



ILO EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** **Mid-Term Independent Evaluation of the Project: “From Protocol to Practice: A Bridge to Global Action on Forced Labor (The Bridge Project)”**

- **ILO TC/SYMBOL:** **GLO/15/26/USA**
 - **Type of Evaluation :** **Independent**
 - **Country(ies) :** **Nepal, Mauritania, Peru and Geneva**
 - **Date of the evaluation:** **Oct 2017 to Mar 2018**

- **Name of consultant(s):** **Angelica Arbulu-Team leader, Uddhav Raj Poudyal-national consultant Nepal, Niang N’dere Mohamed- National Evaluation Consultant Mauritania, Emma Lucia Rotando-National Evaluation Consultant Peru**
 - **ILO Administrative Office:** **Fundamentals**
 - **ILO Technical Backstopping Office:** **Fundamentals**
 - **Other agencies involved in joint evaluation:** **N/A**
 - **Date project ends:** **Sept-2019**

- **Donor: country and budget US\$:** **USDOL- US \$ 14,395,138**
 - **Evaluation Manager:** **Gunja Bahadur Dallakoti**
 - **Key Words:** **forced labour, Appreciative enquiry, protocol, sustainability, sole source award, Theory of Change**

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO’s evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office



MID TERM EVALUATION

From Protocol to Practice: A Bridge to Global Action on Forced Labor

Final Report, July 2018

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
ACRONYMS	9
BACKGROUND	10
METHODOLOGY	12
KEY FINDINGS.....	16
KEQ1: Validity of design:	16
KEQ2: Relevance and strategic fit.....	19
KEQ3: Effectiveness:.....	22
KEQ 4: Efficiency.....	33
KEQ5: Potential impact:	38
KEQ 6: Sustainability	39
CONCLUSIONS.....	40
LESSONS LEARNED and GOOD PRACTICES.....	42
RECOMMENDATIONS	44
ANNEXES	48
Annex I: Evaluation Timeline.....	48
Annex II: Key Evaluation Questions	49
Annex III: Decreto 1323	51
Annex IV: Bridge Activities incorporated into the extended UNDAF in Mauritania	52
Annex V: List of persons interviewed	54
Annex VI: Bibliography	59
Annex VII: Theory of Change	61
Annex VIII: Results Framework Tables	62
Annex IX: Preliminary findings from the country missions.....	77
Annex X: Revised Inception Report	81
Annex X: TORs	103

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project

The Bridge project aims to support global and national efforts to eliminate or significantly reduce forced labor by supporting the implementation of the 2014 ILO Protocol and recommendations on Forced Labor. The Project's management structure includes work at the global level, managed from Geneva, as well as at national levels initially in Peru, Nepal and Mauritania. The priority countries were selected to capture geographic diversity and different forms of forced labor. Since the project was awarded, Malaysia and Niger have been added (in August 2016 and September of 2017 respectively) as well as Thailand and the Dominican Republic (the latter as participating countries and will only include a limited number of activities).

The project was a sole source award to the ILO and designed jointly between the ILO and USDOL with inputs from the key national stakeholders. It identifies 5 intermediate objectives (IOs) or goals:

1. Increased knowledge, awareness, and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation;
2. Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms;
3. Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional, and global levels;
4. Workers' and employers' organizations actively support the fight against forced labor; and
5. Strengthened awareness and livelihoods programs for victims of forced labor

The project is managed by the ILO from Geneva with substantive oversight from USDOL. All management decisions, such as budget and work plans are agreed upon jointly. In addition, there is a National Program Coordinator (NPC) in each implementation country.

The project was awarded in September of 2015 and is scheduled to finish September of 2019. It had an initial budget of \$9,800,000 which had increased to a total of \$14,395,138 by September of 2017.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to provide an independent assessment of the performance of the project, in terms of progress towards the stated goals as well as account for any unexpected results, as well as to document learning and good practices, and make recommendations toward enhancing the project's impact and sustainability. As a pilot it also seeks to provide learning to inform future development efforts.

The scope of the evaluation covers programme implementation from the start of the Project in September 2015 up to and including November 2017. Only the global activities and three initial priority countries are covered by this mid-term evaluation.

The primary users of the evaluation are expected to be USDOL and the ILO as well as national counterparts of the countries covered by the evaluation. The Midterm Evaluation (MTE) is expected to inform development of the project in the other countries, as well as other practitioners involved in the prevention of forced labor.

Methodology of evaluation

This is eminently a formative exercise with some summative elements. As such, it is forward looking and seeks to identify components that will help improve programme performance going forward. The evaluation conclusions stem from the systematic triangulation of data collected from varied methods including: systematic secondary document review; semi-structured interviews (KII); focus group discussions (both with implementing partners and beneficiaries), observation when available of activities and validation workshops with key stakeholders. The underlying conceptual approach used is Appreciative Inquiry, which seeks to focus on the identification of strengths, good practices and opportunities as a means to strengthen project impact, while also looking at the underlying factors that pushed or hindered progress.

Limitations

Due to the independent nature of the different elements of the project, mainly the three Priority countries, the work at global level and the work of ITUC, it has proven particularly challenging to come to conclusions that can apply across the board. The very tight timeframes envisioned sometimes proved to be insufficient, in some instances the team was able to extend the days allocated, in other instances this was not possible and data gathering had to be limited.

Main Findings

1. The evaluation concludes that the sole source award is an effective mechanism to ensure project coherence and relevance. This mechanism enabled the ILO and USDOL to identify the project goals which were then further developed and adapted to each contexts in coordination with national partners and the on-the-ground implementers (NPCs). The downside to this extended process is that it reduces the implementation life of the project to three years, possibly too short for such a complex issue. While this might not be an issue in countries like Peru where the Bridge project is supporting an ongoing robust process, in countries like Mauritania, where it was starting from scratch, the project might be ending before it can fully reap the results of its investment.
2. The project design which includes both normative elements (Geneva) and on-the-ground country level experience, together with the identification of five intermediate objectives, provides a comprehensive approach to a complex problem. At the country level, the evaluation found that the project has successfully contextualized the global project strategy to the country context and priorities, supporting existing initiatives and strengthening existing structures aimed at fighting and preventing forced labor.
3. While maintaining overall thematic coherence, the project implementation functions as small parallel projects fairly independent of each other (Geneva vs country level). This results in increased demands on the project management team, especially as a result of the process of adding new countries, leaving less time for cross-learning. In addition, it was observed that most partners lack an understanding of the overall project and where they fit within it, which can lead to missed opportunities.
4. The evaluation was able to confirm that the project's TOC is still applicable and addresses all the key elements of this complex and multi-layered problem, while including the different elements of the Protocol (prevention, protection, access to justice, and remedy). However, the project design might have benefitted from a more sequenced approach, with the research and normative element starting

before in order to ensure that evidence and tools are in place before advocacy and the livelihoods element begins, and with sufficient time for tools developed to be piloted at country level. Similarly, the different elements within country level need to be sequenced, with research and awareness raising needing to take precedent and inform the design of specific interventions, such as livelihoods or communications campaigns.

5. At the time of the evaluation the average reported financial delivery (end of 2017) was 30%. In effect this amounts to a little over one year of implementation, as such, it is deemed adequate and in line with the normal lifecycle of a project, with an expected slower delivery rate at the beginning when the project is in the startup phase.
6. Overall the project design carefully incorporated minorities and vulnerable groups, however, consideration of the gender aspect was weak. This led to generic approaches which did not take into account specific needs or challenges linked to gender and cultural expectations linked to it. Significantly absent was an analysis of the national context, often patriarchal, and the role this played in normalising some elements of or linked to forced labor.
7. At the time of the evaluation 22 countries had ratified the Protocol, this exceeds the project goals, but more importantly, it achieved an important objective of creating momentum for the Protocol. However, caution should be taken when using ratification as an indicator. Ratification does not guarantee compliance, and some countries may shy away from acquiring formal commitments through ratification but show willingness towards implementation of the Recommendations under the Protocol.
8. Current political instability in the three priority countries included the scope of this evaluation significantly hampered progress. Contextual instability also provided new opportunities, for example, in Nepal current changes provide the project with a unique opportunity as hundreds of laws will be revised in a short period of time. Similarly, in Peru there is a small window of opportunity to ensure adequate implementation of the new Legislative Decree by supporting effective prosecution and convictions.
9. Awareness raising has been a key activity undertaken by the project. Overall the progress at the global level in this outcome is delayed but expected to be completed before the end of the project, with the 50 For Freedom campaign having exceeded initial expectations. At the country level progress is mixed. Of the countries under evaluation Peru, having benefitted from a previous project, is most advanced and in a position to provide guidance from lessons learned and successful practices to the other countries. They have created a wide range of products that address various of the different challenges and which cater for different audiences, from prosecutors to vulnerable indigenous teens. In line with the piloting and learning objective of the project all three countries have developed innovative mechanisms, for example, in Nepal the project created a mechanism for coordinated advocacy by key stakeholders (FLEAG); in Mauritania through the creation of a space to promote dialogue between stakeholders that don't normally meet (Celebration of the first Antislavery Day in Kaiffa); and in Peru through the use of schools' tutoring system for prevention or through the establishment of innovative partners such as the national transport authorities.

10. In terms of improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms (IO2) a key result, which builds on previous work by ILO-USDOL, is the introduction of the national Legislative Decree 1323 in Peru which classifies forced labor as a crime. In Nepal, an office-wide response to legislation as well as the creation of a multi-ministry task-force are examples of how ILO can provide added value to these types of processes.
11. In terms of guidelines on statistical indicators and survey methods for the International Conference of Labor Statisticians, the project has supported the creation of a common framework for measuring bonded labor and forced labor. If adopted in October of 2018, this will be a significant contribution of the project.
12. Bridge's support to the Global Slavery Observatory, an effort initiated in 2013 to provide publicly available country profiles that will inform the work of the 8.7 Alliance, has provided further insight into what the final output might look like and the need to identify a more sustainable format. At the time of the evaluation the final form and use of the Global Slavery Observatory remained unclear.
13. In terms of increasing the availability of reliable data, a significant achievement was the inclusion of forced labor indicators into the Nepal Labor Force Survey, which will ensure data on forced labor is collected and analysed regularly and can also provide learning for the other countries on how to approach such a sensitive subject. The project has also helped to highlight how this can be a sensitive area and as such, dependent on the government dynamics, which can facilitate or hinder the process. The intangible processes that are required to bring these products about should not be underestimated. They are an opportunity for capacity building and to create the necessary conditions for long lasting change. They are often slow and can require many years. Identifying means to measure the progress and achievements in these process should be found to better reflect the progress of the project.
14. Very much in line with ILO's tripartite nature, the project sought to promote activities that can bring the workers and employers on board as allies. These initiatives are key to ensuring that employers and workers understand their role in preventing forced labor. The positive response to the project's initiatives confirmed the demand and interest of the partners. The Bridge project has also directly supported the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) through their ongoing efforts in support of the implementation of the Protocol in Mauritania and Paraguay. In Mauritania the project has supported capacity building which has helped bring closer the four major unions and the creation of the *Comité Technique de Suivi* (CTS), set up on October 2016. In Paraguay, the project supported coordination between organized indigenous groups and the Unions which have not traditionally been very active in these mainly areas of the Chaco region. Reported outcomes include identification of challenges and the production of the first report to be translated into Guaraní.
15. At the time of the evaluation, Nepal was the only country that had begun implementing the livelihoods component. Their experience will provide important inputs for the other countries, for example, the importance of identifying eligibility criteria which accounts for vulnerability, including psychosocial needs and low education levels. Selection criteria and mechanisms to monitor this is also needed. The experience also highlighted the need to clearly set out a post training strategy that ensures the training

translates into better livelihoods. At the time of the evaluation, Mauritania was still looking at the best mechanism to address these challenges and Peru was supporting the design of an innovative proposal which would provide the project's target population with access to existing government programs currently outside their reach. Of particular importance in this initiative was the identification of empowerment and psychological support as a key element when supporting a population that has been subject to systematic abuse.

16. In terms of efficiency, some of the initial management structures proved to be insufficient. In the case of overall project management from Geneva, resources have been stretched by the additional time requirements stemming from the various official project revisions, the additional preparatory work required to incorporate new countries, and the need to oversee the administrative management of Mauritania, all of which were not originally envisioned in the project and which diverted resources away from the M&E function. Going forward, and given the growth of the project in terms of funds and number of countries, the evaluation concludes that project management at Geneva level would benefit from increased support, in terms of staff, to ensure there are sufficient human resources available to fully benefit from the learning potential of the M&E function. Especially as IO5 is expected to increase the demand for support in terms of monitoring.
17. The project's sustainability strategy relies on the promotion of inherently sustainable elements throughout the implementation period. As such, elements such as capacity building (through training for example), and the provision of evidence and reliable data (surveys, research, etc.) are not only the expected outputs but also part of the strategy to ensure sustainability beyond the projects' life. Institutional capacity building has the potential to provide a lasting effect, however, given the high level of turnover, institutionalization of training, identification of strategic partners and provision of sufficient (and sufficiently trained) TOTs before the end of the project will be key to ensure sustainability.

The following **recommendations** are proposed by this mid-term evaluation as a means to strengthen project effectiveness and efficiency (described here in brief it can be found with more detail in the body of the report):

1. Adjust project targets (outputs) taking into account findings from this report, lessons learned and changes in the operating with the view of achieving maximum impact in the time remaining. (linked to finding #5). Focus should be on: a) identify a critical pathway in areas with significant delays; b) reallocate resources and increase HQ support to take advantage of emerging opportunities.
Level of priority: high / Resource implications: low /Timeframe: short
2. Strengthen staff capacity at Geneva level to free up resources for the learning element of M&E and to accommodate the increased demand for support due to the larger number of countries and the expected increased requirements for support to IO5.
Level of priority: high / Resource implications: high /Timeframe: medium
3. **Strengthen M&E:** a) incorporate **indicators** that are better able measure progress in processes (in line with finding #13), as well as add results where currently there is only. Incorporate changes to

the expected deliverables resulting from the changes on the ground. In some instances, this process will help highlight the need for extension to guarantee a return on investment, or to reach a specific milestone. Focus on indicators to ensure they are a) useful and b) results oriented (RBM), some suggestions are included in the text. b) **Revise existing reporting mechanisms to promote learning:** In line with the recommendation #2, the project should strengthen the learning potential of the M&E element by revising existing mechanisms and ensuring that the information loop does not go in only one direction (reporting) but that there are mechanisms and instances in place (which can be virtual) that promote reflection and cross learning

Level of priority: medium / Resource implications: low /Timeframe: medium

4. **Capacity building:** To strengthen the project's sustainability, start or continue the process of institutionalizing capacity building initiatives and strategic partners for replication. Similarly, identify sustainable formats for other outputs (such as the media toolkit, FLEAG, GSO).

Level of priority: medium / Resource implications: low /Timeframe: medium

5. **Strengthen the gender element of the project** towards a more substantive gender-sensitive approach which helps sensitise implementers and counterparts to cultural biases that may hamper the identification of forced labor.

Level of priority: medium / Resource implications: medium /Timeframe: medium

6. **Incorporate lessons learned from livelihoods experience in Nepal** in experiences going forward and into the design of IO5 in the other countries by a) ensuring there are **Clear eligibility and selection criteria** in place which take into account vulnerability, the context and the need for empowerment and psychosocial rehabilitation of the victims of FL , as well as the inclusion of mechanisms in place to monitor that these are applied; and b) ensure a **post-training strategy** is in place and includes all necessary aspects for training (output) to translate into outcome (increased livelihood) such as: (for example), the identification of the minimum package needed (tools, goats, seed money), the provision of technical support post-training, linkage to higher level training or on-the job training opportunities, etc. In line with recommendation #3 ensure that M&E measures results (for example, percentage of beneficiaries who are able to secure better livelihoods as a result of the training and analyse the factors that promoted or hindered success.)

Level of priority: medium / Resource implications: low /Timeframe: short

Overall the project has achieved significant progress in a very short time. Its success can be attributed to many things, but key elements include a participatory approach that empowers partners while ensuring relevance and sustainability of its progress. In addition, a significant effort has been made across the board to reach out beyond the traditional partners in new and strategic directions, creating spaces for dialogue and promoting processes that support substantive change. The changes sought, however, require long-term investments. Just like the Bridge benefited from important initiatives that came before it, building on them to arrive at the next layer, many of the processes initiated by the Bridge will only be starting to bear fruit by the programmed project's end.

ACRONYMS

CGF	Consumer Goods Forum
CBS	Central Bureau of Statistics (Nepal)
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
CNLCTF	National Commission for the Fight against Forced Labor
CSI	Confederación Sindical Internacional (Paraguay)
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DWCP	Decent Work Country Program
FLEAG	Forced Labor Elimination Advocacy Group (Nepal)
GBN	Global Business Network
GCF	Consumer Goods Forum
GSO	global slavery observatory
ICLS	International Conference of Labor Statisticians
ILO	International labor organization
INEI	Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática (Perú)
IO	Intermediate objectives
IR	Inception Report
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation
KEQ	Key evaluation questions
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MININTER	Ministerio del Interior, Perú
MINEDU	Ministerio de educación
MTE	Mid-term evaluation
MTPE	Ministerio de Trabajo y Promoción de empleo, Perú
MTR	Mid-term review
NPC	National Program Coordinator
ONAJUP	National Office of Justice of Peace (Peru)
RBM	Results based management
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SUTRAN	Superintendencia of Land Transport of People, Cargo and Freight
TOT	Trainer of trainers
UNDAF	Unite Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
USDOL	United States Department of Labor

BACKGROUND

This report constitutes the mid-term evaluation of the USDOL funded project *From Protocol to Practice: A Bridge to Global Action on Forced Labor (The Bridge Project)*. It is in line with the evaluation provisions for this project and in line with the USDOL-ILO Management Procedures & Guidelines applicable for this project, mainly the requirement for one mid-term independent evaluation managed by ILO and one final evaluation managed by USDOL as the donor, as well as with ILO's evaluation Policy Procedures¹ which states that all projects with a budget above five million must undertake an evaluability assessment, a midterm and a final evaluation.

The Project

The 2016 Global Slavery Index estimates that 45.8 million persons are currently suffering some form of slavery², of which ILO estimates 24.9 million are in forced labor and 15.4 million in forced marriage³. In addition, the ILO estimates that about 152 million children between 5 and 17 years of age are currently being subjected to child labor⁴.

ILO's FUNDAMENTALS branch has identified four fundamental principles and rights at work, one of which is the Elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor. In addition, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development goal 8 "Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all" and specifically target 8.7 to "take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labor, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labor, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labor in all its forms."

The project *From Protocol to Practice: A Bridge to Global Action on Forced Labor (The Bridge Project)* aims to support global and national efforts aimed at combating forced labor as per the 2014 ILO Protocol and Recommendation on Forced Labor. The overall goal of this project is to strengthen global and national efforts to eliminate or significantly reduce forced labor by supporting the implementation of the 2014 ILO Protocol on Forced Labor and the Recommendations in order to foster a better understanding of its effective implementation at the global and national.

As a sole source award, the project design and the selection of countries was undertaken jointly between USDOL and the ILO's Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS), who are also in charge of implementing it. The Fundamentals branch is part of the Governance and Tripartism Department (GOVERNANCE). Project design was done in coordination with the implementing Country offices, included discussions with key national stakeholders and was finalized only once the national project coordinators (NPCs) in charge of implementing the project was onboard.

¹ EVAL Guidance Note 2: Midterm evaluations

² Source: <https://www.globallslaveryindex.org/findings/> as seen on May 11 2018

³ Source: http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_574717/lang--en/index.htm seen on May 11 2018

⁴ Source: http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_574717/lang--en/index.htm seen on May 11 2018

The Project seeks to achieve these goals through the following intermediate objectives:

- IO1: Increased knowledge, awareness, and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation;
- IO2: Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms;
- IO3: Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional, and global levels;
- IO4: Workers' and employers' organizations actively support the fight against forced labor; and
- IO5: Strengthened awareness and livelihoods programs for victims of forced labor

The project was approved September of 2015 and is schedule to finish September of 2019. It aims to support global and national efforts aimed at eliminating or significantly reducing forced labor by supporting the implementation of the 2014 ILO Protocol and recommendations on Forced Labor. The Project's management structure includes work at the global level, managed from Geneva, as well as at the national levels initially in Peru, Nepal and Mauritania. The priority countries were selected in order to capture geographic diversity and various forms of forced labor, and where there were opportunities to implement the Protocol and/or support actions that it calls for. Since the project was awarded, Malaysia and Niger have been added (in August 2016 and September of 2017 respectively) as well as Thailand and the Dominican Republic (the latter as participating countries and will only include a limited number of activities and not aim to cover all five Intermediate Objectives (IOs)).

Purpose

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to provide USDOL and the ILO with an independent assessment of the performance of the project, in terms of progress towards the goals and unintended results, to document learning and good practices and to make recommendations toward enhancing the project's ability to achieve its goals in a sustainable manner. Ultimately, this mid-term evaluation sought to learn from the process of implementation undertaken as means to improve project performance, contribute towards greater organizational learning and to inform future development efforts. Its recommendations are expected to improve strategic performance, accountability and be used to strengthen the project interventions. As a pilot initiative, its lessons learned and emerging good practices are considered to be particularly relevant for future replication and/or scale-up in other countries as well as in the development of other ILO projects.

The primary users of the evaluation are expected to be the tripartite constituents including the host governments, ILO implementing staff and national project partners at global level and in the priority countries, as well as the USDOL. Other ILO staff that may benefit from the Project's lessons learned, such as ILO country Directors, ILO specialists in HQ and the field, the technical backstopping branch (FUNDAMENTALS). The MTE will be able to inform other practitioners involved in the prevention of forced labor.

Scope

This mid-term independent evaluation focused on the work undertaken by the project in Geneva, both management and implementation, and in the three initial priority countries (Mauritania, Nepal and Peru). For these reasons, whenever the evaluation refers to the country level, it is referring to these three. It looked at programme implementation from the start of the Project in September

2015 up to and including November 2017. Some information which was received after the cut-off date was included to provide a more up-to-date and comprehensive picture. (up to February 2018).

Objectives

The specific objectives were set out in the evaluation terms of reference (annexed) and further refined through the inception report process. The agreed mid-term Evaluation (MTE) objectives are:

- To assess **relevance and alignment** of the intervention model from the perspective of the stakeholders (including ILO, the national partners the donor and beneficiaries);
- To assess the **effectiveness and efficiency** of the intervention including progress made to date towards achieving the planned global and country-level outputs and immediate objectives, identify if possible unintended results as well as identify any factors hindering or helping achievement of these goals;
- To assess the **sustainability strategy** of the project and the likelihood that it will ensure results to be sustained over time;
- Propose **recommendations** for improved effectiveness and performance;
- Identify emerging good practices and consider lessons learned so far.

METHODOLOGY

In this section, we describe the overall methodological and conceptual that was used as underlying guide the evaluation process.

Overall methodological approach

This as an eminently formative exercise with some summative elements. As a **Formative evaluation** by nature it was forward looking and sought to identify elements that would help improve programme performance. The evaluation relies on mixed-methods, including semi-structured interviews and document review, inquiry is used to promote exploration of processes and better understanding of underlying factors that pushed or hindered progress. The Key evaluation questions can be found in Annex 2.

The **summative element** of the evaluation sought to ascertain if progress was in line with expectations, and if the initial goals as set out in the PRODOC were still relevant and feasible. Whenever possible assessment of adequacy and/or quality of the products was also undertaken.

Inclusion of both formative and summative elements is considered good evaluation practice in implementation evaluations/process evaluations.

The conceptual underlying approach was **Appreciative Inquiry**⁵, as such focused on the identification of strengths and good practices as the most effective way to promote effective change, but as part of its utilization focused approach⁶, much effort was also geared towards the

⁵ David Cooperrider (1986) please see the book/article

⁶ Patton (2008): IDEM

identification of barriers, risks and opportunities. This identification was enriched and validated through an ongoing participatory approach⁷ which sought input, feedback and triangulation through various participatory processes such as semi-guided interviews, focus group discussions and validation workshops.

Lastly, and in line with UNEG standards, and ILO evaluation policy the MTR had a **human rights and gender sensitive approach**, seeking to ascertain to what extent the human rights-based approach (and the gender perspective it entails) were incorporated into the design and to the implementation strategies of the interventions, as well as the project's contribution to the relevant SDGs goals.

Evaluation Team

The evaluation team comprised of one international team leader and three national consultants, one for each of the countries under evaluation, as well as one translator in Mauritania.

Angelica Arbulu, team lead: evaluation expert with over 20 years of relevant work experience, including six working for the UN in both field and HQ and three working in the private sector as a strategy analyst. She has an MA in International Relations (Development) from the Johns Hopkins University. Since 2008 she works as an independent evaluator. During this time, she has undertaken 25 separate evaluations for the UN system, including complex multi-country/multi-stakeholder projects, such as leading the Evaluation of the One Plan in Vietnam, MOPAN evaluation of the Interamerican Development Bank and country team lead for the Joint UN Evaluation of joint gender programmes.

Uddhav Raj Poudyal, National Consultant for Nepal: is an independent consultant and researcher on Child Labor, Child Protection and Migration in Nepal. Most recently (2015), he served as Country Coordinator to CLEAR II Project of Winrock International on child labor and child protection. In the past, he has served as Chief Technical Advisor to ILO's IPEC Programmes (1998-2011), Save the Children (UK), Private Sector and Government of Nepal. He has working experience of more than 35 years on child labor, child protection and migration. He has been providing his consultancy services to most of the UN (ILO and UNICEF) and International organizations (Plan International, Save the Children International, World Vision International, Karuna Foundation, International Organization on Migration, Child Fund Japan, etc.) in Nepal and beyond on child labor, child protection and migration.

Emma Rotondo, national consultant Peru: Licensed in Social Anthropology and Counselor in Logotherapy⁸. She is evaluator of social programs with more than 25 years of experience in 15 countries of the Latin-American region. Applies evaluation approaches based on equity, human rights, interculturality and gender. She is the author of about 30 articles, books and texts on M&E. She is a founding member of ReLAC and the Peruvian Evaluation Network Evalperu.

⁷ Quinn Patton (2000) Add the book

⁸ therapy centered on the meaning of life and resilience of crisis and limit situations

Niang Ndery Mohammed: National Consultant for Mauritania: has a Postgraduate Doctorate in "Development Economics", Macroeconomics, University of Social Sciences, (France, 1987), a MA in Business Economics from the University of Social Sciences of (France, 1983) and a Bachelor degree in Economics from the University of Social Sciences (France, 1980). He retired as a teacher in July 2017.

Evaluation Process

The evaluation process includes 3 phases: the inception phase, the data collection phase and the validation/ reporting phase.

Inception Phase

The inception phase sought to ensure clarity between the evaluation team and the evaluation management as to the goals and expected outcomes of the process. This phase included a kick off meeting with the ILO management group and USDOL, a preliminary desk review as well as exploratory discussions with key Bridge staff. This phase culminated with an agreed inception report which included the Key evaluation question (KEQ), agreed methodology for the exercise, deliverables and timeline for the evaluation. This Report would serve as the guiding document for the remainder of the evaluation, any changes will need to be mutually agreed. The final evaluation timeline can be found in Annex 1.

Data collection phase

The data collection phase began during the inception phase in December of 2017 with the preliminary desk review and finalized the first week of March 2018. It included a more in-depth document review and primary data collection through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with the project team, partners and key stakeholders in Nepal (15-23 January), Geneva (25-26 January), Mauritania (28 January – 2 February) and Peru (19-23 February). The country selection for in-country data collection was part of the TOR and includes only the countries in the scope of the evaluation. It also included remote interviews which took place from December 2017 until mid-March 2018. Overall 148 interviews were undertaken, with 3 additional focus group discussions with beneficiaries from the IO5 in Nepal (selected at random from the lists trying to balance gender and include non-Haliyas), interviews to their trainers and one focus group discussion with beneficiaries of training from the transportation sector in Peru.

Analysis, validation and report drafting phase

Due to time constraints and the length of the data collection phase, data analysis took place in parallel with data collection. Data collected was then systematized using the evaluation matrix allowing for validation and triangulation. Validation of preliminary findings took place in the form of stakeholder workshop in Nepal (Jan. 23rd) and Peru (Feb. 23rd), in Mauritania a validation session took place with the Ministry of Labor and the ILO NPC. While all NPC participated of the in-country validation session, a remote validation workshop with the Bridge team and USDOL to present more final findings scheduled for March 13th, 2018.

Data Collection Methods

Overall, the evaluation team undertook over 150 interviews. These were sometimes taken jointly (national and international consultant) and sometimes separately as a means to reach a larger number of beneficiaries, but also other variables were taken into account such as gender and language. The following methods were used in order to collect primary and secondary data, and to validate the findings:

- Desk review of secondary data: Systematic analysis of existing documentation, including quantitative and descriptive information about the initiative, its outputs and outcomes.
- Interviews: semi-structured face to face and remote interviews based on the *key* evaluation questions and adapted according to the intermediary
- Direct on-site observation of training programmes in Nepal
- Small focus group interviews were undertaken with beneficiaries, and in some instances with partners. The selection of the FGD participants was randomised using the lists provided of participants present, ensuring some gender representation as well as inclusion of both training participants and instructors, from different ethnic groups. In the case of partners, the participants were decided by the partners often based on location and availability.
- Key informant interviews were undertaken with project staff and partners.

Data was then systematized and triangulated in order to arrive to conclusions. Validation workshops were undertaken in Nepal, Peru and with limited government partners in Mauritania to validate preliminary findings. A validation workshop with the entire Bridge project, USDOL and ITUC was undertaken on March 13, 2018.

Risks and Limitations

Delays to the project start, together with ILO office closures and an initial February 24 deadline for presentation of findings, limited the time available for the planning and desk review during the inception phase. This meant that the work plan and logistics had to be agreed upon before the national consultants were hired and that decisions in regard to timing, length of missions and prioritization had to be done before the desk review was finalized and with a relatively superficial understanding of the project. Mostly this was ok as the team was able to work remotely and make use of the national consultant's on-site presence, however, increased time for planning and preparation would have ensured a better use of the evaluation team's time in alignment to needs, especially in regard to the work of components IO4 and IO2 which did not immediately fall under the initially identified structure.

In addition, initial times estimates proved to be insufficient. While eventually all evaluation team members received extensions to their contract to address this, some of the extension did not always happen early enough. In some instances it was possible to extend the times to respond to need, for example, to incorporate comments from stakeholders into final report, but in others instances this was not possible, (for example, data analysis had to be incorporated into the field mission schedule as it had not been identified in the initial timeline and the field missions begun before all the feedback to the inception report had been provided and some comments were only fully

incorporated for the last country mission and remaining remote interviews). While every effort was made to triangulate findings in all scenarios, these limitations weaken the evaluations' methodological consistency and there is a risk that some information may have been missed.

