BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

MEASUREMENT, AWARENESS-RAISING, AND POLICY ENGAGEMENT TO ADDRESS CHILD LABOR AND FORCED LABOR (MAP 16)

April 2024

Grantee: International Labour Organization

Project Duration: December 2016 – June 2024

Funding Level: Final total funding (inclusive of initial funding) $23,945,000

Evaluation Team: Dan O'Brien (Lead Evaluator)
Ridhi Sahai (Evaluation Manager)
Shankar Talwar (Local Evaluator, India)
Driton Zeqiri (Local Evaluator, Kosovo)
Pyone Myat Thu (Local Evaluator, Timor-Leste)
Manzo Rio Rio Aminou (Local Evaluator, Niger)
Mayumi Rezwan (Senior Analyst)
McKinzie Davis (Analyst)

Evaluation Fieldwork Dates: July 31 – October 30, 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This report describes the final evaluation of the *Measurement, Awareness-raising, and Policy Engagement Project to Accelerate Action against Child Labor and Forced Labor* (MAP 16). Fieldwork for this evaluation was conducted from July through October 2023. The NORC evaluation team conducted this independent evaluation in collaboration with the project team and stakeholders and prepared the evaluation report according to the terms specified in its contract with the United States Department of Labor. The evaluation team would like to express sincere thanks to all the parties involved for their support and valuable contributions.

Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor under contract number 1605DC-18-A-0023. This material does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT 1
LIST OF ACRONYMS 8
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 10
BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT 10
PROJECT DESCRIPTION 10
KEY EVALUATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS 10
LESSONS LEARNED 14
PROMISING PRACTICES 15
RECOMMENDATIONS 16
1. PROJECT CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION 17
1.1 PROJECT CONTEXT 17
1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION 18
2. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY 20
2.1 PURPOSE 20
2.2 METHODOLOGY 21
3. EVALUATION RESULTS 21
3.1 RELEVANCE 21
3.2 COHERENCE 31
3.3 EFFECTIVENESS 33
3.4 IMPACT 59
3.5 EFFICIENCY 65
3.6 SUSTAINABILITY 68
4. LESSONS LEARNED AND PROMISING PRACTICES 74
4.1 LESSONS LEARNED 74
4.2 PROMISING PRACTICES 76
5. CONCLUSIONS 77
RELEVANCE 77
COHERENCE 77
EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT 78
SUSTAINABILITY 79
6. RECOMMENDATIONS 80
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ILO AND USDOL 80
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USDOL 82
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ILO 83
ANNEX A. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED 87
ANNEX B. TERMS OF REFERENCE 88
1. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION 90
2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION 92
3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS 93
4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME 94
ANNEX C. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY 105
EVALUATION QUESTIONS 105
EVALUATION TEAM 106
EVALUATION APPROACH AND SCHEDULE 106
DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS 107
LIMITATIONS 110
ANNEX D. MAP-16 RESULTS FRAMEWORK 112
ANNEX E. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT PERFORMANCE 115
PROJECT OBJECTIVE 115

ANNEX F. COMPLETE RESULTS OF THE ONLINE PERCEPTION SURVEY 147
TOTAL SAMPLE 147
SAMPLE PROFILE 149
RELEVANCE, EFFECTIVENESS, AND USE OF TRAININGS 151
ARGENTINA, BY OUTCOME 155
FIJI, BY OUTCOME 157
INDIA, BY OUTCOME 159
KOSOVO, BY OUTCOME 161
NIGER, BY OUTCOME 165
SERBIA, BY OUTCOME 167
SRI LANKA 169
TIMOR-LESTE, BY OUTCOME 170

INDEX OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Outcome 1, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements..... 35
Figure 2: Outcome 2, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements..... 36
Figure 3: Outcome 3, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements..... 38
Figure 4: India Outcomes, Indicators, Targets, and Achievement..... 39
Figure 5: Outcome 4, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements..... 50
Figure 6: Outcome 1, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements..... 115
Figure 7: Sub-outcome 1.1.A Outputs, Targets, and Achievements 115
Figure 8: Sub-outcome 1.2 Outputs, Targets, and Achievements..... 117
Figure 9: Outcome 2, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements..... 118
Figure 10: Sub-outcome 2.1 Outputs, Targets, and Achievements 119
Figure 11: Sub-outcome 2.2 Output, Target, and Achievement..... 120
Figure 12: Outcome 3, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievement 121
Figure 13: Sub-outcome 3.2 outputs, Target, and Achievement 121
Figure 14: India Outcomes, Indicators, Targets, and Achievement 122
Figure 15: India Outcomes, Outputs, Targets, and Achievements..... 123
Figure 16: Argentina Outcomes, Outputs, Targets, and Achievement..... 127
Figure 17: Fiji Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements..... 129
Figure 18: Kosovo Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements 131
Figure 19: Niger Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements..... 135
Figure 20: Serbia Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements..... 136
Figure 21: Sri Lanka Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements..... 140
Figure 22: Timor-Leste Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements..... 142
Figure 23: Outcome 4, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements 145
Figure 24: Outcome 4 Outputs, Output Targets, and Achievements 145

INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1. MAP 16 Project Performance Summary 12
Table 2. Project Modifications 18
Table 3. MAP 16 Project Objective and Outcomes 19
Table 4. Recommendations and Supporting Evidence 84
Table 5. Individuals Included in Analysis 147
Table 6. Reason for Not Including in Analysis 147
Table 7. Individuals per Outcome 147
Table 8. What is your gender? 149
Table 9. What kind of organization do you work for? 149
Table 10. How many total ILO MAP 16 trainings on child labor have you participated in so far? 150
Table 11. In which year(s) did you participate in ILO MAP 16 training(s) on child labor? 150
Table 12. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor? 151
Table 13. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor? 151
Table 14. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor? 152
Table 15. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work. 153
Table 16. Please select the reason(s) that best describe why you do not use the knowledge and skills acquired from these trainings. 153
Table 17. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Argentina? 155
Table 18. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor? 155
Table 19. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor? 155
Table 20. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work. 155
Table 21. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Fiji? 157
Table 22. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor? 157
Table 23. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor? 157
Table 24. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work. 157

Table 25. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in India? 159

Table 26. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor? 159

Table 27. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor? 159

Table 28. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work. 159

Table 29. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Kosovo? 161

Table 30. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor? 161

Table 31. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor? 162

Table 32. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work. 162

Table 33. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Niger? 165

Table 34. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor? 165

Table 35. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor? 165

Table 36. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work. 165

Table 37. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Serbia? 167

Table 38. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor? 167

Table 39. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor? 167

Table 40. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work. 167

Table 41. Please select the reason(s) that best describe why you do not use the knowledge and skills acquired from these training. 168

Table 42. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Sri Lanka? 169

Table 43. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor? 169

Table 44. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor? 169

Table 45. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work. 169

Table 46. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Timor-Leste? 170

Table 47. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor? 170

Table 48. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor? 170

Table 49. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work. 170

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CGT	Confederación General del Trabajo de la República Argentina
CLEAR	Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II
CLRISK	Child Labor Risk Identification Model
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
CONAETI	Comisión Nacional para la Erradicación del Trabajo InfantilInfantil (Argentina)
COOPRETI	Comisión Provincial para la Prevención y Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil (Argentina)
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CTAA	Central de Trabajadores Autónoma de la Argentina
CTAT	Central de Trabajadores y Trabajadoras de la Argentina
CSW	Centre for Social Work (Kosovo, Serbia)
DE&I	Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
DOL	Department of Labour (Sri Lana)
ERAD	Employment Relations Advisory Board (Fiji)
FMLE	Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment (Niger)
FUNDAMENTALS	Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (ILO)
FTUC	Fiji Trade Unions Congress
GBNFL	Global Business Network on Forced Labour
IAB	International Advisory Board
ICLS	International Child Labour Statistics
ILAB	Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
LISA	Labour Inspection System Application (Sri Lanka)
KAP	Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAP 16	Measurement, Awareness-Raising, and Policy Engagement Project to Accelerate Action against Child Labor and Forced Labor
MEPIR	Ministry of Employment, Productivity, and Industrial Relations (Fiji)
MICS	Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (UNICEF)
MLEVSP	Ministry of Labour, Employment, Veteran and Social Policy (Serbia)
MLSW	Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (Kosovo)
MOL	Ministry of Labour
MOLEVSA	Ministry of Labour, Employment, Veteran and Social Affairs (Serbia)
MRMDDM	Ministry of Rural and Maritime Development and Disaster Management (Fiji)
MWCPA	Ministry of Women, Children, and Social Protection (Fiji)
NAPCL	National Action Plan for Child Labour (Fiji, Niger, Serbia)
NCAS	National Child Activity Survey (Sri Lanka)
NCLP	National Child Labour Policy (Fiji, India)
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NPC	National Project Coordinator
OCFT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
NSO	National Statistics Office (Mongolia)
PLFS	Periodic Labour Force Survey (India)
RILAC	Regional Initiative Latin America and the Caribbean Free of Child Labour
SCPS	State Child Protection Society (India)
SCREAM	Supporting Children's Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media

SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SECTOR	Sectoral Policies Department (ILO)
SO	Sub-objective
TPR	Technical Progress Report
TUS	Time Use Survey (India)
UIA	Union Industrial Argentina
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USDOL	U.S. Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labour

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

On December 9, 2016, the United States Department of Labor's (USDOL) Bureau of International Labor Affairs' (ILAB) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) awarded the International Labour Organization (ILO) a cooperative agreement for USD 9,400,000 million to implement the *Measurement, Awareness-Raising, and Policy Engagement Project to Accelerate Action against Child Labor and Forced Labor* (MAP 16). Over the life of the project, MAP 16 worked globally, as well as with 13 countries to build capacity: Argentina, Colombia, Fiji, India, Jordan, Kosovo,* [1] Mauritania, Montenegro, Morocco, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste. It should be noted that this final evaluation did not cover the totality of the MAP 16 project since some project components were closed prior to the evaluation.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

MAP 16 aimed to help build and apply the critical knowledge needed to inform policy choices to combat child labor and forced labor and to support measures to address these challenges in key countries, regions, and sectors. The MAP 16 project design consisted of the following four outcomes:

Outcome 1: Improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

Outcome 2: Improved application of knowledge in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor.

Outcome 3: Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations, and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking through national, regional, and global initiatives.

Outcome 4: Strengthened partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

KEY EVALUATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

RELEVANCE

Overall, MAP 16 was relevant and effectively responded to the needs of the countries. The project design, however, had inherent weaknesses. The midterm evaluation found that the project design lacked coherence and missed opportunities for collaboration and did not incorporate a strong gender and inclusiveness strategy. It should be noted, however, according to USDOL, the MAP 16 project was not designed to emphasize coherence. Rather, it was designed to be flexible and allow the ILO to respond to research needs and opportunities and requests from a variety of countries, which allowed the project to implement interventions to meet the needs of a larger number of countries.

To address these findings, the project took concrete steps to improve communication and collaboration; these steps included more frequent meetings and more sharing of information about the four outcomes. It also implemented a gender and diversity tool that it used to gather information and report on gender and inclusion in the technical progress reports (TPRs). To improve the project design, synergies between the outcomes could have been created by

[1] This designation is without prejudice to positions on status and is in line with UN Security Council resolution 1244.

developing outcomes that require the project team to collaborate and develop stronger linkages between global interventions and their implementation in target countries. The project design process, on the other hand, could be improved by streamlining the project document approval process.

COHERENCE

The project collaborated effectively with other organizations at both the global and country levels. At the global level, the project collaborated with a range of United Nations (UN) agencies, such as UNICEF and IOM to develop global research reports.[2] The project was less successful at developing linkages with Alliance 8.7 action groups and civil society organizations at the global level. At the country level, MAP 16 collaborated and coordinated effectively with child labor and forced labor actors in the majority of the target countries. The one exception was the collaboration with UNICEF. Although MAP 16 collaborated with UNICEF on research initiatives in Fiji, India, Niger, Serbia, and Timor-Leste, the project was not able to develop a long-term strategic partnership with UNICEF in any of the countries, as had been called for in the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) document.

IMPACT

Under **Outcome 1**, an important effect is that countries understand that they have the duty and the tools to monitor progress to address child labor. Another important effect is that the research and global reports—which serve as important reference reports—helped increase awareness about child labor and forced labor and provided a strong evidence base to support ILO recommendations to address child labor and forced labor.

Under **Outcome 2**, the project developed a range of digital products to communicate knowledge about child labor and forced labor to broad audiences. While it is difficult to measure the effect of these activities and products, they played an important role in increasing awareness about child labor and forced labor.

Under **Outcome 3**, MAP 16 supported the ILO's Regional Initiative for Latin America and the Caribbean (RILAC) to develop a child labor risk identification model (CLRISK) for 13 countries, which has been used on a limited basis to inform policies and programs.[3,4] In India, the project achieved important effects, including linking child labor families to government social services in Bihar state. In Argentina, research on child labor shows potential to inform public policy. In addition, child labor training modules developed by MAP 16 have been incorporated into ongoing training programs at the Argentine Industrial Union (business association) and at the Ministry of Labor for labor inspectors. In Fiji, Niger, Serbia, and Timor-Leste, the project raised awareness about child labor and developed important policies and protocols that have not yet been approved by governments. While some key legislative policies (revised decree on hazardous child labor and the decree on light work) have not been adopted in Serbia, it should be noted that other key regulatory changes were adopted, such as the protocol and instruction for the social system and the specific protocol for the labor inspectorate on addressing child

[2] The ILO, UNICEF, and IOM collaborated on the report Ending Child Labour, Forced Labour and Human Trafficking in Global Supply Chains. In addition, ILO and UNICEF discussed how to the ILO child labor questionnaire with the UNICEF Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys.
[3] The CLRISK model was implemented in 11 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and 2 countries in Africa. The South to South collaboration was an important achievement in the implementation of the CLRISK model.
[4] The objective of the CLRISK model is to provide information to make timely public policy decisions. The model's risk maps identify territories with a probability of child labor. Through the country maps, more than 12,000 municipalities (local governments) have been identified with a high, medium or low probability of risk of child labor.

labor cases. In Kosovo, the project developed pieces of a child labor regulatory framework that include hazardous child labor and light work lists that will serve as the foundation of the new administrative instruction on child labor. While some of these regulatory changes were not adopted during the life of the project, other important policy changes were made. The Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Development in Kosovo now forbids its subcontractors to use hazardous child labor (based on the hazardous child labor list) and incorporated training on hazardous child labor in its farmer training program.

Under **Outcome 4**, the project provided funding to establish the Alliance 8.7 website and conduct key activities. The website hosts a range of information about the Alliance 8.7, including impact stories that tell the histories of people formerly involved in child labor and forced labor and the effects the projects have had on their lives. MAP 16 also provided funds to establish and help jump-start the ILO's Global Business Network on Forced Labour (GBNFL) and supported GBNFL research and communications activities as well as workshops, webinars, and meetings. Another noteworthy achievement under Outcome 4 is the dissemination of the joint ILO-UNICEF publication Child Labour: Global Estimates 2020, Trends and the Road Forward. In addition, the MAP 16 project supported Alliance 8.7 to raise awareness about Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 8.7 and countries' duties to monitor progress on the achievement of the SDG 8.7 target.

EFFICIENCY

The project operated in an efficient manner. It produced outputs and achieved outcome indicator targets with the planned amount of human and financial resources. The COVID-19 pandemic was the most important hindering factor. The pandemic caused the project to postpone and reschedule activities and shift training and policy dialogue activities to virtual formats that caused some delays. Other important hindering factors were national elections, politics, and changes in key government personnel.

EFFECTIVENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY

Table 1 summarizes the effectiveness (achievement of project outcomes) and their sustainability. The table also provides a rating for both achievement and sustainability: low, moderate, above moderate, and high. The guidance and criteria used to assign ratings are explained in the Terms of Reference (Annex C).

