attained more favorable settlements in shorter times than workers assisted by other private or public institutions (those in the counterfactual).

4.3 EFFECTIVENESS OF IMPLEMENTATION

• The project has consistently exceeded most its indicator targets in both Phase 1 and 2 by 300% at times. Consistently exceeding indictor targets by 300% over a six year period suggests that the project does not have access to information to help it set "stretch" targets or that the targets are set intentionally low.

• The capacity of public institutions such as labor ministries, public defenders, and the courts have both constrained and facilitated the success of the WRC model. Weak public institutions create more demand for the services provided by the WRCs because they are of higher quality. The increase in demand increases the workload of the WRCs. However, the unmet need for high quality legal services provided by the WRCs is one of the keys to their success.

• Approximately 20% of workers that consult with WRC teams about labor rights violations decide to take action. Fear is the primary reason why more workers do not demand their labor rights. Workers are afraid of being fired or blacklisted. Employers have physically threatened some workers. Other important reasons include ignorance about labor rights and mistrust of public institutions, especially labor ministries and the courts.

• Changes in local partners and WRC teams affected implementation in several countries. CRS Guatemala changed the local partner three times. The changes caused delays and interruptions in services to workers. The Caritas director fired the San José WRC team twice, which interrupted services to workers. Caritas Honduras also fired the WRC team in El Progreso, which appears to have more of a positive than negative affect on services to workers.

• WRC teams in San José and Chimaltenango have received inadequate supervision and support from the local partners, which negatively affected implementation. Inadequate supervision and support helped contribute to low morale at times. However, the lack of support from the local partners seemed to have helped to solidify the teams in these two WRCs.

• The heart and soul of Everybody Works is the WRC team. The WRC model has been successful due largely to the people who comprise the teams. Overall, WRC team members are highly competent and dedicated. The teams care about workers and their rights. They put in long hours to educate, negotiate, and litigate. The most successful WRC teams are those that function as teams and not individuals.

• The participation of stakeholders increased significantly in Phase 2, which helped create cooperation, enthusiasm, and ownership in the project. The local partners and WRC teams participated in the redesign of the project and were allowed more flexibility in adjusting the WRC model to meet local needs. The separation of the Jesús Peregrino Service Center from the other partners in the DR helped increase its participation and ownership.

• The WRC teams have engaged in several good practices that represent innovative approaches to increase effectiveness. These include the placement of WRC lawyers at the STSS mediation office in Honduras; use of Facebook by Labor Promoters in Costa Rica; mediation center established by the Justice and Peace Commission in Nicaragua; and the incorporation of

document assistance with legal services in the DR. The collaboration between Everybody Works and the Justice Strengthening Project/UNEH in Nicaragua is also a good practice.

4.4 PROJECT COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION

• Internal coordination and communication was ineffective at times. In Phase 1, the coordination and communication among the four local partners in the DR was problematic. This situation improved in Phase 2 when CRS took over the coordination role and appointed a new coordinator. The coordination and communication between the local partners and WRC teams in San José and Chimaltenango has not been effective. The communication between the regional management team and several of the CRS country coordinators has been less than optimal.

• The project was not required to develop formal channels of collaboration with the labor ministries and courts and did not do so in most countries. The exceptions were Honduras and Nicaragua where the project developed effective coordination and communication mechanisms with labor ministries that facilitated the resolution of cases. The WRC in San Pedro Macoris developed an effective relationship with the labor magistrate.

• In general, the project did not collaborate extensively with other labor projects. The exception was Nicaragua where it collaborated with the Cultivar, CyG, White Paper Verification, and Labor Justice Strengthening projects. The collaboration with UNHE and the Labor Justice Strengthening project is a good practice.

4.5 PERFORMANCE MONITORING

• The PMS was well designed. It included the project's strategic framework, performance monitoring plans, and the software program or database, SACMIDEL. Project staff, however, experienced numerous technical problems using SACMIDEL.

• It is difficult to determine the reliability and validity of the information generated by SACMIDEL. The project did not have a data quality control mechanism in place to verify the accuracy of the data that WRC teams and labor promoters collected and entered into SACMIDEL. There are inconsistencies in reporting how cases were resolved and the amounts reported, which could signal deeper data quality problems. In addition, some labor promoters could be over-reporting the numbers of workers reached with legal and education services.