Due to the project's flexibility in design and its ability to adapt to respond to need and context, as well as the different nature of the separate elements (for example, the work of the ITUC which is fairly independent from the rest of the project) it has proven particularly challenging to come to conclusions that can apply across the board. The evaluation team has gone to great lengths to maintain the focus on the evaluand (the Bridge as a whole) in spite of this. It is important to understand that while there are findings, conclusions and recommendations for the separate elements, such as the participating countries, these should never be seen as equivalent to evaluation of each element separately, so for example, while there are findings and recommendations at country level, this is not an evaluation of (for example) Mauritania, which would have entailed a more in-depth analysis of that particular element.

In regard to IO2 and the work related to surveys, much of it falls outside the geographic scope of the evaluation, as such, the information stems from discussions with ILO staff and secondary data, with no opportunity to triangulate outside of ILO.

Lastly, from an evaluation management perspective, there was also some confusion in regards to how the ILO and the USDOL evaluation procedures applied which cause some delays and led to some procedures not taking place adequately or in the correct order. For example, the inception report was not shared jointly with ILO and USDOL as per the MPG2016, and the initial discussion with USDOL did not take place until after the data collection in Nepal.

While it is important to be aware of these risks and limitations, the team feels there was sufficient data, triangulation of sources and consistency in the findings to feel confident about the evaluation findings, especially as all stakeholders have been provided with an opportunity to raise questions, share comments and put forward concerns.

KEY FINDINGS

This section sets out the key findings that the process of evaluation led to in line with the five key evaluation questions agreed during the inception phase.

KEQ1: Validity of design:

Is the project design adequate to achieve the intended goals?

In this section the evaluation aimed to assess to what extent the project design facilitated the goals of the project, mainly the ratification of the Protocol and the Recommendation it calls for.

The Bridge project was awarded on the basis of five mutually agreed areas of focus identified and agreed jointly between USDOL and ILO, on September 30 of 2015. The award identified the five areas of focus (the intermediate objectives or IO) as well as the geographic coverage, mainly work

at global level and in the three countries: Nepal, Mauritania and Peru. These countries were identified as the minimum number, leaving the door open to other countries coming on board. These initial project countries were identified as providing different contexts or “types” of context that the Protocol would have to be implemented in, and as such, the Bridge would act as a pilot providing guidance and lessons learned for other countries. For example, in the case of Mauritania the project’s focus is on intergenerational slavery linked to ethnicity and its eventual linkages with modern slavery-like practices (different forms of forced labor and trafficking). In Nepal the project looks at debt bondage linked to the cast-based system, and in Peru the target population are vulnerable minorities, such as isolated indigenous communities, as well as migrants (children and women). Geographic distribution was reportedly also a factor, with one in Africa, one in Asia and one in Latin America.

A good practice of the project was that it included an extended design phase where the pre-agreed areas of focus (IOs) could be further elaborated with the relevant counterparts. This was done through bilateral discussions and in-country missions with key stakeholders to further define objectives and priorities. These in-country sessions included both government and civil society, however, due to the high levels of rotation especially of government staff, some stakeholders interviewed highlight participation in design as a weakness, often unaware their own agencies had participated of the process. The evaluation team also views positively the practice of doing an official launch of the project as a means to promote transparency and inclusiveness.

As a result of this process, the project has five common areas of focus (IOs), but the detailed lines within each of these IOs has been adapted to respond to the specific context and need. As such certain degree of overall coherence is maintained while able to respond to the specificity of each context.

Some challenges to coherence were reported in regard to how the global level initiatives fit in with the Bridge at national level. For example, the media toolkit for journalists was developed in Geneva and was tested in Malaysia as part of the Project HQ work plan. Selection of where and when to test is done in line with the needs of the global level product and not in line with the country needs, however, through good advanced coordination this can be mitigated, with Malaysia reporting the experience to have been very beneficial to obtain inputs as to how best to move forward in that area. Another example can be found in the International awareness raising event held in Buenos Aires at the IV Global Conference on CL, where Bridge partners from Peru were invited, but the Bridge NPC was unable to participate, this is an opportunity lost for strengthening and pushing ongoing processes and creates confusion with partners who don’t understand why they have to change interlocutor when dealing with the same agency on the same subject.

Similar challenges were found in relation to the IO4 *Workers’ and employers’ organizations actively support the fight against forced labor* which is mostly⁹ being implemented directly through the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), in liaison with Bridge Management in Geneva, with activities at global level, in Paraguay and Mauritania. As such, while conceptually it is linked and aligned with the rest of the project (“to engage with workers and employers in order to ensure awareness of the new instruments, and support for the ratification campaign and implementation” and the “strengthening of worker and employer organizations”¹⁰) it very much

⁹ 44% of the budget for IO4 was for ITUC activities, once Niger is included this will go up to 50%

¹⁰ PRODOC

acts like a parallel program that does not interlink or support the Project's ongoing initiatives, even when they are taking place in the same country, as is the case in Mauritania. Further, it creates confusion towards national partners who assume there is one Bridge project and approach the NPC in relation to ITUC activities, likewise, any delays in the work of the ITCU can have a negative impact on the Bridge's country programme, even though they are in effect unrelated. In cases where there is no work of the ITUC, such as in Nepal, the evaluation team found there is an expectation from national unions that they will benefit from IO4 of the Bridge at some point. The selection of countries was done by ITUC using internal parameters¹¹ that did not take into account the Bridge, for example, during the evaluation process ITUC learned that Nepal was part of the Bridge project, they a) did not know this and b) felt Nepal would have been a good fit for inclusion into their work plan under the Bridge. This is an opportunity lost as working in Nepal, instead of Paraguay for example, could have potentially strengthened ongoing processes pushed by Bridge in Nepal and provided greater consistency and comparability (from a learning perspective).

In addition to the five intermediate objectives the project design had another structural division, mainly global vs country level. At country level there was work in all IOs except IO4, at global level there was work undertaken in all except IO5, however, even when the IO was the same at these different levels the nature of the work was different, with greater focus on providing the tools, guides, manuals, (including communication campaigns, regional meetings, etc..) to promote ratification and implementation of the Protocol at global level. This comes across as a good design as it provides both global level tools and the opportunity to pilot them on the ground, what was observed is that delays in starting implementation at global level may limit the ability to pilot and fully benefit at country level from some of the products created at global level, at least during the lifetime of the project. Acknowledgement of the need for sequencing at the design stage would have been helpful.

The **Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP)** sets out the narrative for the theory of change and a diagram of the results framework (see Annex X TORs) which allows looking at the programme's expected pathway. Over all the evaluation found there is consensus that the theory of change covers all relevant areas remains relevant and valid. However, the evaluation team opted to develop a more extensive TOC visualization to be able to incorporate and make explicit underlying assumptions that the project is utilizing. This was done partly to ensure that all the actions undertaken fit into the underlying theory of how change is supposed to happen, which was the case demonstrating alignment. This extended TOC helps visualize if there are any outliers (actions that do not necessarily fit into the underlying theory of change), by making explicit what remained implicit it becomes easier for the team to work with a live TOC that can be modified in response to any changes in the environment (with the consequent modifications to action this would require). As such, the evaluation team used it to validate the findings and could be continued

¹¹ According to ILO the selection was done by ITUC following an assessment of country situations to identify target countries. The assessment included:

- (1) scope and degree of forced labor problems, and inputs from the ILO CEACR reports, USDOL List of Goods Produced with Child Labor or Forced Labor, US TIP report, and other available literature;
- (2) national trade union capacity and interest, on-going trade union campaigns, existing Global Union Federation campaigns etc.;
- (3) political situation, including government attitudes during the preparation phase of the new Protocol and during the ILC discussion, ratifications of other relevant conventions and treaties, which are indicators for a country's legal obstacles and readiness to ratify the new Protocol;
- (4) analysis of possible leverage points, including human rights monitoring cycles, corporate and trade angles to forced labor in target countries; and convergence with other civil society initiatives.

to function as a working tool for the Bridge team, by incorporating other factors such as risks and lessons learned. The diagram developed by the evaluation team can be found in Annex 7¹².

The evaluation also sought to assess the level of integration of the gender dimension, minorities and vulnerable groups into the project's design and how this carried over into implementation phase. Overall the evaluation concludes that minorities and vulnerable groups are very much the key target beneficiaries of the project, and as such have been carefully integrated into the design and implementation, however, the gender element was weak at the design stage as it did not look at the different challenges, barriers and needs and how these impact men and women differently. In practice this often translated into an invisibilisation of these specificities during implementation. During the evaluation process the need for a greater gender approach was confirmed, for example, in Nepal the team explained that during the design there was an underlying assumption that the target group, Free Haliyas, are primarily men who work in agriculture and as such the gender approach was not relevant, however, once the implementation of IO5 begun there was a realization that many of the beneficiaries had already gone abroad in search of work, and that the ones demanding the skills training services to support the families were the wives left behind. In addition, of the total 20,000 people estimated to be victims of forced labor in Nepal, 42 percent are estimated to be exploited in domestic work, which is typically women¹³, as such the project's focus on Free Haliyas ignores a large percentage of potential victims.

Similarly, in the case of Peru while domestic workers are identified in the pre-assessment as one of the likely victims of forced labor, the project has not included participation of any association of domestic workers into any of the activities of the project, even though the ILO office in Lima already works with them on other projects. The need for a gendered approach was further highlighted during the evaluation where it was clear that many of the partners and operators charged with addressing forced labor were unaware of their own biases which invisibilised abuse, this was made evident during focus group discussions traditional assumptions surfaced as excuses or justifications for abuse, for example, how a woman was dressed was addressed, or the fact that a man "a young strong man" used as excuse for forced labor.

KEQ2: Relevance and strategic fit

Was the project's strategy appropriate and relevant for addressing forced labor efforts at the national and global levels?

In this section the evaluation aimed to assess the relevance of the project at both global and country level, as well as in regards to the greater context within ILO and the international agenda, such as the SDGs.

Alignment and relevance with ILO's global priorities was easy to confirm, starting with its mission statement "to set labor standards, develop policies and devise programmes promoting decent work for all women and men", with forced labor, human trafficking and slavery being one of the thematic areas of focus. In addition, of the four fundamental principles and rights at work identified by the fundamentals section, two are directly linked to the work of the Bridge (Effective abolition

¹² The CMEP includes a results framework but no diagram of the TOC

¹³ Source: Walk Free survey results

of child labour and Elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labour). Lastly, it was reported that both the ILO Governing Body Session and the International Labor Conference in 2017 highlighted the Protocol and the 50 For Freedom Campaign as priority areas.

The project is also directly aligned with the international agreed priorities, mainly in the form of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development goal 8 “*Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all*” and specifically target 8.7 to “*take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labor, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labor, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labor in all its forms.*” The project also directly addresses SDG 1 as it targets the poorest of the poor and SDG 10 towards reducing inequalities.

At country level the evaluation found that the project has successfully contextualized the global project strategy to the country context and priorities, supporting existing initiatives and strengthening existing structures aimed at fighting forced labor. For example, it is estimated that 2-3% of the population in **Nepal** is suffering from Forced Labor¹⁴, further, the ILO Bridge Project in Nepal is aligned with the Constitution of Nepal¹⁵ which prohibits the exploitation of any persons under Article 29, sub article 3 “No one shall be subjected to trafficking nor shall one be held in slavery or servitude” and 4 “no one shall be forced to work against his or her will”. It is also aligned with the Bonded Labor (Prohibition) Act of 2002, the 14th National Plan 2017-2019¹⁶, Kamaiya, Haliya and Haruwa/Charuwa Rehabilitation and Skill Development Programme of the Ministry of Land Reform and Management which specifically mentions the rehabilitation of Kamaiya, Haliya and Haruwa/Charuwa as a government priority, and the implementation of Bonded Labor Abolition Act under the programme of the Ministry of Land Reform and Management.

In terms of the links to the work of the UN country team’s work in Mauritania, the UNDAF aims to promote sustainable inclusive economic growth with a focus on the promotion of decent employment and income opportunities that are free from forced labor, trafficking and child labor. Specifically, ILO’s work is included in the UNDAF outcome area 2 for marginalized groups, and form part of a newly formed Kathmandu Migration Group, a system wide action plan on migration which includes trafficking, which will serve as a mechanism for ILO to integrate trafficking and forced/bonded labor into the work of other agencies. Overall The ILO Bridge Project is therefore directly aligned with the existing Acts, Plan and Policies including with DWCP and UNDAF as well. Lastly, the Decent Work Country Programme priority 3 mentions the promotion of fundamental principles and rights at work, which explicitly mention under outcome 3.1 “Constituents and major stakeholders have improved capacities to address the implementation gap in respect of conventions 29, 105, 169 and 182 and to ratify conventions of national priorities” highlighting the need to address issues related to trafficking, forced labor and child labor.

¹⁴ Source: preliminary findings Nepal Labour Force Survey 2016 as shared with the Evaluation team

¹⁵ Right against exploitation: (1) Every person shall have the right against exploitation. (2) No person shall be exploited in any manner on the grounds of religion, custom, tradition, usage, practice or on any other grounds. (3) No one shall be subjected to trafficking nor shall one be held in slavery or servitude. (4) No one shall be forced to work against his or her will. Provided that nothing shall be deemed to prevent the making of law empowering the State to require citizens to perform compulsory service for public purposes. (5) Act contrary to clauses (3) and (4) shall be punishable by law and the victim shall have the right to obtain compensation from the perpetrator in accordance with law.

¹⁶ Government of Nepal 14th National Plan 2017-2019

In **Mauritania** there is a clear alignment between the project goals (to combat slavery) and national efforts: slavery was abolished in 1981, criminalized in 2007 (Law 2007-048) and designated as a crime against humanity under the constitutional reform in 2012¹⁷. In addition, Mauritania has ratified all international human rights treaties that prohibit slavery¹⁸ including the ILO Protocol, and more importantly, there are an estimated 43,000 people or 1.06 percent of the total population living in conditions of modern and traditional slavery¹⁹. In August 2015, a new anti-slavery law was enacted which increased the maximum prison sentence for the crime of slavery from 10 to 20 years²⁰, and in March 2013, the National Agency to Fight against the Vestiges of Slavery, Integration, and Fight against Poverty -*Tadamoun*, was created. In March 2014 a “Roadmap to Combat the Vestiges of Slavery”²¹ and a special Tribunal to prosecute crimes of slavery were established,²²²³ and on December 2015 special courts to try slavery cases were created.

In terms of the UN, the 2011-2015 UNDAF was extended until 2017²⁴ and the extension specifically incorporated the follow up and evaluation of the roadmap against the repercussions of slavery. (see annex 4 for details)²⁵. A new UNDAF was finalized on February 1st 2018 and not yet available for the evaluation team to review, however, the Bridge NPC participated of the process in order to ensure inclusion of forced labor into the work of the UN country team. At the time of the evaluation there was no ILO country office (only a project office) and the DWCP had expired.

Lastly, in **Peru** relevance to the national context is also confirmed with the recent approval of the Legislative Decree 1323 (see annex 3) which criminalized forced labor. More importantly, there is evidence of the existence of forced labor, as well as demand from public institutions for technical support given that they are now charged with implementing the new Decree. There is alignment with national institutions and efforts such as the recently created National Commission for the Fight against Forced Labor (CNLCTF) in the MTPE, the Law Against Human Trafficking and its regulatory Law No. 28950 (2014), the creation of a National Plan Against Human Trafficking and the Multisectoral Commission against human trafficking in MININTER, and regional plans.)

¹⁷ UK Human Trafficking Centre *NCA Strategic Assessment: The Nature and Scale of Human Trafficking in 2013*, (National Crime Agency, 2014, Ref. 0093-UKHTC. <http://bit.ly/10j5pql>)

¹⁸ Source : https://www.gfbv.de/fileadmin/redaktion/Publikationen_Dokumente/2016/RAPPORT_FEUILLE-DE-ROUTE_englishSummary.pdf

¹⁹ source: The Global Slavery Index 2016

²⁰ Kevin Bales, Olivia Hesketh, Bernard Silverman, 'Modern Slavery in the UK: How Many Victims?' *Significance* (Royal Statistical Society), June 2015, pp. 16-21.

²¹ Ronald Clarke and Ross Homel, 'A Revised Classification of Situational Crime Prevention Techniques', in *Crime Prevention at a Crossroads*, ed. Cincinnati, OH and Andersen, (1997), p. 17 -27.; Paul Ekblom & Nick Tilley, 'Going equipped: criminology, situational crime prevention and the resourceful offender', *British Journal of Criminology*, 40, 3: (Summer 2000): 376; Klaus Von Lampe, 'The application of the framework of Situational Crime Prevention to 'organized crime', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 11 (2011): pp. 145-163.

²² Kevin Bales, *Ending Slavery: How we Free Today's Slaves*, (University of California Press, 2007); Anne Gallagher & Paul Holmes, 'Developing an Effective Criminal Justice Response to Human Trafficking: Lessons from the Frontline', *International Criminal Justice Review*, 18, 3, (September 2008), pp. 318-348; Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, *The 3Ps: Prevention, Protection, Prosecution*, (Democracy and Global Affairs, 2011), accessed 17/09/14: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/167334.pdf>

²³ <http://humantraffickingsearch.org/resource/slavery-in-mauritania-the-roadmap-to-combat-the-vestiges-of-slavery-is-not-being-implemented-convincingly/>

²⁴ in order to secure a transition that allow to harmonize the joint programming of the United Nations in Mauritania with the Accelerated Growth Strategy and the Shared Prosperity (SCAPP 2016- 2030).

KEQ3: Effectiveness:

To what degree is the project successfully achieving the desired results?

This section seeks to assess if the project is expected to achieve the planned results as expected at global and country levels, specifically, if it is helping to promote ratification and/or implementation of the Protocol, understand the factors that are contributing or hindering the process and reflect on any changes that could strengthen project delivery, when possible if particular project outcomes are more challenging than others to implement at the country level, and if so, why.

Initially, it needs to be clarified that given the modality of the project award, where by the project was developed in detail after the award, while good for relevance (as previously stated) meant that the first year of implementation for the most part focused on setting up the project, meaning undertaking the inception missions, developing the work plans and hiring project staff²⁶. This means the mid-term evaluation is in effect assessing only one year of implementation, and especially taking into account the project lifecycle where by implementation is usually slower at the start, it might have been more appropriate and effective to undertake the mid-term evaluation in mid 2018, (one year and a half after the beginning of the implementation phase). A list of project outputs can be found in the results tables (annex 8), here we present some of the key highlights by Intermediate Objective.

IO1. Increased knowledge, awareness, and ratification of the ILO Protocol and

In regards to the **ratification** of the Protocol, a key goal of the project, there is intensive work at both global and country level in terms of awareness raising and the original project target of 17 countries (OPI2) has been exceeded, at the time of this evaluation 22 countries had ratified the convention and an additional 9 had pledged ratification during the IV Global Conference on the Sustained Eradication of Child Labour organized in Buenos Aires 14–16 November 2017 by the Project, showing the potential of these kinds of activities. Of the Bridge initial countries, there are high expectations that Peru will ratify the Protocol before the end of year 2018. In terms of the communication campaign at global level, the 50 for Freedom seeks to build public mobilization to get the ratification and is mostly regarded as a success, having managed to engage significantly beyond initial expectations through the use of strategic partner's (like Brazilian actor, Wagner Moura VIACOM²⁷, MTV, Comedy Central and paramount) to issue a series of products, videos, gifs, etc. It also seeks to create awareness on forced labor and trafficking for a broader audience, which is why it was done separately from ILO website, and why they are working with artists. It does not target the usual ILO constituent but their citizens. The project worked to support the **50 For Freedom Campaign**, which seeks ratification of 50 countries by the end of 2018. The objective of the project was to provide momentum by promoting a large number of ratification. With 22 ratifications at the time of the evaluation, the project's goal of 17 had been exceeded, as had the number of people reached through the campaign (from the 2,500 goal to 24,344 actual (OTC1)²⁸). The fact that there are organizations reaching out to ILO to partner with the campaign is an indicator of its success.

²⁶ Project staff was in place by May 2016 and were needed on board before the project documents could be finalized.

²⁷ Media company

²⁸ As of latest figures available October 2017

In terms of progress, at the global level most outputs were behind the initial time table, however, the expectation is that the project will be able to complete all the key outputs before the end of the project (September 2019). The project is developing a draft guideline for ILO constituents to formulate **national action plans** on forced labor in line with the recommendations of the Protocol. This product has been developed by a specialist in discussion with the Bridge team, and if timing permits it, will be tested in Malaysia or Nepal (if the timing of those countries' NAP preparations coincides with the publication cycle). At the time of the evaluation this was in the process of editing and translation. It was reported that the Bridge would make the guide available in written and electronic versions on their website, and may be included into existing ILO training courses (ITC ILO -Turin).

The **media toolkit for journalists** was also developed by a specialist and was initially intended to include only forced labor, however, synergies (in terms of recommendations) were found with the fair recruitment, and as a result will now be including both. The final product is expected to be an interactive and easy to use tool for information that allows both experienced and new to the theme journalists to find information quickly, as such acting as both a work tool and source of information. The testing was scheduled to begin in February 2018 in Malaysia, with further testing sessions to take place later on. The delays are due to the inclusion of fair recruitment, and the need to identify adequate technical solutions that guarantee easy use as well as the possibility of a downloadable version in places with limited connectivity. The project is working in agreement with the International Federation of Journalists, while this strengthens the quality of the final product, it has also added to the delays.

The **IPU handbook** is intended as a very practical guide that helps parliamentarians understand the importance of the Protocol, of implementing its recommendations and what they can do and to better understand why ratification is important. The handbook proposed builds on previous successful experiences. It seeks to break down key elements of force labor: What is it? why is it relevant to you? What is the legal definition, what does it look like? While it focuses on individual victims it also looks at societal factors in appropriate language so that it connects directly to parliamentarian's work, and tries to provide a good picture of drivers (individual vulnerabilities (gender, migrant worker, poor education), industries where FL usually comes about (global supply chains, types, sectors, etc...) needs (budget) it gives them concrete examples of what they can do from their own district. It was scheduled to be presented to Parliamentarians in March of 2018, now the project is aiming for IPU General assembly in October 2018. This delay is partly due to the fact that the consultant is only working part time.

At country level progress varies, in many ways directly related to where the country was at the start of the project. For example, an initial study in Mauritania showed that there was very little knowledge and understanding of the laws and regulations that affect forced labor and slavery, even amongst those that are charged with enforcing them. As such, Bridge opted to begin efforts by 1) doing a revision of existing communication (March 2017) and 2) undertake a diagnostic study to better understand needs, areas for prioritization, key partners, as well as barriers to the implementation of the law (against slavery). This is seen as a good practice as it strengthens relevance and adequacy of the communications strategy, while avoiding duplication. For example, one preliminary conclusion from this study is that videos, envisioned in the Bridge work plan, may not be the most effective mechanism to reach the target audience, and less costly methods, such as

radio campaigns, may be more effective. In terms of awareness raising, there have been both formal and informal sessions with partners and stakeholders to increase awareness. One particularly successful experience was the event organized on March 6th, 2017 in Kaiffa together with the Association of Mayors in celebration the first National Day Against Slavery. This event brought together a wide range of stakeholders that don't often have the opportunity to interact. This was highlighted as a useful and appreciated experience by almost every stakeholder interviewed. It opened up a space for dialogue and exchange providing the discussion with different perspectives and highlighting the challenges faces. Often highlighted was the intervention of the judge of the special court, who helped others realize the challenges faced by the special court which counts with inadequate resources for its intended functions²⁹. This event was further strengthened by the realization of an awareness rising event the previous evening, 5th March, open to the public.

In Nepal, at the time of the evaluation advocacy materials such as a documentary film, a TV PSA and three radio PSA were under development and expected to be completed by March of 2018. In terms of awareness raising, a National Civic Conference has been organized and the Forced Labor Elimination Advocacy Group (FLEAG) for advocacy and lobby was established by Bridge, bringing together key stakeholders with a view to develop a common and coherent advocacy approach. While this initiative is seen as a good practice, at the time of the evaluation there had only been one meeting and agreement of the TORs, as such, this initiative needs to be further supported to ensure it has an impact.

Widespread use of communication materials such as videos, comic books, guides, manuals and information pamphlets was observed in Peru. Many of these materials had been developed under a previous ILO project on forced labor³⁰, as a result of this, the Bridge project was able to “hit the ground running” and fully benefit from this previous ILO investment from the very start of the program. The evaluation highlights the wide range of communications materials which are adapted to different audiences ranging from very technical manuals for prosecutors, to comics for youth on prevention of forced labor and the use of the 50 For Freedom Campaign materials. Communication campaigns were undertaken in Ucayali, Cusco, Puno, Tumbes, and Arequipa during 2017. A Facebook page “*Peru Libre de Trabajo Forzoso*” (Peru free of forced labor) was also developed. The Bridge project in Peru has also identified innovative and strategic partners such as the SUTRAN, (Superintendence of Land Transport of People, Cargo and Freight) the national institution in charge of land transport of people, cargo and merchandise and put together an awareness communication campaign targeted at a broad audience including drivers, managers for transportation agencies at transport terminals as well as passengers. Stakeholders interviewed highlighted the relevance of this training, reporting an average of 10 cases each trainee had been able to identify as a result of the training in the short period of time between the training and the evaluation (2 months). This process also helped highlight some gaps in this area (such as the need for protection for both the SUTRAN staff and the victims identified, and for police presence at the bus stations to support these efforts). Another innovative initiative was the use of the national system of *tutorias* (tutoring) a national system where by a trusted teacher chosen by students does weekly sessions on non-curricular themes. The project developed tutorial booklets for three grades as a means for awareness raising and prevention amongst high-risk population, high school students from impoverished areas. This package was developed jointly with the

²⁹ This is not a conclusion of the evaluation but rather reflects the views of the judges.

³⁰ Consolidando y difundiendo esfuerzos para combatir el Trabajo Forzoso en Brasil y Perú (OIT- DOL)

Ministry of Education (MINEDU) and is now available online as part of the resources for these *tutorias*. The project was able to pilot this in Tumbes, but as schools were not in session during the evaluation the team was unable to interview participants, however it would seem that the size of the activity remains small. There would need to be an assessment of impact (an evaluation of the intervention) and further support to ensure quality and wide spread use of the materials.

The primary indicator for this output was the number of people registered on the 50 for Freedom campaign platform (OTCI), which completely exceeded expectations. Ratification of the Protocol by 22 countries at the time of the of the evaluation exceeded the project goals, but more importantly, it achieved an important objective of creating momentum for the Protocol, however, caution should be taken when using ratification as an indicator. Ratification does not guarantee compliance, and some countries may shy away from acquiring formal commitments through ratification but show willingness towards implementation of the Recommendations under the Protocol. Awareness raising has been a key activity undertaken by the project. Overall the progress at the global level in this outcome is delayed but expected to be completed before the end of the project. Progress at country level is mixed and dependent on what progress ILO had on the ground before the project started, however, all countries have put forward innovative solutions and reached out to strategic partners.

IO2 Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms;

A bold achievement under this outcome is the introduction of the national Legislative Decree 1323 in **Peru**, which incorporates forced labor as a crime. While this is clearly a national accomplishment, which builds on work undertaken by ILO-USDOL with a previous project³¹, there is widespread recognition from stakeholders as to ILO's role in this process. The Bridge project in Peru also helped to evaluate the second Plan Nacional para la Lucha Contra el Trabajo Forzoso (National Plan of Action against Forced labor) and to develop the Third National Plan of Action, playing a key role of coordination and providing technical inputs in the National Commission Against Forced Labor where it was developed. (Comisión Nacional Para el trabajo Forzoso).

In **Nepal** the project has supported the Mid-term Review of National Plan of Action against Trafficking, which was being finalized at the time of the evaluation and will support the dissemination of review findings with stakeholders at national and regional level. It has also provided inputs to the government for the redrafting a comprehensive Bonded Labor Act and established a Task Force which incorporated three key ministries to review the forced/bonded labor laws and provided some inputs. Given the multiple political changes and the ongoing process of decentralization³², this did not seem to be priority and at the time of the evaluation there did not seem to be any progress on this act.

³¹ Consolidando y difundiendo esfuerzos para combatir el Trabajo Forzoso en Brasil y Perú (OIT- DOL)

³² From a centralized government to: Federal Government, Provincial Government (7 Provinces) and Local Government (753 Municipalities and Rural Municipalities). Three level of governance but decentralized. So far, all Acts are not developed particularly focusing provinces therefore they are in dilemma to govern effectively. By end of 2018, the federal government is supposed to bring about 300 legislations before the federal parliament.

In **Mauritania** the project has completed an assessment of training needs of members of the judiciary at the special court responsible for slavery-related crimes, as well as for the competent judicial bodies (ordinary prosecutor's offices, courts of appeal, etc.); the security forces (police, gendarmerie, and the National Guard); and mayors, administrative and municipal officials.

A training module to support enforcement of the Act criminalizing slavery and slavery-like practices was created. A series of roundtable discussion were organized to discuss the type of labor relations that to understand which are more susceptible to forced labor as part of the preparatory work for the planned qualitative study.

Progress on this IO is in the early stages as might be expected, not only from the lifecycle of the project, but also from the nature of the expected outputs which require significant coordination and political dialogue on sensitive issues. The key indicators for the IO2 were OTC 2. (Proportion of policies and/or NAPs and/or legislations that have been adopted to include FL), and OTC 3 (Percentage of trained stakeholders with sufficient knowledge on FL). In regard to OTC 2 the last report available to the evaluation (October 2017) reported that only one of goal of nine had been achieved, this was in Peru. In the case of OTC 3 estimated that 78% of trained stakeholders had sufficient knowledge on FL versus the target of 70%. These indicators however fail to reflect the work and progress achieved in terms of aligning promoting awareness, creating spaces for dialogue and coordination, and all the work needed to have a common ground from where significant changes can be sought. There has been work around the Roadmap in Mauritania which, while not per se legislation, is helping both to educate and guide work of the government.

[IO3 Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional, and global levels;](#)

At global level, the ILO set up a working group on the guidelines on statistical indicators and survey methods for the International Conference of Labor Statisticians (ICLS), which met in Kathmandu (June 2016) to identify an operational definition and measurement of bonded labor and reviewed indicators in detail. An important outcome of this meeting was an agreement that what the working group drafted could become the operational definition of bonded labor for measurement purposes. The ICLS met again in Vienna (November 2016) hosted by UNODC to identify an operational definition and measurement framework for trafficking, and in Bangkok (December 2016) to identify a measurement of commercial sexual exploitation of adults and children. Another outcome of these meetings was the creation of a joint collaboration to design common survey tools. These initiatives build on work that has been ongoing since 2013. The results from this work was presented at the Joint Statistical Meeting of the American Statistical Association in Baltimore on August 2017, this was part of a series of outreach initiatives to socialize the findings in the hope there will be sufficient consensus for adoption when they are presented to the ICLS members in October of 2018 (Geneva). This would constitute a significant achievement of the project. The work on surveys and with the ICLS has received substantively support from the ILO's FUNDAMENTALS Branch.