Table 1. MAP 16 Project Performance Summary

Performance Summary	Rating
Outcome 1: Improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking	
ACHIEVEMENT. The project made strong progress in improving the knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking. The project did not have indicators for two of its sub-outcomes under Outcome 1. For the third sub-outcome, number of countries that conduct child labor surveys, the project exceeded the indicator target by one country, and it significantly exceeded the indicator target for the number of country-level core child labor indicator sets (301). The project also completed 76 percent of its outputs. Some of the most noteworthy achievements were the global reports on child labor and forced labor that served as key reference reports and helped raise awareness. The range of data collection and analysis tools, accompanied by training, helped ensure that countries have the means by which to monitor child labor and forced labor. SUSTAINABILITY. The data collection and analysis tools mentioned above exist and are available to countries to use, but they will eventually have to be updated, which will require donor support. The International Advisory Board, which MAP 16 established to provide	Achievement: Above Moderate ☐☐☐¢ Sustainability: Moderate ☐☐☐☐

Performance Summary	Rating
expert review of the research activities, shows promise to continue to provide research support to the ILO once MAP 16 ends. The project trained and worked closely with the countries' statistical offices to build capacity and create ownership. While the project helped strengthen their capacity to conduct future child labor and forced labor surveys and studies, they will require resources that most MAP 16 countries do not have in their budgets. The various global reports on child labor and forced labor exist and are available on the ILO website. However, given the dynamic and changing nature of both child labor and forced labor, these reports and studies will have to be repeated to remain up-to-date and relevant, which will require donor financing.	
Outcome 2: Improved application of knowledge in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor	
ACHIEVEMENT. The project met its indicator target for Outcome 2, which is the number of uses of knowledge products. It also exceeded the indicator targets for the number of persons who accessed the ILO and Alliance 8.7 websites and number of persons who attended knowledge product events. Furthermore, the project achieved all planned outputs except the use of knowledge mobilization and storytelling tools. Those tools have been converted to an online course to be offered to ILO staff free of charge. Other important achievements were the dissemination of the digital summaries of the global estimates report and 10 human impact stories hosted on the Alliance 8.7 website. While these were important achievements, it is not clear to what extent the project achieved Outcome 2, which is to improve the application of knowledge in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor. Although the project reached a large number of persons through the Alliance 8.7 website, physical and virtual events, and social media, it is not clear to what extent this reach translated into the application of the knowledge to address child labor and forced labor. SUSTAINABILITY. On one hand, the knowledge products and materials that the project developed should be available by the end of the project. In particular, the knowledge mobilization and storytelling tools are in the process of being converted to training modules to be hosted by the ILO International Training Centre and offered to ILO employees. Also, the Alliance 8.7 website is operational and hosts a range of resources, including the global reports and impact stories. However, as noted above, since the project did not track use and application of the different knowledge products, the evaluation team was not able to determine the impact these products have had on increasing knowledge and using new knowledge to address child labor and forced labor issues.	Achievement: Moderate ☐☐☐☐ Sustainability: Moderate ☐☐☐☐
Outcome 3: Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations, and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking through national, regional, and global initiatives	
ACHIEVEMENT. The project made progress in strengthening policies and improving capacities of governments, national authorities, employers and trade unions, and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking. The project conducted important research (Argentina, Fiji, India, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste) and strengthened or developed key policies and plans such as national action plans to address child labor, regulatory frameworks, lists of hazardous child labor and decrees, and lists of light work for children (Fiji, Kosovo, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste). While these were important achievements, in some of the MAP 16 countries, governments did not approve these plans and policies, which limits their effectiveness (Fiji, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste). In Serbia, the government did not show interest in the drafting of new legislation proposed by MAP 16. In other countries, the project canceled plans to develop policies and tools due to a lack of interest from the governments (India, Serbia, Sri Lanka). The project also developed important protocols such as labor inspection guidelines and reporting forms that are being used effectively in Fiji, Kosovo, Serbia, and Timor-Leste. To increase capacity to address child labor, the project conducted training for key child labor actors, such as labor inspectors, social workers, police, teachers, parents, and children. The project also trained government officials, employers, and trade unions. The training—	Achievement: Above Moderate ☐☐☐☐ Sustainability: Moderate ☐☐☐☐

Performance Summary	Rating
as reported in the online perception survey—were rated as relevant, effective, and useful for all MAP 16 countries. Finally, the project conducted awareness-raising activities at national and community levels in the MAP 16 countries. These were highly effective. SUSTAINABILITY. The various research products noted above exist and are available to child labor and forced labor actors. The policies and plans (national action plans to address child labor, regulatory frameworks, lists of hazardous child labor and decrees, and lists of light work for children) were developed but have not yet been approved by governments in Fiji, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste. Until they are approved and implemented, they cannot be considered sustained. The inspection guidelines, and other protocols that were developed by MAP 16 are being used in Fiji, Kosovo, Serbia, and Timor-Leste and should be considered sustained for the short to medium term. Training and awareness-raising will be the most difficult to sustain. While both training and awareness-raising were considered relevant, effective, and useful, government agencies, employers' organizations, and trade unions appear to lack resources in many of the MAP 16 countries (Fiji, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste). One exception is Argentina, where the project built training into ongoing activities of employers and trade unions.	
Outcome 4: Strengthened partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking	
ACHIEVEMENT. The project made progress at strengthening partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking. Under Outcome 4, the project achieved all but one of its indicator targets. It was not able to establish long-term and strategic partnerships with UNICEF in three countries, as called for in the CMEP. The project also achieved its output targets except operational tools, templates, and guidance notes for the Alliance 8.7 action groups. It planned to develop operational tools for two action groups and templates and guidance notes for six action groups. The project developed the operational tools for the supply chains action group, which was the only one that remained operational. The project also developed the templates and guidance notes for three action groups (crisis and humanitarian affairs, supply chains and migration) during the initial stage of the project. However, only the supply chain action group remained operational during the life of the project.[5] MAP 16 provided valuable financial support to start up Alliance 8.7 and GBNFL. The support included funds to develop websites and conduct meetings, conferences, advocacy activities, and other events. The ILO-UNICEF global estimates report was disseminated under Outcome 4. SUSTAINABILITY. Both Alliance 8.7 and GBNFL will require donor support in the near to medium term to continue to operate. Although GBNFL intends to eventually reach self-sufficiency through membership fees, it will continue to need donor support for the foreseeable future. It appears that the ILO has adequate donor support in the short to medium term to keep both initiatives operational. As noted above, the ILO and UNICEF were unable to establish long-term strategic collaboration under MAP 16 at the country level.	Achievement: Above Moderate ☐☐☐☐ Sustainability: Moderate ☐☐☐☐

LESSONS LEARNED

1. Projects with research objectives and activities in multiple **countries require expert technical support to ensure high-quality research** and world-class research reports.
2. Projects with both child labor and forced labor research and policy objectives require **participation from both researchers and policy decision-makers** in target countries to ensure research is used to develop or improve policies.

[5] Note that the project was not responsible for establishing the action groups. Rather, it committed to developing the operational tools, templates, and guidance for the action groups once they were established under Alliance 8.7.

3. It is important to include **gender and diversity, equity, and inclusion** (DE&I) in the original project design so these principles are well articulated, coherent, and built into the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and work plans.
4. It is critical to identify the likelihood where and when the lack of political will to approve and act on child labor and forced labor policies will occur and **develop strategies to address political unwillingness that might include shifting resources to other outcomes**.
5. To maximize the impact that a project has, it is important that a project's **main components are linked in ways to create synergies**.
6. Large global projects require **adequate financial resources and sufficiently long implementation timelines** in each of its target countries to achieve impact.
7. Large and complex projects like MAP 16 require a **full-time M&E officer**, preferably designated as key personnel, to effectively manage the project's information and reporting system as well as identify key lessons so the project can use them to make strategic adjustments.
8. Large global projects can be more effectively monitored and reported on if the **number of indicators are limited** to the most essential-to-document achievements at the outcome level, and therefore, help managers make important decisions.
9. It is critical to conduct an assessment prior to beginning activities in countries to **determine the need for the proposed interventions** and whether government and non-government stakeholders are interested in these interventions.

PROMISING PRACTICES

1. **Human impact stories**, which are factual accounts of life experiences told by the persons themselves, are effective mechanisms to communicate messages to broad audiences.
2. The integration of **child labor** within ongoing national household surveys creates efficiency and ensures sustainability of data collection efforts.[6]
3. **International advisory boards**, consisting of academic institutions, international research specialists, representatives of international organizations, and relevant national stakeholders, serve as important platforms for research cooperation and dialogue on child labor and forced labor issues.
4. Large and complex projects require **flexibility to make mid-course corrections** based on lessons learned and changes in the operating environments.
5. **Involving key stakeholders**, such as statistics office personnel, in the development of data collection and other research tools builds capacity and ownership while ensuring that the tools meet the needs of the countries.
6. Internal capacity-building activities not only build capacity but also create cohesion among project team members. MAP 16 created the "**Master of Arts MAP 16**" as a way to identify project team learning needs and develop events to help meet those needs.
7. The ILO collaborated with the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLAC) to develop the **Child Labour Risk Identification Model**. This model aims to assist countries in identifying and classifying territories with probabilities of child labor. Depending on whether there is a high, medium, or low probability of child labor, countries can then determine the most relevant multisectoral actions to address this issue. The development of the model leveraged the strengths of ECLAC and ILO and created important synergies.

[6] Note that child labor questions are integrated into labor force surveys by modifying the main questionnaire. For example, reducing the age of the respondents in some sections and adding sections on household chores and hazardous work.

8. **Building on the existing initiatives** rather than developing new ones creates efficiency and helps ensure success because it does not generate more work for stakeholders.

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ILO AND USDOL

1. Project designs should have a compelling cause and effect logic built into the theory of change and results framework and strong strategic linkages between its main outcomes to ensure the overall project objectives are achieved.
2. Projects, especially large global projects, should have a full-time M&E officer to manage the project's M&E system. Ideally, the M&E officer would be classified as key personnel.
3. Large and complex projects with a large number of outcomes and outputs should limit the number of indicators to those that are essential to measure project performance in achieving outcomes and making decisions.
4. The CMEP process should be streamlined so that the project document is approved in a reasonable amount of time (six to nine months). This allows implementation to begin as soon as possible after the grant is awarded.
5. DE&I principles should be built into project designs, so these principles are well articulated, coherent, and embedded in the project document, results framework, monitoring system, and work plans from the beginning of the project.
6. Projects should develop a process to identify challenges that impede achievement of outcomes and develop strategies to address those challenges. These strategies might include shifting effort and resources to other outcomes that show more promise.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USDOL

1. Large global projects should have adequate resources and sufficiently long implementation periods in target countries so they are able to achieve the intended impact. In addition, the selection of the target countries should be based on strategic criteria.
2. USDOL grantees should be required to conduct a thorough problem analysis that would lay the foundation for choosing project interventions and developing a logically strong theory of change and results framework.
3. Projects should conduct regular CMEP reviews to assess project performance; discuss key lessons learned, including challenges in the operating environment; and determine the relevance of the project design (activities, outputs, outcomes, indicators, and indicator targets).
4. Projects should assess the interest, willingness, and ability of governments and other social partners to participate in a project before initiating project activities in the country.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ILO

1. The ILO should use its presence and influence to encourage governments to finalize and approve important policies, plans, and tools developed under MAP 16 so they have the intended impact on child labor and forced labor. These include Fiji, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste.
2. Global research projects that are implemented in multiple countries should include specific strategies (and budgets) that provide technical support and, when necessary, oversight to the research activities in the target countries. These practices will ensure high-quality research and research reports.

1. PROJECT CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION

1.1 PROJECT CONTEXT

According to the report *Child Labour: Global Estimates 2020, Trends and the Road Forward*, approximately 160 million children around the world are engaged in child labor including 63 million girls and 97 million boys. Slightly fewer than half (79 million) are performing hazardous work that places their health, safety, or moral development at risk.[7] From 2000 to 2016, the number of children in child labor decreased by nearly 40 percent, or 100 million, in part due to awareness-raising and national efforts. However, since 2016, global progress against child labor has stalled for the first time since the International Labour Organization (ILO) began producing global estimates two decades ago.[8]

In the Asia, Pacific, and Latin America and Caribbean regions, child labor decreased over the last four years in both percentage and absolute terms. However, child labor in sub-Saharan Africa increased in both the number and percentage of children in child labor since 2012. There are now more children in child labor in sub-Saharan Africa than in the rest of the world together.[9] Other key findings in the child labor global estimates report include:

- Child labor is higher for boys than girls at all ages.
- Child labor is much more common in rural areas.
- Most child labor continues to occur in agriculture.
- Child labor is frequently associated with children being out of school.

Forced labor is also a major challenge. It is estimated that over 50 million people are victims of modern slavery. Of these, about 28 million are involved in forced labor situations and 22 million are in forced marriage. The number of people in modern slavery has risen significantly in the last five years. In 2021, 10 million more people were in modern slavery compared to the 2016 global estimates. The majority of the victims of forced labor are exploited in the private sector. High-risk sectors include construction, agriculture, fishing, manufacturing, and domestic work.[10]

In 2015, all 193 ILO member countries adopted the Agenda 2030 and the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). SDG 8.7 calls for effective and immediate measures to eradicate child labor in all its forms by 2025 and to end forced labor, modern slavery, and human trafficking by 2030.[11]

To achieve target 8.7 of the SDGs, evidence-based policy choices at all levels of government is required. Alliance 8.7 was established and launched during the UN General Assembly in September 2016 as a global partnership initiative to accelerate action, drive innovation, leverage resources, and disseminate knowledge. Alliance 8.7 represents a renewed commitment of the international community to join forces and to foster long-term public

[7] Child Labour: Global Estimates 2020: Trends and the Road Forward. 2021. Joint ILO and UNICEF publication. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---ipec/documents/publication/wcms_797515.pdf.
[8] Child Labour: Global Estimates 2020: Trends and the Road Forward. 2021. Joint ILO and UNICEF publication. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---ipec/documents/publication/wcms_797515.pdf.
[9] Child Labour: Global Estimates 2020: Trends and the Road Forward. 2021. Joint ILO and UNICEF publication. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---ipec/documents/publication/wcms_797515.pdf.
[10] Global Estimates of Modern Slavery: Forced Labour and Forced Marriage. 2022. Joint ILO-IOM publication. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---ipec/documents/publication/wcms_854733.pdf
[11] SDG Alliance 8.7: Joining Forces Globally to End Child Labour, Forced Labour, Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking. 2016. ILO publication. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---declaration/documents/publication/wcms_450718.pdf

policy–driven solutions to prevent and eliminate child labor, and forced labor, modern slavery, and human trafficking.[12]

1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

On December 9, 2016, the United States Department of Labor's (USDOL) Bureau of International Labor Affairs' (ILAB) Office of Trade and Labor Affairs (OTLA) awarded the International Labour Organization (ILO) a cooperative agreement for USD 9,400,000 to implement the *Measurement, Awareness-raising, and Policy Engagement Project to Accelerate Action against Child Labor and Forced Labor* (MAP 16). The project worked globally, as well as with 13 priority countries: Argentina, Colombia Fiji, India, Jordan, Kosovo, Mauritania, Montenegro, Morocco, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste.

PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

Through a series of project modifications, the funding amount increased from USD 9,400,000 to USD 23,945,000, and the period of performance was extended to March 31, 2024. Table 2 shows the project modification number, the date it was signed, and a brief description of the modification.[13]

Table 2. Project Modifications

No.	Date	Details
1	12-16-2016	Increased funding from USD 9,400,000 to USD 9,580,000 to implement new activities under each of the project's four outcomes.
5	09-12-2017	Increased funding from USD 958,000 to USD 17,080,000 to expand the types and number of research activities, develop global child labor awareness campaigns, expand the number of countries from six to eight, and add the appropriate level of effort for staff directly involved in project activities.
6	09-07-2018	Increased funding from USD 17,080,000 to USD 20,000,000 to expand project activities under the project's four outcomes. Also, extended the project end date from December 31, 2020 to August 30, 2022.
7	08-14-2019	Increased funding from USD 20,000,000 to USD 22,400,000. The addition of USD 2,400,000 was for the implementation of a stand-alone national child labor survey in Mexico that was conducted by National Statistics Office of Mexico.
9	09-07-2022	Increased funding from USD 22,400,000 to USD 23,945,000 to conduct new research activities (Brazil and Democratic Republic of the Congo); to implement additional awareness-raising activities; and to further support capacity-building efforts (Argentina, Fiji, India, Kosovo, Niger, Serbia, Timor-Leste). The modification also provided an extension that extended the project end date from August 30, 2022 to December 31, 2023.

[12] SDG Alliance 8.7: Joining Forces Globally to End Child Labour, Forced Labour, Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking. 2016. ILO publication. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---declaration/documents/publication/wcms_450718.pdf.

[13] Note that there were a total of nine project modifications for the addition of countries, increases in funding, period of performance extensions, changes in personnel, and accounting changes. Only modifications affecting countries, funding, and period of performance are listed in Table 1.

OBJECTIVE, OUTCOMES, AND OUTPUTS

MAP 16 aimed to help build and apply the critical knowledge needed to inform policy choices to combat child labor and forced labor and to support measures to address these challenges in key countries, regions, and sectors.