• The sustainability of the PMS will depend on whether the local partners decide to continue to use SACMIDEL. The decision to continue to use the database is predicated primarily on the need the local partner has to report information to donors and access to technical assistance to resolve software glitches.

4.6 SUSTAINABILITY

• The WRC model is difficult to sustain, especially for local organizations that do not have ready access to donor funding. The WRCs, as they are currently configured, will not be sustained in the medium term. A scaled-down version of the WRC in San Miguel will survive into the medium term. WRCs in Dajabón, Santiago, and Santo Domingo will be incorporated into the local partners' legal offices and continue to focus part-time on labor rights. The WRCs in San

Salvador, San José, Chimaltenango, San Pedro Macoris, and those in Nicaragua and Honduras will likely not survive in the medium term.

• The sustainability of the labor promoters and peripheral WRCs will depend on the supervisory and financial support they receive from the local partners. The local partners that have the political willingness and financial ability to continue to support labor promoters include Solidaridad Fronteriza, CEFASA, Bono Center, Jesús Peregrino Service Center, and GMIES (San Miguel). It will be difficult for the other local partners to sustain the labor promoters and peripheral WRCs without resources.

• The scalability of the WRC model depends on the flexibility that implementers have to adjust to local circumstances and needs and the financial resources to staff the WRCs during scale up. The WRC model has proven to be highly flexible and adaptable. The model has not proved to be financially sustainable.

V   RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the findings and flow from the conclusions. They are intended to inform the design and implementation of future USDOL labor projects, especially WRC-style projects. Unless otherwise stated, USDOL is intended to be the entity responsible for addressing the recommendation.

5.1   PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPACT

Project design criteria should be developed based on the LFA and other results management frameworks (USAID, ILO) and grantees should be required to meet these criteria in their proposal submissions. The criteria should include guidelines for identifying and writing impact and outcome objectives and corresponding indicators. In addition to the LogFrame, a project hypothesis should be required. The hypothesis should show the cause and effect logic flow from outputs to outcomes to impact.

Project proposals should be required to have impact and outcome objectives with the appropriate indicators. Grantees should be required to have a performance monitoring system that measures and reports on the progress in achieving the indicator targets. Possible impact indictors for WRC-style projects might include settlements fulfilled (compensation paid to worker), time taken to reach settlements, willingness and ability of a worker to file complaints, and resolutions of labor cases using national and international law (ILO conventions). The grant should include designated resources for performance monitoring including data quality controls that are explained under recommendation 5.2.

If USDOL decides to continue to use its current development objective, it should operationally define labor law compliance and what constitutes improvements. Once defined, the definitions should be used to develop impact indicators that all project grantees are expected to incorporate into their PMS and report on. These indicators should be broad enough to encompass typical USDOL labor projects but feasible enough to measure during the life of a project. These impact indicators would also serve to focus midterm and final evaluations.

5.2   DATA QUALITY CONTROLS

A WRC-style project's PMS should have data quality control mechanisms. The purpose of the quality control mechanisms are to ensure the accuracy of the data that are collected, analyzed, and used to generate progress reports. Possible data quality control mechanisms might include random spot checks. A random spot check consists of having an objective verifier (project staff but not associated with WRC interventions) check the accuracy of the data collected and reported. For example, if labor promoters report that they provided legal services to 1,000 workers, the project would generate a sample of these workers and the verifier would visit them to verify how many actually received legal services (kinds of services and quality could also be checked). The sample could be scientifically random or purposive based on pre-established criteria.

5.3   ADVOCACY AND PSYCHOSOCIAL COUNSELING

Advocacy and psychosocial components should be added to the WRC model. Advocacy initiatives should compliment WRC legal and education services. The evaluation identified two examples that USDOL could build on for future WRC-style projects. These include the advocacy

work that the WRC in San Pedro Macoris is engaged in to pass a retirement pension law for sugar cane workers and an advocacy initiative that the WRC in Chimaltenango has undertaken with the media to call public attention to labor violations in a garment factory.

The WRC team should be trained to provide basic psychosocial support to vulnerable workers. These might include cases of physical, sexual, or verbal abuse; threats to the safety of workers; severe illness such as cancer or HIV/AIDS; or severe economic consequences stemming from the loss of jobs. If resources are available, the WRC should hire a qualified and trained counselor.