In regard to the **Global Slavery Observatory (GSO)** is an initiative that begun in 2013 which seeks to provide relevant information per country on slavery and forced labor. At the time of the evaluation, the Bridge Project had updated 28 out of the 45 total target (OTP 9) country profiles, however, there is a realization that the current format while good, is too detailed and as such not sustainable. At the time of the evaluation there was an ongoing review to identify a more

sustainable format going forward. After discussion to include the GSO within the Alliance 8.7 website it was agreed that the project will develop an online platform as originally planned.

As mentioned in the initial chapter of the report, much of the work related to the work done on surveys at HQ level falls outside the geographic scope of the evaluation, as such, there was no triangulation of information for these activities, but have been included to provide an adequate picture of the progress and work in this area.

Progress was reported towards undertaking a survey in Thailand which was originally intended to include forced labor, however at the time of the evaluation it was expected to focus only on child labor, and mostly led by the Government of Thailand, with the Bridge providing technical support. Development of methodology and tools had been done through a participatory process to increase awareness. At the time of the evaluation it was reported that, from a technical perspective, the Survey was ready to be implemented.

The project is also in the process of undertaking a palm oil survey in Malaysia, a process that builds on ongoing work. As in the previous scenario, Malaysia will be funding the survey, it is understood that ILO has been invited to participate with its technical expertise.

Lastly, the Dominican Republic and Niger joined the project in September of 2017. It was reported that the project is expected to conduct a survey in Niger which will be a follow up to a previous one undertaken 10 years ago, providing insight into progress and changes. In the case of the Dominican Republic, the focus of the work will be on capacity building of labor inspection to include forced labor and improve data management in the Ministry of Labor and will be mostly managed from the Sub-regional Central America Office.

All three countries within the scope of this evaluation are scheduled to undertake a statistical survey on forced labor. At the time of the evaluation Nepal's study was in the data collection phase after undergoing a long and participatory process with the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) to develop the tools and train the staff which is expected to be finalized before the end of the year. As a result of this positive interaction there is now a plan to undertake a joint study (Bridge-UNICEF and the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) with support from some civil society (Good Weave Nepal and others working in addressing child and forced labor in Brick kilns for qualitative information) on the brick industry where a large number of children in forced labor is suspected. In the case of Peru, the statistical survey is being developed with support of the M&E officer of the ILO Regional Office. Progress has been delayed due to natural disaster La Niña and the national census which was due in 2017. The joint survey with the Ministry of Interior and the National Statistics Office (MTPE -INEI) is expected to take place in 2018. There is also a study planned for 2018 to understand the types of forced labor that are encountered in the triple border with Brazil, Colombia and Ecuador.

In the case of Mauritania, several meetings between the ILO and the Ministry of Labor were held in Nouakchott and Geneva to gather support for the study. As a result of these exchanges, a roundtable to launch the qualitative study was held in February 2018 with the participation of ILO specialists from FUNDAMENTALS along with Government officials, worker's organizations, employer's organizations, civil society organizations, USDOL and other experts. At the end of the roundtable a technical monitoring committee on the research methodology and its results was set

up to facilitate dialogue between the research team and main stakeholders.. Specialists from FUNDAMENTALS will participate along with Government officials, worker’s organizations, employer’s organizations, civil society organizations and experts. At the end of the roundtable a technical monitoring committee on the research methodology and its results will be set up to facilitate dialogue between the research team and main stakeholders.

The overall indicator for this IO was the number of statistical surveys and/or studies publicly available (OTC 4). While the goal was 9, at the time of the evaluation none were reported. However, as it has been explained above, there was significant progress in regards to the design and towards a greater agreement of how and what, with the report for Nepal expected to be finalized and available by mid 2018 (OTP 8).

IO4 Workers’ and employers’ organizations actively support the fight against forced labor; and Intermediate Objective 4 is an attempt to directly involve their constituents, mainly trade unions and employers, very much in line with the tripartite nature of ILO.

The project sought to establish a **Forced Labor Network for employers’ organizations**, business and other stakeholders. The idea of the network goes back to before the project with the realization that there was a need to engage in a more meaningful way, to find a mechanism to share notes, benchmark performance and explore ways to go forward. The forum was officially announced on June 2017 and a consultation of the ILO Global Business Network (GBN) on Forced Labor and Human Trafficking was organized on October 27, 2017. The goals of the Network include knowledge sharing and the identification of good practices among network members; the development of joint projects and services; strengthening business representative organizations to reach out to small and medium sized enterprises and linkages to wider national ILO projects and activities. ILO’s added value is to provide members with hard-to-find data and information on emerging trends, and the opportunity to draw on the ILO’s unique tripartite structure bringing together governments, worker and employer organizations.³³

A mapping undertaken by ILO showed that there are other similar initiatives, however, the linkage to these initiatives is for the most part ad-hoc and informal, and while the membership is often overlapping there is little coordination between them. This initiative provides a forum to discuss the linkages, it has an ecosystem approach looking at the wider context, while others often have a very narrow focus. Creating a forum where we can explore what strengths and comparative advantages, bridge gaps and look at how to engage the smaller players, looking at ways to link with employer organizations, sectoral associations and smaller firms in supply chains and beyond strengthening the linkage to the ground, looking beyond the company’s own supply chain and into the communities.

While they don’t have official members, they have received seed funding from Mars Incorporated in addition to Bridge funds and had groups like Disney hosting events, with stakeholders reporting that 12 companies have reached out to ask how they can contribute. This response, together with the ability to form a 12 member advisory board quickly and diverse acts as evidence of the gap this initiative is coming to fill and the role perceived by others that ILO can play in this field.

³³ http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_556159/lang--en/index.htm

Stakeholders expected to be able to exceed number of businesses engaged goals of Bridge after the global event in Singapore this year, where they also hope to clearly articulate the goals and the source of funding going forward. Beyond this event there are no Bridge resources, but there are resources from another USDOL project, the MAP16 project (Measurement, Awareness-Raising and Policy Engagement Project on Child Labor and Forced Labor) up to 2020. The idea is that to make it self-sustaining through member dues.

*Table 1: Area of focus for the ILO GBN on Forced Labor and Human trafficking*³⁴

<p>Area of focus for the ILO GBN on Forced Labor and Human trafficking³⁵</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of existing policies, identification of risk areas, and due diligence. • Adapting existing relevant ILO tools (e.g. Combating Forced Labor: A Handbook for Employers & Business), and developing other practical tools on the prevention of forced labor and human trafficking in company operations in various languages. • The development and implementation of training modules and training facilitation for company personnel and suppliers. • Understanding existing and emerging legal and regulatory regimes and reporting obligations. • Ensuring fair recruitment, building on the “fair recruitment corridors” pioneered by the ILO and partner organizations in South Asia and the Middle East. • Pilot testing intervention models on forced labor and human trafficking, and “scaling-up” already proven interventions. • Membership is open to globally oriented businesses interested in preventing forced labor and human trafficking in their operations and supply chains. Meetings are targeted at senior executives with direct responsibility for these issues.
--

In October of 2017, and in collaboration with the Consumer Goods Forum (CGF), the project held a half-day event on forced labor and human trafficking in Berlin on June 20, 2017 which included participation of 104 participants and 38 entities. This event made use of ILO’s constituency to highlight the importance of the Protocol for companies, emphasizing the linkages between the Protocol and global supply chain. These activities can play an important role in getting companies as allies.

Following the adoption of the Protocol, The International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) began developing a global awareness raising campaign towards broad ratification with a focus on countries where they deemed it was possible for them to work with trade unions and governments towards ratification and implementation of the Protocol. The ITUC has carried out an assessment of country situations to identify target countries and identified Mauritania and Paraguay as a good fit (more recently Malaysia). With support from the project, ITUC has been undertaking research and providing information tools so that organizations can advocate for ratification. A side-event at

³⁴ Source : http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_556159/lang--en/index.htm

³⁵ Source : http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_556159/lang--en/index.htm

the 35th session of the Human Rights Council was organized with Anti-Slavery International and the Minority Rights Group, entitled “Mauritania’s left behind: Exclusion and Extreme poverty” was organized on 8 June 2017 (Geneva).

In Mauritania the Protocol has been signed (2016). Previously (2014), and in line with Convention 29, the Government had approved a roadmap to fight the sequels of slavery, which -in the view of some of the affiliates of the ITUC and some civil society organizations, is not being delivered effectively. Other ITUC affiliates consider that the roadmap shows the political will and the progress done by Government. Two awareness raising, and capacity building workshops took place with the four main trade unions in October 2016 and January 2018. As a result, the CTS *Comité Technique de Suivi* was set up on October 2016 to follow up on the recommendations of this meetings. ITUC is also documenting ongoing violations and have organized a side meeting at the Human Resource committee on the application of standards. Another mission is scheduled for 2018 funded from other sources which will provide continuity to the monitoring and the National Action Plan. In addition, an advocacy video was produced and released on 4 July 2017, and an article published in the Huff post which reportedly had reached 4,000 people. Meetings with the members of the civil society showed they appreciated these efforts but will continue to need support in order to be effective.

In Paraguay, the reported objective was to promote an alliance between organized indigenous groups and the Unions (*Confederación sindical internacional* or CSI), which are not so active in the Chaco region, by showing both sides how this alliance would be mutually beneficial. At the time of the evaluation two meetings had been reported on 12 March and July 20, 2017 respectively. Reported outcomes for the first meeting was its ability to identify the absence of the Ministry of Labor authorities in as a cause for non-compliance of labor laws by employers, and the second meeting helped conclude that workers in construction, rural and domestic work were particularly vulnerable to exploitation by local employers. A report stemming from the meetings had been finalized and was reportedly being translated into Guaraní. At the time of the evaluation ITUC reported that an initial report had been finalized and were in the process of finalizing the materials for the video etc. Further meetings have been planned with sources, however the evaluation team was informed that ITUC had asked for an extension to be able to continue to support outreach activities by the union in the Chaco region.

As this element of the project is fairly independent from the rest of the project, the evaluation team had limited opportunities to triangulate information and there were no visits to Paraguay. Discussions with the participating trade unions in Mauritania provided confirmation of capacity building activities and the other initiatives, however it seemed unclear what the outcome of these capacity building events had been, and there continued to be confusion in regard to the Bridge divide (ITUC/direct implementation). There also seemed to be lack of understanding on the part of the ITUC of where they fit in within the Bridge. It would seem that earlier consultation to identify countries and specific actions, together with a more comprehensive discussion of the Bridge might have been useful towards solidifying better results within the context of the project.

Key indicators for this IO include looking at the Number of entities that actively participate in Forced Labor Network (OTC 5), which had no entries at the time of the evaluation given the event took place at the same time as the reporting is due (October 2017). The CMEP also looked at the number of entities that attended the Global Supply Chain forum, which at the time of the evaluation

was 38, exceeding the target of 20. The second key indicator looked at percentage of trade unions that conduct a follow-up activity against FL after ITUC's support (G) (OTC 6) which was estimated to be 33% out of the targeted 50%. It is unclear how these percentages are being calculated, however, the number of trade unions with a representative participating in ITUC's awareness raising activities on FL supported by the project (OTP 11) exceeded expectations (goal 10, actual 18) Overall progress has been achieved towards raising awareness and gaining attention from both workers and employers associations.

IO5 Increased awareness and access to livelihood programs for victims of forced labor.

Intermediate objective 5 only takes place at country level. At the time of the evaluation only **Nepal** had begun executing this outcome. As per the PRODOC, this was being done in conjunction with the Freed-Haliyas association in two geographic areas, Bajura and Kanchanpur. Initially the project undertook a mapping exercise to assess existing livelihood programs for freed Haliyas and to explore and recommend sustainable livelihood options that could be offered by the programme by looking at market and other factors. A selection of training partners took place, and selection of beneficiaries was done by the Freed-Haliyas organization based on agreed set of eligibility criteria, mainly: 1) that they are Haliyas, 2) that they have the government card for Freed Haliyas 3) if they don't have the government card that they are members of the Freed Haliyas association³⁶ and 4) that they are a short distance from the training site. There was however no agreed selection criteria to narrow down the participants in a transparent manner once the eligibility criteria had been met. Selection was done by the Free Haliya association.

At the time of the evaluation there were 2 ongoing trainings that the team could visit: goat farming in Bajura and sewing in Kanchanpur. The evaluation team was able to observe the training and interview some of the trainers and participants. It was observed that not all participants were Free Haliyas, when we enquired about this it was explained that it would be bad for community relations if the locals were left out. As such, free Kamiyas, who have also in the past been victims of bonded labor, and dalit were observed to be also participating in the trainings. We also noted that many of those receiving training had a good level of schooling, which was necessary for the types of training provided which were preparing them for government skill certification exams level one, this means in effect that the program left out those most vulnerable (with less studies and more rural areas). The selection of Bajura and Kanchanpur, both rural areas, helps to address this latter bias.

The evaluation concludes that IO5 in Nepal (livelihood services) would have benefitted from more substantive eligibility criteria which allowed to identify the most vulnerable (although it is possible this was not the intention) as it stands, it excluded the most vulnerable either because they did not have the necessary education or because they were located too far from the training. Further, the lack of selection criteria leaves little clarity as to how the participants were selected and lends itself to abuse or favoritism. While there is no evidence that either of these took place, there is no way to state the opposite either. This is particularly worrying given that the agreed eligibility criteria were not followed with a good number of non-Haliyas participating of the programs.

³⁶ This is because some Haliya families are still trying to get their card for recognition which provides them with access to government programs. Leaving those that don't have a card out would effectively re-victimize the most vulnerable.

While there is awareness of the importance of post-training to ensure that it translates into effective livelihoods, at the time of the evaluation no concrete steps had been taken to facilitate transition from training to work, further, since these trainings are lower level, beneficiaries may not be in a position to compete for work once finished even if successfully (for example, for clothes making, there are cheap options from China in the markets), as such, risk of training not translating into effective livelihoods is considered high unless adequate steps are not taken to ensure pathway from training to work. (see recommendations section for specific recommendation).

In the case of **Mauritania**, at the time of the evaluation the mapping of organizations and institutions that can help the victims of slavery and slavery-like practices had not yet been undertaken. In a first stage the project had looked into the possibility of implementing an adapted version of the ILO/Ministry of Employment workshop school for vocational training for victims of forced labor in the construction sector,³⁷ however, after consideration it was decided (in conjunction with the donor), that this approach for the target population could only be tested after the qualitative study and after undergoing the mapping exercise. Collaboration with the Tadamoun agency³⁸ was also considered politically very strategic to ensure long term ownership of the intervention, however, participating of this government program which targets vulnerable and poor families, would make it very difficult for the project to ensure focus on forced labor victims. At the time of the evaluation the Bridge team was undertaking an on-the-ground assessments to better understand realistic training options that would adapt to the profile of the target population (low level of studies, no land, little experience outside agriculture and significant psychological barriers), for example, honey farming.

In **Peru** the project has participated in a long process to design a proposed intervention making use of an existing government fund called FONDOEMPLEO which would be used to support target population so that they can access existing livelihood programmes of the government. victims of forced labor are not normally able to access these programmes because they lack sufficient schooling and due to their psychological trauma. The support proposed would include psychological support and sufficient basic training (relevant to the specific skill they are looking to train in, for example sufficient understanding of math or reading to be able to take the course) so that they may meet the minimum requirements, although as part of the deal they would get a “special pass” of sorts so that the standard for eligibility would be lower for them, addressing a key barrier to entry. Another innovative element is a long interview process in the selection of the participants to ensure that those included in the process will be following through and not abandon mid-way. Lastly, ILO is supporting the design of this pilot but would not be implementing it, only supporting its monitoring to ensure quality, as such, the project -should this programme be confirmed- would have been able to leverage an estimated one million dollars for the implementation of this pilot in Peru.

At the time of the evaluation, with only Nepal having begun the IO5 activities, it was too early to assess the key indicator, (Percentage of sampled individuals that apply the skills they learn from project training in their work during the year following training (OTC 7)). Further, given the delays with this activity, it is unclear if there will be sufficient time to assess this, but more importantly, the identified indicator does not measure the increase in livelihoods which is the project goal, only the use of the skill learned, as such, you could have participants that are (for example) sewing

³⁷ in partnership with two NGOs that targeted the beneficiaries, as initially envisioned in the PRODOC.

³⁸ Agence Nationale TADAMOUN pour la Lutte contre les séquelles de l'esclavage, l'insertion et la lutte contre la pauvreté

clothes but are not able to sell them, in this case the indicator would include them in the percentage as a measure of success, even though there would not be any positive change in their livelihoods, which is the project goal


KEQ 4: Efficiency

In this section we look at the extent that project resources were efficiently used towards project goals, if identified human resources were adequate, how the project is supported by the extensive ILO structure (regional office, HQ, etc.) and the existing M&E system.

To what extent have the project resources translated into outputs?

The project had a slow start due to the type of design which required for the detailed design of the project to take place after the award. As such, the full team was only in place in April 2016, to finalize the country level plans. Most stakeholders consider the effective implementation start of the project to be the end of 2016, which is also when the project management was in transition (see figure 1)³⁹.

Figure 1: project timeline



The project began with a budget of \$9,800,000, increased in December 2015 to 11,498,138 USD and through revisions and expansions to the current final amount of \$14,395,138 at the time of the evaluation, with a reported average financial delivery of 30%⁴⁰ (end of 2017). In effect this measures a little over one year of implementation, with nearly two more years expected until the scheduled end of the project, as such, it is deemed adequate and in line with the normal lifecycle of a project, with an expected slower delivery rate at the beginning when the project is in the startup phase.

In terms of timing, the project officially began in September 2015, however, due to the nature of the award modality, this meant that the first year of implementation for the most part focused on setting up the project, meaning undertaking the inception missions, developing the work plans and hiring project staff, which was only fully in place by May 2016, and were needed on board before the project documents could be finalized. This together with the natural project lifecycle, whereby implementation is usually slower at the start, means the mid-term evaluation is in effect assessing

³⁹ Due to a change in the project director.

⁴⁰ These numbers exclude fixed costs for Nepal and yet to be verified by the financial department. FY16 MPGs

only the first year of implementation. The evaluation concludes it might have been more appropriate and effective to undertake the mid-term evaluation in mid 2018 as this would have provided a better understanding the actual progress and challenges, and with that the expectations, however, the evaluation also acknowledges that there is currently a discussion on a potential and partial no-cost extension, and as such, input from the scheduled MTE was strategic at this point, at the same time, for elements that will not be extended beyond the original timeline, a delay might have meant that the information came too late.

The project has an overall management structure based in Geneva with a Project manager, an M&E officer and administrative support. Management is mostly done bilaterally, although at least two team meetings have taken place (Lima and Washington DC) as well as regular remote team meetings. M&E of the project is fully done at this level, with countries and other elements reporting though the agreed formats on a biannual basis. Administrative management of Mauritania is also done from the central level, adding a layer of complexity to the work there, and causing some delays on the ground. In addition, there was a change in management with the initial project director beginning his new role in September 2016, and the new project director joining the project in April 2017, during this gap the director was functioning at partial basis. Project management has been further strained by the inclusion of new countries into the project, which require a level of focus (such as inception missions and drafting of program/budget) that takes away from being able to follow and support the ongoing elements. The project has undergone 9 modifications, each of which has required time from the management and away from focusing on the project implementation and monitoring. With the IO5 livelihoods element kicking in during the second half of the project, the evaluation predicts a greater need for M&E support to the countries will be needed, further straining the resources in Geneva. Overall the feedback from stakeholder's points to an important and much appreciated role of support and guidance provided by project management to the countries, but also the perception that the team in Geneva is sometimes overwhelmed, causing temporary "black outs" when there is limited feedback to countries. The Bridge project in Nepal established a Project Advisory Committee, at the time of the evaluation it had only met once, as such, it is not seen as an effective structure at the time being. At country level, the office structure includes one national programme coordinator (NPC) and one administrative assistant.

Table 2: Bridge budget distribution by country

Budget by Country	Total	% of total
Global Grand Total	6,478,028.71	45%
Malaysia Grand Total	1,441,245.94	10%
Mauritania Grand Total	2,360,798.86	16%
Nepal Grand Total	891,438.18	6%
Peru Grand Total	2,038,150.24	14%
Dominican Republic	299,380.00	2%
Niger	886,096.00	6%
GRAND TOTAL	14,395,137.94	

Table 3: Bridge Budget

BUDGET SUMMARY	US\$	% over output based activities	
		% of total	
IO.1 Increased knowledge, awareness, and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation	892,170	17%	6%
IO. 2: Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms	1,439,424	27%	10%
IO. 3 Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional, and global levels	1,968,225	37%	14%
IO. 4: Workers' and Employers' Organizations actively support the fight against forced labor	259,710	5%	2%
IO.5 Increased awareness and access to livelihood programs for victims of forced	746,800	14%	5%
SUB-TOTAL (Output-based activities)	5,306,329	100%	36.9%
SUB TOTAL Technical Support Costs	5,883,309		40.9%
SUB TOTAL (M&E)	942,800		6.5%
SUB TOTAL (Provision for Cost Increase (5%))	606,621.62		4.2%
SUB TOTAL -Programme Support Costs (13%)	1,656,077.82	13%	11.5%

The evaluation concludes that the project's effectiveness would benefit from strengthened management at Geneva level, as well as through support to the NPC's, freeing the former to focus on promoting learning (as well as responding to the increase in countries within the project) and the latter to focus on more substantive issues.

Support structures for the project at country level vary significantly with Peru sitting within the Sub regional Office for the Andean Countries and forming part of a thematic team, as such, benefitting from, and providing support to the overall goals of the office which has forced labor as a key goal. It has also received direct support from the ILO Regional office for Latin America and the Caribbean and benefits from the premises and logistics. In Nepal the Bridge sits within the country office and benefits from an internal incentive system which promotes cross-learning, as a result, increased interaction between the project and other country initiatives was observed, including joint monitoring missions and the like. In Mauritania there is currently only a project office, even administratively they require support for management from Geneva. No interaction with the regional office was reported for either Mauritania or Nepal.

The project functions to a great degree as group of smaller projects with a common goal but independent of each other. Even when the different elements coincide, for example with ITUC's work in Mauritania, it does so in a tangential manner, and not in line with the goals or timelines on the ground. As such, it is difficult to speak of an overall effectiveness, but needs to be looked at by element, (global and by country) and even then, there would be a need to differentiate at global level between the different elements. For example, all the work related to the research team and the surveys did not need a preparation time but has been slowed down by the delicate political nature of the products. Meanwhile the communications and awareness raising element has been running effectively from the start, as have the global elements related to the IO4. Most other products (guides, etc.) are delayed, it would appear at least in part due to slow responses from the team due the extensive amount of activities under their care, nevertheless are expected to finalize in time⁴¹. This independence of project element has an impact on efficiency as there are potential opportunities lost for synergies and for using project elements to strengthen and support ongoing processes, for example the case of Mauritania already mentioned.

At country level, there are significant differences with Peru; on one end, where the project is inserted within an existing strong structure of the ILO Regional and Andean office, and receives support from it, and with Mauritania at the other end, which has a project-based office with The Bridge project being the first project related to protection and administered from Geneva. These elements have an impact on the team's ability to deliver results and their efficiency. In Peru the project was able to hit the ground running, with a project staff who was already in place, familiar with the theme (having led the previous ILO-USDOL project on forced labor) and benefitting from the office's resources (offices, meeting rooms) as well as expertise (with the support from the M&E officer towards the design of the survey) and build on the existing ILO partnerships and contacts. In Mauritania, the lack of a ILO structure and the inexistence of previous projects related to protection of workers implied that relations, partnerships, procedures, expertise, etc. had to be established. In Peru the Bridge staff forms part of the ILO Andean office structure. This helps ensure alignment (forced labor is one of the 10 themes covered by the office), however, there appeared to be no synergies between the Bridge and other ongoing projects, this is in contrast with Nepal where there was a concerted effort to create synergies between projects, including joint monitoring mission and comprehensive inputs (for example for the Human Trafficking Control act) with an office-wide response, similarly, joint work with other UN agencies was observed in Nepal, where as a result of the Bridge there is now plan to undertake a joint study on child labor in the brick industry with UNICEF, and in Mauritania where there has been joint work with the office of Human Rights. The Bridge project in Peru, however, has managed to leverage significant national resources both within the ILO sub-regional office, as well as from National counterparts. Resources have also been leveraged at the global level sometimes through cost sharing for the event in Argentina, while another even undertaken to promote the 50 for Freedom Campaign undertaken in Spain was fully funded. Similarly, the project makes use of ILO's extended networks and expertise at both global and country level, some of the ILO staff that are linked to the project although not funded by it.

The country context has also had an impact on the teams' efficiency, in Peru and Nepal there is clear alignment between the project and the official goal of the national partners, in Mauritania while theoretical alignment exists achieving consensus and progress has proven more challenging.

⁴¹ Presentation of the IPU guide was scheduled for March and will likely be delayed to October.

Higher than normal levels of rotation of government staff in all three countries has also had a negative impact on the project's ability to move forward.

One key element in terms of efficiency observed by the evaluation team was the ability to create meaningful and strategic partnerships, for example in Peru the ILO was credited with providing not only technical expertise -as expected- to the National Commission against Forced Labor, but also providing it with continuity in a context of insecurity and constant change. Similarly, in Nepal the project set up the Forced Labor Elimination Advocacy Group (FLEAG) which is essentially a network of key stakeholders that advocate against Forced Labor brought together under one umbrella to facilitate coordination, synergies and prioritization of goals. In Mauritania having partnered with the Mayor's associations, perceived as many as pursuing a policy of denying the existence of slaves, is seen as a key ally to ensure reach at community level in terms of advocacy and awareness raising.

In terms of strategic and unconventional allies, the project has reached out to various companies for support in reaching a wider audience with its message, these range from Disney to renown actors who act as ambassadors (at global level, Geneva), the land transport authorities in Peru, and the Mayor's association in Mauritania stand out as some of the most significant. The transport authority in Peru showed that they are in a unique position to identify trafficking, with trained inspectors having reported at least ten instances since training less than two months ago, and the project's ability to bring on board the Mayor's association which is close to the people, initially reticent to acknowledgement of slavery, are now advocates for the project. The evaluation team also observed a great degree of participation and inclusion between the project implementers and the partners when deciding what the final activities would look like. This was commended by partners in many instances and helps to strengthened relevance as well as ownership and ultimately sustainability. Another example of innovative alliances is in Peru with the peace judges who, while not judges per se, are the de facto adjudicators of justice in much of the country where there is little to none state presence.

The project created a Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) which sets out the entire monitoring strategy, including identification of indicators as well as an evaluation plan. Reporting and monitoring forms were developed. This is a substantive M&E system which is fed into by the NPCs but relies on one staff based in Geneva to do oversight and analysis. Overall, it was observed that data was reported biannually through the TPRs and annually through the CMEP requirement, however, it very much comes across as an upward reporting mechanism rather than a management tool. While stakeholders reported it was useful to do this exercise, there does not seem to be a systematic approach for using the reporting as mechanisms to strengthen management and correct actions. There is no formal space for cross learning, although regular remote calls were reported the information collected is available to all. A more in-depth analysis of the indicators highlights that for the most part they are SMART and able to provide insight, for example *OTC 7. Percentage of sampled individuals that apply the skills they learn from project training in their work during the year following training*. However, while some are smart these are not results oriented. For example, *OTP 1. Number of attendees at Regional and Global Awareness events*. There also appears to be a significant divergence in some instances in regard to the initial targets and actuals, for example, i.e. *OTC 1. Number of people registered on 50 for Freedom platform target of 2,500, actual is over 24,000*. The evaluators view the proposed revision as an opportunity to better align expectations with reality, in some instances this might mean increasing

the targets while in others decreasing, this revision however will help provide a more realistic expectation allowing the CMEP to continue to be a source of monitoring.

Providing increase support to Geneva level management would free up resources to strengthen the learning element in M&E, for example, by documenting learning experiences in a brief form for consumption of the rest of the project; through video conferences on specific subjects; or supporting bilateral links between different parts of the project when there is opportunity for cross-learning.

KEQ5: Potential impact:

Is there any indication that the project interventions will have positive high-level changes for the ultimate intended beneficiaries?

As mentioned earlier, the evaluation comes effectively a year after the start of project implementation, as such, it is early to expect to be seeing high level impact results, however, the evaluation team was able to observe some higher-level results that went beyond the project outcomes and that we expect have the potential to have a long lasting important effect as well as opportunities for the programme. One important example of a high-level result with great potential for long-term impact is the project's support to secure the passing of the Decree to make forced labor a crime in Peru. In the case of Nepal, the forced labor survey has been incorporated to the country's regular survey, as such, there will now be data on forced labor collected regularly to inform policy making going forward, as well as staff trained to collect this data and, by the end of the project, staff trained to interpret the data, as the Government has already requested assistance from ILO to learn how to do this. There was also an awareness raising event held in Kaiffa-Mauritania which was lauded by most stakeholders as being eye opening, and part of the overall effort to create spaces for dialogue between partners that do not generally meet, including government and civil society. All pilot countries within the scope of the evaluation have provided important support to the revision of existing legislation for better alignment with international legislation and the Protocol in particular.

In addition to all this, the project has gone to great lengths to strengthen institutional capacity promoting greater awareness and understanding on forced labor amongst different stakeholders, while at the same time providing a wide range of tools such as manuals, guides, information brochures, teaching guides (*tutorías*), as well as information material (as described in section one) ultimately the project's work is helping to strengthen stakeholders' ability to prevent forced labor, as well as identify and reintegrate victims, and prosecute those involved in the exploitation. These efforts are undermined by the high-level of rotation at the political level, as such, institutionalization of these training efforts will be key to ensure a systematized and sustainable capacity building going forward, as well as bringing on board new allies, for example in Peru there are currently no NGOs working on forced labor, however, the project reached out to other NGOs and one specifically working with refugees made them realize how some of their practices were putting their beneficiaries at risk.

There is expectation that the project will have positive impact at various levels, from the highest international level linked to ratification of the Protocol, at national level through revision and

alignment of legislation, to the ground level through initiatives such as the training of peace judges in Peru who will be able to reach the most remote areas, through tutorías in schools, in bus stations through the work with SUTRAN or with more events in line with the celebration Kaiffa and the work with the mayors who are able to reach remote populations throughout Mauritania.

Overall, the project should leave the countries and global level partners with a better understanding of what forced labor is. Another achievement of the program is having been able to reach beyond the usual constituents of ILO to reach and create awareness with a larger audience.

KEQ 6: Sustainability

How likely is it that benefits of the project interventions will continue to benefit intended beneficiaries after the project lifespan?