The MAP 16 project design consisted of the project objective, four main outcomes, and seven sub-outcomes that address empirical research and development of survey methods and tools, awareness-raising, capacity-building of governments, and policy engagement. The project objective, outcomes, and sub-outcomes are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. MAP 16 Project Objective and Outcomes

Project Objective: The MAP 16 Project will accelerate progress in support of efforts to eliminate child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking
Outcome 1: Improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking ▪ *Sub-outcome 1.1.A:* Improved survey methods and data tools to support research on child labor and forced labor and human trafficking ▪ *Sub-outcome 1.1.B:* Increased Member States' sustainability of child labor data collection, analysis, and reporting ▪ *Sub-outcome 1.2:* Improved data and evidence in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor and human trafficking
Outcome 2: Improved application of knowledge in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor ▪ *Sub-outcome 2.1:* Increased engagement between knowledge producers and end-users in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor ▪ *Sub-outcome 2.2:* Increased awareness and engagement of the target group in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor
Outcome 3: Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations, and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking through national, regional, and global initiatives ▪ *Sub-outcome 3.1:* Increased capacity of sugar and fishing stakeholders to improve policies ▪ *Sub-outcome 3.2:* Increased capacity at regional level in at least 2 regions to combat CL and FL ▪ Sub-outcome 3.3*:* Improved country capacity to address CL: Colombia, India and Jordan ▪ Sub-outcome 3.4*:* Improved country capacity to address CL in 10 other countries
Outcome 4: Strengthened partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking

In addition to the project objective, four main outcomes, and seven sub-outcomes, the project design included 38 outputs. The outcomes and causal relationships are shown in the project's results framework in Annex E. All outcomes, sub-outcomes, and outputs are examined in the project performance analysis that appears in Annex F.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

The MAP 16 project is implemented by the ILO's Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS). The exception was MAP 16 in Colombia, which was backstopped by the ILO's Labour Administration, Labour Inspection and Occupational Safety and Health Branch. Other ILO branches and departments provided periodic support to the project. These include Gender, Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Branch, the Evaluation Office, International Labour Standards Department, International Training Centre of the ILO, Department of

Communication and Public Information, Bureau of Workers Activities, and the Bureau of Employers Activities.

The FUNDAMENTALS branch consists of three units that report to the branch chief. These are the Research and Evaluation, Advocacy and Partnerships, and Solutions and Innovations units. The Research and Evaluation unit consists of Research and Monitoring and Evaluation clusters, while the Advocacy and Partnerships unit consists of Technical Advisory and Advocacy and Communication clusters. In addition, the branch has regional desks and thematic areas where some of its projects are situated under the Solutions and Innovations unit.

The MAP 16 key personnel consisted of the project director and communications officer, which were fully funded by the project. They were located in the Advocacy and Partnerships unit and reported to the unit head. The rest of the Geneva-based staff that support MAP 16 were partially funded by the project. These included the M&E officer, administrative and finance assistant, and the research team members who were working on research funded by MAP 16. The M&E officer and research team reported to the research and evaluation unit head while the administrative officers reports to the official managing the admin staff.

In addition, each of the four MAP 16 components or outcomes had a focal point responsible for its implementation. The focal point for Outcome 1 was the policy research officer, while the focal point for Outcome 2 was the communications officer. The project director also served as the focal point for Outcome 3 including the target countries under Outcome 3.3 and 3.4. Outcome 4's focal point was the Advocacy and Partnerships unit head. In each target (capacity-building) countries, MAP 16 had a national project coordinator, usually a full-time position, who reported to the ILO's country director.

The number of staff working on the MAP 16 project varied over the seven years of implementation. At the project's high water mark, 62 full-time and part-time staff worked on the project. These included 22 based in Geneva and 40 based in the target countries.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of the final evaluation includes:

- Determining whether the project achieved its objectives and outcomes.
- Identifying the challenges encountered in achieving the objectives and outcomes and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges.
- Assessing the intended and unintended effects of the project.
- Identifying lessons learned and emerging practices from the project that can be applied in current or future projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors.
- Assessing which outcomes or outputs can be deemed sustainable.

This evaluation intends to provide ILAB, ILO, and other project stakeholders with an assessment of the project's performance, its effects on project participants, and an understanding of the factors driving the project results. The evaluation results, conclusions, and recommendations are intended to inform stakeholders in the design and implementation of future projects as appropriate. A more detailed description of the evaluation and purpose and objectives is described in the Terms of Reference (TOR) in Annex C.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team used a mixed-methods evaluation design consisting of document reviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and an online perception survey. Evaluation fieldwork was conducted in person for Argentina, India, and Kosovo. Fieldwork was conducted remotely for Geneva, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste using video conference platforms. The lead evaluator also interviewed Regional Initiative Latin America and the Caribbean Free of Child Labour (RILAC) representatives in Peru, Costa Rica, Argentina, and Mexico as well as representatives of statistics offices in Mongolia and Nigeria where MAP 16 supported child labor and forced labor surveys.

The evaluation team interviewed 190 key informant stakeholders, including females and males. The evaluation team conducted focus group discussions in India and Kosovo. In India, the local evaluator conducted three focus group discussions with 24 representatives of civil society organizations working in skills development activities, Panchayat, and self-help groups. In Kosovo, the local evaluator conducted four focus group discussions with 22 representatives of the agriculture, education, child protection, and statistics sector and agencies

The online perception survey was administered to stakeholders who participated in capacity-building events such as trainings in Argentina, Fiji, India, Kosovo, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste. The survey was administered using a combination of email, WhatsApp, and SMS. The survey response was 11 percent.[14] It is important to note that a key limitation of the survey: it was administered well after the training activities, which made it difficult to accurately assess the perceptions of the training participants. For more information on the perception survey methodology and results, please refer to Annex G.

A detailed description of the evaluation methodology, including the evaluation questions, the evaluation team, evaluation approach, schedule, data collection and analysis methods, and limitations appear in Annex D while the documents and references appear in Annex A.

3. EVALUATION RESULTS

3.1 RELEVANCE

Relevance Questions
The midterm evaluation found the design was lacking coherence and that some opportunities for collaboration among the components had been missed. Acknowledging the project was designed with very separate components (outcomes), how did the project respond to the finding that opportunities for collaboration had been missed?
Do the project's four distinct components, including component #3's sub–components, respond to the needs in each country/objective? How might the project design be improved?
How has the project addressed the mid-term evaluation recommendation to incorporate a gender perspective? How has the project addressed equity and needs for inclusion of underrepresented groups in project activities?
How could the project design phase (both prior to award and during the CMEP process) have been improved to support a well-designed project?

[14] To enable the evaluation to cover both types of efforts, the countries surveyed included some of the priority capacity-building countries as well as some countries in which project research was conducted. The evaluation did not cover all the priority capacity-building countries under MAP 16 since some of these country components were closed at the time of the evaluation

3.1.1 LACK OF COHERENCE AND MISSED OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION

The MAP 16 midterm evaluation found that the project's design "does not include a global results framework reflecting the connection among its four main outcomes that explains the weak coherence among the outcomes, and feeds the idea that MAP 16 is not a project in itself, but a conjunction of different projects." [15] To address the weak coherence, the evaluation recommended that the project create a steering group inside the FUNDAMENTALS branch bringing together HQ staff and national project coordinators to address the weak coherence as well as other issues noted in the evaluation report.[16]

During interviews, both ILO and USDOL representatives agreed with the midterm evaluation finding that the four main project outcomes lacked coherence. ILO representatives noted that it seemed like MAP 16 consisted of four separate projects that worked in silos and did not create much synergy and opportunities to build operational linkages between generation of data, generation of knowledge, knowledge uptake, pilot testing in selected countries, and building strategic partnerships between research, policy, and advocacy partners. According to project staff, weak coherence between the outcomes made it difficult to coordinate activities and workflow.

There was an especially notable disconnect between Outcomes 1, 2, and 4 and Outcome 3 and its sub-outcomes (SOs). For example, while research staff supported a rapid assessment in the forestry sector in Argentina and the incorporation of a child labor module in the labor force survey in Serbia, there was minimal collaboration on other research activities in the target countries under SOs 3.3 and 3.4. USDOL representatives noted that the research conducted in Fiji and India would have benefitted from more collaboration with the research team. Likewise, the target countries under SOs 3.3 and 3.4 could have benefited from more direct support for communications activities (Outcome 2) and advocacy and partnerships (Outcome 4). While Outcome 2 provided communication support to Alliance 8.7 pathfinder countries, only two were MAP 16 target countries.

USDOL representatives explained that MAP 16 was not designed to emphasize coherence. Rather, it was designed to be flexible and allow the ILO to respond to research needs and opportunities and requests from a variety of countries, which allowed the project to implement interventions to meet the needs of a larger number of countries. One USDOL representative said the design allowed the project to do at least something and rapidly in countries, which was a hallmark of the project. ILO representatives noted that this approach had both strengths and weaknesses. On the one hand, it provided the project with flexibility to add countries and adjust to political and operational realities. On the other hand, the absence of a theory of change and of a clear logical framework (many outputs only randomly contributed to the respective outcome formulation) made it difficult to focus on strategic results.

To address the evaluation finding and recommendation, the project agreed to establish a steering committee. The project director developed terms of reference and planned two meetings. However, the project abandoned the steering committee because the national project coordinators were busy with the close-out phase of the project and did not have time to participate in meetings. In addition, time differences and other challenges made it difficult for the national project coordinators to participate. While a formal steering committee did not continue, the project director facilitated regular meetings with the outcome focal points.

[15] MAP 16 midterm evaluation report, page 24.
[16] MAP 16 midterm evaluation report, page 46.

Most of the ILO representatives who were interviewed believe that the level of communication and coordination between the main outcomes improved somewhat after the midterm evaluation. They noted there was more effort placed on organizing meetings and sharing information. For example, the research staff (Outcome 1) met more frequently with communications staff (Outcome 2) to discuss strategies to disseminate research results and were invited by the Advocacy and Partnerships unit (Outcome 4) to present research findings for the Alliance 8.7 countries and to meet companies to discuss research findings on child labor in global supply chains.

3.1.2 RESPONDING TO NEEDS AND IMPROVEMENTS TO PROJECT DESIGN

MAP 16 project staff, ILO and USDOL representatives, and the stakeholders in the target countries were nearly unanimous in their belief that the project's outcomes were appropriate and responded adequately to the needs of both objectives and countries. (The only exception was Sri Lanka, where the lack of government interest and support led to the cancellation of about 50 percent of the planned outputs and activities.) However, when asked how the project design could have been improved, interviewees offered a wide array of opinions and suggestions.

To improve the project design, the ILO representatives recommended that complex global projects like MAP 16 should be designed to create synergies between the different components. One idea is to develop outcomes that require the ILO unit teams to collaborate in order to achieve the outputs and ultimately the outcomes. Another idea is to create stronger linkages between global interventions and products and their implementation in target countries. For example, research could be designed and conducted so it supports advocacy and awareness-raising activities in the target countries.

Another suggestion to improve project design involves the selection of countries under Outcome 3. ILO representatives told the evaluation team that there should have been fewer countries with longer timeframes. Later in the project's life, USDOL allocated more funds to add eight countries that some project staff and stakeholders thought were too many for the amount of funding. Project outcomes such as the development of policies and legislations can take longer than three years, which was about the average timeframe for the countries that were added. Stakeholders interviewed from those countries added later in the life of the project also noted that future projects should have longer implementation periods.

In addition, ILO representatives noted that the countries should have been chosen based on strategic criteria, such as the potential to leverage other ILO project resources or previous ILO investments. Fewer and more strategically chosen countries with higher levels of resources and longer project durations would translate into more impact.

The project design—and, more specifically, the monitoring system—could be improved by developing effect-level indicators for outcomes. The midterm evaluation found that the MAP 16 monitoring system "did not include indicators at the outcome level, thus impelling advancements in actual changes in behaviors and attitudes. The fact that the indicators are basically at the output level, such as specific products or services provided, only allows measuring *the things done* instead of the *changes achieved*.[17] In other words, the project monitoring system lacked indicators to measure if and how the products or services were used to bring about higher-level effect changes.

[17] MAP 16 midterm evaluation report, page 24.

The evaluation team agrees with this finding. The project design consisted of four main outcomes and nine sub-outcomes (SOs). Of these 13 outcomes and SOs, only six had indicators. While the other seven outcomes and SOs had indicators, several were written more like outputs rather than effect-level changes. For example, Outcome 2 indicators included the number of people who visited the Alliance 8.7 website and attended knowledge activities. Outcome 4 indicators included the number of collaborative actions taken, such as participating in webinars and meetings. These indicators fall short of measuring the effects of these activities.

Suggestions also included improving the design of the research component. For example, a scoping exercise or assessment could be conducted before beginning a research activity. The assessment would help determine the need, feasibility, interest, and overall usefulness of conducting the research. Likewise, to strengthen the relationship between research and policy, it is important to have strategies that communicate research findings to policymakers and decision-makers in compelling ways so that they take concrete actions to develop or improve policy and programs.[18] It is also important for researchers from the countries' statistics offices and for policy decision-makers to engage in dialogue over how research can be used to influence policy on child labor and forced labor.

The key stakeholders who were interviewed in the target countries included in this evaluation provided a range of suggestions to improve project design. These are presented and discussed below by country: Argentina, Fiji, India, Kosovo, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste.

ARGENTINA

To improve the project design, stakeholders recommended that research should be carried out at the provincial level and in areas where the prevalence of child labor is high. The research should be strongly linked with awareness-raising and advocacy activities, allowing the research to be used to shape public policy and other government programs. Working at the provincial level is important because the provinces have a significant amount of autonomy in Argentina. It should be noted that the project conducted a rapid assessment on forced labor in the forestry sector in two provinces that helped local officials understand the problem and propose appropriate responses.

Another way to improve the project's design would be to include awareness-raising and capacity-building activities for judges. Many judges in provincial areas tend to hold traditional views about children working, and these beliefs influence their rulings on child labor cases. For example, some judges believe it is part of a child's development to work on farms and operate farm equipment.

Regarding training for labor inspectors, the project design could include training that is more practical and less theoretical. This would include practicing conducting inspections and using new skills and tools, such as inspection protocols.

FIJI

A common theme for many stakeholders was that the project needed more funds and a longer implementation period to reach rural villages where the prevalence of child labor is high because people do not understand the dimensions of child labor. They require more information. While the project, through its awareness-raising activities, reached some villages,

[18] As explained in Section 3.2.2, the project decided to convert the original planned knowledge management and storytelling tools, outputs under Outcome 2, to online training courses/modules that should prove to be a valuable resource to help communicate research in compelling ways to policymakers and practitioners.

many were left out. Several stakeholders noted that the project only scratched the surface with its child labor awareness-raising efforts.

Stakeholders also noted that in future projects, they would like to be consulted during the design stage, so they can provide information about where child labor is more common and how to reach these communities with the appropriate interventions. One regional government representative explained that the government has mechanisms in place to reach communities, and the project could have taken more advantage of these mechanisms, such as district councils and working groups that are gatekeepers to reach communities.

INDIA

To improve the project design, local implementing partners (subcontractors) told the evaluation team that they needed more time to pilot convergence model activities. Although MAP 16 was implemented in India from 2018 to 2023, local partners reported that they had less than one year to implement activities (2022–2023). Furthermore, the short nature of the contracts and the gaps between when contracts ended and were renewed caused problems with retaining staff continuity of activities. For example, the project contracted Prayas in Bihar for three months with a no-cost extension for an additional three months. The project awarded a second contract several months later for another three months that was extended for one more month. The short duration of the contracts and the gap between contracts meant that Prayas could not retain some staff and lost momentum. Similar contracting issues occurred with the implementing partner Samarthan in Chhattisgarh and with International Trade Union Congress (INTUC) in Bihar.

Another project design improvement would be to involve project stakeholders with implementation of the project. For example, while officials from the labor departments of the three target states were consulted during the project design phase, they were less involved during implementation.

Project staff noted that project design could have been improved by having a specific strategy to bring together both policymakers and implementers to have a dialogue that would create a common commitment to the project's purpose and objectives. In addition, MAP 16 would have benefited from a specific strategy to involve both employers and trade unions in the eradication of child labor. Participation of employers was especially low.

To improve training, stakeholders suggested assessing how participants were using the newly acquired knowledge in their work on the elimination of child labor and then use this information to conduct follow-up training sessions to reinforce the learnings. Stakeholders also suggested conducting child labor–related training in communities instead of government offices. This would base the training in reality—the actual communities where child labor occurs.

KOSOVO

In Kosovo, stakeholders from judiciary, prosecutor's office, labor inspectorate, agency of statistics, and Centres for Social Work reported that more training activities for longer durations should be provided to them. They considered the existing trainings to be limited in scope and quantity compared to their needs. They also noted that they needed more training to address the real challenges they face.

In addition, the number of training participants within a stakeholder group should be increased to ensure that the stakeholder group is strengthened. The number of judges, prosecutors, and social workers that the project trained is low compared to the total number within each

stakeholder group. For example, the project trained 6.4 percent of judges (24 of 375), 2.1 percent of prosecutors (4 of 182), and 29 percent of social workers (39 of 182).