5.4 ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The WRC model should provide the WRC teams with a menu of ADR techniques such as direct negotiations with employers and mediation in the labor ministries and other public institutions as applicable (public defenders offices and courts). The WRC teams should be trained in ADR techniques and provided guidelines on negotiated or mediated settlements that ensure fairness to workers (i.e. what is negotiable and what is not negotiable according to labor law) so they get the best outcome possible

The WRC model should include having an accredited mediation center where feasible. The advantages of having an accredited mediation center is that the mediated settlements are legally binding and enforceable by law. While legally binding agreements are not a guarantee that workers will receive the settlement, they provide a legal remedy if the employer does not meet the terms of the settlement such as seizure of property. The mediation center should be located with the local partners so it can be sustained once the project ends. If USDOL determines that the ADR process should occur in public institutions, a WRC-style project should shift its focus to building the capacity of these institutions to effectively implement ADR.

5.5 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS

Future WRC-style projects should include public institutions responsible for protecting worker rights and key employers or employer organizations as stakeholders that the project is expected to collaborate with to address labor rights. Public institutions include labor ministries, attorney generals, public defenders, and the courts. Employers might include larger companies in targeted sectors that have made a commitment through their corporate social responsibility strategies to adhere to labor laws. One of the strengths of Everybody Works was its mandate to provide legal assistance directly to workers. This important strategy should be maintained in future projects. However, as demonstrated in Honduras with the STSS, a formal collaboration mechanism and coordination can facilitate case resolutions.

5.6 IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

Criteria should be used to select local implementing partners. The selection criteria should include experience and capacity in labor rights and labor law; political willingness and financial ability to host the WRC, supervise the WRC team, and sustain the WRC; and strong networks and linkages with key sectors and workers organizations (unions and NGOs). The local implementing partners should also have the confidence and trust of workers, which is just as important as having experience and capacity in the field of labor rights.

Mechanisms and strategies should be developed during project start-up to ensure the local implementing partners and other key stakeholders participate in strategic and annual planning,

budgeting exercises, and performance monitoring. The local implementers should also be given the flexibility to adjust the WRC model to meet local needs early in the life of the project.

5.7 SUSTAINABILITY AND SCALABILITY

Grant applicants should be required to include a section in their proposal describing the sustainability strategy. The sustainability strategy should be used as one of the criteria to grade and award grants. Once the grant is awarded, the grantee should be required to update the strategy and develop a sustainability plan during project start-up. The plan should have specific activities, timeframes, persons responsible, and indicators. The sustainability plan should be included in the annual workplan and the PMS so the indicators can be tracked.

The sustainability strategy should address the selection of local organizations that will host and sustain the WRCs. The political willingness and financial ability of the local organization to sustain the WRC should be well vetted in the strategy. For example, the resources and personnel required to run and supervise a WRC should be defined, discussed with the local organization, and demonstrated in the sustainability strategy that the local organization will be willing and able to support the WRC once the project ends. In addition, USDOL should work with the grantees to experiment with cost-recovery models such as including a percentage of settlements as legal fees.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMS OF REFERENCE
FINAL EVALUATION OF THE *TODOS Y TODAS TRABAJAMOS* PROJECT
WORKER RIGHTS CENTERS IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) chose the Catholic Relief Services (CRS), in conjunction with local partners in each of the five Central American countries and the Dominican Republic, to implement the *Todos y Todas Trabajamos:* ***Worker Rights Centers in Central America and The Dominican Republic*** project (TTT). The project was part of funds issued to improve specific labor rights issues identified in the context of the U.S.-Central America-Dominican Republic Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR). At the inception of the CAFTA-DR, there was no real culture of compliance with labor laws and workers' rights, and workers often feared to use or distrusted the legal mechanisms available to demand their rights or were largely unaware of those rights. The cooperative agreement began in May 2007, initially scheduled to end May of 2011. USDOL twice extended TTT, giving a total of $8,325,000 to implement the project through March 2013.

The project works under a development objective, to which its own specific project objectives should contribute, but for which it is not required to measure impact. The Development Objective for this project is: Improve labor law compliance in Central America and the Dominican Republic.

The project's objective is: To empower workers to exercise their labor rights using appropriate legal mechanisms.   TTT was initially designed to achieve this through three outputs:
- Output 1: Workers receive quality legal assistance about labor rights.
- Output 2: Workers receive labor rights training and outreach.
- Output 3: Targeted workers informed on how to exercise their rights regarding specific labor issues.