The project's sustainability strategy, as stated in the PRODOC, focuses on creating outputs and outcomes that are inherently sustainable, such as enhancing the capacity of local actors (including training), creation of tools, (guides, manuals, etc.), provision of evidence (studies, mapping, surveys) as well as promoting participatory approaches that promote ownership. The evaluation team was able to confirm widespread ongoing efforts to address all the points stated, with particular emphasis on the participatory approach. The evaluation team notes that institutionalization of training, which had been secured in some instances, as well as ensuring that good enough trainer of trainers are in place for high-quality replication is a pre requirement for this to be true. As such, institutionalization, identification of good TOTs and key allies that have an internal motivation for continued training (for example, unions) will need to be part of the projects exit strategy during the second half of the project.

The research planned for each country combined with the communication and dissemination activities will improve awareness of the problem and enhance the local knowledge on forced labor. In the countries where a survey or a study will be carried out, the results will serve as a starting point for allowing for the measurement of progress long after the end of the project, especially true in the case of Nepal where the forced labor survey is being collected as part of the labor force survey.

The creation of agreed forced labor indicators has helped position ILO in this sector and will also have a sustainable impact over time, serving as reference going forward and providing for a common agreed standard.

It should also be noted that some of the outputs are not intended to be sustainable, for example, the 50 For Freedom campaign. Other initiatives such as the Global Business Network will rely on alternate mechanisms, such as need co-sponsors or paying membership, in order for them to be sustainable.

In terms of Intermediate Objective 4, the project has come to support an ongoing process which is fully expected to continue once the project is over. In terms of the livelihood component, the project aims to illustrate what works, what does not, and what can be considered scalable and/or replicable, as such, it is necessary to ensure that the project is able to go beyond the training phase

to make this assessment and document the factors that played a role in the success and failures in the learning process.

Ultimately, the countries that ratify the protocol will then be obliged to continue supporting the project goals and implementing the Protocol's recommendations.

However, many stakeholders highlighted the need for the project to be the first step in a long process. As a complex and multilayered problem, many stakeholders felt that change could not be expected in such a short space of time, and that a longer-term commitment would be necessary in order to achieve significant progress.

CONCLUSIONS

A lot of the work of the project is politically sensitive and dependent on context, as such, ILO's ability to deliver will depend on the political appetite and contextual dynamics which may change over the life of the project. Identifying "allies" or champions who can help move the process forward is key. Current political instability in the three priority countries covered by this evaluation hampered progress in this area due to the 1) more than usual rotation of political partners and operators in charge of implementing the laws linked to the prevention and sanction of forced labor; 2) deviated focus away from project activities and 3) led to changes in the government stance vis a vis project goals. However, contextual changes have also provided opportunities going forward, the mid-term evaluation recommended review is an opportunity to incorporate these opportunities.

The evaluation concludes that the sole source award based on agreed goals followed by an extended inception phase is an effective mechanism to ensure overall coherence while allowing enough flexibility for adapting to the national context, ensuring the project design is both relevant and realistic. There is clear alignment between the project and ILO's mandate and the SDGs (8 and 8.7 in particular), as well as SDG 1 (the poorest of the poor) and SDG 10 (towards reducing inequalities). However, this methodology is time-intensive and needs to be considered when designing a program, for example, if this initial period is accounted for adequately the mid-term evaluation should have taken place later in time.

While there is thematic coherence, implementation is more dispersed with the work in countries, at global level and by the ITUC functioning independently. This allows for increased relevance and coherence but increases demands on the management team which needs increased resources to be able to promote cross-learning and the identification of synergies between these different layers. Currently most partners lack an understanding of the overall project and where they fit within it, again leading to inefficiencies or opportunity loss, for example, the fact that Nepal could have been included as part of the ITUC IO4 strengthening the Bridge's work and impact in that country.

The need for sequential order between the different intermediate objectives and activities: there is a need to establish an understanding of the reality and the needs through research and mapping, before you can effectively start to do awareness raising and before a livelihoods component can be adequately designed, similarly, in order for these initiatives to be effective, there is a process of

securing ownership and buy-in from key partners that is time consuming. Given this need for sequencing, the project's lifetime of effectively 3 years, may limit its ability to follow through the livelihoods component to the final stage, at least 6 months after completion, to assess its effectiveness. Similarly, global level products were intended to be tested at country level, at the time of the evaluation as most were still being finalized these products had not yet had a chance to be tested at country level, and Bridge participating countries may not be prioritized for piloting.

The project activities sometimes highlight gaps and needs that fall outside its planned objectives, for example, the work with SUTRAN in Peru led to the understanding that if supervisors etc. were going to be playing a role in the identification of victims, there needs to be a bigger presence of police and protection mechanisms for both the victims and the supervisors, on site. In order to be effective, the project needs to advocate for these gaps to be addressed, even if they fall outside the initial objectives (this is linked to Recommendation #1)

The project needs to look at quality and sustainability of capacity building initiatives, this is especially true given the high level of rotation on the government side, if capacity building initiatives are not somehow institutionalized in a manner that can ensure quality replication going forward, the positive impact of the project's efforts in this area may be short lived. Institutionalization of training and providing TOTs before the end of the project will be key elements for this to have a lasting effect (linked to Recommendation #4)

Generally speaking, while the project clearly identified ways to reach minorities and the most vulnerable, it does not adequately consider the specific barriers and needs and how they differ for men and women. (linked to Recommendation #5)

Awareness raising has been done successfully across the different elements of the project through innovative mechanisms. In addition to creating information and guides, the project has helped promote spaces for dialogue such as the Celebration of the first Antislavery Day in Kaiffa, which can have a significant impact going forward. While the project's contribution towards the ratification of the Protocol is difficult to measure, it can be stated that it has helped the efforts to build momentum around its launch ensuring its relevance in the international arena.

Ratification of the Protocol exceeded project goals, however caution should be taken when using ratification as an indicator, as it does not automatically guarantee effective compliance.

Some of the key achievements of the project include the introduction of forced labor as a crime in Peru and the inclusion of forced labor in the Nepal Labor Force Survey. If the proposed and piloted methods on how to measure forced and bonded labor, if adopted in October of 2018 this will be a significant contribution of the project.

At the time of the evaluation only Nepal had begun implementing the livelihoods component and was shedding light to many of the challenges that will be encountered when implementing this kind of complex exercise. The learning from this initiative can be applied to the other countries, which have also had a process of learning in the course of developing their own livelihoods element. It is likely that the project will have many lessons learned that should be documented and shared with other countries seeking to implement this element of the Protocol. It will be key to

measure success of this element in regard to the rehabilitation of victims in terms of their employability and earning opportunities. (linked to Recommendation #6)

The evaluation concludes that the initial management structures are not sufficient given the changes in the programme, mainly the significant increase in the number of countries and the need to provide administrative support to Mauritania from HQ. These activities have taken resources away from the learning element of M&E and weakening the ability to support the countries at times. Similarly, while staff structure is good at country level, in the case of Nepal there may be a need for increased support from HQ in order to respond to new opportunities. (linked to Recommendation #2 and #3)

On the whole, progress of the project has been adequate and consistent with the project lifecycle. There are however some significant changes to the project (number of countries) and to the context in those countries which in some instances has hampered progress and in other opened new opportunities. Ensuring adequate staffing, planning, resources and means to measure progress will be key going forward (linked to Recommendation #3).

Overall the project is achieving its goal of helping ILO lead in the fight against forced labor while promoting awareness and the incorporation of the Protocol into national dialogue and legislation (when possible).

LESSONS LEARNED and GOOD PRACTICES

This section looks at emerging good practices and lessons learned observed. Given that the project has in effect only been implementing for one year, for the most part the results (a key element of the definition⁴² of a good practice) are still not evident. The same can be said about lessons learned, which require a more sustained implementation time to be considered as such⁴³, however, the mid-term evaluation has sought to highlight what could over time amount to good practices so that they can be monitored and -if they develop as expected, documented and disseminated for learning and replication.

Lessons Learned

- **Substantive change in behaviour and belief is slow and requires slow process which needs to be accounted for**, the project seeks to make significant changes into long-established and culturally accepted practices that are often beneficial for those in power. In this case the original lifespan of the project is four years, however, with the time required to set up the project, the implementation time of the project is reduced to 3 years, and in some countries the changes in the environment have not been positive towards project goals. These processes which are slow and required significant consistent action and advocacy to ensure buy in and sustainable/

⁴² **Good Practices** are well documented and assessed programming practices that provide evidence of success/impact and which are valuable for replication, scaling up and further study. They are generally based on similar experiences from different countries and contexts.

⁴³ **Lessons Learned** are more detailed reactions on a particular programme or operation and extraction of lessons learned through its implementation. These lessons may be positive (successes) or negative (failures). Lessons learned have undergone a wider review than innovations and have often been implemented over a longer time frame.

- meaningful change. It is important to have a way to measure progress in these processes not only to acknowledge the work of the team, but also to understand what has been achieved and how it can be built on.
- **Language can play a key role** for example, the 50 For Freedom online platforms is available in a variety of languages. At the time of the evaluation Brazilian Portuguese speakers were the largest consumers of the content, this might not have happened if it had not been made available in Portuguese, in spite of the fact that it is a fairly minor language worldwide. Similarly, in Paraguay it was reported that this was the first time that discussions and reports were being done in indigenous languages, which was highly appreciated by the counterparts.
 - **Importance of including protection mechanisms** to surround and support the work of the project. This was made evident in Peru where after the project begun working with transport authorities training bus drivers and personnel in the bus stations, these found themselves in situations of danger after identifying and intervening to protect someone that was being trafficked for forced labor. The need for immediate protection for the person identified was also made evident. Similarly, also in Peru, advocacy against forced labor practices in mines in Peru had put advocates lives in danger.
 - **Importance of sequencing:** Activities within the project design need to be sequence adequately, for example at country level, there was a need to first take stock (qualitative studies) advocate for support, create awareness etc. Only then can you begin working on statistics and designing the livelihoods element (IO5) when you are certain that the key implementers are aware and fully understand the principles of the Protocol before going forward)

Good practices

- **The sole source award**, where by the project is awarded on the basis of key common agreed goals (in this case the intermediate objectives), and then developed in conjunction with the staff that will be implementing the project, the donor and the national counterparts is seen as a good practices which strengthens relevance and ownership of the process while ensuring thematic coherence.
- **The work undertaken with peace judges** is a good practice and an innovative mechanism of ensuring wider reach at ground level. While peace judges are not per se judges, they are the de-facto administrators of justice in remote regions of Peru. Further strengthening this practice reaching approval of the "Directive" for intervention and the role of peace judges on forced labor, based on the technical assistance provided to the Judiciary through the National Office of Justice of Peace (ONAJUP). The aforementioned standard establishes rules and criteria that regulate the performance of peace judges in cases allegedly related to forced labor, guiding their actions at different levels such as awareness raising, prevention and coordination with other authorities of the ordinary justice system and of their special jurisdiction.
- **Creation of spaces for dialogue** One particularly successful experience was the event organized on March on 6, 2017 in Kaiffa together with the Association of Mayors in celebration

the first national day against slavery. This event brought together a wide range of stakeholders that don't often have the opportunity to interact. This was highlighted as a useful and appreciated experience by almost every stakeholder interviewed. It opened up a space for dialogue and exchange of both perspectives and challenges. Often highlighted was the intervention of the judge of the special court, who helped others realize the challenges faced by the special court which counts with inadequate resources for its intended functions⁴⁴. This event was further strengthened by the realization of an awareness rising event the previous evening, 5th March, open to the public.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents recommendations which aim to help increase effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the Bridge project. Some country specific recommendations have also been provided during the in-country validation workshops. The recommendations identify don't necessarily stem linearly from one particularly finding or questions, but rather from the overall triangulation and analysis of the data collected which has helped to shed light on the gaps and weaknesses. analysis of the different findings.

1. **Adjust project outputs and resources (Level of priority: high / Resource implications: low / Timeframe: short):** Due to the significant changes in the environment in some of the pilot countries, and as described in the text of this document, some of the activities are significantly behind schedule while others are no longer as relevant or feasible. At the same time and due to the changes and lessons learned new opportunities have risen which are not part of the current project. For these reasons the evaluation recommends that the ILO team in close collaboration with the USDOL focal points revise and adjust project goals (outputs) and redistribute resources taking into account findings, lessons learned and changes in the operating context in order to maximise potential for sustained impact. As a result, we would expect shifts of funds but also in prioritisation. While overall goals would remain the same, some of the activities may shift to what is now seen as a more effective and realistic way to achieve that goal. The funds attached to that activity may need to be revised accordingly, requiring increased funds or liberating funds for other activities. This should not be seen as a redraft of the document, but remain focused on the areas identified for revision in this report. The ultimate objective of this revision ultimately is to adjust goals and resources with the view of achieving maximum impact in the time remaining. (linked to finding #5)
 - Where delays in progress are significant, identify a critical pathway and intermediate goals allowing the project to better monitor and track progress, for example, for the survey in Mauritania and the livelihoods component in Peru.
 - Consider reallocation of program resources and increased HQ support to take advantage of emerging opportunities for example, stemming from the current process of decentralization in

⁴⁴ This is not a conclusion of the evaluation but rather reflects the views of the judges.

Nepal, which provides a window to integrate the recommendations of the protocol into local level legislation.

- USDOL should consider a no-cost extension of the Mauritania component so that it has the time reap results of investment (initially estimated for implementation). Other specific areas or activities may require similar extensions.
2. **Strengthen management of Bridge** by increasing staff capacity at Geneva level to free up resources for learning, a key part of M&E, and to accommodate for the increased demands stemming from the increased number of countries, the support for Mauritania and the expected increased requirements monitoring IO5 will require during the second half of the project. **(Level of priority: high / Resource implications: high /Timeframe: medium)**
 3. **Strengthen M&E (Level of priority: medium / Resource implications: low /Timeframe: medium)**
 - Indicators: The report describes the importance of process in order to arrive to the final goals, and how these can be slow, cumbersome but also very important to guarantee sustainability, ownership and relevance: i) for long term processes, it will be important to incorporate indicators that are better able monitor progress (in addition to goal), ii) identify results indicators where currently there is only measurement of output (for example, ofr IO5 currently there is no indicator that measures increase in the livelihoods as a result of the training, which is the ultimate goal/result); iii) Incorporate changes to the expected deliverables resulting from the changes on the ground (for example, the case of IO5 in Peru where the Bridge will not be part of the implementation, achievement needs to be measured differently).
 - Revise existing reporting mechanisms to promote learning: In line with the recommendation #2, the project should strengthen the learning potential of the M&E element by revising existing mechanisms and ensuring that the information loop does not go in only one direction (reporting) but that there are mechanisms and instances (which can be virtual) that promote reflection and cross learning.
 4. **Capacity building (Level of priority:medium / Resource implications: low /Timeframe: medium):**

To strengthen the project's sustainability, start or continue the process of institutionalizing capacity building initiatives and strategic partners for replication. Similarly, identify sustainable formats for other outputs (such as the media toolkit, FLEAG, GSO).

 - All Bridge partner governments:
 - Commit to avoid rotation of staff trained by the Bridge and promote means for institutionalisation of Bridge training by incorporating forced labor into national curriculums for (for example) judges, police, prosecutors, etc.
 - Identify and train actors able to and committed to replication (eg unions, academia, municipalities, etc.)
 - Jointly with ILO support the creation of a pool of trainers (multiplier effect)
 - Government of Peru:

- The next 1-2 years will be decisive to ensure the adequate application of the new Decree, the evaluation team recommends increased training of Judges and prosecutors to guarantee adequate and successful implementation of the Decree through identification, prosecution and conviction of
 - Training and use civil society networks, especially those already working on trafficking, as a means to reach the most vulnerable and ensure sustainability
 - Academia in partner countries: seek ways to incorporate training on forced labor into relevant national curriculum. Promote its inclusion into national debate forums
5. **Strengthen the gender element of the project (Level of priority: medium / Resource implications: medium /Timeframe: medium).** This goes beyond looking at participation (number of women, for example), and beyond looking only at women towards a more substantive gender-sensitive approach which helps sensitise implementers and counterparts to cultural biases that may hamper the identification of forced labor (for example) including case studies used for analysis and discussion during training that deal with gender related cultural biases.
- Bridge Peru: Incorporate the Union of domestic workers ONAMIAP into the regular discussion of the *Comisión Multisectorial de Trabajo Forzado* processes so that the female perspective, and in particular that of the domestic worker, is included into the national policy discussions; including case studies in training exercises that highlight cultural biases
 - Government of Peru: support further training on forced labor with a focus on training female judges of peace
6. **Incorporate key lessons learned learnings from livelihoods experience in Nepal** in experiences going forward and into the design of IO5 in the other countries (**Level of priority: medium / Resource implications: low /Timeframe: short**):
- Clear eligibility and selection criteria: Need for clear beneficiary eligibility criteria which takes into account vulnerability, the context and the need for empowerment and psychosocial rehabilitation of the victims of FL, as well as the inclusion of mechanisms in place to monitor that these are applied
 - Clear post-training strategy: Need to identify a clear that leads from training to actual increase in livelihood, this may include: i) Identification of a minimum package needed (i.e. tools, goats, seed money, etc.) that will be needed to set up a business post training; ii) Provision of technical support for some time after the training; iii) Linkage to higher level training or on-the job training opportunities; iv) Importance to incorporate empowerment as part of the service Provided to address psychosocial barriers stemming from abuse or from belonging to a discriminated group; v) Provide for long-term monitoring that goes beyond output (training) to be able to measure results (increased livelihoods/outcome). Assess percentage of beneficiaries who are able to secure better livelihoods as a result of the training and analyse the factors that promoted or hindered success. (RBM)
 - Employers: align with the Bridge to promote support training on the job initiatives or mentoring that helps trainees link training to livelihoods, (for example in Nepal Include freed Haliya entrepreneurs in one district one product programme of)

- Unions: support victims of forced labor post training (for example in Nepal support freed Haliya in receiving training in trade schools organized by Trade Unions and Employers Organizations).

ANNEXES

Annex I: Evaluation Timeline

Activity	Date	Delays
Initial kick off meeting	Nov 6, 2017	
Technical briefing	Dec 7, 2017	
Desk Review	Dec 10, 2017- Feb 16, 2018	
Inception Report	January 5	
Data collection	Jan 13- March 8	
Bridge Team presentation	March 13	
Zero draft, limited distribution*	March 13	
Comments to Zero Draft	March 20	
Draft Report	March 30	
Comments to draft Report	April 17	
Consolidated Comments to consultant	April 25	May 8
Draft 2	May 30	
Draft 3	June 5	
Comments from USDOL	June 8	June 22
Final Report	May 4	July 6

* Additional work incorporated after the start of the project in red 3

Annex II: Key Evaluation Questions

The final six key evaluation questions which will be answered by the MTR for global or country activities are:

KEQ1. Validity of design: Is the project design adequate to achieve the intended goals?

The sub questions identified for this question are:

- To what extent is the underlying theory of change (or results framework) and its assumptions still valid to achieve the project goals (mainly to support what the Protocol and Recommendation call for)? What adjustments could be made in the project objectives and strategy to strengthen the project?
- Has the project successfully contextualized the global project strategy to the country context and priorities, taking into consideration national capacity, legal framework and availability of data?
- Are gender issues well integrated into the project document, CMEP and the countries' Scopes of Work? Does it take into account minorities and other particularly vulnerable groups? / Did the project adequately consider the gender dimension on the interventions design and how?

KEQ2. Relevance and strategic fit: Was the project's strategy appropriate and relevant for addressing forced labor efforts at the national and global levels?

This question talks about alignment, the sub questions identified for this question are:

- Were the needs of forced labor victims fully taken into account while designing the interventions?
- To what extent were national relevant stakeholders, including government, employers' and workers' organizations, as well as beneficiaries (e.g. victims of forced labor), consulted and involved in the design and prioritization of the project interventions?
- Is the project aligned with the ILO strategic objectives and policy outcomes; existing ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs); United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs); SDGs, other national development frameworks; and, existing government initiatives?

KEQ3. Effectiveness: To what degree is the project successfully achieving the desired results?

The sub questions identified for this question are:

- Is the project accomplishing its planned results as expected at global and country levels? (discuss according to each intermediate objective) specifically, is the project helping to promote ratification and/or implementation of the protocol
- What factors, internal and external to the project, are contributing or hindering these successes?
- What changes may be needed to improve project delivery?

KEQ4. Efficiency: To what extent have the project resources translated into results?

The sub questions identified for this question are:

- Is the project progressing in a timely manner?
- How effectively is the project collaborating with constituents and implementing partners?

- What are the main challenges the project has faced during implementation and what efforts have been made to overcome these challenges?
- Are the human and financial resources designated to the project adequate to carry out the project activities effectively and with high level of quality?
- Are resources aligned with the needs of the project? Is there a need to review the project strategy or intervention level taking into account the available resources?
- How are ILO HQ, country and regional offices contributing to project implementation?
- How is the project using monitoring data to inform learning and better project implementation?
- How are the roles and responsibilities of ILO country staff and Bridge staff delineated in priority countries? What is the contribution of ILO's ROs to project implementation?

KEQ5. Potential impact: Is there any indication that the project interventions will have positive high-level changes for the ultimate intended beneficiaries?

The sub questions identified for this question are:

- From the evidence available, are there any indications of positive impact resulting from the project interventions at local, national and global levels?
- To what extent has the project strengthened the institutional capacity (service and policy) of ILO tripartite constituents in eliminating forced labor?

KEQ6. Sustainability: How likely is it that benefits of the project interventions will to continue to benefit intended beneficiaries after the project lifespan?

The sub questions identified for this question are:

- Is the project leveraging national and regional commitment and resources to address the forced labor issue?
- Is there a phase out strategy developed and has it been started being implemented in order to promote project sustainability?
- What is the likelihood that the project models of intervention and outcomes will be replicated or scaled up by national partners or other actors by the end of the project?
- Which interventions are most likely to be sustainable and/or transferable to the communities or relevant institutions when the project ends (e.g., interventions for livelihood or vocational training solutions)?

Annex III: Decreto 1323

DECRETO LEGISLATIVO 1323 “DECRETO LEGISLATIVO QUE FORTALECE LA LUCHA CONTRA EL FEMINICIDIO, LA VIOLENCIA FAMILIAR Y LA VIOLENCIA DE GÉNERO”

Cambios al tipo penal de Discriminación:

Redacción anterior	DL Nº 1323
<p>Artículo 323.- Discriminación e incitación a la discriminación</p> <p>El que, por sí o mediante terceros, discrimina a una o más personas o grupo de personas, o incita o promueve en forma pública actos discriminatorios, por motivo racial, religioso, sexual, de factor genético, filiación, edad, discapacidad, idioma, identidad étnica y cultural, indumentaria, opinión política o de cualquier índole, o condición económica, con el objeto de anular o menoscabar el reconocimiento, goce o ejercicio de los derechos de la persona, será reprimido con pena privativa de libertad no menor de dos años, ni mayor de tres o con prestación de servicios a la comunidad de sesenta a ciento veinte jornadas.</p> <p>Si el agente es funcionario o servidor público la pena será no menor de dos, ni mayor de cuatro años e inhabilitación conforme al numeral 2 del artículo 36.</p> <p>La misma pena privativa de libertad señalada en el párrafo anterior se impondrá si la discriminación, la incitación o promoción de actos discriminatorios se ha materializado mediante actos de violencia física o mental o a través de internet u otro medio análogo.</p>	<p>Artículo 323.- Discriminación e incitación a la discriminación</p> <p>El que, por sí o mediante terceros, <u>realiza actos de distinción, exclusión, restricción o preferencia que anulan o menoscaban el reconocimiento, goce o ejercicio de cualquier derecho de una persona o grupo de personas reconocido en la ley, la Constitución o en los tratados de derechos humanos de los cuales el Perú es parte, basados en</u> motivos raciales, religiosos, <u>nacionalidad</u>, edad, sexo, <u>orientación sexual, identidad de género</u>, idioma, religión, identidad étnica o cultural, opinión, <u>nivel socio económico, condición migratoria</u>, discapacidad, <u>condición de salud</u>, factor genético, filiación, <u>o cualquier otro motivo</u>, será reprimido con pena privativa de libertad no menor de dos ni mayor de tres años, o con prestación de servicios a la comunidad de sesenta a ciento veinte jornadas.</p> <p><u>Si el agente actúa en su calidad de servidor civil, o se realiza el hecho mediante actos de violencia física o mental o a través de internet u otro medio análogo, la pena es privativa de libertad no menor de dos ni mayor de cuatro años e inhabilitación conforme a los numerales 1 y 2 del artículo 36.</u></p>

Annex IV: Bridge Activities incorporated into the extended UNDAF in Mauritania

- Specific product 1.2.5 (2017): The OSC have the increased capacities for actively participating to the vulgarization of the international conventions and follow up recommendations on forced labor and child labor (convention 29 and protocol on forced labor, C150, C144,C138-182):
 - National Communication Campaign on convention no.29 and the protocol of 2014 on forced labor and similar practices to slavery (Bridge 1.1.2);(Media, trade unions, OSC)
 - Organization of discussion with the religious authorities and the development of training modules on law no 2014/031 in relation to C 29 and the protocol (Bridge 1.1.3);(Religious Associations, MAIEO,ENAMJ)

- Specific product 2.2.6 (2017): The ONS and the producers departments of the social data are able to collect, to deal with, analyze and distribute the break up statistic data on the consideration of forced labor among children and adults:
 - Realization of the statistical surveys on the prevalence of forced labor of children and adults on the base of the guidelines statistical indicators lines elaborated by ILO (Bridge 3.1.2.2),
 - Realization of a study on the recruitment mechanisms and the employments, and statistic investigation to define the different types of work, including the similar forms of the practice of slavery (Bridge 3.1.2.4).

- Specific product 2.6.3 new (2017): Administration is equipped the necessary skills for the increased application of labor legislation, including into the field of health and safety at work and in relation to child labor, forced labor and practices similar to slavery:
 - Training of labor inspectors and trade unions in the identification of cases of slavery in the sector of work or practices similar to slavery, especially domestic (Bridge 2.2.2.1);
 - The evaluation of the international roadmap against slavery with regards to aspects related to the world of work (Bridge 2.1.1.4)

- Specific product 3.1.6 (2017): The actors involved in the administration of justice in connection with the law 2015/ 031 have the texts and tools of application for the implementation of politics in connection with the forced labor and practices similar to slavery:
 - Development of the decrees about the application of law 2015/031 on the criminalization of washing and using slavery practices with the concerned actors(Bridge 2.1.1.3),(Special courts, judges , prosecutors, lawyers, dense forces, administrative authorities and municipals),
 - Production of equipment of information and training for a better implementation of the law number 037-2015 with special courts, prosecutors, judges ,lawyers of other actors in charge of judgments, security forces (National Guard Police Services) and administrative and municipal authorities (Bridge 2.2.1.1,2 and 3);
 - Development of a training module on the identification and proper management of judicial complaints of victims of forced labor and practices similar to slavery for the training of prosecutors, judges, lawyers and other partners (judges, prosecutors ,and lawyers).