Participants also believe there should be a well-mainstreamed process of consulting and involving children in project activities. For example, consulting about hazardous labor and light work with children who are at high risk for child labor would add value to the hazardous child labor and light work lists.

Some stakeholders believe that the project's scope and design was too broad compared to MAP 16 human and financial resources and the length of the project. The design could be improved by decreasing the number of outcomes and stakeholders, so the project would have a more narrow, strategic, and deeper focus.

Finally, according to stakeholders, the quality of the MAP 16 research reports were low. The reports contained generic language that did not adequately describe the most prevalent forms of hazardous child labor in Kosovo. They also noted that the reports contained inconsistencies between descriptive analysis and conclusions and did not provide tailored recommendations for Kosovo institutions. These stakeholders requested more specific studies on different forms of hazardous child labor among street children or in the agriculture sector. They commented that research could have been improved by having a methodology tailored to the child labor situation in Kosovo and by ensuring that the researchers have the required experience and training.

NIGER

One important way to improve project design in Niger would be to focus on training strategies to increase the number of labor inspectors who are trained and to improve the methodology so the inspectors can practice and apply new skills and knowledge in the field including where to refer child labor cases. Several stakeholders also mentioned that the design could be improved by having mechanisms to increase the participation and collaboration between government, community organizations, and other key child labor actors. Finally, project staff noted that the project design did not include a sustainability plan that would have been useful to have and implement earlier in the life of the project to help ensure the sustainability of key outcomes.

SERBIA

Serbian stakeholders recommended that, rather than develop new policies, more of a focus should be placed on the implementation of existing child labor and child protection policies and laws. For example, the methodological instruction on how to work with children has been developed but its implementation is weak. In addition, the project could focus interventions on families in rural areas that have children at risk for child labor as identified by the child labor survey module. The interventions might also include support to parents for education and income-generating activities, so children would attend school rather than work.

SRI LANKA

To improve future project designs in Sri Lanka, a thorough scoping exercise should be conducted to assess government needs and priorities and ensure that project interventions are designed to address these needs and priorities. The project experienced difficulties achieving some of its outputs. Due to a lack of interest on the part of the Department of Labour (DOL), the project canceled its plans to improve the labor information system and develop policy recommendations linking child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking actors. It also canceled the outputs and activities related to Alliance 8.7 because Sri Lanka already has the Sustainable Development

Council that is responsible for monitoring progress in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) including SDG 8.7. The project's plan to establish an Alliance 8.7 coordinating group and a roadmap would have been redundant.

TIMOR-LESTE

A variety of stakeholders told the evaluation team that to strengthen the project's design, the project should have had more resources and a longer timeframe. The project needed at least two more years to work on the hazardous work list and other policies as well as awareness-raising activities. A USDOL official explained that the MAP 16 project in Timor-Leste was a continuation of the GAP 11 project that was funded by USDOL and implemented by the ILO. GAP 11 operated in Timor-Leste between 2012 and 2015 to build support for the National Action Plan on Child Labour.

Stakeholders also noted that that the training of trainers component could be strengthened by training more inspectors to cover all municipalities to reach parents and local authorities with child labor awareness messages. In addition, the project could have been improved by working more with local leaders such as village chiefs and sub-village chiefs and the village councils on key child labor awareness messages and dissemination strategies. It also could have established a mechanism to continuously track progress and exchange knowledge on combating child labor. Although the project invited village chiefs, religious leaders, parents, teachers, and students to the municipality-level training that it conducted, the project lacked resources to conduct training in all of the villages.

3.1.3 GENDER, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION OF UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS

The midterm evaluation found that MAP 16 did not include a gender and inclusion (non-discrimination) approach in most of its components.[19] The evaluation recommended to strengthen gender and inclusion throughout the program components. More specifically, the project should promote the involvement of gender-specialized organizations (e.g., UN Women), increase representation of women in the regions, promote use of more qualitative research methods, and improve the gender perspective in the M&E system.[20]

The project partially accepted the recommendation. It agreed that gender and inclusion needed to be strengthened and mainstreamed throughout the project by taking advantage of in-house resources to improve gender and inclusion but also noted that it was not feasible to redesign project components. To strengthen gender and inclusion, MAP 16 started to use the Gender, Diversity, and Inclusion tool to help ensure that these principles were incorporated into activities and outputs that were reported in the TPR, Annex G. In addition, the project continued to report on the ratio of women and men participating in training activities that were reported in the TPR, Annexes A and B.

In general, ILO representatives agreed with the midterm evaluation finding that the gender and inclusion approach was weak and should be strengthened. They also noted that reporting on gender, diversity, and inclusion in the TPR is a step in the right direction but also explained that reporting does not mean that the project has a coherent gender, diversity, and inclusion strategy. Gender, diversity and inclusion is a cross-cutting issue that should have been built into the project design including a component to train project staff, so they understand these principles. The design should also include some sort of scoping exercise to identify and understand the vulnerable populations the project intends to reach and how to reach them

[19] MAP 16 midterm evaluation report, page 10.
[20] MAP 16 midterm evaluation report, page 47.

with interventions. Finally, the project's monitoring system should include indicators focused on gender, diversity, and inclusion.

USDOL representatives who were interviewed acknowledged that MAP 16 was not designed to have a gender perspective, which is an important lesson. They noted, however, that during research, vulnerable and under-represented groups surfaced organically since the prevalence of child labor in these populations tends to be higher. For example, in Mexico, the Regional Initiative for Latin America and the Caribbean Free of Child Labour (RILAC) child labor risk identification model identified indigenous populations at high risk for child labor, which helped ensure government programs targeted them. It also supported the development of an innovative report on child labor and education exclusion among indigenous children. In Serbia, the assessment of children working in streets in Belgrade identified a high percentage of children to be Roma, an ethnic group that has been discriminated against for centuries.[21]

3.1.4 IMPROVING PROJECT DESIGN PROCESS

MAP 16 Project Design

Internally, USDOL decided that MAP 16 would be its flagship research project. Although the project concept started as a global research project, USDOL decided to add communication and country capacity-building. It also decided that it would provide a non-competitive grant to the ILO to implement the project based on the ILO's mandate, capacity, and credibility to conduct research on child labor and forced labor. The request was made to the USDOL procurement board and eventually approved.

Based on discussions between USDOL and ILO representatives regarding the design of MAP 16, the ILO developed and submitted a scope of work along with the other grant application documents in November 2016. USDOL approved the application and issued the grant award to the ILO in December 2016. The scope of work served as the project document and included the four main outcomes of MAP 16 (research and research tools, communication, country capacity-building, and partnerships to support SDG 8.7).

In October 2017, the project sent the first draft of the MAP 16 project document to USDOL for review. Based on comments provided by USDOL in December 2017, the project made revisions and submitted the second draft of the project document to USDOL in February 2018. In April 2018, USDOL hosted the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) workshop, which is its mechanism to discuss and finalize project objectives, develop the results framework that also serves as the theory of change, and develop the M&E plan, including indicators and means of verification. After the CMEP workshop, the project submitted the third draft of the project document in May 2018. After a final round of comments and revisions, the project submitted the final approved version of the project document in July 2018, nearly 18 months after the award. ILO representatives told the evaluation that the project document review and approval process was too cumbersome and lengthy.

According to USDOL, the project document took 18 months to finalize and approve for several reasons. First, since the project was awarded to the ILO as a noncompetitive grant, there were fewer project design criteria that USDOL required prior to the award compared to a competitive award, meaning the design was less developed. In addition, the CMEP process—which USDOL and ILO used to finish the project design—is demanding and time consuming. In addition, it took the project nearly six months to hire key personnel, which was necessary before the CMEP

[21] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Romani_people_in_Serbia#Discrimination

process could be started. Finally, since USDOL did not have the entire amount of funds needed when the project started, it had to add funding through project modifications, meaning that activities were modified and expanded.

The evaluation team agrees with ILO representatives that 18 months is too long to review and approve the project document, which is the project's master plan to achieve its objectives. The evaluation team also believes that the MAP 16 project design process helped contribute to the midterm and final evaluation findings that the outcomes were implemented like separate projects and that, much of the time, the outcome teams operated in silos.

IDEAS TO IMPROVE PROJECT DESIGN PROCESS

Following are a set of ideas to improve the project design process based on comments from interviewees and observations by the evaluation team.

Streamline Project Document Approval

It took 18 months to conduct multiple reviews and revisions of the project document. Since the project document is the main reference document for a project and serves as a roadmap to implementation and measuring progress, a project's effectiveness and efficiency would benefit from a short project document review and approval process. One way to shorten the process would be for USDOL to provide explicit instructions (including criteria) for what it needs to have in the project document. This would allow ILO to understand USDOL expectations and develop the draft project document to meet those expectations. Both USDOL and the ILO might also commit to a reasonable timeframe to comment on the project document and then to make the requested changes. Regarding future USDOL-funded and ILO-implemented projects, both organizations might meet to discuss the project design process, including the project document review and approval process, with the objective of determining ways to shorten the process.

Problem Analysis and Theory of Change

When USDOL initially created the CMEP, it included a workshop where the grantee, key stakeholders, and USDOL representatives developed the first rough draft of the project document. The workshop included conducting a problem analysis (often using a problem tree tool). Based on the problem analysis, the workshop participants determined where to intervene in the analysis (e.g., which causes of the problem to address) and developed interventions (sometimes a solution tree tool was used). Next, they developed the project hypothesis or theory of change that was converted into the project objective, outcomes, and outputs. The advantage of this kind of approach is that the project design is based on a solid problem analysis and theory of change that project staff and key stakeholders created and own. The disadvantage is that the original CMEP workshops lasted nearly one week that was both time intensive and expensive.

The evaluation team believes that project designs would benefit from a participatory process where project staff and stakeholders conduct a thorough problem analysis/theory of change on which to build the design and eventually the project document. This process would help avoid the kinds of problems that the MAP 16 project design had, such as the lack of integration of the project components or outcomes.

Synergy and Collaboration Between Outcomes

As noted in Section 3.1.2, another way to improve the project design process is to create synergies between the different project outcomes. One way to achieve this, especially in large and complex projects like MAP 16, is to have the different technical teams work together to develop

outcomes and their outputs that require collaboration to achieve them. This would include linking global and country-level outcomes and outputs, so they are mutually supportive. Creating synergies between outcomes would promote collaboration and help avoid the lack of coherence between the outcomes and their outputs. The kind of participatory project design process described above would facilitate synergy and collaboration.

An Index of Indicators for Common Outcomes

Another way to streamline the project design process and create efficiency would be to develop an index of indicators for outcomes, so a project does not have to develop them from scratch. According to both project staff and stakeholders, the process of developing indicators and adjusting them during the project document reviews is time consuming. The USDOL could create a set of acceptable indicators for common outcome categories (e.g., training, awareness-raising, policy implementation) that grantees could use rather than having to develop them. This would reduce the amount of time and effort it takes to develop the project document.

USDOL/OCFT already has a set of "common indicators" that are used to collect comparable information for outcomes and outputs and to measure and report on their achievements. USDOL/OCFT might build on this concept by developing sets of indicators for outcome categories. To develop these sets of indicators, USDOL could take indicators from previous projects that were effectively used to measure outcome-level changes such as applying new skills and knowledge, taking actions based on awareness-raising, or implementing new or revised policies. The evaluation team understands that some outcomes will be unique and require customized indicators. However, other outcomes such as training and awareness-raising are common interventions in many projects and do not require "new" indicators.

Another issue noted by both ILO and USDOL representatives is that the MAP 16 M&E system had too many indicators to track, especially output indicators. Along with sets of outcome indicators, USDOL might require grantees to only develop indicators for outcomes, especially for large and complex global project like MAP 16. However, the indicators should be well linked to the outcomes to "indicate" achievement and measure changes in behavior, such as adopting policies, application of new skills and knowledge, identification and referral of child labor, and so forth.

Periodic CMEP Reviews

In recent years, USDOL has started to conduct periodic CMEP reviews that are used to review project performance in relation to project activities, outputs, and outcomes. The CMEP reviews often lead to adjustments in the project design. For example, based on changes or new information in the project's implementation environment and lessons learned, planned activities, outputs, and even outcomes may no longer be relevant or effective. The CMEP reviews are an opportunity to make changes to the project design, so it remains relevant.

MAP 16, which did not conduct periodic CMEP reviews, would have benefited from some sort of periodic review of project performance and assessment of the relevance and effectiveness of the project design, including activities, outputs, outcomes, and the corresponding indicators. This would have been an opportunity to identify key challenges (e.g., pollical willingness to endorse policies in Serbia, Fiji, Timor-Leste, and Sri Lanka) and make adjustments to keep the project on course to achieving its overall objective of accelerating progress in the elimination of child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking. It would also have been an opportunity to ensure that outcomes had indicators and indicator targets. As

noted in Section 3.1.2, only six of the project's 13 outcomes and SOs had indicators. Of the 11 outcome indicators that did exist, three did not have indicator targets.

3.2 COHERENCE

Coherence Question
To what extent has the project established links and coordinated with other efforts to address child labor and forced labor by key tripartite plus organizations? How could the project improve coordination and collaboration with these organizations?

3.2.1 COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION WITH OTHER ACTORS

Global Level

At the global level, the project's efforts to collaborate and coordinate were primarily concentrated in Outcome 4, which was embedded in the FUNDAMENTAL's Advocacy and Partnership unit. The bulk of the collaboration efforts took place within the Alliance 8.7 and Global Business Network on Forced Labour (GBNFL) initiatives, which were established with the help of MAP 16 resources.

Alliance 8.7 collaborated with the Food and Agriculture Organization on the supply chain action group, with International Organization for Migration on migration issues, and with the UN Women on gender-related issues. To date, Alliance 8.7 has over 500 organizations that have signed on as partners and 37 countries that have expressed interest in becoming a pathfinder country. Of these 37 countries, 27 have met the criteria to be considered pathfinder countries.[22]

GBNFL, on the other hand, collaborated with employers' organizations on a range of forced labor awareness-raising activities, such as workshops, seminars, webinars, and meetings. The project also collaborated with UNICEF to disseminate the global report on child labor estimates 2020–2021.[23]

According to ILO representatives, one area that lacked adequate linkages was the Alliance 8.7 action groups. Although six action groups were envisioned, the action group on supply chains was the only one that remained active. According to ILO representatives, creating linkages would have helped not only form but sustain the six action groups that were envisioned.[24] Alliance 8.7 and MAP 16 might have collaborated on creating these linkages. USDOL representatives note that while Alliance 8.7 made progress in increasing the number of partners and pathfinder countries, the participation of civil society organizations (CSOs) in Alliance 8.7 could be strengthened. This would allow CSOs to play a more substantial role within Alliance 8.7 and in countries to develop the Alliance 8.7 pathfinder roadmaps.

Regional Level

The project's primary effort to collaborate at the regional level was through RILAC and the implementation of the CLRISK model. RILAC is firmly embedded in the ILO traditional tripartite

[22] https://www.alliance87.org/pathfinders
[23] Note that the ILO and UNICEF collaborated to produce the global estimates report with funding from a different donor.
[24] While creating the linkages could have been key in sustaining the action groups, it is important to note that MAP 16 was not responsible for establishing the action groups. Rather, MAP 16 was responsible for developing operational tools, templates, and guidance for the action groups once they were established. Only the supply chains action group remained operational during the life of the project.

partners: government, employer organizations, and trade unions, and the activities it implements also involve these stakeholders. Interviews with RILAC staff as well as stakeholders in Argentina and Mexico who were involved in implementing the CLRISK model told the evaluation team that the level of collaboration and coordination was effective.[25]

Country Level

Overall, MAP 16 collaborated and coordinated effectively with child labor and forced labor actors in the majority of the target countries. Nearly all stakeholders interviewed praised the project for its efforts to include a range of organizations in project activities. According to stakeholders, MAP 16 brought government, employers, and trade unions together to work on child labor policies, protocols, and awareness-raising and capacity-building activities. Within the government sector, the project included labor inspectors, teachers, social workers, judges, prosecutors, and police in the awareness-raising and capacity-building activities in most countries.

The collaboration with UNICEF at the country level did not meet ILO and USDOL expectations. For example, the project failed to develop long-term strategic partnerships with UNICEF in three countries as planned. ILO representatives noted that collaboration with UNICEF at the country level was less than anticipated because UNICEF and the ILO have country strategies with different priorities. The ILO works within a "decent work" framework while UNICEF promotes the rights of children within a child social protection framework.