The project has established model WRCs in target zones in order to educate workers about their labor rights and provide legal assistance when necessary. TTT used a phased start up—initiating project activities in El Salvador and Nicaragua—with the intention of identifying best practices and lessons learned and developing and refining project processes and materials before expanding to the other CAFTA-DR countries. By the end of its second year, the project had opened worker rights centers (WRCs) in all six countries. The project surpassed its goal and eventually opened 14 WRCs (CR-1, DR -4, SV -2, GU -1 HN -4, NI-2).

In two countries, Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic, TTT has become especially involved with migrant workers (Nicaraguan and Haitian respectively) whose irregular legal

status makes them particularly vulnerable with respect to realizing their labor rights and to abuse of those rights by their employers.

In October 2011, two USDOL extensions enabled the project to enter a new "sustainability" phase for the final 18 months of the project. This phase was premised on decentralizing project services and empowering volunteers and community members in the target areas. Part of this entailed creating a more robust Labor Promoter (LP) who would serve as a sustainable advisor on labor rights issues than the Training of Trainers (TOT) initially envisioned. For this period, a new framework was developed with new indicators focused on the sustainability of the legal services and education supported by the project as well as the willingness and ability of workers to understand and demand their rights, rather than the WRCs or the project's outputs. The project decided to measure not only the impact of the WRC teams, but also of those trained by the project (Labor Promoters) and through decentralized service provided outside of the WRCs.

EVALUATOR

The evaluation team will be comprised of an independent evaluator with specific skills in international project evaluation, including rigorous impact evaluation techniques, familiarity with labor issues and development projects, experience in Central America, and fluent in English and Spanish.

PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The final evaluation will be used by USDOL and implementing organizations to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the project's design and implementation, to determine its possible use as model for improving workers ability to claim their rights in other contexts, and to provide guidance for future projects about how to measure the causal impact of the project on ensuring that workers enjoy their rights. To serve these purposes, the Final Evaluation will examine the following four key issues by addressing their associated questions:

A. Validity of the project strategy, objectives and assumptions

1. Are the project strategy, objectives and assumptions appropriate, sufficient and feasible for 1.) measuring the causal impact(s) of the project and 2.) achieving planned results? Why or why not? If necessary to adapt any of these in future projects of this type, please provide recommendations on how to do so.

2. The project was designed to contribute to a culture of compliance by addressing workers' willingness or ability to demand their rights. Accordingly, the interventions were meant to change workers' behavior. However, workers' willingness or ability to demand their rights may be affected by government and employer willingness to supply (recognize, promote or cease from suppressing) those rights. To what extent has the supply side (i.e. institutional capacity, political will, inability or refusal to pursue violators etc.) constrained or facilitated the success of the TTT model (made workers more or less reluctant to demand their

rights)? Are capacious institutions with political will a requirement for the success of the model?

3. How and to what extent did the project directly address the causes of fear that prevented them from demanding their rights? Did workers who feared or mistrusted their institutions still file claims? Will they continue to do so when the project ends?

4. Are the activities appropriately adapted for the needs of each country? What, if anything, limited its flexibility? Where appropriate, did they take into consideration or build upon existing local capacity in the country? Because it is not in Central America, did the Dominican Republic have different needs or pose different challenges than the model initially envisioned? How, if at all, were these differences addressed?

5. Is there a mechanism built into the strategy to ensure stakeholders would have a regular role and opportunities for inclusion and ownership throughout the project? Were there instances where building this in was not necessary or possible? Why not? Was this effective or limiting on the project? What kind of support (e.g., cooperation, resources, enthusiasm for the objectives and activities?) from local stakeholders did the project start with, what kind did it need and expect throughout, and how did it unfold?

6. To what extent are the project's successes due to personnel characteristics or contributions (e.g., skills, personality, experience, contacts) vs. the project strategy per se? If difficult to answer, what would be needed in the design of the project or otherwise to discern this more clearly?