- Specific Product 3.1.7 (2017): The OSCs of protection of the human rights and the organizations of labors in a framework of tools and working capacities to effectively represent the interests of vulnerable groups (the victims of forced labor and the similar practices of slavery) in front of justice:
- Translation and distribution of the law number 031/2105 on the criminalization of the slavery and repressing the slavery practices of the used languages in Mauritania(Bridge 2.1.1.2),(OSC, Unions);
- Production of a module on the treatment of complaint and training of civil organizations involved in the process of support and insertion of the victims as well as in the construction of their legal cases(Bridge 2.2.1.5),(OSC, Unions)

Annex V: List of persons interviewed

Nepal

- Bina Kunwar Thapa, Programme Officer, ILO Kathmandu Office
- Narayan Bhattarai, Project Coordinator, ILO Bridge Project
- Bharati Pokhrel, Project Coordinator, Work in Freedom Project, ILO Kathmandu Office
- Richard Howard, Director, Kathmandu ILO Office
- Shanker Thapa, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Land Reform and Management, Nepal
- Gopal Giri, Under Secretary, Ministry of Land Reform and Management, Nepal
- Roshani Karki, Under Secretary, Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare, Nepal
- Krishna Gyanwali, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Employment, Nepal
- Dilli Raj Joshi, Director, Household Survey Division, Central Bureau of Statistics, Nepal
- Nabin Lal Shrestha, Deputy Director General, Central Bureau of Statistics, Nepal
- Chet Bahadur Rokaya, Statistician, Central Bureau of Statistics, Nepal
- Writu Bhattarai, Office-in-Charge, Swatantrata Abhiyan, Lalitpur, Kathmandu
- Jitendra Jonchhein, Deputy General Secretary, General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions, Nepal
- Gopal Ghimire, Project Officer, General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions, Nepal
- Ram Mani Pokharel, Programme Officer, Nepal Trade Union Congress, Nepal
- Sujan Karki, Media Migration Officer, Nepal Trade Union Congress, Nepal
- Benu Maya Gurung, Coordinator, Alliance Against Trafficking of Women in Nepal, Kathmandu
- Prakash Shrestha, Coordinator, All Nepalese Trade Union Federation, Nepal
- Bhim Suwal, Freelance Consultant, Kathmandu
- Som Luitel, Freelance Consultant, Kathmandu
- Dependra Bhandari, Freelance Consultant, Kathmandu
- Milan Dharel, Freelance Consultant, Kathmandu
- Christopher Geoffrey, Economic and Political Officer, Embassy of the United States of America, Kathmandu
- Jaya Ram Nepali, Political Assistant, Embassy of the United States of America, Kathmandu
- Rajan Lohani, Project Coordinator, RHMS, Kanchanpur
- Aanada Bhatta, Consultant Monitor, ILO Bridge Project, Kanchanpur
- Kale B K, Coordinator, DHMS, Kanchanpur
- Faguni Chaudhary, Trainee - Carpentry, Krishnapur Municipality, Ward No. 2, Kanchanpur
- Deepak Kumal, Trainee - Carpentry, Krishnapur Municipality, Ward No. 2, Kanchanpur
- Ram Kumari Rana, Trainee – Carpentry, Krishnapur Municipality, Ward No. 2, Kanchanpur
- Lal Bir Sarki, President, Rastriya Haliya Mukta Samaj, Bajura
- Raju Ram Bhul, President, Rastriya Haliya Mukta Samaj Federation Nepal, , Dadeldhura
- Shibi Lohar, President, Rastriya Haliya Mukta Samaj, Kanchanpur
- Sanjeeb Khadka, Social Mobilizer, Under Privileged Children Education Programme, Nepal
- Surendra Orha, Bridge Project Coordinator, Human Resource Center, Bajura
- Rajan Lohani, Bridge Project Coordinator, RHMS Kanchanpur, Nepal
- Hari Singh Bohora, Executive Member, RMHSF-N, Dadeldhura

- Bharat Singh Dhama, Trainer, Goat Farming Training, HRC
- Pradeep Bista, Co-Trainer, Goat Farming, HRC
- Geeta Nepali, Trainee – Goat Farming, HRC
- Devaki Oddh, Trainee – Goat Farming, HRC

Geneva

- Mr. Ricardo Furman and
 - Mr. Peter Wichmand, Senior Evaluation Officer, FUNDAMENTALS Branch, Senior Evaluation Officer, EVAL
 - Mr. Stephen McClelland, Director, Bridge project (discussion during the inception phase, three during the collection phase)
 - Ms. Aurélie Hauchère-Vuong, Communication Officer, Bridge project Campaign and Advocacy Officer, Department of Communication and Public Information (DCOMM)
 - Mr. Remi Doherty, Monitoring and Database officer, Bridge project
 - FGD Research team, FUNDAMENTALS Branch: Ms. Michaelle De Cock, Mr. Federico Blanco, Mr. Gady Saiovici,
 - Ms. Jane Colombini, Communication Officer (Media guidelines)
 - Friday, 26 January 2018
 - Mr. Wade Bromely, Senior Technical Officer, ILO Global Business Network on Forced Labour & Human Trafficking
 - Mr. Akiyo Afouda, Human Rights Officer, Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU)
 - Mr. Houtan Homayounpour, Forced Labour Specialist and previous Director of the Bridge project
 - Mr. Taehohn Lee, Consultant – IPU guide
 - Mr. Jean-Maria Kagabo, Technical Officer (Forced labour specialist for Africa – supports the Bridge project with Niger and Mauritania)
 - Mr. Jeroen Beirnaert, Project Coordinator Forced Labour and Trafficking, International Trade Union Confederation, ITUC
 - Graciela Congo, secretaria de educacion, La Central Unitaria de Trabajadores Auténtica del Paraguay (CUT - A)

Mauritania

- Mr. Alassane Diakité, US Embassy in Nuakchott, Coordinator, Office of Grant Program
- Dieinaba Dia, US Embassy in Nuakchott, Assistant, Office of Grant Program
- Mr. Marc Niñerola, ILO Mauritania, Bridge MRT project coordinator
- Mr. Adama Dieng, Translation Service, Translator ENG-FR-Hassanya
- Mr. Mohamed Ansari Habaye, CAD Sahel, Manager Administrator of Design Office CAD Sahel
- Mr. Haimoud Ramdhane, Ministry of Justice, Mission Responsible nearby MJ
- Mr. Amadou Abdoul DIA, ILO, Consultant, legal advisor, expert in public administration
- Mr. Thomas Bradley, US Embassy in Nuakchott, Resident Legal Advisor

- Mr.Mohamedou Ould Ahmedou O. M'Haimid, TADAMOUN, National Program Coordinator"Tekavoul" the social transfers (Tadamoun)
- Mr.Rassoul Ould El Khal, CDHAH, Assistant Commisioner for Human Rights and Humanitarian Action
- Mr.Hamoud Ould T'FEIL Ould BOWBE, MFPTMA, General Director of Labor
- Mr.Mamadou SARR, FONADH, Executif Secretary of FONADH
- Platform of no State Actors
- Mme Aminetou Ely , Women Association of Family Leaders(AFCF), ThePresident of the Association
- Mr.Mohamed Bnejara, Association of integral Devlopment of Guidimalkha ADIG, President ADIG
- Focal Point CNDH Guidimakha
- Member of FONADH
- Mr.Mamadou Niang, ILO, Consultant on domestic work
- Mayors Association of Mauritania (AMM), Mayor of Ryad (Nouakchott)
- Mayors Association of Mauritania (AMM), Mayor of Chinguetti (Adrar)
- Mayors Association of Mauritania (AMM), Mayor of Selibaby (Guidimagha)
- Mayors Association of Mauritania (AMM), Mayor of Kiffa (Assaba)
- Mayors Association of Mauritania (AMM), Mayor of Akjoujt (Inchiri)
- Mayors Association of Mauritania (AMM), Mayor of Moudejeria (Tagant)
- Mr. Sid Ahmed Dellahi HMEIMED, Mayors Association of Mauritania (AMM)
- Mayor of Atar (Adrar)&
- The President of Mayors Network against SLAVERY (RMCE)
- Dethié SALL, High Commissariat of Human Right (HCDH), Advisor
- Isselmou Ould Meïmouh, Prime Minister, President of the continual committee of the road Map
- Sidya Hamdy, President NGO, Ancient Slave New Citizens (AENC)
- Moussa Gawi , President NGO, Mauritanian Association for Promoting Human Rights(AMPDH)
- Hawa Sidibé, president NGO, Association for Development for Human RightsPromoting(ADPDH)
- Me Ethman Yatma B'Neidjegue, Ministry of Justice, President of the Special Court of Nouakchott
- Me BA, Ministry of Justice, President of the Special Court of Néma
- Salimata LAM, SOS-SLAVE, Coordinator NGO
- Boubacar Ould Messaoud, SOS-SLAVE, President NGO

Peru

- Torres, Teresa, OIT, Coordinadora proyecto
- Guzmán, Gabriela , SUTRAN, Coordinadora
- Solórzano, Raúl , SUTRAN, Gerente Gerencia Prevención
- Balbín, Edgardo , MINTRA, Director General de Derechos Fundamentales
- Cáceres, Sylvia , MINTRA, Superintendenta SUNAFIL

- Serrano, Luis Alberto , MINTRA, Supervisor SUNAFIL
- Capcha, Rosa, MINTRA, Supervisora Inspectora SUNAFIL
- Weiner, Vivian, Poder Judicial, Asesora de la Oficina de Cooperación Internacional
- Delgado, Antonieta, Poder Judicial, Directora Oficina Cooperación Internacional
- López Wong, Rosario, Ministerio Público, Coordinadora Unidad de Víctimas y Testigos
- Meza, Fernando , Poder Judicial, Jefe Oficina Nacional de Justicia de Paz y Justicia Indígena ONAJUP
- Levaggi, Renato, Poder Judicial, Asesor consultor ONAJUP
- Coloma, José, Ministerio de Justicia, Vice Ministro de Derechos Humanos y acceso a Justicia
- Valencia, Ana María, Ministerio de Justicia, Representante ante CMNTF
- Rubio, Raisa, COMEX-CONFIEP, Representante empresarios ante CMNTF
- Gomez, Maybol, OIT, Consultora proyecto Bridge Instrumento medición personas en riesgo TF
- Sanz, Teodoro, OIT, Consultor proyecto Bridge evaluación y diseño Plan TF
- Sánchez Malaga, Armando, OIT, Consultor proyecto Bridge penalista y docente diploma
- Cárdenas, Carlos , OIT, Consultor Campañas comunicacionales
- Gómez, Ana, OIT, Consultora talleres jueces de paz indígenas
- Velazco, Julia, OIT, Consultora diseño Plan Nacional contra el TF
- Roberts, Jason, Embajada de los EEUU, Political Officer
- Burga, Cybele, OIT, Especialista Evaluación Oficina regional
- Rubio, Cesar, Red Encuentros, coordinador
- Vanhuhuynegem, Phillippe, OIT, Director Oficina Países Andinos
- Egusquiza, Paola, CATP, representante sindical ante comisión nacional contra el TF
- Del Castillo, Jesus, CGTP, representante sindical ante comisión nacional contra el TF
- Gomez, Lupe Lili, Defensoría Pública, Defensora
- Lima, José Luis, Defensoría Pública, Defensor
- Solis, Cristian, MININTER, Asesor Dirección General para la Seguridad Democrática
- Huerta, Miguel , MININTER, Director General para la Seguridad Democrática
- Fernandez, Gladys, Ministerio Público, Fiscal Superior titular Septima Fiscalía representante ante CNMTF
- Cárdenas, Raquel, Ministerio Público, Fiscal Penal alumna Diplomado
- Mena, Berenice, Poder Judicial, Asesora Secretaria Técnica contra trata y trabajo forzoso, comisión de género
- Sanz, Pilar, Fundación Friedrich Ebert, Directora de proyectos
- Casanove, Míryan, Orientadora, SUTRAN
- Cabrera, Tito, Orientador , SUTRAN
- Zea, Percy, Orientador, SUTRAN
- Vasquez, Luis , Orientador, SUTRAN
- Córdova, Carlos Antonio, Orientador, SUTRAN
- Cusirramos, Julio César, Orientador, SUTRAN
- Laura, Hugo, Orientador, SUTRAN

ILO

- Gunjan Dallacoti, Evaluation manager
- Mr. Stephen McClelland, Director, Bridge project
- Ousmane Cisse, Political Officer
- Thomas Bradley, Legal Advisor
- Briguite Poulsen, international consultant for the National Action Plan guide
- USDOL FGD
- Ms. Karrie Peterson (USDOL Bridge Project Manager)
- Ms. Margret Hower (USDOL Evaluation Specialist)
- Carolyn Huang (Managing Bridge Research Activities)
- Kristen Pancio (general M&E support, developed CMEP)

Remote Interviews


- US Mauritania
- Alassane Diakite-Program and Grants Coordinator; POC for the Bridge Program at the Embassy
- Andrew Byrley-Economic/Commercial Officer
- Dieynaba Dia-Program and Grants Deputy Coordinator; alternate POC for the Bridge Program at the Embassy.

Annex VI: Bibliography

- ILO policy Guidelines for results-based evaluations, second edition, ILO
- Bridge Project Pre-situational analysis
- Bridge PRODOC Final
- Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP)
- UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference and Inception Reports
- From Protocol to Practice: A Bridge to Global Action on Forced Labour (The Bridge Project), Nepal Fact Sheet, December 2016
- Project award
- Project Amendments 1 through 9
- Presentation Diagnostic Bridge
- Mapping of Livelihoods report, Bridge Mauritania
- Data reporting Forms
- www.fiftyforfreedom.org
- Fifty for freedom brochure
- MPG2016, USDOL Management Procedures and Guidelines for USDOL-ILO Cooperative Agreements , December 2016
- Partnership to end forced labor in Supply chains, Executive Summary, Berlin June 2017
- General Secretary, International Trade Union Confederation
- 2030 is too long to wait for freedom – how to end slavery today, Huffpost 9/19/2017 as seen https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/2030-is-too-long-to-wait-for-freedom-how-to-end-slavery_us_59c0d8c5e4b082fd4205b990?ncid=engmodushpimg00000004.
- Government of Nepal, 2002, Bonded Labour (Prohibition) Act -2002 Kathmandu
- National Planning Commission, 2016, 14th National Plan Kathmandu
- Government of Nepal, 2015, The Constitution of Nepal, Kathmandu
- ILO, 2013, Decent Work Country Programme Nepal 2013-2017, Kathmandu, YEAR, 2018-2022
- United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Nepal, Kathmandu
- Government of Nepal, 2017, Labour Act 2017, Kathmandu
- Government of Nepal, 2017, Labour Act 2017, Kathmandu
- ILO, 2015, ILO Bridge Project Document, Geneva
- Ministry of Land Reform and Management, 2016, Progress Report -2016, Kathmandu
- MAPPING OF ON-GOING LIVELIHOOD PROGRAMS FOR FREED-HALIYAS IN KANCHANPUR AND BAJURA, Bhim Raj Suwal. Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Feb 2

Annex VII: Theory of Change

Developed by the evaluation team



Annex VIII: Results Framework Tables

ILO BRIDGE PROJECT – NEPAL RESULTS FRAMEWORK TABLE			
Intermediate objectives	Planned Outputs	Key Outputs to date (January 2018)	Key Outcomes to date
IO 1 Increased knowledge, awareness, and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation;	1.1.2.2 Organize a national media campaign on least addressed forms of forced labor	Output 1.1.1 Communication strategy to promote the Protocol and Recommendation on FL at global and regional level implemented	No Outcomes till date under this output Production of media tools (a documentary film, a TV PSA and three radio PSA) to create awareness on forced labor in Nepal is under process and expected to complete by end of February 2018 (delayed by 3 months)
	1.1.3.4 Development of a joint advocacy platform and work plan	Output 1.1.2 Communication strategies on FL implemented at national level, with a focus on vulnerable groups	National Civic Conference organized and Formation of Forced Labor Elimination Advocacy Group (FLEAG) for advocacy and lobby
		Output 1.1.3 Key stakeholders informed on FL advocacy	

<p>IO 2 Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms;</p>	<p>2.1.1.5 Conduct mid-term review summarizing achievements, challenges and gaps of Anti-Trafficking National Action Plan</p> <p>2.1.1.6 Provide technical inputs to the Bonded Labor Act Implementation Guidelines (Regulations)</p> <p>2.2.1.6 Ensure access to justice for victims of forced labor and trafficking</p> <p>2.2.1.7 Adapt ILO-UNODC guidance material for “front line responders” on how to identify and file a case of forced labor under national legislation</p> <p>2.2.1.8 Conduct case study review with Access to Justice Commission and Foreign Employment Tribunal</p> <p>2.2.2.2 Conduct capacity building trainings for labor inspectors, special investigators from the</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1 Policies and/or integrated national action plans and/or legislations are drafted/ revised, and disseminated</p> <p>Output 2.2.1 Relevant officials and other stakeholders trained on law enforcement, prevention and victim assistance</p> <p>Output 2.2.2 Front line actors trained in the identification of FL cases and other relevant issues</p>	<p>Review of Anti-Trafficking National Action Plan (NAP) but Nepali version report is yet to be submitted. Inputs provided on revision of Kamaiya Labor Prohibition and Regulation Act</p> <p>No Outcomes so far under this Output</p> <p>No outcomes under this Output as well</p>
---	---	--	--

	Department of Foreign Employment and other law enforcement officials		
IO 3 Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional, and global levels;	<p>3.1.2.5 Strengthen government capacity to estimate figures on Forced Labor, Bonded Labor and Child Labor</p> <p>3.1.2.6 Conduct a national sectorial statistical survey to measure the prevalence of forced labor</p> <p>3.1.2.7 Rapid assessment through qualitative and quantitative research methods to unveil the scenario of bonded/forced labor situation in non-traditional sectors</p>	<p>Output 3.1.1 Guidelines on statistical indicators and survey methods on FL developed</p> <p>Output 3.1.2 Statistical surveys and/or other studies on FL are produced</p> <p>Output 3.1.3 Key stakeholders with improved access to information</p>	<p>Survey methods and questions were developed with CBS on FL</p> <p>NLFS-III to include Forced Labor Module and the survey is continuing. Expected to finish by end of September 2018</p> <p>No outcomes under this output so far.</p>
IO 4 Workers' and employers' organizations actively support the fight against forced labor; and	NONE IN CASE OF NEPAL	NONE IN CASE OF NEPAL	So far not applicable to Nepal as there is no any strategies to work with employers' and workers' organizations on FL in Nepal under the Project

<p>IO 5 Increased awareness and access to livelihood programs for victims of forced labor.</p>	<p>5.1.1.2 Mapping and field visits for existing livelihoods efforts</p> <p>5.1.2.2 Provide livelihood support to the victims of forced labor in Kanchanpur and Bajura</p>	<p>Output 5.1.1 Increased information available about services for victims of FL</p> <p>Output 5.1.2 Livelihood support provided to victims of FL</p>	<p>Orientation programme organized to partners and implementation agreement signed with Regional Free Haliya Mukta Samaj Nepal (RFHMS-N)</p> <p>Selection of Training implementation Partners and initiated three trainings (Tailoring, Carpenter, Massioner and Goat farming) based on criteria of target groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Holding identity cards of freed-Haliyas given by the government - Only one member from one family - Should be member of RMHSF-N - Women/Single women (widow) to get priority - Participants need to be within the reach of half-an hour's distance from the place of the training - If there are not enough participants in the list having ID cards of freed Haliya in the area, the other participants can be enrolled on need-basis and are to be verified by one government representative
---	--	---	--

ILO BRIDGE PROJECT – MAURITANIA RESULTS FRAMEWORK TABLE

Intermediate objectives	Planned Outputs	Key Outputs to date	Key Outcomes to date
<p>I.O.1 Increased knowledge, awareness, and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation;</p>	<p>Output 1.1.2 Communication strategies on forced labor implemented at national level, with a focus on reaching vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3 Key stakeholders informed on forced labor advocacy.</p>	<p>The project is developing a national strategy of communication for the key results in Mauritania. To this day a campaign of sensitization of the law 2015-031 "On the criminalization and repression of slavery activities" was organized by Bridge Project during the annual celebration event of fight against slavery in 2017 (Kiffa) and 2018 (Selibaby) .</p> <p>The project has signed a MOU with regional delegates of the Ministry of Islamic Affairs and Original Teaching (MAIEO) to organize roundtable discussions with religious and social leaders. A professor of the University of Nouakchott has been recruited to support discussions and write on the role of religious authorities to combat forced labour practices and the social and religious remnants of slavery.</p>	<p>Officials and civil society actors in two target regions are informed and sensitized on the law 031/2015 and the need to fight slavery practices and all forms of forced labor</p>

<p>I.O.2 Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms;</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1 Policies and/or integrated national action plans and/or legislations are drafted/ revised, and disseminated. Output 2.2.1 Relevant officials other stakeholders trained on law enforcement, prevention and victim assistance Output 2.2.2 Labor Inspectors, workers' and employers' organizations and other front-line actors trained in the identification of forced labor cases</p>	<p>The project has completed an assessment of training needs of members of the judiciary at the special court responsible for slavery-related crimes, as well as for the competent judicial bodies (ordinary prosecutor's offices, courts of appeal, etc.); the security forces (police, gendarmerie, and the National Guard); and mayors, administrative and municipal officials.</p> <p>The project has produced a training module in the area of enforcement of the Act criminalizing slavery and slavery-like practices. It will be used for the planned training sessions organized with the Ministry of Justice (MJ) and the Ministry of Interior (MI). Participants coming from the judiciary, the administration and the security forces will review and enrich the contents of the modules.</p>	<p>Government acknowledges the support of the Project in order to substantially raise awareness and train relevant officials and stakeholders around the fight against forced labor and slavery-like practices.</p>
<p>I.O.3 Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional, and global levels;</p>	<p>Output 3.1.2 Statistical surveys and/or other studies on forced labor are produced.</p>	<p>The Project organized in February 2018 a roundtable discussion on the typology of labor relations that may be more susceptible to forced labor in close coordination with the Minister of Labor. The aim was to achieve consensus on and support for the objectives and the scope of the planned qualitative study. The statistical study has not been discussed yet, although the project is still planning for it.</p>	<p>Ministry of Labour agrees to support the qualitative research and accepts to lead an inter-ministerial follow-up and coordination committee.</p>

<p>I.O.4 Workers' and employers' organizations actively support the fight against forced labor; and</p>		<p>In October 2016, the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) with the support of the project organized an international conference in Nouakchott on the fight against forced labor. Affiliates from Niger, Mauritania, Mali, Senegal and Burkina Faso were invited. A second workshop was organized in January 2018. The purpose was the assessment of progress and challenges based on the recommendations of the Committee on the Application of Standards (CAS) of the International Labour Conference of June 2017 on the follow up of Convention no. 029 on forced labor.</p>	<p>ITUC affiliates coordinate to fight forced labor in Mauritania and have agreed a set of recommendations to orient their respective action plans based on the conclusions of both meetings.</p>
<p>I.O.5 Increased awareness and access to livelihood programs for victims of forced labor.</p>	<p>Output 5.1.1 Increased information available about services for victims of forced labor</p>	<p>The project will wait for the results of the qualitative survey and the mapping exercise to determine the livelihood intervention.</p>	<p>The Tadamoun agency accepts to partner with ILO on the mapping exercise and an eventual joint livelihood intervention and underscores the importance of the leadership and coordination of the Ministry of Labor.</p>

ILO BRIDGE PROJECT - PERU RESULTS FRAMEWORK TABLE 2016-2017

Intermediate objectives	Planned Outputs	Key Outputs to date	Key Outcomes to date
<p align="center">IO.1: Increased knowledge, awareness and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation.</p>			
<p>Supporting Outcome 1.1: Increased public awareness and knowledge on the issue of forced labor</p>			
<p>Output 1.1.2 Communication strategies on forced labor implemented at national level, with a focus on reaching vulnerable groups.</p>	<p>1.1.2.3: Media campaign to prevent forced labor within a vulnerable area designed and implemented.</p>	<p>Communication Strategy approved by the National Commission for the Fight against Forced Labor (CNLCTF) 2015-2019, "Ballad of the modern slave: say NO to forced labor" applied in Ucayali, Cusco (with schools), and Ayacucho with the Regional Commission against Human Trafficking, Forced Labor and Illicit Trafficking of Migrants, as well as with the</p>	<p>This Communication Strategy aims to provide information on the definition of forced labor, its risks, tools to identify possible cases associated to students (such as false labor offers) and how to react in those cases. The campaign was coordinated and carried out together with the Regional Commission against Human Trafficking (Red Descentralizada de Lucha contra la Trata de Personas) and the Regional</p>

		<p>School Fiscal Program of the Public Prosecutor's Office.</p> <p>With MINEDU development of a booklet addressed at teachers to prevent forced labor (“Cartilla dirigida a profesores para prevenir el trabajo Forzoso”). Applied in Loreto, Ucayali, Cusco, Madre de Dios, Piura, Tumbes and Ayacucho.</p> <p>Campaign "No to slavery, no to forced labor in Peru" in the city of Pucallpa, Ucayali, on the International Day for the Abolition of Slavery (local radio, cartoons, drama group; the design and production of a video and a poster).</p> <p>With the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights (MINJUS): the Project joined the campaign "I give zero marks to human trafficking" (“Yo le pongo cero a la trata”), which was aimed at high school students and implemented in public schools in Lima, Loreto, La Libertad, Tumbes and Ucayali.</p>	<p>Bureau of Labor and Employment from Ucayali and was attended by a number of public government bodies, including: the Social Development Regional Bureau, the Regional Health Bureau, the Regional Education Bureau, the Public Defense Unit of the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights, the Public Ministry, the National Police and members of the Judiciary.</p>
	<p>1.1.2.4: Educational mentoring materials addressed to high school students disseminated</p>	<p>Communication Strategy products: videos, a drama, a song and a cartoon highlighting the main motives of the campaign and providing information about forced labor characteristics, prevention mechanisms, as well as complaint channels. A brochure which aims to give an overview of the problem of forced labor both globally and in Peru, and to provide information on human trafficking, also includes relevant information on the project and on the ILO Protocol.</p> <p>A fan-page on Facebook: to disseminate basic information, raise awareness, and to encourage people to file complaints.</p> <p>With the Ministry of Education (MINEDU): audio-visual material that summarizes the key points observed in the tutoring sessions.</p> <p>The Project developed videos with statements by authorities on the importance of incorporating the crime of forced labor into the Criminal Code and</p>	<p>The Communication Strategy 2015-2019; aimed of awareness-raising activities as well as the general population using social networks.</p> <p>The videos have been disseminated within the networks of the ILO and its partners, and also used in different training events for justice operators as well as labor inspectors, among others.</p> <p>The General Directorate of Fundamental Rights and Occupational Safety and Health, has expressed its commitment to taking over the Fan-page and will hire a professional who will be specifically responsible for its management.</p> <p>The booklet was approved by the MINEDU and uploaded to its official website on tutoring/mentoring materials. The project has shared the digital booklet with the Regional Commissions against Human Trafficking, with which it promotes prevention activities against forced labor.</p>

		invoking the ratification of the 2014 Protocol on forced labor, among other necessary actions to combat forced labor. The products include statements by the Director of the ILO Office for the Andean Countries, the Attorney General of the Nation, the Deputy Minister of Labor of the MTPE, and the Superintendent of SUNAFIL.	Materials were adapted to the economic activity and other specific characteristics of the problem in the subnational areas.
1.1.2.4: Educational mentoring materials addressed to high school students disseminated	Support the graphic design, printing and dissemination of the mentoring materials in at least one high-risk area (Activity 1.1.2.4.2)	In coordination with MINEDU: booklets materials with the mentoring sessions, and printed 1,000 copies for the 3rd, 4rd and 5th year of secondary school. Development of communication campaigns in 4 schools in risk areas: Tumbes and Puno (both in November 2017).	School children and teachers sensitized on the issue of forced labor.
	Seminar to present the proposal of the educational mentoring materials for students in their 3rd, 4th and 5th year of high school (selected high-risk areas) (Activity 1.1.2.4.1)	Mentoring materials endorsed by the Ministry of Education (MINEDU) Peru are part of the curriculum of public and private schools. Additionally, to support the implementation of mentoring sessions in Tumbes, the Project produced an information sheet on the region including related demographic, economic and human trafficking information.	Communication materials have been adapted culturally. Tutors of schools in Tumbes, in the provinces of Contralmirante Villar and Zarumilla (November 2017), were trained in the implementation of forced labor tutoring sessions, with the support of the Regional Directorate of Education.
Output 1.1.3: Key stakeholders informed on forced labor advocacy.	1.1.3.5: Joint advocacy initiatives built with stakeholders to increase public awareness of forced labor	High-level officials, members of the National Commission against Forced Labor, as well as technical officials and ministers from different government bodies and civil society organizations, have been sensitized about ILO protocol (events and workshops). Among other events, the Project held a presentation of the Protocol on forced labor at the National Council for Labor and Employment Promotion (CNTPE), a mechanism for social dialogue composed of representatives of trade union organizations, employers' organizations and chaired by the Minister of Labor and Promotion of Employment.	At the beginning of 2018, the protocol is ready to be approved in the Peru Congress of the Republic, even with the objection of the business associations for the issue of "extra hours". Andean Parliament recommendation encouraged member states (Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia and Chile) to ratify the ILO Protocol. The aforementioned recommendation was approved on 24th February, 2017 (Recommendation No. 333).
1.1.3.5: Joint advocacy initiatives built with stakeholders to increase public awareness of forced labor	Support the implementation of partnership initiatives with national stakeholders and Regional Commissions on Human Trafficking to	The project has developed decentralized actions in several regions, including Arequipa and Ucayali. On August 23, 2017 a workshop for raising awareness was held for the members of the Arequipa Regional Commission against	These actions reinforce the role of decentralized commissions and sensitize justice operators and public in general.

	<p>prevent forced labor and advocate for the ratification of the Forced Labor Protocol in Peru. (Activity 1.1.3.5.1)</p>	<p>Human Trafficking, Forced Labor and Illicit Trafficking of Migrants, which explained the concept of forced labor, its magnitude in the world and its specific characteristics in the country, as well as the Commission's role to fight forced labor in the region. In addition, the Project participated in the Labor Seminar on Fundamental Rights and Occupational Safety and Health held at the Bar Law School of Arequipa about the 2014 Protocol on forced labor and the importance of its ratification. The Project provided technical assistance for the proposal of a Regional Plan against Human Trafficking and Forced Labor in the region of Ucayali to increase public awareness.</p>	
	<p>Promote an initiative with the Ministry of Transport and Communications or related institutions to improve awareness of the routes of high risk of forced labor and human trafficking. (Activity 1.1.3.5.2)</p>	<p>In cooperation with the Prevention Management of the Superintendency of Land Transport of People, Cargo and Freight (SUTRAN), the Project coordinated the development of an awareness raising campaign in Lima on forced labor and human trafficking, aimed at transporters. The Project provided two induction workshops for SUTRAN personnel to ensure the right message was getting across and was addressed to the Prevention Management and counsellors, and staff of the Territorial Articulation Management. In addition, and as planned, the Project created a video on both issues and the close relationship between forced labor and trafficking in the country. It is called "Forced labor: Story of a victim of modern slavery"; the video was recorded on DVD.</p>	<p>The materials were distributed by the counsellors of SUTRAN within the campaign at the main land transport terminals in Lima capital. SUTRAN requested that an entertaining video have been produced for terminal televisions and buses in the form of a mini-novel. This activity has been very relevant since in the bus terminals the counselors have found human trafficking and referred to the competent authorities. Likewise, videos that are publicly broadcasted are alerts for the population. The SUTRAN counselors are very motivated and carry out prevention actions in the bus terminals in an active way.</p>
	<p>Support joint activities with civil society organizations to raise awareness of forced labor with focus on high-risk areas (Activity 1.1.3.5.3)</p>	<p>In partnership with the NGO Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES) and the NGO Intercultural Communication Services (Servindi), the Project participated in the Panamanian Social Forum held on April 28th 2017 in the San Martín region, at the panel discussion on "Forced labor in the public agenda of the Amazon regions." The Project also participated in two workshops</p>	<p>As a result, some representatives of civil society, indigenous communicators and professional associations have been sensitized about forced labor, its legislation and the necessary actions for prevention.</p>

		<p>organized by the NGO Friedrich Ebert Stiftung in Loreto and Piura on 1th and 8th September. Presentations were given at both workshops on the role of the ILO, the objectives of the Project and the importance of ratifying the Protocol on forced labor. The Project participated in the V Conference on Communication and Democracy, held from 9 to 11 August in Lima and organized by Intercultural Communication Services (SERVINDI), the Peruvian Network of Indigenous Communicators (REDCIP), Friedrich Ebert Foundation (FES), and the School of Journalism at the Antonio Ruiz de Montoya University. The project participated in the International Conference on Human Trafficking, organized by the Lima Bar Association, in which it presented forced labor as a form of modern slavery and its connection to human trafficking in Peru. Participation in "Reflection Day on women in the context of forced displacement in the face of gender-based violence" in partnership with Red Encuentros (civil society) December 2017</p>	
IO.2: Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms.			
Supporting Outcome 2.1: Target countries with updated Policies and/or Integrated National Action Plans and/or legislations			
	Planned	Achieved	
2.1.1.7: Capacity of the National Commission for the Fight against Forced Labor (CNLCTF) enhanced to update and monitor the National Plan to combat forced labor		<p>In January 2017 the Peruvian Government (Executive Branch) approved Legislative Decree No. 1323, which incorporates forced labor as a crime in the Criminal Code. It is based on the proposal previously approved by the National Commission against Forced Labor (CNLCTF), in which the ILO (through the former forced labor project) played a crucial role providing technical assistance.</p>	<p>This result is extremely important in order to achieve the prevention and future eradication of forced labor in Peru.</p>
	Provide technical assistance for the evaluation of the National Plan against Forced	In coordination with the MTPE, the Project conducted the evaluation of the "National Plan to Combat Forced Labor 2013-2017" and also	The following limitations were found: lack of budget; the inability to penalize forced labor because it was not considered a crime up until last year; and