Nevertheless, the project collaborated with UNICEF on specific initiatives in Fiji, India, Niger, Serbia, and Timor-Leste. In Fiji, the project collaborated with UNICEF to conduct and publish the report on the characteristics of child labor there. In India, MAP 16 and UNICEF collaborated on the Uttar Pradesh action plan. In Niger, MAP 16 collaborated with UNICEF, among many other stakeholders, to develop the National Action Plan on Child Labour. In Timor-Leste, the project and UNICEF collaborated on the knowledge, attitude, and practice survey as well as activities for the 2021 World Day Against Child Labour.

In Serbia, the project collaborated effectively with other child labor and forced labor actors, such as the Centre for Youth Integration, who was a member of the steering committee and several working group; SeConS Development Initiative Group; and the Association Putokaz that supported the awareness campaign on child labor and hazardous child labor. The project also collaborated with UNICEF with mixed results. On one hand, UNICEF participated in the project's steering committee, the national committee of practitioners, and the technical intersectoral working group that developed the draft decree on hazardous child labor. UNICEF made important contributions to these committees and their work.

On the other hand, UNICEF was approached to participate as a member of the technical working group for the national child labor survey. UNICEF representatives expressed surprise that they were not consulted earlier on the decision to include a child labor module in the labor force survey. They believe it would have been more efficient for the ILO to support the UNICEF multiple indicator cluster survey (MICS) that also collects data on child labor. The problem, according to UNICEF, is that two sets of data on child labor were produced that are not entirely consistent and caused some confusion.

[25] The evaluation team interviewed RILAC staff in Peru, Costa Rica, and Argentina. The team also interviewed some stakeholders who were involved with the CLRISK model in Argentina and Mexico. While the interviews were designed to ascertain information to answer evaluation question #8 on how to scale RILAC research efforts, interviews with staff and stakeholders suggested that the coordination and collaboration was effective.

According to ILO representatives, the ILO child labor survey module complements MICS because it disaggregates industries and occupations and measures hazardous work and household chores as well as factors that push children to work. Also, since the child labor estimates from the ILO child labor survey module and MICS are similar, there should not be confusion about the results.

USDOL representatives said they were hoping for stronger collaboration and synergies between the UNICEF MICS and the ILO child labor surveys (both child labor modules incorporated into labor force surveys and stand-alone child labor surveys). Collaboration between UNICEF and the ILO on the MICS and child labor surveys could have created efficiency that donors like USDOL encourage.

The project collaborated with the ILO's traditional tripartite partners, including government, trade unions, and employer organizations. The strongest collaboration occurred with government agencies such as the labor ministries, education ministries, social services ministries, and law enforcement. One exception was India where, despite strong efforts of the project to involve the Ministry of Labour and Employment at both the national and state level, its participation, according to stakeholders, was less than expected.

The collaboration with trade unions in most countries was effective. The exceptions were India and Timor-Leste, where the participation of the trade unions did not meet expectations. In India, participation by the trade unions was weak because, according to project staff, trade unions' presence in the unorganized sector is low, and the informal sector is what is linked to employment of children. In Bihar, the project worked with a central trade union that successfully promoted convergence among the district administration, labor department, and trade unions. This convergence model resulted in a resolution by the trade union to include child labor elimination in its mandate. In Timor-Leste, trade union representatives told the evaluation team that they wanted to be more involved in project activities to address child labor.

The project was less effective at collaborating with employer organizations in some countries. Project staff told the evaluation team that engagement with employers in Fiji, India, Kosovo, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste needed to be strengthened. MAP 16 required a different strategy to engage the employers. In Fiji, the project collaborated with the Fiji Commerce and Employers Federation and its Women Entrepreneurs Business Council to conduct business training for its members as well as non-members. However, one of the training coordinators told the evaluation team that the project missed an opportunity to work closer with the federation to reach its members and work on child labor awareness-raising activities.

3.3 EFFECTIVENESS

Effectiveness Questions
To what extent did the project address the midterm evaluation finding regarding the lack of clear roles and responsibilities of project staff?
To what extent did the project achieve the targets for each component and sub-component? For Components 3.3 and 3.4, to what extent did the project achieve the country-level outcomes for those countries included in this final evaluation? What are the key internal or external factors that limited or facilitated the achievement of these components, sub-components, and country-level outcomes?
How can future project interventions build on and scale the achievements, including the facilitating factors, while addressing the limiting factors? For Component 1, research in Mongolia, Nigeria, and RILAC and capacity-building in Fiji, India, and Niger will be assessed.

3.3.1 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROJECT STAFF

Midterm Evaluation Finding on Roles and Responsibilities of Project Staff

The midterm evaluation found that "management and accountability structure is challenging for a project of this budget. It relies on the figure of a project director, who remains responsible for ensuring the project's implementation without the proper official management responsibilities over MAP 16 staff." It also found that the "project director has no supervisory powers."[26]

The mid-term evaluation recommended to clarify the role and managerial tasks of the MAP 16 project director and improve internal program coordination. More specifically, it recommended that the profile and managerial tasks of the project director should be fully recognized and supported and that a steering group should be formed to strengthen internal coordination.[27]

In response to this finding and recommendation, the ILO agreed that the project director is responsible for the overall operational management of the project, for reporting to the donor, for coordinating with other relevant national and international projects, and for serving as team leader. However, the ILO and USDOL have diverging views over the supervisory role of a project director.

According to ILO representatives, the FUNDAMENTALS' management structure was designed to facilitate the branch's mandates and objectives that include the management of donor-funded projects but also other ILO work. The management structure consists of the branch chief and three units and their unit heads. Staff within the units are supervised by the unit head while all unit heads are supervised by the branch chief. The management structure is explained in more detail in Section 1.2.3.

FUNDAMENTALS oversees a variety of projects funded by different donors. Usually the costs (e.g., salaries and benefits) of some members of staff are partially charged to the different projects, depending on how much of their time is required.[28] Also, it is common for each project to have its own project director. For illustrative purposes, suppose USDOL, the European Union, and Japan might be funding three different research projects, each with its own project director, but each project requires a different level of effort from the research unit staff. In theory, the unit staff would be supervised by three different project directors, which does not make sense from a management point of view.

USDOL, on the other hand, expects the project director on all of its projects to have the authority over project staff to ensure that project requirements, such as deliverables and timelines, are achieved. According to USDOL representatives, the lack of supervisory control over project staff is an accountability issue. When ILO staff being charged to a project are not accountable to the project director, project performance problems can surface, such as the underachievement of key deliverables.

While the ILO did not modify the FUNDAMENTALS' basic management structure, it made changes that it believes will help address USDOL's concerns about the supervisory powers of a project director. For example, the supervisory roles and practices have been adjusted to ensure more clarity while preserving the structure, as enforced by the ILO Governing Body. Any staff located in the same unit as the project director and who is paid 100 percent by the project will be directly

[26] MAP 16 Independent Midterm Evaluation Report, page 38.
[27] MAP 16 Independent Midterm Evaluation Report, page 46.
[28] Please note that the cost of unit heads are never charged to projects. Unit heads are fully funded by the ILO regular budget. Staff working in their respective units might be charged to projects, depending on the level of effort/time they are working on the projects.

supervised by the project director. However, the project director will not directly supervise staff in the units who are partially paid by the project nor the unit heads.

3.3.2 ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT OBJECTIVE OUTCOMES

This section includes an assessment of the achievement of the project objective and the four outcomes and their sub-outcomes. The assessment of the outcomes and sub-outcomes are based on the achievement of their indicator targets that are reported in the TPRs. Please refer to Annex F for a more complete and technical discussion, including achievement of the outputs.

Project Objective

The overall project objective states: *The MAP 16 Project will accelerate progress in support of efforts to eliminate child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking*. The project objective does not have indicators or other criteria to assess its achievement. Nevertheless, based on the achievement of the project's outcomes, sub-outcomes, and outputs, the evaluation team believes that MAP 16 made an important contribution to efforts to eliminate child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

Outcome 1: Improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

Figure 1 shows Outcome 1 and its sub-outcomes (SOs). It also shows the indicator target, the end-of-project indicator target achieved, and overall performance status.

Figure 1: Outcome 1, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements

Outcomes and Indicators	Target	Achieved	Status
Outcome 1: Improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking			
SO 1.1.A: Improved survey methods and data tools to support research on child labor and forced labor and human trafficking			
SO 1.1.B: Increased member states' sustainability of child labor data collection, analysis, and reporting			
Indicator: Number of member states that implement activities on child labor data collection, analysis and reporting based on strategic engagements with the project	5	6	+1
SO 1.2: Improved data and evidence in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor and human trafficking			

SO 1.1.A did not have a specific indicator to assess its achievement, so the evaluation team assessed the achievement of its 15 output indicators. These indicators focused on improved survey methods and improved data collection tools. The project either met or exceeded 10 of the 15 output targets, resulting in an overall output achievement rate of 67 percent. See Annex F for a complete assessment of the output achievements for SO 1.1.A.

The **SO 1.1.B** indicator was the number of member states that implemented activities on child labor data collection, analysis, and reporting based on strategic engagements with the project. The project set a target of five and achieved six: Chile, Mexico, Serbia, Nigeria, Mongolia, and Burkina Faso. See Annex F for a complete assessment of the output achievements for SO 1.1.B.

SO 1.2 also did not have an indicator to measure achievement, so the evaluation team assessed the achievement of its seven output targets. The project met or achieved six of the

seven output targets, for an achievement rate of 86 percent. See Annex F for a complete assessment of SO 1.2 output achievements.

Summary of Outcome 1 Achievement

Based on the over-achievement of the SO 1.1.B indicator target and the output achievement rates for SO 1.1.A (67 percent) and SO 1.2 (86 percent) the evaluation team determines that the overall outcome of improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking was largely achieved.

Outcome 2: Improved application of knowledge in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor.

Figure 2 shows Outcome 2, its two SOs, the SO indicators, indicator targets, achievements against the indicator target, and the overall performance status. Outcome 2 had one indicator: the number of uses of knowledge of products by stakeholders. The project set a target of 12 and reported that it achieved 12. These included the use of slide decks in briefings of the Global Estimates of Modern Slavery report and reference to the publication in articles and technical papers.

Figure 2: Outcome 2, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements

Outcomes and Indicators	Target	Achieved	Status
Outcome 2: Improved application of knowledge in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor			
Indicator: Number of uses of knowledge products by stakeholders	12	12	0
SO 2.1: Increased engagement between knowledge producers and end-users in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor			
Indicator: Number of users that access the ILO and Alliance 8.7 websites and social media accounts for the knowledge products developed by the project	6,000	123,000	+117,000
Indicator: Number of individuals who attended activities about project knowledge products	2,250	2,500	+250
SO 2.2: Increased awareness and engagement of the target group in support of efforts to eliminate child labor			

SO 2.1 had two indicators. The first was the number of users that access the ILO and Alliance 8.7 websites and social media accounts for the knowledge products developed by the project. The project set a target of 6,000 users who access ILO and Alliance 8.7 websites and reported that 123,000 accessed these websites. This significant overachievement of the target, according to project staff, was because when the target was set, baseline data were not available to help determine whether the target was realistic. In addition, the International Year for the Elimination of Child Labour, which was not envisioned when the target was set, generated interest that drove a high number of users to the Alliance 8.7 website and social media.

The second indicator was the number of individuals who attended activities about project knowledge products. The project set a target of 2,250 and achieved 2,500 persons who attended activities about knowledge products. These include virtual events held online that started during the COVID-19 pandemic and continued afterwards.

It should be noted that the project significantly underachieved on two outputs: number of ILO and non-ILO persons using the knowledge mobilization tool and the storytelling tool[29]. The project set a target of 75 persons for each tool (150 combined) and only achieved 9 each (18 total). According to project staff, the COVID-19 pandemic delayed the production of materials that, along with other issues, contributed to the underachievement of these two outputs. Furthermore, these tools were not adapted to the realities of ILO work and ILO staff. Rather than continue with the knowledge mobilization and storytelling tools, the project decided to adjust the content to better meet the needs of ILO staff. The information was converted to online training courses to be hosted by the ILO's International Training Centre in Turin. These will be offered to ILO employees free of charge. At the time of the evaluation, the training courses were being developed.

SO 2.2 did not have indicators that can be used to measure its achievement. To assess performance of this SO, the evaluators analyzed output achievement. The project achieved the IPEC+ 2021 advocacy strategy and produced 10 impact stories as planned. See Annex F for a complete assessment of the output achievements for SO 2.2.

Summary of Outcome 2 Achievement

The project met its overall outcome indicator target, which was the number of uses of the knowledge products. It also significantly exceeded the indicator target for SO 2.1 (number of persons who accessed ILO and Alliance 8.7 websites) and exceeded the indicator target for the number of persons who attended knowledge product events but significantly underachieved on the use of two knowledge tools. The project also achieved the two output targets under SO 2.2. The project achieved most of its outcome and output indicator targets and, in the process, reached a large number of persons through the Alliance 8.7 website, physical and virtual events, and social media. However, it is not clear to what extent these achievements translated into the application of the knowledge to address child labor and forced labor because the project did not have a mechanism in place to measure the extent to which the knowledge and knowledge products were used.

Outcome 3: Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations, and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking through national, regional and global initiatives

Figure 3 shows Outcome 3, its four SOs, the SO indicators, indicator targets, achievements against the indicator target, and the overall performance status. The project did not develop an indicator for SO 3.1. While it did develop indicators for SO 3.2 and SO 3.3, the project did not set indicator targets. According to USDOL representatives, one possible explanation is that the project decided to wait to establish indicators and targets given the uncertainty at the beginning of the project but never returned to develop them.

[29] Our analysis on these indicators is based on the results per the October 2023 TPR, however, there is ongoing discussion between the ILO and USDOL teams to revise these indicator targets.

Figure 3: Outcome 3, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements

Outcomes and Indicators	Target	Achieved	Status
Outcome 3: Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking through national, regional and global initiatives			
SO 3.1: Increased capacity of sugar and fishing stakeholders to improve policies			
Indicator: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
SO 3.2: Increased capacity at regional level in at least 2 regions to combat child labor and forced labor			
Indicator: Number of regions with increased capacity to address child labor	N/A	N/A	N/A
SO 3.3: Improved country capacity to address child labor: Colombia, India, and Jordan			
Indicator: Number of countries with increased capacity to address child labor or forced labor	N/A	N/A	N/A
SO 3.4: Improved country capacity in 10 other countries			
Indicator: N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Since **SO 3.1** did not have an indicator and target, it was not possible for the evaluation team to assess indicator achievement. It should be noted that since the project did not address capacity in the sugar sector, increased capacity of sugar stakeholders is not relevant. For the fishing sector, the project collaborated with Cornell University to develop and subsequently revise a handbook to detect forced labor in the sector. The handbook is currently on its third iteration, which is more operational and provides guidance to users. At the time of the evaluation, the handbook was under final review by the ILO. However, it is too early to say whether the handbook increased capacity of fishing stakeholders to improve policies, although both ILO and USDOL representatives are highly optimistic about its potential to increase capacity.

While **SO 3.2** included an indicator, it did not have a target—making it difficult to assess achievement. Instead, the evaluation team reviewed its two outputs: 1) a regional action plan on child labor, forced labor, modern slavery, and human trafficking endorsed by the African Union; and 2) capacity of RILAC strengthened (three CLRISK models, validated with country participation). The project developed the regional action plan endorsed by the African Union and also developed 11 CLRISK models (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Jamaica, México, Paraguay, and Peru) compared to the target of three. See Annex F for a detailed assessment of output achievement. Based on the achievements of the two outputs, SO 3.2 was achieved.

SO 3.3 aimed to increase the capacity of Colombia, India, and Jordan to address child labor and forced labor. The project closed in Colombia and Jordan, leaving India, which is one of the target countries for this final evaluation. MAP 16 India had a logical framework that listed three outcomes with indicators. To assess increased capacity to address child labor and forced labor in India, the three outcome indicators are analyzed below.

Figure 4: India Outcomes, Indicators, Targets, and Achievement

Outcomes and Indicators	Target	Achieved	Status
Outcome 1: Child labor policies and action plans improved to be convergent at the state and district levels			
Indicator: Number of government schemes planning documents relevant for child labor that incorporate convergence measures	8	0	-8
Outcome 2: Improved capacity to collect and analyze child labor data at the state and district levels			
Indicator: Number of state statistical offices that use the updated survey questionnaire in the production of child labor statistics	3	0	-3
Outcome 3: Targeted state governments have strengthened capacity and knowledge base on child labor and its worst forms			
Indicator: Number of government agencies at the state and district level that are incorporating the capacities and knowledge base developed with the project support in action plans/policies/programs on child labor	3	1	-2

The indicator for **Outcome 1** was the number of government schemes planning documents relevant for child labor that incorporate convergence measures.[30] The project set a target of eight. The project reported that it identified eight government schemes (education, health, skill development, employment, rural housing, financial inclusion, social welfare, and child protection programs) for inclusion in convergence measures in its three target states (Bihar, Chhattisgarh, and Uttar Pradesh). However, the evaluation team could not find evidence that any of the three target states' planning documents relevant to child labor incorporated convergence measures. The evaluation team did find evidence that the project took steps to pilot/implement convergence measures in Bihar. The project also reported that the convergence measures and other learning from Bihar were incorporated in the draft of the Uttar Pradesh child labor policy.