7. If the project were just beginning, what should be done differently? Why?

B. Project Impact and Sustainability

1. Describe any benefits and impacts that the project has had on the following target groups (listed in order of importance), distinguishing between benefits that may not have been caused exclusively by the project, and verifiable impacts that are objectively proven to have been caused exclusively by the project's activities/inputs/outcomes:

   a. Workers who have used WRC services (remuneration/vacation due, increased knowledge of labor rights, reinstatements, etc.)
   b. Training recipients (comparing the benefits and commitment/success of TOTs with LPs especially, but also including law students interning in centers) (increased knowledge of labor law, increased ability to use legal mechanisms, ability to directly aid workers in legal claims, etc.)
   c. Organizations working with project to develop their services related to labor rights (this can include local partners, universities, etc.) (increased labor in portfolio, more and more successful advocacy efforts, higher profile in

community among workers/other organizations, better management and use of data, etc.)
    d. Local Labor Ministry offices (greater efficiency in processing cases, ability to serve more workers, ability to dedicate resources to other activities, greater information about businesses' and workers' needs, etc.)

2. How could the project design have ensured greater sustainability? Please address in terms of a given time span (e.g., five years, ten years) and the nature or types of sustainability that pertain (e.g., institutional, financial, political support, social/community) and were or should have been anticipated.
    a. How reliable is it that the local partners will exist in this time period?
    b. How likely is it that they will have the resources to continue WRC services in that time period?

3. Which elements of the project will be sustainable and which will not? What contributed to or impeded the sustainability or lack thereof for those elements? How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustainable funding?

4. What can be said about the commitment of project stakeholders (workers, Labor promoters, local partners, organizations working with the WRCs, ministries of labor, CRS, etc.) to continue offering the services offered or using the knowledge/tools acquired during the project? To what extent will they continue carrying out activities started by the project after the project ends and without USDOL funding? What will it take for them to continue using the model or the undertaking the activities TTT promoted in the future?

5. Is the project scalable? Can the WRC model be expanded to other contexts? If so, in what ways and why? What are the minimal requirements of a successful WRC team?

6. Is there a different evaluation methodology that would have made you more confident in your responses to the questions in the section? If so, please detail why it was infeasible to implement that methodology. In future WRC-type projects what changes can be made to program design and implementation to ensure that evaluation methodologies can more confidently ascribe causal relationships between project activities an changes in outcomes of interest? Could this model be implemented using a random controlled experiment to better determine impact with certainty? If so, please discuss limitations to this approach and suggest potential valid comparison groups, if any, that could be used as a counterfactual.

7. If the project had been required to measure progress towards its Development Objective (e.g., improve labor law compliance in Central America and the Dominican Republic), what impacts would have been appropriate to assess? In a future project employing a similar WRC model, what data should be collected and how should the project be implemented so as to be able to measure this impact?

8. What role did gender and immigrant status of workers impact the success of the model? What implications does gender or immigrant status have on sustainability of the model, particularly on stimulating these workers' demand for and use of legal institutions to protect their rights (i.e. a willingness to file claim, approach an employer, use the MOL/courts, etc.)? How does the model need to be adjusted to help these vulnerable workers?

9. How and to what extent did the nature of the institution (e.g. religious organization, university, non-religious civil society organization) impact:
    a. the confidence of workers in learning about their rights and filing complaints?
    b. The sustainability of the project?

C. Effectiveness of project performance monitoring

1. How does the project's strategic framework, PMP and data collection process reflect progress towards achieving project objectives?

2. Was the performance monitoring system practical, useful, sufficient and cost effective for project management? What problems were encountered with project indicators? Collection of data? Reporting?
3. How was the gathered data used? How could it be used better?
4. Will the monitoring systems created by the project be sustainable? How did the monitoring systems (PMP, indicators) and the Cooperative Agreement impact the ability of the project to generate outcomes as opposed to outputs?

D. Project Coordination

1. Has the project developed the necessary relationships with stakeholders, such as local organizations and the community, to ensure sustainability, inclusivity and buy-in? Are stakeholders satisfied with the nature and frequency of communication/involvement? Does communication between implementer and stakeholders occur frequently or at least regularly, and in a mutually agreed upon manner and extent?

2. 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)? Briefly discuss what impediments arose and how they were overcome.

3. Did TTT use or share the materials with other projects, organizations, or the Ministry or incorporate existing materials where appropriate?

4. What have been the major challenges and successes in maintaining partnerships, especially with government agencies, in support of the project?

5. What efforts were made to coordinate or collaborate with other related projects in the region/specific CAFTA-DR countries (US government, multilateral organizations,

foundations, other governments, etc.)? What were the best practices and lessons learned from this coordination?