	Labor 2013-2017. (Activity 2.1.1.7.1)	provided technical assistance for the formulation of the third Plan 2017-2021.	high staff turnover in government bodies working on forced labor, among others. Lessons learned have been considered in the new third plan.
	Provide technical assistance to the National Commission to elaborate the National Plan for 2017. (Activity 2.1.1.7.2)	The Directorate General of Fundamental Rights and Occupational Safety and Health of the MTPE has requested the recruitment of two consultants to prepare the next National Plan, one of them being the consultant who has been in charge of the evaluation of the current National Plan.	To date, the formulation of the third plan is very advanced. The preliminary version was presented to the commission and its contributions are being incorporated, before its approval.
	Provide technical assistance to the national stakeholders on the revision and updating of the national legislation related to forced labor. (Activity 2.1.1.7.4)	The Project has developed basic material regarding both crimes and how to prosecute and punish such cases in practice. The material and has been distributed to the members of the CNLCTF, as well as to different officials and justice operators during trainings carried out by the project. MINJUS has formed a sub-group of criminal types of human trafficking and related offenses, in order to analyze the entire criminal legislation, as well as related legislative projects, and formulate recommendations and proposals. The Project has provided technical assistance to SUNAFIL to review and identify regulatory aspects in the Forced Labor Inspection Protocol that require updating in order to comply with current regulations and to update information collection tools.	The criminalization of forced labor (January 2017) represents an important step forward in legislation, but it is also a challenge in terms of the proper application of justice, especially in relation to other related crimes, such as human trafficking. It involves sensitizing the community and, above all, training the justice operators at a national and decentralized level, on an ongoing basis. The SUNAFIL Protocol review is to day, very advanced.
Supporting Outcome 2.2: Enhanced knowledge among individuals from relevant institutions to combat forced labor			
Output 2.2.1: Law enforcement, justice system and other stakeholders trained on law enforcement, prevention and victim assistance	2.2.1.9: Capacity of justice system actors to combat forced labor strengthened	The Project have been invited to give a session at the "Training Course on Investigation Procedures for Human Trafficking under the New Criminal Procedure Code" of the Peruvian National Police, carried out by MININTER twice a year. The Project participated in the International Conference "Forced Labor in Peruvian Legislation: Implications and Challenges", addressed to labor judges, organized by the Superior Court of Justice of Lima. At the conference the concept of forced labor, its penal	The participation of the project has been highly appreciated among participants.

		regulation and its key characteristics were presented. The Project carried out a training workshop in Arequipa directed at justice operators in the region.	
	Support the design and implementation of a training program to train justice system actors (judges, procurators, police, public defense lawyers) on tools to combat forced labor (Activity 2.2.1.9.2)	During the reporting period, in collaboration with MININTER, the Project completed the development of a course on forced labor and human trafficking, directed at justice operators. The Legal Training Center of the Pontifical Catholic University of Peru has been contracted for the development of the Diploma "Modern forms of slavery: human trafficking and forced labor, focused on the role of justice operators", due to its experience and recognition in penal and labor matters. The Diploma began in October for 40 justice operators.	The participation of the project has been highly appreciated among participants for its methodology and content, clarifying with cases, having strengthened the knowledge of justice operators, judges, public defenders and police. The results only have scope among those operators trained and their work, so that institutionalization requires a strategy of massification in the academic institutions of justice operators and police, among others.
	Support the development of a training program addressed to the GEIT and labor inspectors focused on the implementation of the Protocol on Labor Inspection to combat forced labor and other on specific tools to combat forced labor (Activity 2.2.1.9.3)	The Project developed the "Training Course on Forced Labor directed at Labor Inspectors of Peru (SUNAFIL)" in two parts. The course was comprised of a total of 30 classroom-based hours. It was coordinated together with the Training Center of SUNAFIL and incorporated into the Annual Training Plan of the Inspection System. The course included staff of the Metropolitan Regional Government of Lima, the Regional Directorate of Lima, and the Regional Directorate of Callao. Blended training course on forced labor for labor inspectors: macro region south, Nov- Dec 2017. The course was 28 hours (12 classroom hours, 16 virtual hours) distributed over 3 weeks, and the classroom classes were in Cusco. Training on forced labor directed to municipal inspectors of the municipal association: Comas in October and Ancón, Santa Rosa and Los Olivos (Lima) in November 2017	The training course has been highly appreciated among participants, who for the first time take knowledge about the causes and consequences of forced labor as well as sanction aspects.
2.2.1.10: Peace judges' role as prevention and eradication agents of FL and HT strengthened	Elaboration of a manual and an awareness video on FL for peace judges, in coordination with ONAJUP (Activity 2.2.1.10.1)	In coordination with the National Justice Office (ONAJUP), the Project drafted the Manual on Forced Labor for peace judges. In addition, under the basis of the draft of the "Protocol of forced labor addressed to peace judges", reported in	The approval of the "Directive for intervention and the role of peace judges on forced labor", establishes rules and criteria that regulate the performance of peace judges in cases allegedly related to forced labor, guided their actions at different levels such as

		March, the Judiciary has approved the "Directive for intervention and the role of peace judges on forced labor". Training workshops on the manual for the identification and prevention of forced labor have been developed for peace judges in Ucayali, San Martín and Piura in alliance with the ONAJUP and in coordination with their local offices.	awareness raising, prevention and coordination with other authorities of the ordinary justice system and of their special jurisdiction. The project actions with peace judges are highly relevant since they act in a preventive manner in areas of high prevalence of forced labor.
	Translation to native communities' dialects of materials on FL and peace judges' role (i.e. Quechua, Aymara, Ashaninka, Shipibo, and Shawi dialects, where relevant). (Activity 2.2.1.10.3)	The Project, in coordination with ONAJUP, has identified an official translator for the materials to be translated from Spanish into Quechua, since most peace judges communicate in that language. Translation and printing services will be formally contracted after ONAJUP's formal validation of the Manual.	
2.2.2.3: Training developed and carried-out for workers' and employers' organizations on forced labor	Train workers organizations on the implementation of the "Guideline for the Prevention and Identification of Forced Labor addressed to workers organizations" (Activity 2.2.2.3.1)	The Project developed two training workshops in Lima (April 2017): "Training workshop on the role that workers' organizations can play in the fight against forced labor" for the affiliates of the Autonomous Trade Union of Peru (CATP) and the General Confederation of Workers of Peru (CGTP), respectively; both organizations are part of the CNLCTF and act on behalf of workers. In addition, three regional workshops were held between April and September with CATP in Ucayali, Loreto and Piura.	The workshops addressed the concept of forced labor, related indicators, as well as the specific role of workers' organizations in prevention and identification, among other aspects. Results are positive. The two union centrals are very motivated to continue training their bases and the community regarding forced labor.
	Support the development of awareness material focused on forced labor prevention addressed to employer's organizations (Activity 2.2.2.3.2)	During the period of reporting, the Project developed two infographics on forced labor addressed to employers. These infographics contain information on the characteristics of forced labor, indicators to identify it, illegal profits and main economic sectors.	
IO.3: Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional, and global levels.			
	Planned	Achieved	
Supporting Outcome 3.1: Increased data available on forced labor			

<p>Output 3.1.2 Statistical surveys and/or other studies on forced labor are produced</p>	<p>3.1.2.8: Study on forced labor focused on a specific national border developed</p> <p>Systematization of the information on forced labor and human trafficking in national borders to collect information and identify a methodology for the research (Activity 3.1.2.8.1)</p>	<p>The systematization of information related to human trafficking for labor exploitation and the risk of forced labor includes an exploratory analysis of two previously selected border areas of Peru, for which an analysis of relevant national information on both frontiers was carried out, as well as interviews with key stakeholders in Lima and in the selected regions. The triple border of Peru with Brazil and Colombia. According to national information, these borders show an increased prevalence of the problem.</p>	<p>The information is very relevant for the community and authorities in areas with a high prevalence of forced labor.</p>
	<p>3.1.2.9: Survey on forced labor using ILO methodology conducted in a selected region and economic sector</p>	<p>The study focuses on the “Amazon trapezium”, the zone between Peru, Brazil and Colombia, and it seeks to document cases of forced labor and human trafficking for labor exploitation in the main areas of recruitment near the triple border, through interviews, and data analysis based on the archives of the justice system. A technical meeting with the MTPE and the Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática (INEI) will be organized to discuss the MOU and the implementation plan for the survey on forced labor.</p> <p>The Project, in response to a request for technical assistance from the MTPE and in coordination with INEI, contracted a consultant to develop a proposal for identifying those potentially at risk of forced labor and the most appropriate methodological approach and to propose indicators for the questionnaires. The design proposal for the survey has been reviewed by ILO and USDOL specialists and it has been endorsed. The Project shared the design proposal with the MTPE.</p>	<p>The information is very relevant for the community and authorities in areas with a high prevalence of forced labor.</p>
<p>Output 3.1.3 Key stakeholders with improved access to information</p>	<p>3.1.3.2: Data collection mechanisms on forced labor improved.</p>	<p>Under the framework of the Cooperation Agreement signed among the MTPE, INEI and ILO (March 2017), an addendum to the methodology for collecting information for the survey, as well as budget activities, disbursements, and timeframes was expected to be signed between MTPE and INEI. The plan is to hold a workshop to discuss the</p>	<p>To date the Project has a questionnaire reviewed by the parties involved and ready to work in the preparatory phase of the execution (pilot validation, interviewer training, etc.)</p>

		indicators of forced labor in the framework of the National Commission against Forced Labor, led by the MTPE.	
	Support the process of integration of the data bases on repression of human trafficking and forced labor (RETA- PNP and SISTRA-MPFN) (Activity 3.1.3.2.1)	Two meetings were held with the vice minister of Public Security (MININTER) who is in charge of the Human-Trafficking Database and Related Subjects (RETA), as well as with the new specialist of the Criminality Observatory (MPFN) who is in charge of information related to forced labor in coordination with the System of Strategic Information on People Trafficking (SISTRA), a database developed by the Public Ministry (National Prosecution Office).	The systems are ready to be articulated. In the near future authorities will indicate to the Project their needs to reinforce this articulation.
IO.5: Increased awareness and access to livelihood programs for victims of forced labor.			
Supporting Outcome 5.1: Forced labor victims with increased livelihood opportunities and access to information on relevant services			
	Planned	Achieved	
Output 5.1.2 Livelihood support provided to victims of forced labor	<p>Support implementation of the Inter-agency Protocol through the inclusion of forced labor and HT victims in government social and/or employment programs</p> <p>Provide technical assistance for the design of a pilot to incorporate victims as part of employment programs in charge of the MTPE and support its implementation in a high-risk sector in a specific region. (Activity 5.1.2.3.2)</p>	<p>The Project, in coordination with the MTPE, supported the design of a pilot scheme to incorporate victims of force labor (“alleged victims”) and vulnerable people at risk of forced labor and human trafficking into the framework of the National Fund for Labor Training and Employment Promotion – FONDOEMPLEO. This is a grant-based fund supported by companies in the mining, hydrocarbon, energy and telecommunications fields, among others.</p>	<p>Currently, the MTPE has a preliminary pilot design. The National Prosecution Office has recently provided some information on victims and has committed to provide further information in order to improve the pilot intervention scheme. In the next future the new Board of FONDOEMPLEO will review the proposal.</p>
	Support the elaboration of a guideline on the process to incorporate victims as beneficiaries of employment programs (Activity 5.1.2.3.3)	This activity depends on the conclusion of the pilot design, as the latter will serve as a basis for the development of the guide. Due to this, it is necessary to wait for FONDOEMPLEO to complete the pilot review and approval process.	

Annex IX: Preliminary findings from the country missions

NEPAL

Challenges

- Continued government instability/changes and how to feed all project components within the changes.
- LF requires work at multiple levels (with various ministries and law enforcement agencies + civil society + trade unions)
- How to ensure new laws translate into reality
- Due to the changing context and the need to revise multiple laws (300) FL may not be a priority

Opportunities

- Strengthen the capacity of civil society, government (provincial and local) and trade unions so that they are able to advocate for FL at province and local government level
- ILO Nepal is one of the few ILO offices with donor funding in all the ILO strategic areas, provides an opportunity to bring the global strategy to life
- Support CBS to translate data into policy analysis and wide dissemination of forced labor survey outcomes (Survey)
- Development of livelihoods training -> opportunity to provide a model of *how-to* (demonstration)
- With multiple revision of laws due to transition there is a great opportunity for alignment with international standards

Emerging good practices

- Introductory information sharing meeting of the project to other agencies
- Alliance building, bringing all key stakeholders together reaching beyond forced labor to include other forms such as trafficking, foreign employment, entertainment, child labor, etc. (formal and informal)
- Engagement with CBS, and the creation of a sustainable and credible source of FL survey
- Reaching out to new government partners (i.e. CBS, Ministry of Women, children and social welfare).
- ILO Internal cross learning management incentives
- Mapping of existing skills and market demand for livelihoods before the design of livelihoods training

Lessons learned

- Because of limited resources and vast opportunities need to work in consortium
- Selection of remote and scattered locations makes logistics, management and effective monitoring difficult
- Livelihoods skill training requires strong post-training analysis to ensure access to market (tools, technical support, on-the-job training, links to employers). Post training support and assistance will be critical for the success of the livelihoods initiative
- Assumption that because free Haliya are male the project would have a male focus-> males are often abroad, wives/daughters are attending the trainings
- Limited follow up from market demand study to selection of trainings.

The way forward (preliminary recommendations)

- BRIDGE will need to balance work at federal level (design) with opportunity at local level where new laws will be made and where ILO can have a greater impact. Will requires redistribution of resource use.
- Given the opportunity to influence the revision of a great number of laws, and in order to effectively advocate and provide technical expertise in the drafting of new relevant laws the BRIDGE would benefit from increased support form HQ and ILO CO office
- Livelihoods:
 - Eligibility criteria needs to be revisited to include vulnerability and selection criteria
 - Need mechanism to monitor selection of participants is done according to agreed criteria
 - Need clear end-of-training strategy:
 - ✓ Minimum package (tools, goats, etc.)
 - ✓ Technical support beyond training
 - ✓ Linkage to higher level training/ on-the job opportunities
 - ✓ Needs to address low morale -> incorporate empowerment approach
- ILO should collect lessons learned from the implementation process and lessons learned from FL survey experience, especially on how to obtain sensitive information
- Need for institutional strengthening of FLEAG so that it is independent and sustainable beyond the life of the project

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS PERU

Lessons Learned

- The next 1-2 years will be decisive to ensure the adequate application of the new Decree, need to secure adequate capacity to secure convictions, increased need for training of key Judges and prosecutors to guarantee adequate and successful implementation of the Decree
- Confusion between precarious work and forced labor (and trafficking) -> Need to provide casuistry to ensure key concepts are clear
- There is certain degree of normalization in regards to gender discrimination due to cultural biases -> need to create greater sensitization amongst partners, provide case studies during training that are able to highlight these biases.
- Strong need to guarantee protection and restitution for victims and claimants

Challenges and Risks

- Political instability and rotation of counterparts delays the program and weakens the impact of training
- FL requires an intersectoral articulation -> need to articulate better between sectors
- Limited expertise within civil society to monitor and demand
- Geographic dispersion of Project approach
- How to incorporate FL into professional training.

Opportunities

- Given that the criminalization of FL is recent there are few specialized NGOs -> opportunity to sensitize NGOs in other areas to create critical mass
- Take advantage of the spaces working on TIP (which is more developed) to push FL forward (eg regional plans)
- Employers have expressed their desire to support ILO efforts, find means to collaborate and increase awareness of their role (eg Material or awareness raising spaces, link them to Bridge initiatives at global level for employers)
- Need to strengthen capacities of those that have received training so that they are able to replicate adequately
- Incorporate new strategic actors (journalists, indigenous women's unions, domestic worker NGOs, women's ministry) -> this will help strengthen the rights approach and overall support to eliminate FL
- Intermediate objective 5 - potential to pilot victim recovery methodology
- Creative use of spaces for existing materials (eg for videos in schools, lectures in universities, ...)

Emerging Good Practices

- Use of the Justice of the Peace network to reach the most remote areas
- Collaboration with SUTRAN for high-risk areas
- Sensitization of indigenous communicators (radio messages in native language)
- Active training methodology (role play, analysis of real cases, ...)
- Adaptive communication strategy (videos, comics ...) and culturally adapted (Quechua, indigenous radio)
- Diploma

The way forward (preliminary recommendations)

- Strengthen the program's gender approach by:
 - o including relevant information in for training other exercises, such as the design of the livelihoods component
 - o focus on training female judges of peace
 - o incorporate the Union of domestic workers ONAMIAP into the regular discussion of the Mesa processes and design of project activities (participatory and inclusive methodology) so that the female and in particular the domestic workers' perspective is included into the discussions
 - o Identification of casuistry that may highlight cultural bias
- Identify casuistry to help understand the difference between forced labor and precarious work, (this is also linked to cultural bias as certain amount of exploitation is considered culturally acceptable)
- Highlight the rights approach during advocacy and training,
- Centralize and institutionalize training initiatives to achieve critical and sustainable mass (eg work with schools)
- Mapping and training of actors in civil society
- Identify creative spaces for awareness and dissemination (brown bags at universities, auditoriums, use of video in public spaces, prelude in cinemas, in agreement with the private sector ...)

- Identify and train actors able and committed to replication (eg unions, municipalities)

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS MAURITANIA

Challenges and risks

- Progress requires participation and buy-in of multiple ministries and at multiple levels (legislative branch, law enforcement agencies, trade unions)
- Great progress BUT still limited political will, knowledge of the law and agreement (recognition) on the existence of slavery
- Many changes in key staff in partner ministries
- Greatly advanced national structures to combat slavery and forced labor (such as the 031 2015 law, the special courts, contracts for domestic workers) BUT there are insufficient means/mechanisms to make these effective on the ground
- Limited ILO information guidelines on FL in French -> need to translate and adapt to the national context

Lessons Learned

- Very weak national capacity on the subject matter
- National context was more favorable to goals when it was designed than now
- Logframe -> need to adjust in line with reality on the ground
- Importance of language used (slavery vs former slavery or modern slavery and FL) to promote alignment on terminology and problematic
- Project has limited timeframe, delays can have a very negative effect on the project's ability to deliver
- Hampered by the of will to agree on definitions
- ILO needs to reassess its relationship with Unions in Mauritania beyond the Bridge to ensure a dialogue that goes beyond FL
- Activities need right sequence (first qualitative studies, then work on statistics/ livelihoods) (i.e. need to ensure key implementers are aware and fully understand the law before going forward)
- Partners appreciate the inclusive, transparent approach -> breaking down barriers
- Success of project depends on the degree of involvement and commitment of the partners -> Bridge can't advance alone

Opportunities

- Need to look at the value of the process (not only output/result) important to build capacity up of key stakeholders
- The creation of the Forced labor survey-> unique opportunity to establish common ground among partners
- Development of livelihoods training -> opportunity to provide a model of *how-to*

Emerging good practices

- Bringing together multiple partners from different lines of work that don't normally work together but have the same goals promoting complementarity and promotion of transparent dialogue
- Participatory approach, slower but more meaningful

- Focusing on the local level (mayors, police, etc.) where the project can have bigger impact
- Studies to understand needs and demands ->evidence-based approach

The way forward (preliminary recommendations)

- BRIDGE may need to reassess goals given the available time and prioritize accordingly
- USDOL should consider no-cost extension of Mauritania component so that it has the time reap results of investment (initially estimated for implementation)
- Create pool of trainers to help sustainability efforts (multiplier effect)
- Identify common goals from Bridge (ILO-Govt) to be incorporated into the SCAPP
- Livelihoods: Ensure IO5 has in place previously agreed eligibility and selection criteria which incorporates vulnerability aspects (such as low income, limited education)
 - ensure sustainability strategy is in place BEFORE training
 - Clear understanding of Minimum package needs post training (tools, goats, etc.)
 - Importance of technical support beyond training
 - Linkage to higher level training/ on-the job opportunities/government programs
 - incorporate empowerment approach (low morale)
 - Ensure gender approach (needs, barriers and opportunities differ for women)
 - Provide for a longer term measurement to be able to show results & provide a full case study and module of how-to (RBM)

Annex X: Revised Inception Report

Introduction

The objective of this inception report is to ensure agreement on the conceptual framework, methodology and work plan for the midterm evaluation of the programme From Protocol to Practice: A Bridge to Global Action on Forced Labor (The Bridge Project). This Inception report reflects the revised TORs and will guide the Evaluation going forward.

Background

The ILO estimates about **24.9 million** men, women, and children are trapped in **forced labor**, – trafficked, held in debt bondage, or working under slave-like conditions. The vast majority of these forced laborers, an estimated **16 million** people are exploited in the **private sector** such as domestic work, construction or agriculture; **4.8 million** persons in **forced sexual exploitation**, and **4 million** persons in **forced labor imposed by state authorities**. **1 in 4 victims of modern slavery are children. Women and girls are disproportionately affected** by forced labor, accounting for 99% of victims in the commercial sex industry, and 58% in other sectors⁴⁵

Addressing forced labor and slavery-like practices,⁴⁶ is a key part of ILO's mandate. In 1930 ILO adopted the Forced Labor Convention (No. 29) and in 1957 the Abolition of Forced Labor Convention, 1957 (No. 105). In June 2014, governments, employers, and workers at the ILO International Labor Conference overwhelmingly supported the adoption of the new ILO Protocol⁴⁷ of 2014 to the Forced Labor Convention, 1930 (henceforth the Protocol) and a and Recommendation No. 203⁴⁸ on supplementary measures for addressing forced labor (henceforth the Recommendation). If widely ratified and implemented by ILO

⁴⁵ Source: [Global Estimates of Modern Slavery: Forced Labor and Forced Marriage](#), Geneva, September 2017.

⁴⁶ ILO: Global Estimate of Forced Labor (2005, Geneva).

⁴⁷http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO::P12100_ILO_CODE:P029

⁴⁸ http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:12100:0::NO:12100:P12100_ILO_CODE:R203:NO

member countries, the Protocol and Recommendation promise to act as a catalyst for achieving the vision of a world without forced labor.

From Protocol to Practice: A Bridge to Global Action on Forced Labor (The Bridge Project) stems from the need to focus more actively on prevention, and to emphasize protection, and access to justice (including compensation) to ensure that the human rights of victims are respected and that perpetrators are punished. It aims to support global and national efforts aimed at combating forced labor under the 2014 ILO Protocol and Recommendation on Forced Labor. The Bridge Project will work globally, as well as in at least three priority countries, to advance and provide a concrete grounding to this strategy. Priority countries include, but are not limited to, Malaysia, Mauritania, Nepal, Niger, and Peru. The project aims to harness and build on the momentum that led to the adoption of the Protocol and Recommendation and to foster an understanding of their effective implementation at the global, regional, national and local levels. Bridge is a four-year starting 30 September 2015 and a scheduled end date of 02 September 2019. The project is fully funded by the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) with an initial budget of US \$11,495,138 and currently US \$ 14,395,138. At the time of the review, USDOL and ILO were in discussions in regards to a possible no-cost extension to allow more time for implantation in the priority countries.

Description of the Project

The project *From Protocol to Practice: A Bridge to Global Action on Forced Labor (The Bridge Project)*, aims to support global and national efforts aimed at combating forced labor as per the 2014 ILO Protocol and Recommendation on Forced Labor. The overall goal of this project is to strengthen global and national efforts to eliminate or significantly reduce forced labor by supporting the implementation of the 2014 ILO Protocol on Forced Labor and its recommendations in order to foster a better understanding of its effective implementation at the global and national.

It was designed and is being implemented by the ILO's Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (fundamentals), which is part of the Governance and Tripartism Department (governance), in coordination with the implementing Country offices.

The Project seeks to achieve these goals through the following intermediate objectives:

1. Increased knowledge, awareness, and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation;
2. Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring, and enforcement mechanisms;
3. Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional, and global levels;
4. Workers' and employers' organizations actively support the fight against forced labor; and
5. Increased awareness and access to livelihood programs for victims of forced labor.

The Bridge Project was approved in September of 2015 to implement work at a global level (from Geneva), as well as in three priority countries, (Mauritania, Nepal, and Peru). Since the project was awarded Malaysia and Niger were added (in May and September of 2017 respectively) as well as Thailand and the Dominican Republic have joined as participating countries, meaning they will only have limited number of activities and not aim to cover all five Intermediate Objectives (IOs). This means that they will partake of some activities but not seek to address all five intermediate objectives. The countries selected have different geographical and historical/contextual characteristics as a means to illustrate how the Protocol can be implemented efficiently in different scenarios.

Reason for the evaluation

This mid-term evaluation is in line with ILO's evaluation Policy Procedures⁴⁹ which states that all projects with a budget above five million must undertake an evaluability assessment, a midterm and a final evaluation. The specific evaluation provisions for this project are also in line with the USDOL-ILO Management Procedures & Guidelines applicable for this project, mainly the requirement for one mid-term independent evaluation managed by ILO and one final evaluation managed by USDOL as the donor⁵⁰.

Purpose, Scope and Objectives

Purpose

ILO project evaluations aim to assess the relevance of project design as it relates to the ILO's strategic and national policy frameworks. They also consider the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of outcomes, and test underlying assumptions about contributions to broader development impacts. Project evaluations are used to improve project performance and contribute towards organizational learning⁵¹

This mid-term independent evaluation (MTE) provides an opportunity for reflection and to improve the project's effectiveness and efficiency for the remaining implementation time, it also allows ILO to build up its knowledge on programme implementation in this area of work. In particular, the MTE will look at relevance and alignment of the project design; efficiency of the mechanisms put in place for delivery; progress/contribution towards project goals; and likelihood of sustainability of the project's achievements.

The purpose of this inception report is to ensure a common understanding between the Evaluation manager and the evaluation team as to the TOR and to agree on the way forward, including a time table for delivery, methodology for the evaluation and expected deliverables.

Its recommendations are expected to be used to help strengthen the project strategy and interventions in order to improve strategic performance and accountability. As a pilot initiative, its lessons learned and emerging good practices are considered to be particularly relevant when considering replication and scale-up of the model of intervention in other countries as well as in the development of other ILO projects.

Scope

This mid-term independent evaluation will cover both global and country level interventions from the project start (September 2015) up to and including November 2017, with particular focus on the work undertaken by the project in the three initial priority countries (Mauritania, Nepal and Peru) and by ILO in Geneva where the project is managed.

Objectives

The specific objectives set out in the evaluation terms of reference, together with observations from the evaluation team, are can be found in annex 7. As a result of this analysis, the proposed final MTR objectives to lead this exercise are:

- To assess relevance and alignment of the intervention model from the perspective of the stakeholders (including ILO, the national partners the donor and beneficiaries);
- To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the intervention including progress made to date towards achieving the planned global and country-level outputs and immediate objectives, identify if possible unintended results as well as identify any factors hindering or helping achievement of these goals;

⁴⁹ EVAL Guidance Note 2: Midterm evaluations

⁵⁰ FY16 MPGs

⁵¹ ILO policy Guidelines for results-based evaluations, second edition, ILO

- Asses the sustainability strategy of the project and the likelihood that it will ensure results to be sustained over time;
- Propose recommendations for improved effectiveness and performance;
- Identify emerging good practices and consider lessons learned so far.

Use of the evaluation

The primary users of the evaluation are expected to be host governments, ILO implementing staff and national project partners at global level and in the priority countries, the tripartite constituents as well as the USDOL project manager. Other ILO staff that may benefit from the Project’s lessons learned, such as ILO country Directors, ILO specialists in HQ and the field, the technical backstopping unit (FUNDAMENTALS), and monitoring and evaluation division. The MTR will be able to inform other practitioners involved in the prevention of forced labor.

Evaluation Framework

In this section, we describe the overall approach, type and conceptual model that will guide the evaluation process.

Overall methodological approach

Building on the TORs and after initial desk review, we view this as an eminently formative exercise with some summative elements. As a **Formative Review** this exercise will seek to confirm relevance of the project design, understand the strengths and weakness of the project implementation mechanisms identified (efficiency), assess effectiveness, and identify lessons learned. Formative exercises are by nature forward looking and make recommendations with the aim of improving programme performance during the remainder of the intervention⁵². They lend themselves best to qualitative methods of inquiry, with questions generally more open to promote exploration of processes, both from the viewpoint of beneficiaries, partners and other stakeholders. The use of participatory methods is particularly relevant and appropriate to a formative evaluation.

This exercise will also have a **summative element** which will seek to ascertain progress in outputs, and if relevant, assess feasibility and desirability of initial programme goals as set out in the PRODOC. Inclusion of both formative and summative elements is considered good evaluation practice.

We propose the use of appreciative enquiry (AE) as the conceptual underlying approach to guide this exercise, and in order to promote these a participatory approach. **Appreciative Inquiry**⁵³ focuses on the identification of strengths and good practices instead of weaknesses as the most effective way to promote effective change. It promotes a high level of stakeholder participation. AE is in line with the most recent research that views focus on strengths as a more effective mechanism to achieve results than the more traditional focus on strengthening weakness. *“When people are thinking about what they have achieved, and their strengths and what they are proud of, they feel good – which according to research makes their thinking skills improve”*⁵⁴ While AI focuses on strengths, it does not preclude from looking at barriers and risks around what can and cannot be achieved.

The evaluation will be underlined by the following approaches:

⁵² UN Women evaluation handbook, page 118

⁵³ David Cooperrider (1986)

⁵⁴ ANDY SMITH

- a. Utilization-focused Theory⁵⁵ (UFT) developed by Michael Quinn Patton, where by an evaluative exercise is judged on how useful its results are to its intended users. This is promoted through a strong focus on participation of users throughout the evaluation process.
- b. As a means to make the UFT operational, in line as well as with UNEG standards and a human right based approach to programming (HRBAP), the MTR will make use of a Participatory approach⁵⁶ which means we will be seeking meaningful involvement of stakeholders at each step of the evaluation process.

Lastly, the MTR will have a **human rights and gender sensitive approach**, meaning it will assess to what extent the human rights-based approach and a gender mainstreaming were incorporated into the design and to the implementation strategies of the intervention; extent to which the programme looks at underlying specific barriers that affect gender and marginalized or vulnerable groups; Extent to which Human rights & gender perspectives have been integrated as part of the goals and results stated by the intervention; Extent to which the allocation and use of resources to targeted groups takes into account the need to prioritize women and individuals/groups who are marginalized and/or discriminated against. (UNEG). The evaluation will pay attention to issues related to social dialogue and international labor standards, as well as the project’s contribution to the relevant SDGs goals, particularly the “No one left behind” principle which is reflected in the HRBAP.

Evaluation Methodology

Initial review of existing data

To date the evaluation has undertaken a preliminary desk review of key program data including the TORs. Pre-situation report and the PRODOC, as well as review of relevant documentation (such as the protocol), ILO specific relevant documentation (such as the evaluation guidelines) and limited desk review of program specific information (see annex 2 for full list). Due to delays in the recruitment process the time available for the IR has been limited, as such, for efficiency purposes and to be able to meet the February 27 deadline for preliminary evaluation findings, a more in-depth country specific desk review will be undertaken before each in-country mission. In addition to the desk review there were three initial remote interviews: two with the evaluation manager and one with the Bridge project manager (with a second expected to take place before the missions). Initial discussions with the national project coordinators was also undertaken in order to identify the basic overall needs for each country mission, such as location(s) to be visited, key overall stakeholders to be interviewed and day requirements. An overall evaluation timeline was put together trying to secure efficiency as well as value for money (by grouping missions where possible, and limiting days in country when not deemed necessary).