The indicator for **Outcome 2** was the number of state statistical offices that used the updated survey questionnaire in the production of child labor statistics. It should be noted that India does not maintain child labor data at the national level. It does not implement a stand-alone child labor survey to capture child labor information nor does the national census have specific child labor questionnaires. The most recent data available on child labor come from the 2011 census, which is outdated.

To help ensure availability of recent child labor data, the project initially planned to update relevant sections of the National Child Labour Project (NCLP) survey questionnaire. The government circulated in December 2017 that it expected district project societies to implement. However, due to a lack of interest, the project decided to abandon the plan to update the existing survey instruments. Instead, the project decided to conduct an analysis of child labor data in the Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS) and Time Use Survey (TUS) to estimate the status of working children below 18 years of age.

[30] Convergence measures is a term used in India to describe combining government social programs to create synergies that have more impact on poverty. The project uses convergence measures to describe the convergence or combining of key social services targeted at child labor families, such as education, health, skill development, employment, rural housing, financial inclusion, social welfare, and child protection.

While the analysis was completed, USDOL and the ILO decided for several reasons not to publish results of the analysis estimating the status of working children. First, the PLFS asks questions about whether children either work or attend school but does not capture whether children are combining work and school, which is common. This is due to the questionnaire design. By not capturing information on children who combine work and school, PLFS misses a large number of children who attend school but also are involved in child labor. On the other hand, while the TUS captures the information on children who combine work and school, it does not collect information on industry or occupations that are important to measure child labor. Next, the analysis of the PLFS data reaches the conclusion that child labor is decreasing in India—which, according to USDOL and the ILO—is a claim that cannot be supported by the PLFS. Finally, the Government of India did not provide MAP 16 and the ILO an indication that it would approve the publication of the analytical report.

The indicator for **Outcome 3** was the number of government agencies at the state and district level that are incorporating the capacities and knowledge base developed with the project support in action plans/policies/programs on child labor. The project reported that it was able to work with the state government in Uttar Pradesh to incorporate child labor knowledge into its action plan. According to project staff, the states of Bihar and Chhattisgarh were not in the process of developing action plans.

Also under Outcome 3, the project trained NGOs and university students on child labor issues. Nineteen persons responded to questions in the online perception survey about training relevance, effectiveness, and utilization (see Annex G for a complete presentation of the survey findings). Seventy-three percent responded that the training was either highly relevant (26 percent) or relevant (47 percent). Twenty-one percent thought the training was somewhat or not relevant. Sixty-eight percent believed that that the training was effective, and 21 percent thought it was highly effective. All 19 respondents reported using the new knowledge and skills. Seventy-four percent often use them while 21 percent somewhat use them.

A noteworthy achievement under Outcome 3 (Output 5) was the implementation of a unique collaboration model in Bihar where the project collaborated with district administration officials, the Workers Information and Support Centre (WISC), Jan Shikshan Sansthan, and community volunteers to link eligible child labor families with government services. See Annex F for more information on this collaboration as well as an in-depth analysis of the achievement of all MAP 16 India outputs.

SO 3.4 aimed to build country capacity in 10 additional countries that were added later in the life of the project. These countries were not required to develop results frameworks with indicators, activities mapping, and monitoring plans. Instead, the countries under SO 3.4 developed outcomes, outputs, and activities and reported on achievements as part of their workplans. The following section summarizes the outcome and output achievements for the countries covered by this evaluation. They are presented in alphabetical order: Argentina, Fiji, Kosovo, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste. Annex F provides a more technical and detailed discussion of outcome, output, and activities achievements.

Argentina

Argentina had two main outcomes. Under **Outcome 1**, the project aimed to achieve six outputs focused primarily on research and research products related to child labor and adolescent work. These included a qualitative analysis of national survey data to improve the understanding on child labor and family dynamics and two empirical studies. The first study examined the perceptions of girls and boys about gender stereotypes and the sexual division of labor and tasks as well as gender stereotypes among adult caretakers. The second study

examined the statistical relationship between social protection measures, such as child allowances and conditional cash transfers, and child labor among households with working and non-working adolescents. Based on the research and consultations with stakeholders, the project developed briefs on policy options and recommendations. In addition to the studies mentioned above, the project conducted a rapid assessment in the provinces of Corrientes and Misiones to understand the dimensions of forced labor and other forms of labor exploitation in the forestry sector. The ILO FUNDAMENTALS and SECTOR branches supported the assessment. To disseminate the results of the rapid assessment, the project organized workshops in Corrientes and Misiones. All of these research outputs were completed as planned.

Outcome 2 aimed to increase awareness regarding child labor and forced labor. Outcome 2 included three outputs related to knowledge products, their promotion, and increasing capacity to undertake advocacy actions. The project reported conducting three different communication campaigns, including the use of innovative communication materials and approaches such as infographics to communicate research findings and YouTube videos. Under the second output, the project presented the findings from the qualitative analysis on child labor and family dynamics and the RILAC child labor risk identification (CLRISK) model to the National Commission for the Eradication of Child Labor (CONAETI) and the Provincial Commission for the Eradication of Child Labor (COPRETI) in their five regional meetings (North-East, North-West, Cuyo, Central, and Patagonia). The project also disseminated the findings from the different studies through workshops and other activities aimed at informing public policies.

Under the third output, the project worked with the country's largest business manufacturing organization, the Argentine Industrial Union (UIA), to conduct regional workshops for the private sector on how to protect adolescent workers in global value chains. In addition, it conducted regional workshops for 35 labor inspectors to raise awareness about child labor and forced labor and its prevention. The workshops also aimed to improve inter-institutional coordination and collaboration.

MAP 16 worked closely with UIA and three large trade union federations to develop training modules on child labor. The trade unions included the General Labor Confederation of the Republic of Argentina (CGT); Autonomous Workers Central of Argentina (CTAA); and Central of Workers of Argentina (CTAT). At the time of the evaluation, UIA and the trade unions were in the process of incorporating the training modules into their ongoing training and meeting activities. Finally, the project provided technical assistance to the government, employers, and trade unions to update the list of hazardous child labor

Under Outcome 2, the project provided training to increase knowledge of the causes, prevalence, and consequences of child labor to labor inspectors, employers, trade unions, and other key child labor actors. Based on the online perception survey (see Annex G), the trainees believe the training was relevant and effective. Ninety-three percent opined that the training was either highly relevant (56 percent) or relevant (37 percent). Ninety percent also thought the training was either highly effective (37 percent) or effective (53 percent). Ninety-eight percent of trainees reported that they use the new skills and knowledge. About 58 percent use new knowledge and skills sometimes while 40 percent use new knowledge and skills often.

Fiji

The aim of Outcome 1 was to support the development of the National Child Labour Policy (NCLP) and the National Action Plan to Eliminate Child Labour (NAPCL). Outcome 1 had three

outputs that included the NCLP, NAPCL, and the incorporation of a child protection provision into the relevant government policies. While the project supported the revision of the NCLP, including draft lists of hazardous occupations for children and light work for children, review and revision of the NAPFL, and a draft child protection provisions, these policies have not yet been endorsed by the cabinet as planned. According to the project, the Employment Relations Advisory Board (ERAB) needed to submit these policies to the cabinet for endorsement. However, for various reasons, ERAB did not meet regularly and failed to submit the policies to the cabinet.

A high-ranking official at Ministry of Employment Productivity and Industrial Relations (MEPIR) told the evaluation team that child labor was not a priority of the previous government, but it is for the current government. He explained that MEPIR will work with ERAB to submit the different child labor policy documents that the project helped produce and send them to parliament for endorsement.

Outcome 2, which aimed to update the national child labor framework, had two outputs. One was updating/developing the lists of hazardous occupations for children and light work for children in artistic, performing, and entertainment Industries. The second was harmonizing the definition of child labor. The lists were updated and finalized as planned. However, they have not been endorsed by the cabinet for the reasons mentioned above under Outcome 1. The second output was canceled because the project felt it did not have the support of the cabinet to harmonize the definition of child labor.

For Outcome 3, the project intended to improve the knowledge base on preventing child labor. It had two outputs: national child labor information system and a report on the characteristics of child labor. Under the first output, the project initially planned to provide support to MEPIR to develop agreements with government agencies to access and share data on child labor and support MEPIR and national authorities to develop a database with standard indicators to better assist victims of child labor. These activities were canceled because, according to project staff, the government advised the project not to proceed with this activity. Instead, the project helped MEPIR develop the child labor component for its paperless national labor inspection system. This was achieved, but the paperless labor inspection information system is having minimal impact because MEPIR lacks all of the required hardware to make it fully operational. The ILO is continuing to provide assistance to MEPIR, so it can fully operationalize the system.

Regarding the second output, the project produced a report on the characteristics of child labor: *COVID-19 and Child Labour in Fiji: A Situational Assessment*. The draft report is currently with ILO's FUNDAMENTALS branch, awaiting final edits required before finalizing.

Outcome 4 included a range of child labor pilot activities. The two outputs were labor inspection guidelines (and training) and awareness-raising campaigns. For the first output, the project developed the joint labor inspection protocol for the worse forms of child labor (WFCL). The protocol was sent to the Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation (MWCPA) and Fiji Police Force that cleared it to be submitted to MEPIR. MEPIR intends to develop a paper to present the draft protocol to the Fiji cabinet for endorsement.

Although not formally approved by the cabinet yet, the project used the protocol to train labor inspectors, social welfare officers, police officers, teachers, municipality representatives, agriculture officers, medical personnel, and sugar sector officers. In total, 212 persons were trained (97 females and 115 males). In addition, the project worked with the MEPIR, Fiji Police Force, and MWCPA to jointly pilot the inspection protocol for child labor.

Under the second output, the project intended to conduct a training program for child labor focal points and provide support to Alliance 8.7 partners to organize the first ever 2021 World Day Against Child Labor Campaign in Fiji. The 2021 World Day Against Child Labor Campaign was canceled due to COVID-19. Instead, the project organized a series of online events. These included pledges from the government, employers and trade unions, statements from the ILO and US Embassy about the importance of World Day Against Child Labor, and a session on combatting child labor through labor inspection. ILO and UNICEF wrote an op-ed piece for the national media and collaborated on a practical guide for journalists that they can use to report on child abuse, neglect, and exploitation such as child labor. The project also provided three business/entrepreneur trainings for women in the Qauia community, women dairy farmers in Naitasiri, and women entrepreneurs in the Western Province. Finally, the project provided technical support for the Revamping School Monitoring Programme and conducted interviews with students.

In addition to the training provided on the use of the joint inspection protocol, MAP 16 conducted training for employers and workers on national legislation on employment and protection of children. Based on the results of the online perception survey, stakeholders who were trained under Outcome 4 on how to eradicate and end all forms of child labor, believe the training was relevant and effective. Of the 60 persons who responded to the survey questions, 94 percent thought that the training was either highly relevant (62 percent) or relevant (32 percent). Ninety-five percent believe the training was either highly effective (48 percent) or effective (47 percent). Ninety-eight percent of trainees reported that they use the new skills and knowledge. About 37 percent use the new knowledge and skills sometimes while 62 percent use new knowledge and skills often.

Kosovo

In Kosovo, MAP 16 had six outcomes. **Outcome 1** aimed to establish national and municipal child labor monitoring frameworks. It had 10 specific outputs. The project reported achieving the first three outputs that include determining the cost to manage a child labor case that took the form of policy research, updating child labor indicators in the digital database, and an updating the child labor monitoring system. Two outputs, increased capacity of municipal institutions to monitor child labor and amplified child labor case management, were mostly achieved.

Under the amplified child labor case management, the promotion of the child labor database has been delayed because the Social Services Division was transferred to the Ministry of Justice. This is considered an administrative delay and does not threaten the achievement of the output. However, it should be noted that some stakeholders believe that social workers lack the capacity to use the database.

The hazardous child labor list has been completed but due the transfer of the Social Services Division to the Ministry of Justice, the approval by the government has been delayed. The light work list has been completed and validated by stakeholders. It will be used as a guide for regulation of light work during the amendment of the labor law and for drafting the sub-legal acts on the regulation of light work. The project reported achieving the child labor situation report and increased capacity of Kosovo Statistical Agency (KSA) to produce quality reports. However, based on focus group discussions with KSA staff, the training that the project provided was not adequate to allow them to produce reports on child labor based on data generated from future surveys.

The project conducted and published an assessment on child labor in the agriculture sector, which means hazardous child labor data in the agriculture and forestry sectors are available.

The assessment report is available on the ILO website. The last output, the roadmap to eliminate child labor in the agriculture sector, was completed in September 2023.

Under Outcome 1, the project provided training to strengthen the framework for monitoring the prevalence of child labor and fact-based planning measures to address child labor. Of the 13 persons who responded to the questions about this training in the online perception survey, 62 percent rated the training as highly relevant while 38 percent rated it as relevant. Regarding effectiveness, 54 percent believe the training was highly effective and another 46 percent thought it was effective. The respondents also reported using new knowledge and skills from the training. Seventy-seven percent say they often use them while 23 percent noted that they sometimes use them.

Outcome 2 focused on strengthening the social protection system and had two outputs, including the review of Centre for Social Work (CSW) child labor management forms and increased capacity of CSW personnel to manage child labor cases. The project reported that the CSW forms were reviewed and updated while a case management training manual was developed and used to train CSW personnel. To strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor, the project provided training to social services staff as well as training of trainers focused on case management to some of the CSWs (eight CSW did not participate in the MAP 16 project). Seven persons responded to the online perception survey about this training. Four opined that the training was highly relevant, two said it was relevant, and one persons noted it was somewhat relevant. Regarding effectiveness and utilization, two persons said it was highly effective and that they often use the new information; five said it was effective and that they somewhat use the information.

Outcome 3 intended to increase the capacity of the education system to prevent child labor and protect children. It had five outputs that project reported having achieved. It trained school inspectors and quality assurance coordinators in the municipal education directorates on child labor and school dropout prevention. The project also updated the module on prevention of school dropout by adding one indicator on child labor and linking it to other child protection systems. Under the last two outputs, the project trained education personnel on child labor that will serve as trainers including the implementation of the ILO SCREAM methodology (Supporting Children's Rights through Education, Arts and Media).

Based on the results of the online perception survey, the trainees believe the training to strengthen the education system to prevent child labor was relevant and effective. Of the 13 persons who responded to questions related to the training provided under this outcome, 69 percent said it was highly relevant and 31 percent it was relevant. Regarding effectiveness, 77 percent rated the training as highly effective while another 23 percent rated it as effective. Approximately 69 percent often use new knowledge and skills while 31 percent use new knowledge and skills somewhat.

Outcome 4 was designed to improve the enforcement of child labor laws and had three outputs: train employers' organizations and trade unions on identification and prevention of child labor, strengthen capacities of the labor inspectorate to inspect and report cases of child labor, and train police, forestry inspectors, and agriculture inspectors on the identification of child labor and protection of children. While the project trained 11 representatives from employee unions, it did not train representatives from employers' organizations. Although the project invited them to participate in a planned training activity, they did not attend and did not provide an explanation. However, the project met with the Kosovo Chamber of Commerce and shared the training materials.

The project also trained approximately 48 labor inspectors on the use of the child labor identification and referral checklist, and trained police (22 persons), rural development inspectors (35 persons), and forestry inspectors (30 persons) on identification of child labor and the protection of children. Six persons responded to questions in the online perception survey about training designed to improve enforcement of child labor laws. Three persons thought the training was highly relevant, and three believed it was relevant. Regarding effectiveness and utilization, three persons noted that the training was highly effective, and they often use new knowledge and skills while three said it was effective and that they somewhat use them.

Outcome 5, which aimed to increase the capacity of the judicial system to address child labor, had one output to increase the capacity of judges and prosecutors to address child labor. The project reported that it prepared and validated training tools and trained 24 judges and four prosecutors and judges over two training events. Only one person responded to questions about this training in the online perception survey. The person thought that the training was relevant and somewhat effective. However, according to judicial stakeholders, the Academy of Justice does not intend to use the training materials because they do not meet the needs of judges and prosecutors. Instead, the Academy would have preferred to have had assistance developing a unified approach to hearing and deciding child labor cases.