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Evaluator is responsible for conducting the evaluation according to the terms of reference (TOR). S/he 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 methodology (i.e., surveys, conduct interviews, review documents) to answer the evaluation questions, including a detailed discussion of constraints generated by the retrospective nature of this evaluation methodology and data collection and how those constraints could be avoided in future projects.
- Conduct Planning Meetings, as necessary, 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 and share with USDOL and Project
- Prepare final report

The USDOL Project Manager is responsible for:

- Drafting the TOR
- Finalizing the TOR with input from the implementer and the evaluator
- **Reviewing proposed evaluator**
- Providing project background documents to the Evaluator (responsibility is shared with project regional staff in El Salvador)
- Obtaining country clearance
- Briefing project field staff on upcoming visit and work with them to ensure coordination and preparation for evaluator
- Reviewing and providing comments of the draft evaluation report
- Approving the final draft of the evaluation report
- **Participating in the Post-Trip Debriefing**
- **Including USDOL Evaluation contract COTR on all communication with evaluator(s)**

Implementing Organization is responsible for:

- Reviewing the TOR and providing input, as necessary
- Providing project background materials to the evaluator
- Participating in any team planning meetings
- Preparing a list of recommended interviewees
- Scheduling all meetings for field visit and coordinating all logistical arrangements

- Reviewing and providing comments on the draft evaluation report
- Organizing and Participating in the Regional debrief
- **Including USDOL Program Office on all communication with USDOL Project Manager and/or evaluator**

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
- Any other relevant documents

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

a. Project director and M&E coordinator
b. CRS staff in countries visited
c. Staff from the WRCs and the Local Partners that house them
d. Participants of train-the-trainer programs (TOTs) and Labor Promoters (LPs)
e. Other staff form organizations working with WRCs
f. Center beneficiaries
g. USDOL Project Manager
h. US Embassy Labor Attachés
i. Other donor groups who have been involved with the project (possibilities include Spanish cooperation, IDB, ILO, USAID)

Field Visit: The evaluation will cover the six CAFTA-DR countries in which the project operates: Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica y República Dominicana. The evaluator will base his/her evaluation on information obtained through a desk review of key project documents and visits to each country.

Country	Location of the WRCs
1. Costa Rica	San José
2. República Dominicana	Santo Domingo
	Santiago
	San Pedro de Macoris
	Dajabón
3. El Salvador	San Salvador
	San Miguel

4. Guatemala	Guatemala (capital)
	Chimaltenango
5. Honduras	Tegucigalpa
	San Pedro Sula
	El Progreso
	Choluteca
6. Nicaragua	León
	Chinandega

The exact itinerary will be determined later based on scheduling and availability of interviewees.

Meetings will be scheduled in advance of the field visits by the *Todos y Todas Trabajamos* staff, coordinated by the Project Director and the project's Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator, 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.*

Debrief in Field: The evaluator will conduct a debrief, either at the last country calling to USDOL or upon return with the project staff via teleconference if possible, depending on the schedule and input from evaluator.

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. In discussing the evaluation process, the evaluator will clearly describe the constraints generated by the retrospective nature of this evaluation methodology and data collection and how those constraints could be avoided in future projects.

DURATION AND MILESTONES OF EVALUATION

Activity	Date	Products/Comments
Prepare TOR	December 2012	Draft TOR
Preparation: Doc reviews, methodology, data collection instruments	Jan 7-11	-Final eval. questions -Methodology section -Instruments
Fieldwork El Salvador	Jan 14-19	
Fieldwork Nicaragua	Jan 21-23	Depart Managua afternoon
Fieldwork Costa Rica	Jan 23-25	Depart San Jose evening to San Salvador
Fieldwork Guatemala	Jan 28-30	Depart early morning San Salvador to Guatemala
Fieldwork Honduras	Jan 30-Feb 3	Depart evening to Guatemala participate in regional meeting (Thur and Fri) staff meetings

		Monday
Fieldwork DR	Feb 4-7	Depart Guatemala for Santo Domingo Tuesday morning
Debrief call	Feb 11	
Analysis and report writing	Feb 11-21	In San Salvador
Send first draft report	Feb 22	Draft Report 1
Revise draft based on 48 hour review	Feb 27-28	
Send second draft report	March 1	Draft Report 2
Revise second draft report based on comments	March 13	Depends when received
Send final report	March 15	2 days to finalize and send

DELIVERABLES

A. Finalized TOR with DOL and CRS consensus, January 10, 2013.
B. Method to be used during field visit, including itinerary, January 15, 2013.
C. Debrief call, February 11.
D. Draft Report by February 22.
E. Final Report to USDOL and CRS by March 15 in accordance with the BPA.