Evaluation questions

Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs) are the high-level questions that an evaluation is designed to answer, but do not necessarily correspond to the specific questions that are asked in an interview or a questionnaire. Evaluation sub questions are intended to act as a type of indicator that provides evidence to respond to the KEQ, but are not meant to be responded to individually. The evaluation TORs identified six key evaluation questions and 25 evaluation sub questions. Under closer scrutiny it was noted that some of these sub questions essentially sought out the same information, as such, the original proposed sub questions have been redrafted and reorganized to better serve the ultimate objectives of the evaluation. At the same time,

⁵⁵ Patton (2008):

⁵⁶ Quinn Patton (2000)

the key evaluation questions have been fleshed out to ensure there is clarity as to what exactly the evaluation seeks answers to.

The final six key evaluation questions which will be answered by the MTR for global or country activities are:

1. *Validity of design: Is the project design adequate to achieve the intended goals?*

The sub questions identified for this question are:

- 1.1. to what extent the project design facilitated the goals of the project, mainly the ratification of the Protocol and the Recommendation it calls for?
- 1.2. To what extent is the underlying theory of change (or results framework) and its assumptions still valid to address FL efforts at national and global level? What adjustments could be made in the project objectives and strategy to strengthen the project?
- 1.3. Has the project successfully contextualized the global project strategy to the country context and priorities, taking into consideration national capacity, legal framework and availability of data?
- 1.4. Are gender issues well integrated into the project document, CMEP and the countries' Scopes of Work? Does it take into account minorities and other particularly vulnerable groups? / Did the project adequately consider the gender dimension on the interventions design and how?

2. *Relevance and strategic fit: Was the project's strategy appropriate and relevant for addressing forced labor efforts at the national and global levels?*

This question talks about alignment, the sub questions identified for this question are:

- 2.1. Were the needs of forced labor victims fully taken into account while designing the interventions?
- 2.2. To what extent were national relevant stakeholders, including government, employers' and workers' organizations, as well as beneficiaries (e.g. victims of forced labor), consulted and involved in the design and prioritization of the project interventions?
- 2.3. Is the project aligned with the ILO strategic objectives and policy outcomes; existing ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs); United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs); SDGs, other national development frameworks; and, existing government initiatives?

3. *Effectiveness: To what degree is the project successfully achieving the desired results?*

The sub questions identified for this question are:

- 3.1 Is the project accomplishing its planned results as expected at global and country levels? (discuss according to each intermediate objective) specifically, is the project helping to promote ratification and/or implementation of the protocol
- 3.2 What factors, internal and external to the project, are contributing or hindering these successes?
- 3.3 What changes may be needed to improve project delivery?

4. *Efficiency: To what extent have the project resources translated into results?*

The sub questions identified for this question are:

- 4.1 Is the project progressing in a timely manner?
- 4.2 How effectively is the project collaborating with constituents and implementing partners?

- 4.3 What are the main challenges the project has faced during implementation and what efforts have been made to overcome these challenges?
- 4.4 Are the human and financial resources designated to the project adequate to carry out the project activities effectively and with high level of quality?
- 4.5 Are resources aligned with the needs of the project? Is there a need to review the project strategy or intervention level taking into account the available resources?
- 4.6 How are ILO HQ, country and regional offices contributing to project implementation?
- 4.7 How is the project using monitoring data to inform learning and better project implementation?
- 4.8 How are the roles and responsibilities of ILO country staff and Bridge staff delineated in priority countries? What is the contribution of ILO's ROs to project implementation?

5. *Potential impact: Is there any indication that the project interventions will have positive high-level changes for the ultimate intended beneficiaries?*

The sub questions identified for this question are:

- 5.1 From the evidence available, are there any indications of positive impact resulting from the project interventions at local, national and global levels?
- 5.2 To what extent has the project strengthened the institutional capacity (service and policy) of ILO tripartite constituents in eliminating forced labor?

6. *Sustainability: How likely is it that benefits of the project interventions will continue to benefit intended beneficiaries after the project lifespan?*

The sub questions identified for this question are:

- 6.1 Is the project leveraging national and regional commitment and resources to address the forced labor issue?
- 6.2 Is there a phase out strategy developed and has it been started being implemented in order to promote project sustainability?
- 6.3 What is the likelihood that the project models of intervention and outcomes will be replicated or scaled up (if appropriate) by national partners or other actors by the end of the project?
- 6.4 Which interventions are most likely to be sustainable and/or transferable to the communities or relevant institutions when the project ends (e.g., interventions for livelihood or vocational training solutions)?

Evaluation Matrix

The TOR sets out a proposed evaluation matrix structure which has been further refined in line with the evaluation methodology as follows:

Proposed heading	Comment	Final headings
Evaluation questions	Key evaluation questions have been fleshed out to ensure clarity	Key Evaluation Questions (KEQ)
Indicator	Instead of indicators, sub questions that will identify or indicate likelihood towards that	Sub questions (indicators)

	question. The sub questions will not be answered per se, rather, will serve to provide evidence to allow an evidence based response to the KEQ	
Sources of data	Data sources will be identified	Sources of data/Data collection method
Method	This is already reflected under sources of data	
Who will collect	n/a as evaluation team will be in charge of data collection	
How often	n/a as it will be done once during the MTR exercise	
Cost	Not relevant for the effects of the MTR	
Who will analyze	Evaluation team for all, as such not included	
		Limitations/ risk (if applicable)

Final evaluation matrix is included under annex 4.

Data collection methods and sources of information

To strengthen the credibility and usefulness of evaluation results, the evaluation will use a mix of data sources collected through multiple methods. As such, the Evaluation will benefit from the use of a mixed-methods approach to include both quantitative and qualitative data, as well as primary and secondary data. As a formative exercise, a stronger focus will be on qualitative information able to provide insight as to the underlying factors for success. The process will use the Evaluation matrix as the key guiding tool for data collection, systematization and triangulation.

Secondary data collection will be done through the desk review and will include (when relevant) nationally and internationally published reports; economic indicators; project or programme plans; monitoring reports; previous reviews, evaluations and other records; country strategic plans; and research reports.

Data sources for the desk review include:

- ILO Evaluation guidelines and templates
- Project documents (Prodoc, pre-situational analysis, CMEP)
- Technical Progress reports
- Project modification approvals
- Project publications
- Project research/studies (TORs, reports etc.)
- Project outputs
- Global norms related to forced labor (such as the Protocol)
- National UNDAF documents

Primary data collection will allow the evaluation team a deeper understanding of observed changes and the factors that contributed to change. It also allows for triangulation and verification of findings emanating from the desk review.

Primary data instruments include:

- Interviews (face-to-face, telephone or computer- assisted)
- Direct on-site observation about how the project operates, such as observation of ongoing activities, processes, discussions, social interactions and observable results, activities.
- Focus Group Interviews as a particularly useful mechanism to increase stakeholder participation allowing the evaluation to reach a wider group of stakeholders in the available time
- Key Informant Interviews, one on one qualitative in-depth interviews with stakeholders that have an in-depth knowledge of the project and/or relevant experts.
- While there are not sufficient resources (time) for case studies per se, given that the evaluation team will visit three pilot countries, there will be some degree of case comparison to help draw analysis and strengthen understand the operational dynamics and explore factors that contribute to outputs and outcomes.

Primary data will be collected through the in-country missions to Nepal, Mauritania, Peru and Geneva, as well as through a limited number of remote interviews. The mission locations have been selected by the Evaluation Manager and were part of the original TORs. Direct consultations will be held with:

- ILO Bridge staff (HQ and field)
- ILO HQ specialists supporting the Bridge project
- Implementing partners (HQ and country level)
- Direct beneficiaries of the project (beneficiaries of trainings and of livelihood programs)
- Project Advisory Committees⁵⁷ (where applicable)
- National/district Government officials involved with the project
- Employers' and workers' organizations
- Civil Society Organizations/NGOs working with the project
- ILO Country Directors
- US Embassy officials
- Karrie Peterson (Project Manager)
- Carolyn Huang (Managing Bridge Research Activities)
- Kristen Pancio (general M&E support, developed CMEP)
- Marcia Eugenio (TBD, Director of OCFT, Provided initial vision for the project)

This use of multiple data sources allows for triangulation ensuring data accuracy, avoid data and validate findings through cross-referencing. It is in in line with DAC recommendations to of methods is recommended to ensure data accuracy and facilitate its interpretation

Analysis will be done through the systematization of findings in line with the evaluation matrix and triangulating findings form the different data sources. A key mechanism for validation of findings are the in-country preliminary findings workshops. These findings will allow for an informal discussion of the initial conclusions providing stakeholders an opportunity to correct and complement findings.

Evaluation Phases

The evaluation process, in line with the Tors will include a series of phases:

⁵⁷ A project advisory committees was set up in Nepal With participation of key stakeholders to oversee and support management of the project.

Inception Phase

The inception phase seeks to ensure clarity as to the goals and expected outcomes of the evaluation between the evaluation team and the evaluation management team, and USDOL. This phase includes the kick of meeting, a preliminary desk review, exploratory discussions with key Bridge staff. This phase culminates with the agreement of methodology, deliverables and timeline through the agreement to this Inception Report, which will serve as the guiding document for the evaluation going forward. For this reason the final version of the Inception Report must be ready before any primary data collection can take place⁵⁸.

Data collection phase

The data collection phase will see a more in-depth document review and the primary data collection through Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with the project team and key stakeholders in Geneva, Mauritania, Nepal and Peru. The in-country mission selection was done by the project manager and constituted part of the evaluation terms of references, as such, no sampling analysis has been undertaken.

Analysis, validation and report drafting phase

Due to time and logistical constraints this phase will take place in parallel with the data collection phase. Data collected will be systematized in line with the agreed evaluation questions through the evaluation matrix, allowing for systematic triangulation. The in-country validation workshops will be both data collection and an opportunity to validate findings, whenever possible actionable recommendations will be discussed with the teams to ensure feasibility and alignment.

If requested by the team the evaluation team lead will participate of the Bridge team workshop scheduled for February 27-28 in Washington DC to present preliminary evaluation findings, in the same spirit as the in-country workshops.

Risks and Limitations

Initial delays led to time restrictions

Delays to the project start, together with holiday related ILO office closure, limited the time available for the desk review and the inception phase, this together with the need to have initial findings for the Bridge Project meeting originally scheduled for February in Washington DC led to a reduced inception phase and the need to agree work plan and logistics of the data collection phase before the desk review and limited the consultant's ability to pre assess partners and field visits. Due to the lack of time before the missions, the in-country specific desk reviews will be undertaken before each in-country mission.

Too many evaluation questions, less depth

Another risk observed is that the evaluation TORs has ambitious expectations for the evaluation, which seeks to cover all traditional evaluation criteria and 6 key evaluation questions. While the recommended amount of evaluation questions is 5-7, i.e. falls in line with the project, it seeks to answer these questions for four different levels (3 pilots plus Global-Geneva), effectively quadruplicating the work of the evaluation team. While there are no expectations for these levels to be answered independently (this would not be feasible) it never the less requires the evaluation team to be able to address a 6x4 matrix, and deal

⁵⁸ The MPGs specify that "The evaluator will submit the evaluation inception report concurrently to the evaluation managers of ILO-EVAL and ILAB according to the agreed-upon deliverable timeline, in cases where the inception report is a required deliverable by the managing organization. This inception report will provide opportunity for the evaluator to show how the TORs will be implemented." This did not take place

with effectively 24 KEQ. Although project has provisioned national evaluation consultant, coordinating with them and synthesizing the findings from them is still a huge challenge.

Guide questions for questionnaires and focus group discussions

Below are the preliminary interview guides prepared based on the TORs, the preliminary desk review and the final proposed evaluation questions. These questions will be adapted in accordance with the audience, questions will be added or omitted depending on relevance and if new relevant areas of inquiry are identified new questions will be added.

At the beginning of each interview the following will be provided: basic introduction of the project; objectives of the evaluation and the role of the interview within this process; guarantee of anonymity of the responses provided.

The following information will be recorded: Gender, location of the interview, organization.

Interview guide for National Partners
1. Is the project design adequate and relevant to achieve the intended goals?
<p>30. In your view, does the project design adequately take into account the national context (priorities, national capacity, legal framework and availability of data)</p> <p>31. In your view, does the project have a specific approach/strategy to make sure women and the most vulnerable groups can benefit?</p> <p>32. Where you or your organization involved in project design? If so when (design?) and how?</p>
2. Was the project’s strategy appropriate and relevant for addressing forced labor efforts at the national and global levels?
<p>33. In your view, do the interventions of the project address the primary needs of beneficiaries and relevant stakeholders? How so?</p> <p>34. How will the project help promote the relevant SDGs?</p> <p>35. Is the project aligned with the existing national strategy/policies/laws?</p> <p>36. Is the project aligned/ linked/collaborating/building on other national development frameworks; and, existing government initiatives?</p>
3. To what degree is the project successfully achieving the desired results?

Interview guide for ILO staff

1. Is the project design adequate to achieve the intended goals?

1. In your view, is the underlying theory of change of the project still valid? If not, how should it be adjusted?
2. In your view, has the project successfully adapted the global project to the national context (priorities, national capacity, legal framework and availability of data)
3. How have gender issues and vulnerable group's needs been incorporated into the project design?
4. Where national stakeholders (government, employers' and workers' organizations, beneficiaries) part of the project design/adaptation? Did they have a say in the prioritization of the project activities? ,

2. Was the project's strategy appropriate and relevant for addressing forced labor efforts at the national and global levels?

5. In your view, do the interventions identified address the primary needs of beneficiaries and relevant stakeholders? Is there any documentation that can support this?
6. How does the project incorporate key ILO strategic objectives and policy outcomes?
7. How will the project help promote the relevant SDGs?
8. Is the project aligned with existing UN national strategy documents? (ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs); UNDAFs)
9. Is the project aligned/ linked/collaborating/building on other national development frameworks; and, existing government initiatives?

3. To what degree is the project successfully achieving the desired results?

10. Is the project accomplishing its planned results as expected at global and country levels?
- 11.
12. In your view, what have been the key achievements of the project this far? (best practices)
- 13.
14. In your view, what are the key factors, internal and external to the project, are contributing or hindering these successes? (lessons learned)
- 15.
16. What changes may be needed to improve project delivery?

4. To what extent have the project resources translated into results?

17. In your view, are the human and financial resources designated to the project adequate to carry out the project activities effectively and with high level of quality?
18. Are resources aligned with the country context? (existing capacity, etc.)
- 19.
20. How are ILO HQ, country and regional offices contributing to project implementation?

21. Based on the lessons learned, do you have any recommendations on how to make the project more efficient?

5. Is there any indication that the project interventions will have positive high-level changes for the ultimate intended beneficiaries?

22. From the evidence available, are there any indications (now or in the future) of positive impact resulting from the project interventions at local, national and global levels?

23. In your view, has the project strengthened national institutional capacity (service and policy) towards eliminating forced labor?

6. How likely is it that benefits of the project interventions will to continue to benefit intended beneficiaries after the project lifespan?

24. Is the project leveraging national and regional commitment and resources to address the forced labor issue?

25.

26. Is there a phase out strategy developed)and has it been started being implemented in order to promote project sustainability?)

27.

28. What is the likelihood that the project models of intervention and outcomes will be replicated or scaled up by national partners or other actors by the end of the project?

29. Which interventions are most likely to be sustainable and/or transferable to the communities or relevant institutions when the project ends (e.g., interventions for livelihood or vocational training solutions)?

37. In your view, what have been the key achievements of the project this far? (best practices?)

38. In your view, are there any outside factors helping or hindering the project's success? (lessons learned)

39. With the current pace of achievement is project likely to achieve its overall objectives? If not what changes should be considered?

40. What changes would you suggest that could help to achieve the project goals?

4. To what extent have the project resources translated into results?

41. In your view, are the human and financial resources designated to the project adequate to carry out the project activities effectively and with high level of quality?

42. Are resources aligned with the existing capacity/needs in the country?

43. Based on the lessons learned, do you have any recommendations on how to make the project more efficient?

5. Is there any indication that the project interventions will have positive high-level changes for the ultimate intended beneficiaries?

44. From the evidence available, are there any indications (now or in the future) that the project will have a positive local/ national levels?

45. In your view, has the project strengthened national institutional capacity (service and policy) towards eliminating forced labor? (examples?)

6. How likely is it that benefits of the project interventions will to continue to benefit intended beneficiaries after the project lifespan?

46. Is the project leveraging national and regional commitment and resources to address the forced labor issue?

47. Is there a phase out strategy developed and has it been started being implemented in order to promote project sustainability?

48. What is the likelihood that the project models of intervention and outcomes will be replicated or scaled up by national partners or other actors by the end of the project?

49. Which interventions are most likely to be sustainable and/or transferable to the communities or relevant institutions when the project ends (e.g., interventions for livelihood or vocational training solutions)?

Interview guide for project participants

c. Please explain how and when you participated with the project

1. Is the project design adequate and relevant to achieve the intended goals?

50. In your view, did the project make specific changes to make sure that women and (any other vulnerable group) were able to participate of this activity?

51. Where you involved in deciding the activities and/ or content?

2. Was the project's strategy appropriate and relevant for addressing forced labor efforts at the national and global levels?

52. In your view, do the interventions of the project address the most important needs?

53. If not, what could/should it be doing?

54. As far as you know, does the project use/build on other projects or institutions?

3. To what degree is the project successfully achieving the desired results?

55. How has (activity) helped you?

56. In your view, are there any outside factors that helped or made it more difficult to benefit from this (activity)

57. What changes would you suggest to make this (activity) better? Lessons learned

4. To what extent have the project resources translated into results?

58. In your view, did the (activity) have the right people (number and expertise) and other resources (location, materials, etc.) necessary?

59. Based on your experience, do you have any recommendations on how to make the (activity) more efficient?

5. Is there any indication that the project interventions will have positive high-level changes for the ultimate intended beneficiaries?

60. Do you think the project will change the way things are now?

61. Why or why not (and how?)

62. Do you think the project/activity is helping to strengthened national capacity (better services and/or policy) towards eliminating forced labor? (explain)

6. How likely is it that benefits of the project interventions will to continue to benefit intended beneficiaries after the project lifespan?

63. Do you think the project will continue without ILO?

64. Do you think this activity will be replicated by the Government or other NGOs?

Interview guide for focus groups

1. (introduction of participants) Please introduce yourself, your organization (if relevant), explain how and when you participated with the project, and what how this (activity) helped you?

Group discussion

2. Where you involved in deciding the activities and/ or content?
3. In your view, was the activity done in such a way that it allowed for women to benefit as much as men?
4. Did this activity address your most important needs? If not, what else could it have done
5. Did the (activity) have the right people (number and expertise) and other resources (location, materials, etc.) necessary?
6. Does the project use or build on national capacities (of the government, NGOs or others)?
7. In your view, are there any outside factors that helped or made it more difficult to benefit from this (activity). Based on your experience, do you have any recommendations to make it better?
8. What changes would you suggest to make this (activity) better? Lessons learned
9. How do you think the (activity) will change the way things are done?
10. Do you think this activity will be replicated by the Government or other NGOs?

Work plan

Timeline

Overall agreed timeline for the midterm evaluation is as follows:

Deliverable	Key Tasks	Date
	Kick off meeting	December 2017
	Initial Logistics and mission prep	December 2017
Inception Report	Inception Report	5 January 2018
	ILO Comments to IR	9 January 2018
	In country missions for data collection	January 13- February 22
Validation workshops	Validation workshop in 3 priority countries	January 23, 26 and February 2 2018
Draft report	Draft Report	March 9, 2018
Final Report	Final Report	March 23, 2018

Detailed fieldwork plan

The following are more detailed fieldwork plans for the three priority in-country missions, which have been put together with the country project managers. In most instances, and due to the ILO offices being closed for the end of year holidays, it was not possible to secure further details at this stage.

Detailed fieldwork plan for Nepal

16-23, January 2018

Time	Activities	Remarks
Monday, 15th January, 2018		
-----	Arrival in Kathmandu /Etihad airways	Stay at Hotel Himalaya
Tuesday, 16th January, 2018		
09:00 – 10:00	Meeting with the Bridge Project Team and the Program Officer at the ILO office	Confirmed
10:30 – 11:30	Meeting with the Officials at the Ministry of Land Reform and Management (Under Secretary and the team)	Confirmed
12:00 – 13:00	Meeting with the Officials at the Ministry of Women Children and Social Welfare (Joint/Under Secretary and the team)	TBC

13:30 – 14:30	Lunch	
15:00 – 16:00	Meeting with officials at Central Bureau of Statistics (Director/Deputy Director and team)	Confirmed
16:00 – 17:00	Meeting with other colleagues at ILO office (Nita, Bharati and Niyama)	Confirmed
Wednesday, 17th January, 2018		
09:00 – 10:00	Meeting with Richard Howard, ILO Country Director at ILO office	Confirmed
10:30 – 11:30	Meeting with the Officials of the Ministry of Land Reform and Management (Joint/Under Secretary and the team)	Confirmed
12:00 – 13:00	Joint meeting with key members of the Forced Labor Elimination Advocacy Group at ILO office	TBC
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch	
14:30 – 16:00	Meeting with ILO consultants that contributed to the Bridge Project	TBC
Thursday, 18th January, 2018		
09:00 – 10:30	Joint Meeting with Officials of the US Embassy, UNICEF and UNODC	TBC
11:00 – 12:00	Early Lunch	
13:30 – 14:45	Flight to Dhangadi	
14:45 – 15:15	Reach to Hotel Devotee, Dhangadhi	
Friday, 19th January, 2018		
09:00 – 13:00	Visit to one training site at Kanchanpur (Jhalari) and interaction with the beneficiaries of skill/employability training	Confirmed
13:00 – 16:00	Visit to DHMS- Kanchanpur Office and meeting with the officials of the RMHSF-N	Confirmed
Saturday, 20th January, 2018		
	Free time/prepare workshop and debriefing	
Sunday, 21st January, 2018		
09:00 – 12:00	Meeting with Training Partners (UCEP, DHMS and HRC) of the Bridge Project	Confirmed

12:00 – 13:00	Lunch	
14:00 – 16:00	Visit to other skill/employability training site (Mahendranagar) and observation of on-going training program and interaction with the beneficiaries	Confirmed
Monday, 22nd January, 2018		
09:00 – 12:00	Free time	
12:00 – 16:30	Flying back to Kahtmandu from Dhangadi	
Tuesday, 23rd January, 2018		
09:00 – 12:00	Validation workshop with the stakeholders in Kathmandu, Hotel Himalaya	TBC
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch	
14:00 – 17:00	Debriefing with the ILO/Nepal Director	TBC
18:00	Departure to the Airport	

Detailed fieldwork plan for Switzerland

Dates	Location	Activities
Jan 25 and 26	Geneva	<p>Aurelie Hauchere on awareness raising and 50 for Freedom campaign</p> <p>Michaëlle de Cock or Federico Blanco on research</p> <p>Houtan Homayounpour as previous project Director and business forum</p> <p>Remi Doherty on project monitoring and evaluation</p> <p>Jean-Marie Kagabo on Mauritania and Niger</p> <p>Rosalind Silva from Normes department.</p>

Detailed fieldwork plan for Mauritania

Dates	Location	Activities
Jan 29, 2 Feb	Nouakchott	National Agency for the Fight against the Remnants of Slavery, Integration and the Fight against Poverty (ANLSESILP), also called TAMADOUN.

		Interministerial committee for plan of action? Government of Mauritania, Workers' and Employers organizations, Civil Society Organizations (CSO) including youth and faith based associations, schools and local NGOs.
2 Feb	Nouakchott	Workshop preliminary findings

Detailed fieldwork plan for Peru

Dates	Location	Activities
Feb 12-16	Remote	Remote interviews stakeholders from Tumbes, (north of Peru) local officers in relation to the justice peace trainings in other regions (Piura, San Martin)
Feb 19-23	Lima	public sector: MTPE, SUNAFIL, PNP, MININTER, MINJUS, MPFN, PJ, SUTRAN. unions: CATP, CGTP employers sector: CONFIEP and SNI civil society SERVINDI, FES and RED encuentros
23 Feb	Lima	Workshop preliminary findings

Evaluation team responsibilities

The evaluation will be managed by Gunjan Dallakoti, the **Evaluation Manager** (EM), based in Lusaka who reports directly to EVAL⁵⁹.

The evaluation team consists of a team leader based in Panama, and three national consultants. The **evaluation team leader** will be in charge of designing the evaluation, coordinating the national consultants and producing the final evaluation report. A debriefing to the Bridge team during the Washington DC workshop may be requested. Oversight of the national consultants will also be undertaken by the evaluation leader. The team leader will report to the Evaluation Manager.

The three **national consultants** (Peru, Nepal, Mauritania) will lead the in-country evaluation activities under the guidance of the team leader. Responsibilities include the identification of relevant country context factors and how they link to the project; the identification of lessons learned and good practices at national level; support to the in-country mission and the preliminary findings workshop and; provide country specific inputs for the draft and final reports.

⁵⁹ As per ILO's directives, the EM has been selected to ensure he is not directly involved in the project nor works for the same department.

The **Bridge project team** in Geneva will be in charge of providing administrative support to the consultants as required, in particular, support for logistics, travel and to set up the in-country mission agenda, including the preliminary findings workshop. They will also ensure the evaluation team has all key documentation in a timely manner.

During the evaluation process, the project monitoring and database officer, will provide overall administrative and logistical support for the evaluation, including setting up the meetings in Geneva and liaising with the National Project Coordinators (NPCs) for the organization of the in-country missions. Translation for the in-country mission for Mauritania will also be provided and, if necessary, the project will undertake the translation of any reports and key reference documents.

To see full list of project liaisons, see Annex 1.

Proposed report outline structure

The proposed report, in line with the TORs includes the following sections:

As proposed in the TORs	Comments/ Amendments
An executive summary with methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations in the format required for the ILO summary template so that it can act as a stand alone summary.	As agreed, executive summary will have the structure of ILO’s Report Summary in order to be able to act as stand-alone document
Purposes and methodology of the evaluation (including limitations)	
Findings and a table presenting key outputs and outcomes achieved at both the global and country levels by project intermediate objective	See annex 4
Analysis of findings, conclusions and recommendations	
Lessons learned and good practices in ILO template format	
Annexes including data files, survey data, Lessons learned and good practices fact sheets	There will be no survey undertaken The TORs included “focus group transcripts” as part of the annexes, this goes against the principle of confidentiality (UNEG) that guarantees the stakeholders are able to respond truthfully to the questions without fear of retribution. For this reason no data files or transcripts will be shared.

The Final Report will follow the following structure:

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
3. BACKGROUND
 - a. Purpose, objectives, scope
 - b. Methodology
 - c. Limitations
4. FINDINGS

- a. Key outputs table
 - b. Findings evaluation questions
 - c. Conclusions
 - d. Lessons Learned & Potential good practices
5. RECOMMENDATIONS
6. ANNEXES
- a. TORs
 - b. List of persons interviewed
 - c. Schedule of the evaluation
 - d. Others as relevant

Annex X: TORs

**Terms of Reference for the Mid-term Independent Evaluation of the project
“From Protocol to Practice: A Bridge to Global Action on Forced Labor (The Bridge Project)”**

Identification

<i>Title:</i>	From Protocol to Practice: A Bridge to Global Action on Forced Labor (The Bridge Project)
<i>DC Codes:</i>	GLO/15/26/USA
<i>Administrative and Technical Backstopping Unit:</i>	Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS)
<i>Location:</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Global: Geneva 2. Priority countries: Malaysia, Mauritania, Nepal, Niger, and Peru. 3. Participating countries: Thailand, Dominican Republic
<i>Link to P&B</i>	2. Ratification and application of International Labour Standards
<i>Duration:</i>	48 months
<i>Start Date:</i>	30 September 2015
<i>End date:</i>	02 September 2019
<i>Donor:</i>	United States Department of Labor (USDOL)
<i>Budget:</i>	US \$ 14,395,138
<i>Evaluation Type</i>	Mid-term Independent Evaluation
<i>Date</i>	December 2017 – March 2018

Acronyms

ACORD	Agency for Cooperation and Research in Development
ADIG	Association pour le Développement Intègre du Guidimakha/Association for the Comprehensive Development of Guidimakha
AFCF	Action Française contre la Faim/Action against Hunger France
ANLSESILP	Agence Nationale pour la Lutte contre les Séquelles de l'Esclavage, l'Insertion et la Lutte contre la Pauvreté/National Agency for the Fight against the Vestiges of Slavery, Integration and the Fight against Poverty (Mauritania)
ANTUF	All Nepal Trade Union Federation
ASI	Anti-Slavery International
CAS	Committee on the Application of Standards (ILO)
CATP	Central Autonomía de Trabajadores de Perú/Autonomous Centre for Peruvian Workers
CDHAH	Commissariat aux Droits de l'Homme et à l'Action Humanitaire/High Commissioner for Human Rights and Humanitarian Action
CDLM	Comité pour la Défense des Libertés en Mauritanie/Committee for the Defense of Freedom in Mauritania
CDO	Chief District Officer (Nepal)
CGTM	Confédération Générale de Travailleurs de Mauritanie/General Confederation for Mauritanian Workers
CGTP	Confederación General de Trabajadores de Perú/General Confederation for Peruvian Workers
CHS	Alternativo Human Social Capital Alternative (NGO – Peru)
CLPRA	Child Labor Prohibition and Regulation Act (Nepal)
CLTM	Confédération Libre des Travailleurs de Mauritanie/Free Confederation of Mauritanian Workers
CNDH	Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Homme/National Commission for Human Rights (Mauritania)
CNLCTF	Comisión Nacional para la Lucha contra el Trabajo Forzoso (National Commission for the Fight against Forced Labor (Peru)
CNSS	La Caisse Nationale de Sécurité Sociale/National Social Security Fund
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
CWIN	Child Workers in Nepal (NGO)
CWISH	Children and Women in Social Services and Human Rights (Nepal)
DoFE	Department of Foreign Employment (Nepal)
ENAMJ	l'Ecole Nationale d'Administration de Magistrature et de Journalisme/National School of Administration of Magistracy and Journalism (Mauritania)
FEA	Foreign Employment Act
FET	Foreign Employment Tribunal (Nepal)
FONADH	Forum des Organisations Nationales de Droits Humaines/Forum of Human Rights Organizations (Mauritania)

FPRW	Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (Department of the ILO)
GEFONT	General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions
ICLS	International Conference of Labor Statisticians
ILAB	Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILC	International Labor Conference
ILO	International Labor Organization
INEI	Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas e Informáticas/National Institute of Statistics and Informatics (Peru)
IOE	International Organization of Employers
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IRA	Initiative for the Resurgence of the Abolitionist Movement in Mauritania
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation
GIZ	German Development Agency
HTAT	Human Trafficking Assessment Tool (Nepal)
HTTCA	Human Trafficking and Transportation Control Act
KLFN	Kamaiya Liberation Front Nepal
KLPA	Kamaiya Labor Prohibition Act
LIC	Labor Inspectors and Controllers
MAIEO	Ministre d’Affaires Islamiques et de l’Enseignement Originel/Minister for Islamic Affairs and Original Education (Mauritanie)
MASEF	Ministère des Affaires Sociales, de l’Enfance et de la Famille/Ministry for Social Affairs, Children and the Family
MFI	Microfinance institution
MFPTMA	Ministry of Public Services, Labor and the Modernization of Administration (Mauritania)
MININTER	Ministerio del Interior/Ministry of Internal Affairs (Peru)
MINNJUS	Ministerio de Justicia y Derechos Humanos/Ministry of Justice and Human Rights (Peru)
MoLE	Ministry of Labor and Employment (Nepal)
MoLRM	Ministry of Land Reform Management (Nepal)
MoWCSW	Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare (Nepal)
MRG	Minority Rights Group
MRO	Mauritanian Ouguiyas (currency)
MTPE	Ministerio de Trabajo y la Promoción del Empleo/Ministry of Labor and the Promotion of Employment (Peru)
NAP	National Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NMP	National Master Plan
NPA	National Plan of Action (Nepal)
NPC	National Planning Commission (Nepal)

NTUC	Nepal Trade Union Congress
OHCHR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
ONS	Office National de la Statistique/National Statistics Bureau
PANE	Plateforme des Acteurs Non-Etatiques/Platform for Non-State Actors
PANETE-RIM	Plan d'Action pour l'Elimination du Travail des Enfants/National Plan of Action on the Elimination of Child Labor
PNCLTF	Plan Nacional de Lucha contra el Trabajo Forzoso/National Plan for the Fight against Forced Labor (Peru)
PNP	Policía Nacional del Perú/Peruvian National Police
PSA	Public Service Announcement (Nepal)
RETA	Trata de Personas Sistema de Registro/Human Trafficking Registration System
RHMSF	Rastriya, Haliya, Mukti, Samaj Foundation (Nepal)
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SISTRA	Sistema de Información Estratégica sobre la Trata de Personas/Strategic Information System for Human Trafficking (Peru)
SNAJ	Stratégie Nationale d'Accès à la Justice/National Strategy for Access to Justice (Mauritania)
SNGM	Stratégie Nationale de Gestion de la Migration/National Strategy for Migration Management (Mauritania)
SNPE	Strategie Nationale de Protection de l'Enfance/National Strategy for Child Protection (Mauritania)
SUNAFIL	Superintendencia Nacional de Fiscalización Laboural/Superintendence of Labor Inspection (Peru)
TdH	Terres des Hommes
TOT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
VDC	Village Development Committee (Nepal)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Introduction

As of 2016, the ILO estimates that 40.3 million men, women, and children are the victims of forced labor – trafficked, held in debt bondage, or working in slavery-like conditions. The vast majority of these forced laborers - 24.39 percent - are exploited in the domestic work. Forced labor is a severe violation of human rights, which deprives victims of their freedom and dignity. But it is not only the victims who suffer; industries and businesses face unfair competition, and governments lose billions of dollars annually in tax income and social security contributions. In 2014, the ILO estimated the illegal profits generated by forced labor at the US \$150 billion per

year.