Outcome 6 was a child labor awareness-raising objective, which had three primary outputs, including mobilizing institutions against child labor, informing the public about hazardous child labor, and providing information to approximately 1,000 farmers about hazardous child labor in the agriculture sector. The project organized a 90-minute webinar on child labor that was attended by 83 persons. It was also streamed on ILO Budapest and UN Kosovo Facebook pages that reached nearly 500 persons. The project also developed public service announcements on child labor and hazardous child labor in agriculture for television and social media. Finally, it provided information and guidance to nearly 10,000 farmers on hazardous child labor in the agriculture and forestry sectors, which significantly exceeded the target by 9,000 farmers.

Only four persons responded to questions about the training provided under Outcome 6. One person believes that the training was highly relevant and highly effective while the other three said it was relevant and effective. Three of the respondents noted that they are able to use new knowledge and skills often in their jobs.

Niger

In Niger, the project had three outcomes. Outcome 1, which was the development of the National Action Plan on Child Labour (NAPCL), had two outputs. The first was to update the NAPCL, while the second was to strengthen national ownership of the plan. Following the Coup d'Etat of July 2023, the democratically elected government was dissolved, and instructions were given by the United Nations coordinator and the ILO Country Office Abidjan to suspend all support to the bodies and institutions created by the new military authorities. Therefore, the activities related to the validation of the NAPFL were suspended because they involved consultations with the government and parliamentarians.

Outcome 2, which aims to strengthen the agriculture sector to address child labor, had three outputs: strengthen national ownership of the NAPCL, strengthen the mobile schools, and increase awareness among farmers and other agriculture stakeholders about hazardous work in the sector. The project reported that awareness-raising workshops and other activities to strengthen ownership were completed. Regarding the second output, the project decided to cancel it due to security concerns where the mobile schools operate. The third output included

radio debates to raise awareness; these were successfully completed. The two persons who responded to the online perception survey rated the training as relevant and either as highly effective or effective.

Outcome 3 aimed to strengthen the capacity of key stakeholders and consisted of four outputs. The first three involved strengthening employer organizations, trade unions, and labor inspectors. The fourth output aimed to establish a national steering committee for child labor. The project reported that it organized and conducted workshops for employers, trade unions, and labor inspectors. Furthermore, it helped establish the national steering committee. The training that aimed at strengthening institutional capacities of ministries and social partners on the elimination of child labor was also rated highly. The nine persons who responded to the online perception survey rated the training as either highly relevant (67 percent) or relevant (33 percent) and either as highly effective (78 percent) or effective (22 percent). Eight of the 9 respondents (89 percent) reporting often using the new knowledge and skills they acquired from the trainings.

Serbia

MAP 16 in Serbia had six outcomes. **Outcome 1** aimed to strengthen the national child labor framework. It had two main outputs. The first was to integrate the child labor survey into the labor force survey, and the second was a set of recommendations on how to protect children living and working in the streets. The project developed, piloted, and published the results of the child labor module and trained the statistical office. However, the government has not yet approved its integration into the labor force survey. Under the second output, the project conducted a rapid assessment of the situation of street children in Belgrade and used the results to develop the set of recommendations noted above. However, the project decided to cancel this output because, for political reasons, it determined that the members of the city council were not ready to approve the recommendations. The ILO intends to publish the rapid assessment report on its website.

Outcome 2, which aimed to align national laws with international standards of child protection, had five outputs. These included recommendations to align national laws with international standards, an amended decree on hazardous child labor, draft list of light work, child labor provisions integrated into protocols, and discussing of legal instruments for hazardous and light work with the corresponding authorities. As planned, the project produced the recommendations report, the draft amended decree, and the draft list of light work. During the project extension period, the project also implemented an awareness campaign on child labor, including hazardous child labor. The recommendations report was submitted to the Ministry of Labour, Employment, Veteran and Social Affairs (MOLEVSA), as planned. The draft amended decree and the draft list of light work were also completed and submitted to the corresponding ministries. According to the project, once the new labor law is approved, the recommendations and the list of light work will likely be incorporated.

Output 4 aimed to amend a draft legal instrument on child begging within the Law on Public Peace and Order that was developed under the USDOL Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II (CLEAR). The government adopted a new General Protocol for Protection of Children against Violence, including all child labor provisions developed previously by the CLEAR project. The protocol defines child labor per international standards, provides a government-wide standard definition of child begging, and integrates labor inspectors into the child protection system. On the other hand, **Output 5** (discussing the hazardous work and light work legal instruments with the new government) was canceled. The light work decree would need to be incorporated into the new labor law envisioned for 2026,

while the revised hazardous work decree lacks government support. Although this output was canceled, the decree was discussed with relevant stakeholders at the final event of the project in Serbia, held in October 2023.

Outcome 3 intended to strengthen the child social protection system and included one output, which was the development of a strong child social protection system. Under this output, the project collaborated with UNICEF to develop a set of indicators to identify child labor in the formal and informal economy (seasonal work in the agriculture sector). Through a series of consultative meetings and workshops, the project developed draft amendments of instruction to protect children; one for the Centers for Social Work (CSW) and another for the labor inspectorate. These were eventually signed by MOLEVSA. The project also revised the special protocol for labor inspection and developed a draft set of amendments of instruction for the protection of children during labor inspections.

The project provided seminars and training to social welfare actors and was aimed at strengthening social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor. Of the 11 persons who responded to the question about the relevance of this training, 45 percent thought it was highly relevant while another 45 percent thought it was relevant. Nearly 91 percent responded that the training was highly effective (55 percent) or effective (36 percent). Although 82 percent reported that they sometimes use new knowledge and skills, only about 18 percent reported that they often use it. It should also be noted that the project initiated and supported the Republic Institute for Social Protection to accredit the training course (Child Labour, Prevention, Identification, and Intervention) and offer it to professionals working in the social protection system.

The only activity under this output that was not completed was the reporting software that the project hoped to develop in collaboration with MOLEVSA and UNICEF. Due to delays in developing the software, the project decided to cancel this activity.

Outcome 4 focused on the enforcement of child labor laws. It had two outputs: one is the training of employers and trade unions on the protection and prevention of child labor, and the other is training of social protection and prosecution officials on the same topic. It should be noted that the trainings were delayed several times due to the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions on face-to-face meetings. Eventually the trainings were conducted online. In the trainings for employers and trade unions, approximately 28 representatives from these social partners participated. A total of seven trainings were conducted for labor inspectors, prosecutors, and supervisors from CSW. Nearly 115 persons were trained from these institutions.

Seven persons responded to the question about the relevance, effectiveness, and utilization of the training designed to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor. Four persons rated the training as highly relevant and effective while three rated it as relevant, and another two persons rated the training effective. Two persons reported that they often use the new knowledge and skills in their work, and two persons said that they sometimes use it. The other three persons reported they do not use the newly acquired knowledge and skills.

Outcome 5 intended to communicate project achievements to the public and had one output that was designed to develop advocacy and communication materials. The project developed and disseminated both a PDF document and poster about the MAP 16 project. It also organized an online workshop for World Day Against Child Labor in which the labor ministry, employers' organizations, trade unions, and other institutions participated.

Outcome 6 and its output is the roadmap to eliminate child labor in Serbia. The activities under this outcome were initially delayed until the new government was formed and in place. However, the project decided that it was not feasible to develop the roadmap because child labor is not a high priority for the government at this time. There would need to be a ministry to anchor the roadmap, but neither the Ministry of Family Care and Demography nor the Ministry of Human and Minority Rights and Social Dialogue—the most appropriate ministries in which to anchor the roadmap—have expressed an interest. However, it should be noted that the project did conduct an assessment of the 2018–2022 roadmap.

Sri Lanka

Outcome 1, which focused on ascertaining evidence on child labor, had five outputs. These included analysis of the 2016 National Child Activity Survey (NCAS) data to show child labor trends, interventions to address hazardous child labor, child labor communication strategy, use of labor inspection system (LISA) to refer child labor cases, and technical assistance to strengthen the school-to-work program.

Regarding the first output, it should be noted that the project did not analyze the 2016 NCAS data. Instead, it analyzed data from the National Child Protection Authority hotline that provided an important source of information to understand child labor in the country. However, due to a small sample and confidentiality, the project could not to publish the results. It did use some of the information to help develop the child labor communication strategy.

Under the second output, the project produced a package of materials and trained labor inspectors, child services officers, and police on how to use them. In total, the project conducted training events for 146 officials from DOL and the Department of Probation and the Police Department. The project also planned to produce 10 child labor impact stories but was unable to complete this activity. DOL could not provide case information to the project because it needed to protect the identifies of the case victims. In hindsight, this was not an appropriate activity, given the sensitivity of the information.

> The online perception survey was sent to 17 stakeholders. Only two persons responded to questions about training relevance, effectiveness, and utilization. These two persons, one from the Ministry of Education and another from an employers' organization, believe that the training was relevant and effective. Only one person, however, reported using the new knowledge and skills acquired during training.

As noted above, the project—under the third output—produced a child labor communication strategy that DOL is currently using. Messages were posted on the DOL YouTube page, but the number of views have been minimal. Furthermore, the project contracted a service provider to conduct an awareness session for members of the media to promote the messages, but due to a miscommunication, the event was canceled.

Regarding the LISA output, the project decided to cancel it because DOL did not consider it an effective child labor monitoring tool. While DOL uses LISA to enter labor inspection data, it does not use it as a monitoring tool and is in the process of replacing LISA with another labor inspection monitoring tool. Thus, adding a child labor module to LISA did not make sense. Under the fifth output, the project developed a school-to-work manual for parents that was approved by the Ministry of Education (MOE). The manual was used to train more than 2,400 parents in 20 schools. Since the project ended, the MOE has continued to use the manual to train parents because, according to MOE officials, the manual is highly effective.

Under **Outcome 2** the project had three outputs: publishing and disseminating the Commercial Sex Exploitation of Children (CSEC) study, policy dialogue based on this report, and an action

plan with recommendations. It should be noted that the CSEC study was produced under the CLEAR project but was not approved by USDOL due to quality issues. The project improved the quality of the report and developed recommendations that the government could act on. However, by the time the project started to work on the study, the government had lost interest. Therefore, the project decided to cancel the second output, which was to engage in policy dialogue around the recommendations.

Outcome 3 consisted of three main outputs: the establishment of an Alliance 8.7 coordination group, mapping with links to SDG to facilitate monitoring, and localized indicators for SDG 8.7. The project decided to abandon the plan to establish an Alliance 8.7 coordination group because Sri Lanka has the Sustainable Development Council that is responsible for monitoring progress in achieving the SDGs, including SDG 8.7. Since the Alliance 8.7 coordination group output was canceled, the mapping and local indicator outputs were also canceled. In hindsight, the integrated coordination mechanism for Alliance 8.7 was not an appropriate outcome for the MAP 16 project in Sri Lanka since it would have been redundant.

Timor-Leste

In Timor-Leste, the project had four outcomes. **Outcome 1**, which meant to strengthen both knowledge and policy bases for child labor, had two outputs. The first was the finalization of the child labor survey. The report on child labor was completed and disseminated in 2022. The second output was the National Action Plan on Child Labour (NAPCL). The NAPCL, which was originally drafted under the GAP 11 project, was completed and submitted to the Ministry of Economic Affairs for approval. However, due the formation of a new government after elections in March 2022, the approval of the NAPCL is pending. Based on interviews with high-ranking government officials, it appears that the new government is committed to approving these policies. The policies are currently with the Ministry of Coordinating Economic Affairs but due to a complex process, the approval of the policies could be further delayed.

Outcome 2 aimed to ensure the national child labor legal framework meets international convention standards. It had three outputs. The first was the adoption of the hazardous work decree while the second was labor inspection guidelines/protocols. The project developed these outputs but they have not been adopted by the government yet. Although the inspection guidelines have not been formally adopted by the government, they are being used by the labor inspectors. The third was promoting the minimum age standards. The project promoted the minimum age standards by organizing seminars on ILO conventions and workshops for school inspectors and community policing officials. In addition to promoting the age standards, the project submitted minimum age standards to the Ministry of Economic Affairs for endorsement but they have not been endorsed yet.

Outcome 3 was focused on raising general awareness about child labor. It had two outputs that include a knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) survey and awareness campaigns based on the KAP results. The KAP survey was conducted as planned. To promote awareness, the project organized a couple of workshops where the KAP findings were shared and discussed with the government.

Outcome 4 was meant to increase the knowledge among professionals so they can recognize child labor and take the appropriate actions to address it. It had one main output, which was training for government and civil society professionals. The project had managed to map out professionals, develop training materials, and pilot the training. The project conducted training on child labor in 13 municipalities for parents, students, teachers, school inspectors, police, and labor inspectors. It should be noted that the training was conducted in municipality centers and not in the villages, which some stakeholders noted as a weakness. While the

project made an effort to invite village representatives to the municipal level training, it did not have sufficient resources to conduct the training in all of the villages.

Seventeen persons responded to the questions in the online perception survey about training relevance, effectiveness, and utilization. Sixty-five percent opined that the training was highly relevant while another 35 percent said it was relevant. They also thought the training was effective with 35 percent responding that it was highly effective and 59 percent saying it was effective. Only one person thought the training was somewhat effective. Regarding utilization of the child labor information, 53 percent reported often using the information while 35 percent said they sometimes use it.

Summary of Outcome 3 Achievements

Outcome 3, which aimed to strengthen policies and capacities of key actors to address child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking, was complex. SO 3.1, that focused on the sugar and fishing sector, was partially achieved since the sugar research was dropped and the handbook to guide fishing sector policy is work in progress. The regional capacity-building work, SO 3.2, was largely achieved. SO 3.3, capacity-building in India, was also largely achieved. Finally, the achievement of SO 3.4 is mixed. Several countries, such as Argentina and Kosovo achieved all or most of their outcomes and outputs while others, such as Fiji, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste experienced difficulty.

In summary, the analysis suggests that, overall, progress was made in strengthening policies and capacities of key actors to address child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking in Latin America and the Caribbean and in most of the countries listed under SO 3.4.

Outcome 4: Figure 5 shows Outcome 4 and its six indicators, indicator targets, achievements against the indicator targets and the overall performance status. It should be noted that the first indicator, number of pledges made at the IV Global Conference on Child Labor, was determined by the ILO and USDOL not to be an appropriate indicator and thus is not reported on.

Figure 5: Outcome 4, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements

Outcome and Indicators	Target	Achieved	Status
Outcome 4: Strengthened partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking			
Indicator 1. Number of pledges made at the IV Global Conference on Child Labor to address child labor	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 2. Number of collaborative actions mobilized under the Alliance 8.7 (disaggregated by type: research, advocacy, direct intervention and others)	36	46	+10
Indicator 3. Global report on child labor estimates 2020–2021 developed and published jointly by ILO and UNICEF	1	2	+1
Indicator 4. Number of countries in which ILO and UNICEF has a long-term strategic collaboration on child labor elimination	3	0	-3
Indicator 5. Number of collaborative actions taken by business and employers' organizations on child labor with the support of the Child Labour Platform	4	4	0

Outcome and Indicators	Target	Achieved	Status
Indicator 6. Number of collaborative actions taken by business and employers' organizations on forced labor with the support of the Global Business Network on Forced Labor	0	37	+37

The project met or exceeded four of the other five indicator targets. It exceeded the number of collaborative actions taken under Alliance 8.7 by 10 actions. The project also exceeded its target for the number of global reports on child labor estimates by one report. The project met its target of four collaborative actions taken by businesses on child labor. Although the project did not set a target for Indicator #6, the Global Business Network on Forced Labor helped organized 37 actions on forced labor including workshops, webinars, meetings, forums, and online events.

The only indicator target that was not achieved was the number of countries in which the ILO and UNICEF developed a long-term strategic collaboration on child labor elimination. The project set a target of three countries where MAP 16 collaborated with UNICEF and achieved none to date. The project reported that while cooperation with UNICEF on research and advocacy at the international level increased, long-term strategic collaboration at the country level was more difficult to achieve. One reason is that child labor is only one aspect in a much broader child protection agenda that UNICEF pursues in countries. The other issue that surfaced when discussing the achievement of this indicator is that "long-term strategic collaboration" is not well defined in the CMEP, and it did not translate to work plan activities and outputs.

Summary of Outcome 4 Achievements

The project met or exceeded all but one of its outcome indicator targets. Thus, the project largely achieved Outcome 4, which is strengthened partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

Facilitating and Limiting Factors

The evaluation team identified a variety of factors that facilitated or limited the achievement of project objectives. Key **facilitating factors** are summarized below:

Fundamentals Research Unit Mandate and Capacity

The FUNDAMENTALS research unit has both the mandate and capacity to conduct research and produce world-class research reports and other publications on child labor, forced labor, freedom of association and collective bargaining, and discrimination at work. This mandate and capacity facilitated the achievements under Outcome 1, such as the global report on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking in supply chains, the global report on the economics of forced labor I, and technical papers on emerging areas of vulnerability in child labor and forced labor. The research unit also produced important tools such as child labor and forced labor questionnaires and sampling manual tools, reporting templates for reporting on child labor surveys, mixed-methods toolkit, forced labor measurement guidelines adopted at the 18th ICLS and manual on estimating forced labor, guidelines for ethical research on child labor and forced labor, and training curriculum for research on child labor and forced labor.