REPORT

The evaluator will complete a draft report of the evaluation following the outline below and will share it with the USDOL COTR, USDOL Project Manager, and implementing organization who will review the report. USDOL and the implementing organization will have one week (five business 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 Methodology (1)[7]
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

---

[7] This section should include a discussion of how future projects of this nature could be implemented to allow for evaluation methods that can more confidently assert causal impacts.

1. Terms of reference
2. Strategic Framework
3. Project PMP and data table
4. Project Workplan
5. List of Meetings and Interviews
6. Any other relevant documents

ANNEX B: INTERVIEW GUIDES

Below is the general interview guide that was modified based on the interview. For example, the Chief of Party, CRS country coordinator, and WRC coordinators were asked the full list of questions. On the other hand, WRC staff, promoters, beneficiaries, and other collaborators were asked questions tailored to the information they possessed.

General Interview Guide

1. To what extent has institutional capacity, political will, and the inability or refusal to pursue violators constrained or facilitated the success of the WRC model?
2. Do you believe capable institutions are a requirement for the success of the WRC model?
3. How and to what extent did the project address the reasons why workers did not demand heir rights?
4. Did workers who feared or mistrusted their employers file claims? Will they continue to do so when the project ends?
5. Are the activities appropriately adapted for the needs of each country? If not, why?
6. Did the project build upon existing local capacity? Explain.
7. (ONLY DR) Did the Dominican Republic have different needs or pose different challenges than the CA countries? Were these differences adequately addressed?
8. How well did the project ensure that stakeholders participated and felt ownership throughout the project? Was participation an effective or limiting strategy?
9. Did stakeholders provide the level of support that was expected and needed for the project to be successful? Explain.
10. To what extent were the project's successes due to personnel characteristics as opposed to the project strategy? How might this affect replication of the model?
11. Describe the direct and indirect benefits that the project has had on the following target groups:
    - *Workers/Clients*
    - *Training*
    - *Collaborating Organizations*
    - *Ministry of Labor*
12. How and to what extent did the nature of the institution (e.g. religious organization, university, non-religious civil society organization) affect the confidence of workers in learning about their rights and filing complaints?
13. What obstacles arose during implementation and how they were overcome?
14. Has the project created buy-in from stakeholders to ensure sustainability?
15. Are stakeholders satisfied with the level of communication and their involvement? What could have been improved?
16. What have been the major challenges and successes in developing partnerships with the labor ministries?
17. How effective was the project at collaborating and coordinating with other labor projects?
18. What were the best practices and lessons learned from this coordination?
19. Did the project use or share the materials with other projects, organizations, or the ministries? Provide examples.
20. How sustainable is the project interventions, especially the WRCs, in the following areas:
    - *Institutional*
    - *Financial*
    - *Political*
    - *Community*
21. What do you think will happen to the WRCs when the project ends? Which activities will continue and which ones will end?
22. What could the project have done to increase the likelihood of sustainability?
23. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Provide list of alliances and contributions.
24. Are there prospects for sustainable funding?
25. Do you believe the WRC model can be expanded to other countries? If so, in what ways and why?

26. What are the minimal requirements of a successful WRC team?
27. How did gender and immigrant status affect the success of the WRC model? How will these factors affect sustainability?
28. How does the model need to be adjusted to help these vulnerable workers?
29. If the project were just beginning, what should be done differently? Why?

ANNEX C: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. EVERYBODY WORKS PROJECT DOCUMENT AND STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK
2. PROJECT MONITORING PLAN
3. USDOL-CRS COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT E-9-K-7-0004
4. EVERYBODY WORKS MIDTERM EVALUATION REPORT
5. EVERYBODY WORKS PHASE 1 INTERNAL EVALUATION
6. EVERYBODY WORKS PROJECT REVISION #12
7. EVERYBODY WORKS PROJECT REVISION #14
8. EVERYBODY WORKS PHASE 2 STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK
9. EVERYBODY WORKS PHASE 2 MONITORING PLAN
10. TECHNIAL PROGRESS REPORTS (QUARTERLY) 2007-2012
11. TOOL #6: TARGET POPULATIONS
12. DATABASE GENERATED REPORTS FOR PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND OUTPUT INDICATORS