Since the early days of its existence, the International Labour Organization (ILO) has addressed forced labour and slavery-like practices, adopting Conventions on the issue in 1930 and 1957 – the Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (No. 29) and the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105). Several other international instruments⁶⁰ deal with the issues of forced labor and human trafficking. The latest one was approved International Labour Conference (ILC) in June 2014, to supplement the Forced Labor C.29. The Protocol is a new legally binding instrument that is intended to strengthen global efforts to eliminate forced labor

The new instrument lays out strategies to prevent forced labor. It requires ILO member States to take measures to identify, release⁶¹, and provide assistance to victims of forced labor. The Protocol also obligates States to ensure that victims have access to appropriate and effective remedies, such as compensation. To ensure the effective implementation of those measures, the Protocol calls for ILO member States to consult with employers' and workers' organizations to develop national policies and action plans against forced labor.

1.2 Background and description of the project

The project was designed and is being implemented by the ILO's Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS), which is part of the Governance and Tripartism Department (GOVERNANCE), in coordination with Country offices. The overall goal of this project is to strengthen global and national efforts to eliminate forced labor under the 2014 ILO Protocol on Forced Labor.

The project is being implemented both at the global level and in six countries with different geographical coverage to illustrate how the Protocol can be implemented efficiently: five priority countries include Malaysia, Mauritania, Nepal, Niger, and Peru and two partner countries, Dominican Republic and Thailand.

The project will strive to achieve this through five Intermediate Objectives (IOs):

1. Increased knowledge, awareness and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation;
2. Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with robust implementation, monitoring and enforcement mechanisms;
3. Increased efforts to collect reliable data to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional and global levels;
4. Workers' and employers' organizations actively support the fight against forced labor; and

⁶⁰ UN Slavery Conventions, as well as the UN Protocol to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, especially women and children, supplementing the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

⁶¹ In this context, release signifies liberating, or freeing a victim from a situation of forced labor.

5. Strengthened awareness and livelihood programs for victims of forced labor.

1.3 Description of main outputs and achievements by September 2017 as reported by the project

The project Results framework is available at Annex I

Global

IO 1. Increased knowledge, awareness and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation

- The ratification of the Protocol by 20 countries⁶²
- Over 16,000 people registered to the 50forFreedom web platform which raise aims to raise awareness on forced labor and the Protocol.
- A media training kit on forced labor is currently being developed by the project.

IO2. Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring and enforcement mechanisms

At the global level, the project is currently developing a guidance tool to develop/revise, implement, monitor and evaluate gender and age sensitive National Action Plans on forced labor.

IO3. Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional and global levels

Two workshops on developing these guidelines were held the International Conference of Labor Statisticians (ICLS) working group in 2016.

The project is in the process of signing an implementation agreement with the National Statistical Office in Thailand for a Statistical surveys on the prevalence of forced labor affecting adults and children.

The work on updating the Global Slavery Observatory is also ongoing, with 22 country profiles updated by April 2017.

IO4. Workers' and employers' organizations actively support the fight against forced labor

With project support, ITUC,t has undertaken activities in Paraguay and Mauritania on awareness raising, training, research and the development of media products to raise awareness about contemporary forms of forced labor and the Protocol.

⁶² Niger, Norway, United Kingdom, Mauritania, Mali, France, Czech Republic, Panama, Argentina, Estonia, Finland, Cyprus, Poland, France, Jamaica, Denmark, Iceland, Sweden, Netherlands, Spain

In partnership with the ILO Bureau of Employers' activities, the project announced the creation a forced Labor Network for employers' organizations, business and other stakeholders in June 2017

Dominican Republic

The Dominican Republic was added as participating country to the Bridge project in September 2017. The project staff should be appointed by the end of 2017. Interventions in the Dominican Republic will aim to strengthen the capacities of the Ministry of Labor to carry out their supervisory role and enforcement of labor laws, specifically related to forced labor, at national level. This will largely be done through work on the labor inspection process, under Intermediate objectives 2 and 3 of the Bridge project.

Malaysia

Malaysia was added as fourth priority country to the Bridge project in 2017 and is currently in the inception phase. Initial consultations suggest that the main outputs in Malaysia will fall under four of the project's intermediate objectives: IO1, IO2, IO3 and IO4.

Mauritania

IO 1. Increased knowledge, awareness and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation

The project is currently developing a national communication strategy for Mauritania. Other key results to date include a campaign to raise awareness of the Law 2015-031 "*on the criminalization and repression of slavery practices*" which was organized by the Bridge project in March 2017 around the annual national commemoration day of the struggle against slavery

IO2. Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring and enforcement mechanisms

The project has organized a training for mayors and administrative authorities on the Law 2015-31 and the role of locally elected representatives and administrative authorities in its implementation. The project is also currently assessing the training needs for judiciary at the special courts charged with judging the slavery-related crimes, the security forces (police, gendarmerie, and the National Guard), as well as administrative and municipal authorities.

IO 3. Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional and global levels

The projects is at planning stage of a study on recruitment mechanisms and employment of the workforce and conduct a statistical survey to define the different types of employment including forms similar to the practice of slavery.

IO 4. Workers' and employers' organizations actively support the fight against forced labor

In October 2016, the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), with the project support, organized a sub-regional training seminar on the fight against forced labor and modern forms of slavery in Mauritania for trade unionists from Niger, Mauritania, Mali, Burkina Faso and Senegal. The key outcome of the event was development of guidelines for the development of action plans on the effective implementation of international labor standards (ILS) on the elimination of forced labor and modern forms of slavery.

IO 5: Strengthened awareness and livelihood programs for victims of forced labor.

The project is currently exploring options for vocational training to victims of slavery in order to facilitate their socio-economic insertion in partnership with the national agency TADAMOUN.

Nepal

IO 1. Increased knowledge, awareness and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation

Rastriya Haliya Mutka Samaj Federation (RMHSF), an organization of freed-Haliyas, has been selected to carry out advocacy activities for the protection of forced labor victims in Kanchanpur and Bajura, and to review freed-Haliya protection policies at the national level. The selection of other partners for advocacy work on forced/bonded labor laws and policies will be completed by December 2017. These partners will form a core group called the Forced Labor Action Group (FLAG)

IO2. Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring and enforcement mechanisms

No outputs achieved yet.

IO3. Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional and global levels

The project has organized in partnership with the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) a capacity building workshop on March 2017. The workshop brought together key stakeholders to create a common understanding on forced labor definitions in Nepal and developed the draft questionnaire for the forced labor module of the NLFS-III.

IO 5: Strengthened awareness and livelihood programs for victims of forced labor.

The mapping of livelihood services was completed in 2017 as well as the selection of implementing partners who will provide skills/employability trainings for freed Haliyas in Nepal.

RMHSF is working with the project in identifying 600 beneficiaries who will be offered the trainings in two districts, Kanchanpur and Bajura. These trainings should begin in October 2017.

Niger

Niger was added as fifth priority country to the Bridge project in September 2017. The project staff should be appointed by the end of 2017. The main interventions in Niger are likely to fall under all five of the project's intermediate objectives. This will be confirmed after the four-month inception phase, required to finalize the proposed interventions and budget allocations, in consultation with USDOL.

Peru

IO 1. Increased knowledge, awareness and ratification of the ILO Protocol and Recommendation

In December 2016, the project supported the launch of the campaign "*No to slavery, no to forced labor in Peru*" in the city of Pucallpa, Ucayali, on the International Day for the Abolition of Slavery.

The project also provided technical assistance to the Andean Parliament to develop a recommendation, which encourages member states (Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia and Chile) to ratify the ILO Protocol. The recommendation was approved in February 2017.

IO2. Improved and responsive national policies and/or action plans and/or legislation on forced labor with strong implementation, monitoring and enforcement mechanisms

The project has provided technical assistance to the MINJUS and the MTPE in the revision of the criminal code to include forced labor as a crime. The resulting Legislative Decree came into force in January, 2017. The project has developed brief guidelines to inform public officials about the implications of the new Decree.

Other outputs achieved to date under this IO include:

- Training workshops for judges, prosecutors and police carried out in Lima, Ayacucho and Tumbes In November 2016.
- The first stage of evaluating the National Plan for the fight against Forced Labor 2013-2017 (PNLCTF) was undertaken in December 2016, in coordination with the MTPE and the CNLCTF. Recommendations are currently being drawn up for the development of the next National Action Plan which is expected to be completed in December 2017.
- A draft "Protocol on Forced Labor for peace judges" was developed and submitted to the Judiciary Executive Council for approval in 2017.

Thailand

Thailand is a participating country of the Bridge project. The sole activity to be implemented will be a statistical survey on Child Labor (Intervention 3.1.2.3). Work on the survey will get

underway as soon as the contract with the National Statistical Office is signed. Thailand has however raised concerns over certain provisions in the draft contract, which is likely to further delay the process.

IO3. Increased efforts to collect reliable data in order to carry out research and share knowledge across institutions at national, regional and global levels

To date the project has launched the activity on the systematization of information on human trafficking for labor exploitation and risks of forced labor along the border with Ecuador near Tumbes, and along the triple border with Brazil and Colombia near Loreto.

In 2017, the Ministry of Labor and Promotion of Employment (MTPE), the National Institute of Statistics (INEI) and the ILO also agreed to sign a Cooperation Agreement to carry out a specialized survey on forced labor in a specific region and economic sector.

IO 5: Strengthened awareness and livelihood programs for victims of forced labor.

The project in coordination with the MTPE is currently supporting the design of a pilot scheme to incorporate victims of force labor (“alleged victims”) and vulnerable people at risk of forced labor into MTPE employment programs. The design of the pilot aims to use the platform provided by FONDOEMPLEO, which is a grant-application fund supported by companies in the mining, hydrocarbon, energy and telecommunications fields, among others. Its central objective is to finance projects, training activities, professional development activities in relation to the promotion of employment opportunities, improving worker employability and informing workers of their fundamental rights.

PURPOSES OF THE EVALUATION

In accordance with the ILO Evaluation Policy and procedures⁶³, all development cooperation programmes and projects with a budget over USD five million must undertake an initial monitoring and evaluation appraisal, a midterm and a final independent evaluation. The specific evaluation provisions for this project are in line with the USDOL-ILO Management Procedures & Guidelines applicable for this project. One mid-term evaluation managed by ILO and one final evaluation managed by USDOL as the donor.

The mid-term independent evaluation (MTE) provides an opportunity for reflection and self-learning to improve project’s effectiveness operations for the remaining years as well as for building knowledge on programme implementation. Its recommendations are expected to be used to modify and adjust, if needed, the project strategy and interventions in order to improve strategic performance and accountability. Lessons learned and emerging good practices will be considered regarding the replication and scale-up of the model of intervention in other countries

⁶³ [EVAL Guidance Note 2: Midterm evaluations.](#)

as well as the development of other ILO projects. It is expected that the MTE identifies possible emerging organisational learning issues and other issues that the final evaluation could address

Moreover, the MTE will ascertain whether or not project interventions are aligned with ILO strategic objectives and policy outcomes as well as with existing Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs), United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and other national development frameworks. In particular, the MTE will analyse the project contribution to the SDGs 8.7. Lastly, the evaluation will consider the coordination with other ILO interventions.

The specific objectives of the present evaluation are:

- (i) review the continued relevance and usefulness of the intervention models designed for the stakeholders and project participants;
- (ii) assess the progress made to date towards achieving the planned global and country-level outputs and immediate objectives and identify any constraints hindering the achievement of these objectives;
- (iii) identify unexpected positive and negative results due to the project interventions;
- (iv) examine delivery of project outputs in terms of quality, quantity and timing and suggest what can be done to improve project performance;
- (v) analyse the effectiveness of the project through its delivered services and products at global and country levels.
- (vi) assess the potential impact of the project on the project participants and related stakeholders;
- (vii) review the sustainability strategy of the project and whether the strategy is still in line with project outcomes
- (viii) propose recommendations for improved effectiveness and performance;
- (ix) Identify emerging good practices and consider lessons learned so far.

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This mid-term independent evaluation will cover both global and country level interventions since the project start in September 2015 until November 2017. In particular, it will look into the work developed by the project in three initial priority countries (Mauritania, Nepal and Peru) and at Global level, in line with the USDOL approved Project document “The PRODOC”.

The primary users of the evaluation are global and national stakeholders, the project and other ILO staff⁶⁴, host governments of priority countries, the USDOL project manager, and management team, monitoring and evaluation division. Other practitioners to inform the knowledge base and target interventions to victims of forced labor should also use findings. The target groups are the tripartite constituents, the implementing agencies and the beneficiaries at each country.

⁶⁴ It includes the ILO country Directors, ILO specialists in HQ and the field, the technical backstopping unit (FUNDAMENTALS), the project team at global and country levels.

The evaluation will integrate gender equality as a cross-cutting concern throughout its deliverables and process. Furthermore, it should pay attention to issues related to social dialogue and international labour standards.

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the ILO policy guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 3rd ed. (Aug. 2017)⁶⁵. The ILO evaluation policy bases its definition of evaluation on that employed by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD/DAC) and also follows the evaluation criteria (e.g., relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability)⁶⁶. Gender concerns should be addressed in line with EVAL guidance note n° 3.467. It should also take into consideration EVAL Guidance Note n° 3.368 to ensure stakeholder participation. The evaluation, in addition, is also in line with USDOL guidelines for evaluation.

The evaluation should address the questions below both for global or country activities. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluation team in accordance with the given purpose and in consultation with the evaluation manager. Any fundamental changes to the evaluation criteria and questions should be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator team, and reflected in the inception report.

Validity of design

- To what extent the theory of change of the project is still valid? Please suggest adjustments to be made in the project objectives and strategy in the second half of the project.
- Has the project contextualized the global project strategy to the country context and priorities, taking into consideration national capacity, legal framework and availability of data?
- Are gender issues well integrated into the project document, CMEP and the countries' Scopes of Work?
- Are the interventions addressing the needs of project participants and relevant stakeholders?

Effectiveness:

- Is the project accomplishing its planned results as expected at global and country levels? What are the factors, internal and external to the project, which may be contributing to these successes and challenges?
- What changes may be needed to improve project delivery?
- How effective is the project in delivering core services to stakeholders and project participants? Are livelihood services well adapted to the project participants' needs and context?
- Assess the effectiveness of public media engaged by the projects in campaigns against Force labor

⁶⁵ ILO evaluation guidelines can be accessed at http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

⁶⁶ Evaluation Criteria for OECD/DAC: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

⁶⁷ [EVAL Guidance Note 4. Integrating gender in monitoring and evaluation of projects.](#)

⁶⁸ [EVAL Guidance Note No. 7 Stakeholder participation.](#)

Efficiency:

- Is the project on track to achieve its intermediate objectives?
- How relevant and appropriate are CMEP indicators for the monitoring of the project? How is the project using monitoring data to inform project implementation?
- Is the project management team adequate to carry out the project activities and are financial resources appropriately allocated for efficient project implementation?
- How are the roles and responsibilities of ILO country staff and Bridge staff delineated in priority countries? What is the contribution of ILO's regional offices to project implementation?
- Is there a need to review the project strategy or intervention level taking into account the available resources?

- Potential impact:
 - How likely are the project interventions in the priority and participating countries to result in positive high level changes regarding the ultimate beneficiaries at local, national and global levels?
 - How likely are the project interventions in the priority and participating countries to result in positive changes for the ultimate beneficiaries?
 - To what extent has the project strengthened the institutional capacity (service and policy) of ILO tripartite constituents in eliminating forced labour?

- Relevance and strategic fit:
 - Is the project aligned with the ILO strategic objectives and policy outcomes; existing ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs); United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs); SDGs, other national development frameworks; and, existing government initiatives?
 - To what extent were national relevant stakeholders, including government, employers' and workers' organizations, as well as beneficiaries (e.g. victims of forced labour), consulted and involved in the prioritisation and implementation of interventions?
 - Were the needs of forced labour victims fully taken into account while designing the interventions?
 - Did the project adequately consider the gender dimension on the interventions design and how?
 - Was the project's strategy appropriate and relevant for addressing FL efforts at the national and global levels?

- Sustainability:
 - Are the project models of intervention and outcomes are developing to be replicated or scaled up by national partners or other actors by the end of the project?
 - Which project's outcomes are most likely sustainable and transferable to the communities or relevant institutions when the project ends (e.g., interventions for livelihood or vocational training solutions)?
 - Is the project leveraging national and regional commitment and resources to address the forced labour issue?
 - How likely are the benefits of the project interventions for victims to continue after the project lifespan?
 - Is there a phase out strategy developed and has it been started being implemented in order to promote project sustainability?

METHODOLOGY⁶⁹ An international evaluator will undertake the evaluation, supported by national evaluators in the 3 countries that will be visited (Mauritania, Nepal and Peru). The international evaluator will be the Evaluation team leader responsible for coordinating the work of the national evaluators.

The evaluation methodology will be developed by the selected international evaluator and approved by the evaluation manager, and will build further on the following activities/steps:

- Document review and analysis (e.g. project documents, progress reports, pre-situational analysis, CMEP, etc.);
- Development of the inception report with detailed work plan;
- Interviews and discussions with the project team in Geneva at the beginning of the evaluation process to discuss the evaluation design (e.g. develop a list of interviewees, data collection methodology, identify case studies, etc.) and to interact with the key stakeholders (project staff in HQ, staff of FUNDAMENTALS, donor, etc.);
- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders (e.g. project staff, social partners and government officials, ultimate beneficiaries of the project, donor, etc.) in three priority countries and the global level;
- Three country visits where the evaluators will undertake site visits, focus group discussion and interviews with key stakeholders and beneficiaries.
- Validation workshops at the end of each country visit with key stakeholders.
- One debrief workshop in Geneva (with relevant stakeholders including the donor through Skype/VC) to present the major preliminary findings, solicit feedback, and obtain clarification or additional information as needed.
- As part of the evaluation process, but without involvement of the evaluation team leader, the project will organize a follow-up global meeting with participation of the project core team in end of February/early March to discuss the evaluation report, particularly the recommendations, regarding the second part of the project timeframe.

Sources of information and consultations

1. The following are suggested sources of information for the desk review:

Available at HQ and to be supplied by the evaluation manager	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. ILO Evaluation guidelines and templates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project documents (Prodoc, pre-situational analysis, CMEP)
--	--

⁶⁹ The evaluator may adapt the methodology, but any fundamental changes should be agreed upon between the evaluation manager and the evaluator, and reflected in the inception report.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical Progress reports - Project modification approvals - Project publications - Project research/studies (TORs, reports etc)
--	--

2. Consultations will be held with:

- Implementing partners (HQ and country level)
- Direct beneficiaries of the project (beneficiaries of trainings and of livelihood programs)
- Project Advisory Committees (where applicable)
- National/district Government officials (Statistical offices, MOL, other key ministries working with the project)
- Employers' and workers' organizations
- Civil Society Organizations/NGOs working with the project
- USDOL/OCFT including the Project Manager and the Evaluation Specialist assigned to this evaluation
- ILO Bridge staff (HQ and field)
- ILO HQ specialists supporting the Bridge project
- ILO Country Directors

MAIN DELIVERABLES

The mid-term evaluation will include the deliverables described below. All reports should be submitted in English:

An inception report

The inception report should be prepared on the basis of the documents and reports reviewed as well as of the briefings with the evaluation manager, the project staff and the donor.

In line with EVAL Checklist 3⁷⁰, the report should include:

- a) Description of the evaluation methodology and instruments to be used in sampling, data collection and analysis and the data collection plan mentioned above.
- b) Guide questions for questionnaires and focus group discussions;
- c) Detailed fieldwork plan for the three priority countries should be developed in consultation with the Evaluation Manager and project team;
- d) The proposed report outline structure.

The ILO evaluation manager will review and approve the inception report upon reception before starting the fieldwork.

Validation workshop in three priority countries.

After the field visit consultant will organize a validation workshop involving local stakeholders and country project staff to validate the preliminary findings.

Stakeholders workshop in Geneva

⁷⁰ [EVAL Checklist 3: Writing the inception report.](#)

A workshop will be organized at ILO-HQ to validate findings with ILO staff (HQ) and the field (via VC or Skype) and with the donor (via VC).

Draft Report

In line with EVAL Checklist 5⁷¹, the draft report should include, *inter alia*:

- a) an executive summary (Max 5 pages)⁷² with the methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations;
- b) purposes and methodology of the evaluation (including limitations);
- c) findings and a table presenting key outputs and outcomes achieved at both the global and country levels by project immediate objective;
- d) Conclusions and recommendations;
- e) lessons learned and good practices⁷³;
- f) annexes, including data files, survey data, case studies, and focus group transcripts,;
- g) Lessons learned⁷⁴ and good practices⁷⁵ fact sheets (for EVAL database).

The total length of the report should be a maximum of 30 pages for the main report, excluding annexes; background and details on specific projects evaluated can be provided in the annexes. The report should be sent as one complete document. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.

The Evaluation Manager will circulate the draft report to key stakeholders, the project staff and the donor for their review and forward the consolidated comments to the evaluation team. The project will translate the report into national languages, if necessary, for submission to stakeholders in the countries.

Final report

The evaluator team leader will finalize and submit the report to the evaluation manager in line with EVAL Checklist 5⁷⁶. The report should address all comments and/or provide explanations why comments were not taken into account. A summary of the report, a data annex and the lessons learned and good practices fact sheets from the project should be submitted as well. The quality of the report will be assessed against ILO/EVAL's Checklist 6⁷⁷.

The evaluation manager will review the final version and submit to EVAL for approval. The evaluation report will be distributed to global and national stakeholders to ensure enhance learning. The final evaluation report, good practices and lessons learned will be stored and broadly disseminated through the EVAL's database⁷⁸ as to provide easy access to all development partners, to reach target audiences and to maximise the benefits of the evaluation.

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

⁷¹ [EVAL Checklist 5: Preparing the evaluation report.](#)

⁷² [EVAL Checklist 8: Preparing the evaluation summary for projects.](#)

⁷³ [EVAL Guidance Note 3: Evaluation Lessons Learned and Emerging Good Practices.](#)

⁷⁴ [ILO Lesson Learned Template.](#)

⁷⁵ [ILO Emerging Good Practice Template.](#)

⁷⁶ *Opus cit.*

⁷⁷ [EVAL Checklist 6: Rating the quality of evaluation reports.](#)

⁷⁸ [ILO i-eval Discovery.](#)

The evaluation will be managed by an ILO officer certified as ILO Evaluation Manager (EM)⁷⁹, who reports for this evaluation directly to EVAL. The EM is responsible for the overall management of the evaluation and in particular to:

- a) prepare the TOR and search for the external evaluators;
- b) ensure proper stakeholder involvement;
- c) approve the inception report
- d) circulate draft and final reports;
- e) ensure follow-up.

The Bridge project team in Geneva will provide administrative support as required, in particular for the work in the countries. It will also provide the evaluators with the required information on the project strategy. During the evaluation process, the project monitoring and database officer, under the guidance of the Project director, will provide overall administrative and logistical support for the evaluation, including setting up the meetings in Geneva and liaising with the National Project Coordinators (NPCs) for the organization of the in-country missions. If necessary, the project will support the translation of the reports and key reference documents to the national languages.

An evaluation team comprised by an evaluation leader and local evaluation consultants should perform the evaluation. Gender balance and knowledge of gender equality issues will be considered in the selection of the evaluation team. The local evaluation consultants must have working knowledge of English and fluent in local languages and dialects in order to perform the interviews with stakeholders from Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The background and responsibilities of the evaluation team members are described below.

Evaluation team leader

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of project documents • Briefings with project staff and EM in Geneva • Telephone interview with the donor • Development of the Inception report • Interviews with global stakeholders • Review of documents, interviews and • Field visit to 3 countries and validation workshops • Facilitate stakeholders workshop in Geneva • Draft evaluation report • Finalise evaluation report • Coordinate local evaluation consultants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not have been involved in the project. • Relevant background in social and/or economic development. • Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects that include research components, in particular with policy level work and institutional building. • Experience in evaluations in the UN system or other international context (5 years) • Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings. • Experience with global projects evaluations that include Americas, Africa and/or Asia • Fluency in English is essential, working knowledge of Arabic, French and Spanish are an asset

⁷⁹ The EM is not directly involved in the project neither works for the same department.

Local Evaluation Consultants

Responsibilities (jointly with the team leader)	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of country specific project documents • Review of documents, organize interviews • Support the drafting of the evaluation report • Support the team leader in field work in the country with the necessary interviews, translation and gathering of other supporting information • Provide inputs to the draft report • Present the preliminary findings in the validation workshop in their respective countries • Address the country specific concerns and information in the evaluation report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not have been involved in the project. • Relevant background in social and/or economic development. • Experience in qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis • Experience in the evaluation of development projects in particular with policy level work and institutional building. • Experience with project evaluations in their respective country • Fluency in English and local languages

Timeline

The mid-term evaluation will be conducted between October and February 2017, in accordance with the tentative timeline below⁸⁰:

Deliverables	Tasks	Tentative dates	Working days (leader)	Working days per national consultant (national evaluators)
1) Inception report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A desk review of project documents • A briefing with the evaluation manager and the project team at ILO-HQ in Geneva and with the donor (via skype). • Development of the inception report 	December 2017	5	
2) Field work in the priority Countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field missions to <i>Mauritania</i>, Nepal and Peru • Validation workshop by country (only key stakeholders) 	January/February 2018	27	21

⁸⁰ The exact dates will be established between the ILO and the evaluators.

3) Global stakeholders' interview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews with global stakeholders and ILO staff at HQ and the regions 	February 2018	2	0
4) Sharing preliminary findings with the project stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present preliminary findings of the evaluation in the project review workshop in Washington 	TBD	1	
5) Draft report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of the report 	March 2018	7	2
6) Comments to the draft report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft report circulated by the EM to global and national stakeholders, ILO staff and the donor Comments received consolidated by the EM and sent to evaluation team 	March 2018	0	0
7) Final report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalization of the report, integrating comments received 	March 2018	3	
Total			45	21

LEGAL AND ETHICAL MATTERS

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with the criteria and approaches for international development assistance as established by OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard. The DAC Evaluation Quality Standards provide guidance on the conduct of evaluations and for reports with the aim to improve the quality of development intervention evaluations. They are intended to contribute to a harmonized approach to evaluation in line with the principles of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. The evaluation should adhere to the international technical and ethical standards in line with the Code of Conduct for Evaluation one the UN System, which should be dully signed and returned to the ILO (see annex).⁸¹

⁸¹ [ILO Code of Conduct Agreement for Evaluators.](#)

All evaluation drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents and analytical reports ownership rests jointly with ILO and the consultants. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

RESOURCES

Estimated resource requirements at this point:

Fees


- Team leader: 45 working days
- Local consultant: 21 working days

Travel & DSA

- Team leader: 4 missions (2 days in Geneva, 9 days in Nepal, 9 days Mauritania and 9 days in Peru)
- Local consultants-3 (priority countries): 1 missions each

Other costs

- Workshop costs for national consultations in the countries
- Workshop cost for the final validation of the findings at Geneva
- Translation of documents to national languages
- Interpretation
- Project follow-up workshop



Critical Assumptions:

1. The Government, workers' and employers' organizations and civil society are committed to eliminating forced labor.
2. Potential social, economic, political and climate change factors may influence the achievement of project outcomes.