International Advisory Board

Under Outcome 1, the project established, jointly with the RTA project, the International Advisory Board (IAB) to provide technical guidance and strategic advice to the development of research developed within the framework of the MAP 16 and RTA projects. More specifically,

within the framework of the MAP 16 project, the IAB discussed and reviewed a number of research tools, notably the child labor and forced labor questionnaires and the ethical guidelines for ethical research. The IAB consists of representatives from ILO, IOM, UNICEF, UNODC, UN University, USDOL, and academic institutions national stakeholders from a subgroup of Pathfinder countries.

ILO Historical Technical Support to Governments

Historically, the ILO has provided technical assistance to governments to develop or improve national policies, national action plans, and legislation on labor related issues. This experience and credibility with governments facilitated key achievements under SO 3.3 and 3.4 such as national action plans on child labor and forced labor, hazardous work decrees, hazardous and light work lists, and labor inspection protocols/guidelines and related tools.

ILO Tripartite Process and Convening Power

The ILO uses a tripartite process that involves working closely with government, employer organizations, and worker organizations on labor issues. The tripartite process requires the ILO to consult and ascertain approval from the representatives of governments, employers, and workers for ILO standards, policies, and programs. This approach has helped the ILO build relationships, gain credibility, and develop the ability to convene these tripartite organizations. The ILO's tripartite process and convening power facilitated the achievement of Outcome 3, especially capacity-building initiatives under SO 3.3 and 3.4 where collaboration with ILO's traditional tripartite partners were critical to the achievements. In India, stakeholders noted that ILO's credibility with tripartite partners increased the acceptance of MAP 16 interventions.

Host Government Commitment

The commitment of governments to address forced labor was noted by stakeholders in several countries as a key facilitating factor. In Niger, there was a strong political commitment to MAP 16 because the labor ministry requested support from the project. In Timor-Leste, the General Inspector's support for MAP 16, along with the fact that the timing of the project coincided with an emerging interest about child labor in the country, were strong facilitating factors. At the local level in India, the strong involvement of the District Magistrate in Jamul district in Bihar encouraged involvement of other line ministries in providing convergence services to vulnerable families. Since District Magistrates have the highest bureaucratic power in the district, all the departments are bound to follow their orders.

Relevant and Strategic Fit Between ILO and USDOL

The primary focus of MAP 16—child labor and forced labor—fit well into the organizational priorities of both ILO and USDOL. In addition, the main project components including research, use of knowledge to inform policy, communication and advocacy, partnerships, and country-level capacity-building were important priorities for ILO and USDOL. Regarding partnerships, USDOL encouraged MAP 16 to collaborate with UNICEF and other UN agencies on research activities and with civil society organizations and governments within the Alliance 8.7 framework.

Other Facilitating Factors

In Argentina, stakeholders commented that two important facilitating factors were the high level of competencies of the consultants who were hired to conduct the research and the importance and relevance of the research topics chosen. In Kosovo, stakeholders commented that the national project coordinator largely contributed to the success of the project due to her credentials and prior experience working with stakeholders on child labor issues. In Niger,

the National Steering Committee that the project helped establish was a key facilitating factor because the committee provided valuable advice and guidance as well as facilitating collaboration and coordination among key child labor actors. In Serbia, the previous CLEAR project, funded by USDOL and implemented by the ILO, laid the groundwork and contacts that MAP 16 built on was noted as an important facilitating factor.

Key **hindering factors** that the evaluation team identified are summarized below:

COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic was the most important hindering factor. At the global and country levels, project staff and stakeholders told the evaluation team that restrictions on travel and social distancing protocols forced the project to postpone training, meetings, and other key activities and move them to virtual formats. MAP 16 target countries reported difficulties in moving training and meetings to virtual formats because government ministries did not have enough computers. This was the case with Fiji and Timor-Leste. In Serbia, the project decided to suspend activities instead of moving them to virtual formats, thinking that the pandemic would not last long. While the project eventually moved certain activities to virtual formats, significant delays had already occurred.

Government Priorities, Interest, and Bureaucracy

The fact that child labor was not a top priority was a hindering factor in several countries. In Fiji, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste, the governments have not approved child labor policies and plans that MAP 16 helped develop because, according to stakeholders, child labor is not a top priority. In India, out-of-school children and not child labor was the priority for the government. In addition, the national government does not have national-level child labor data, which proved to be barrier to working on child labor policies.

In Kosovo, the project was able to set the foundations for a new administrative instruction on hazardous child labor but the government has not approved the instruction yet. The delay is largely bureaucratic due the Social Services Division being transferred to the Ministry of Justice. In Niger, the political situation caused by the military takeover of the government meant the adoption of child labor action plan, which is meant to protect children, has been placed on hold. Also, the poor security situation limited project staff travel to some communities.

National Elections and Changes of Key Government Personnel

National elections resulting in changes in governments and key personnel such as ministers were hindering factors in Fiji, Serbia, and Timor-Leste. The elections led to the formation of new governments and changes in ministers and other key personnel. This meant that the project had to orient the new personnel about MAP 16 including an explanation of the project purpose and objectives and what activities had been implemented as well as what it had been planned with the previous governments. Many of these planned activities had to be renegotiated. In Serbia, project staff commented that new government personnel were reluctant to agree to what the previous government had agreed to support. In Timor-Leste, labor ministers changed twice, which meant that the project had to renegotiate planned activities both times. In Fiji, frequent transfers of government officials created delays because the project had to take time to orient new officials and "get them up to speed."

Limited Budget and Duration of Project Activities

As discussed in Section 3.1.1, USDOL designed MAP 16 to allow for the quick addition of countries. Fiji, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste were added later in the project life cycle.

Stakeholders in those countries opined that the project timeframe and budget were not adequate to achieve its objectives. Although Kosovo had an ample implementation timeframe (four years), some stakeholders opined that the budget was inadequate given the number of outcomes (six) and the large number of stakeholders involved.

Other Hindering Factors

In Argentina, a significant hindering factor was that judges did not attend regional events. Stakeholders told the evaluation team that their participation is important because, although the number of child and forced labor complaints have increased, very few are actually prosecuted. One possible explanation is that many of the judges hold traditional views about child labor. They consider it is part of a child's development to work in family businesses or work to earn money to help families meet their obligations.

In Kosovo, the lack of supporting systems hinder other advances to address child labor. For example, child protection and the penal code make it obligatory to report child labor cases, but there is not an effective reporting system in place. In addition, the database for social workers is not being used because, according to stakeholders, social workers require more training to increase their capacity to use it.

In Niger, the security situation did not allow project staff to travel to certain communities. And in Serbia, stakeholders noted that the government appoints personnel that often lack the necessary professional credentials to carry out their responsibilities. In addition, there is a shortage of qualified consultants that made it difficult for the project to produce high-quality reports that relied on consultants.

SCALING THE INTERVENTIONS

The following section examines how future projects might build on and scale MAP 16 achievements for the child labor and forced labor surveys in Mongolia and Nigeria, the child labor risk identification model developed under RILAC, and capacity-building activities for Fiji, India, and Niger.

Mongolia

MAP 16 supported both child labor and forced labor research in Mongolia. The Ministry of Labour and Social Protection requested assistance to conduct a national child labor survey and to assess the prevalence of forced labor among conscripts, while the Human Rights Commission requested help to determine the compliance with ILO Conventions Nos. 29 and 105 in Mongolian prisons. MAP 16 worked directly with the National Statistics Office (NSO) to design and conduct a stand-alone child labor survey and to include in its quarterly Labour Force Survey module on forced labor, including a section on privately imposed and state-imposed (among military conscripts) forced labor. The MAP 16 project also supported mixed method research in prisons to determine whether the working conditions of prisoners comply with ILO Conventions Nos. 29 and 105 as well as a qualitative study on military conscripts and career members of the armed forces to complement the results from the forced labor survey noted above. The survey reports are still in the process of being finalized and approved The results of the research in prisons were presented to and validated by national stakeholders.

The child labor survey results are presented by individual socio-demographic characteristics (age and sex), area and province of residence, economic sector, and forms of work. Moreover, an analysis is performed on the household and community characteristics correlated with child labor (such as, poverty, level of education of the household head, access to basic services, etc.) and on the relation between child labor and school attendance and, health. The

survey report will include conclusions and recommendations that the government and NGOs can use to help design strategic child labor interventions. On the other hand, the forced labor survey data could not be disaggregated by provinces and regions due to a low number of observations. The data were disaggregated by individual socio-demographic characteristics (age and sex), and by area of residence (rural and urban). Nevertheless, since this was the first statistical forced labor survey conducted in Mongolia and the first-ever survey assessing working conditions among conscripts, both ILO and NSO representatives consider it significant.

According to NSO representatives, the most feasible way to ensure sustainability of the child labor survey is to formally incorporate it into the labor force survey by including it in the national statistical law. The steps to formally incorporating child labor questions in the labor force survey is for the NSO methodological standing committee to review and approve the additional questions and send them to the NSO board of directors that would provide the final approval. The ILO office in Mongolia intends to encourage and support this process to help ensure that the child labor questions are regularly incorporated into the labor force survey.[31]

The NSO representatives told the evaluation team that incorporating forced labor questions in the labor force survey is feasible, but it would have limitations. The labor force survey is a household-based survey and does not capture information on forced labor that might occur outside households (e.g., prisons, military, workers living in the work premises) or for non-Mongolian citizens, such as migrant workers. NSO representatives noted that to capture comprehensive information about forced labor, a mixed methods approach targeting specific at-risk sectors or populations, such migrants working in the construction sector, would be most effective. ILO representatives, on the other hand, made the point that while using the labor force survey to capture information about forced labor has limitations, the results fill an important knowledge gap by providing useful and important information that decisionmakers can use.

The other concern expressed by the NSO representatives is that due to an economic downturn, the government reduced budgets for many ministries and departments, including the NSO, calling into question the resources that might be available for future surveys.[32]

Nigeria

MAP 16 and the ACCEL Africa project co-funded the child labor and forced labor surveys in Nigeria (a stand-alone child labor survey with a module on forced labor).[33] The Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment requested assistance from ILO and the MAP 16 project to conduct the survey. MAP 16 worked directly with the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) to carry out the survey. Although the child labor and forced labor survey reports are in the process of being finalized and approved, it is important to point out that their preliminary results have been presented to and validated by national stakeholders.

The child labor survey data are presented by individual socio-demographic characteristics (age and sex) and by area of residence (urban, rural); region (North Central, North East, North West, South West, South East and South); and states (36 states and federal territory). Characteristics of child labor are also looked at, such as sector, and forms of work. In addition,

[31] According to an ILO Mongolia representative, the NSO also intends to conduct the child labor surveys every four years or so, and to reflect it in the Law on Statistics. If the NSO is able to get the child labor survey incorporated into the Law on Statistics, the NSO will receive funding from the state budget to implement the survey.
[32] Both ILO and NSO representatives told the evaluation team that the economic downturn was caused by COVID-19 and the Russia-Ukrainian war that negatively affected Mongolian exports.
[33] The ILO "Accelerating Action for the Elimination of Child Labour in Supply Chains in Africa" in Nigeria.

there is an analysis that correlates household and community characteristics with child labor (such as poverty, level of education of the household head, access to basic services, etc.), the relation between child labor and school attendance, and health. The forced labor survey data are also presented by individual socio-demographic characteristics (age and sex), and by area (rural, urban), region, and state of residence. The forced labor survey data are also analyzed by household and community characteristics related with forced labor to identify risk and protective factors. The survey reports will include conclusions and recommendations that the government and NGOs can use to help design both child labor and forced labor interventions.

A representative of the labor inspectorate told the evaluation team that the government is discussing the feasibility of incorporating the child labor questions into the national labor force survey. This would be the most efficient way to ensure that child labor data are regularly collected. Another way to scale up the child labor survey is through the National Steering Committee on Child Labor that intends to use the results of the child labor survey to inform policy and develop interventions. Another government representative believes the results can be scaled up by leveraging the National Children's Parliament and the National Children's Conference to raise awareness and engage children on child labor awareness and prevention activities throughout the country. These are initiatives of the Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development.

RILAC

MAP 16 collaborated with the Regional Initiative for Latin America and the Caribbean (RILAC) to continue to implement a child labor risk identification (CLRISK) model that was developed before MAP 16. The model uses existing data to identify territories where the risk of child labor exists and classifies these territories as high, medium, and low. The first step toward scaling up the model in Latin America and the Caribbean was to develop the model for 11 countries. To date, the model has been used in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Jamaica, México, and Peru.

In Argentina, the government implemented the model in 24 provinces. The results were used to help the government target territories at risk for child labor with *Buena Cosecha* child services interventions. Buena Cosecha is a government program that aims to eradicate child labor and protect adolescent by providing care and support to young children of rural agriculture workers while they work and education services to adolescents at Buena Cosecha care centers. According to ILO representatives, to continue to scale up the model in Argentina, the government should evaluate the effectiveness of the model and document lessons. With this information, the model can be adjusted and scaled up.

In Mexico, phase two of the model has been implemented in four municipalities, including Cuetzalan in Progreso; Tuxtla Gutierrez and Tapachula in Chiapas; and in Villa Victoria in Mexico.[34] Information from the model was used to target interventions. For example, in Chiapas, the model helped the municipal governments target social assistance to vulnerable families where child labor is present. To scale up the model, RILAC collaborates with the Secretary of Labor and Social Welfare to encourage states to implement the model. This is done during meetings of the *Inter-secretarial Commission for the Prevention and Eradication of Child Labor and the Protection of Adolescent Workers*.

[34] In phase two, RILAC focuses on helping countries use the results of the CLRISK model to address child labor policies and inform programs/interventions.

According to RILAC representatives, the primary challenge to scaling up CLRISK model in many of the countries in Latin America and Caribbean is the lack of resources. RILAC representatives believe that countries will require support from projects like MAP 16 to implement the model in the short term. In the longer term, once governments understand the utility of the model, they may be willing to allocate resources to implement the model without external donor assistance.

Fiji

MAP 16 achieved important capacity-building outcomes in Fiji, such as child labor policies, joint inspection training, awareness-raising, and training for employers and trade unions. Regarding child labor policies, the project developed the National Child Labour Policy (NCLP), National Action Plan to Eliminate Child Labour (NAPCL), and the hazardous and light work lists. To scale up the policy achievements, the government needs to adopt and implement the policies. While the previous government did not approve these policies, most of the stakeholders who were interviewed believe the new government will adopt them. The ILO office in Fiji as well as the U.S. Embassy's labor office could play an important role by encouraging the government to adopt and implement the policies.

The project also helped develop the labor inspection guidelines and reporting formats and action protocols for the worst forms of child labor. While the government has not formally approved the protocol, the Ministry of Employment, Productivity, and Industrial Relations (MEPIR) is requesting that its labor inspectors use the guidelines. However, the Ministry of Women, Children, and Social Protection (MWCPA) does not plan to use the guidelines because, according to one representative, they are redundant. MWCPA uses the *Interagency Guidelines on Child Abuse* that the government has approved.

To scale up the labor inspection guidelines, the ILO office in Fiji might encourage the government to formally approve the guidelines and continue to train the labor inspectors to apply them during inspections. One idea to scale up the labor inspection training is to use those inspectors that MAP 16 trained as trainers to train inspectors who have not yet been trained. Project staff believe that MEPIR would not require resources to train inspectors at the central level but would require resources to train inspectors located in rural districts, which could be an important obstacle to scale up the training.

Another important achievement was awareness-raising about child labor in communities. Awareness-raising could be scaled up using the infrastructures of two different ministries. MAP 16 worked closely with the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs to conduct child labor awareness activities in indigenous communities. The Ministry of iTaukei Affairs, which is responsible for the social and economic development of indigenous Fijians, can serve as an effective mechanism to reach indigenous communities. The project also collaborated with the Ministry of Rural and Maritime Development and Disaster Management (MRMDDM) to mobilize communities for child labor awareness activities. According to one of the MRMDDM divisional directors, the project could have taken more advantage of the ministry's reach by creating more linkages with its district councils and village-level working groups to drive out child labor awareness-raising messages. This would be another viable strategy to scale up community-level awareness-raising in the future.

Any future projects could build on and scale up training provided to employers and trade unions. While the Fiji Commerce and Employers Federation does not have a specific budget for child labor training for its members, its human resources department has a training budget. One federation representative told the evaluation team that projects could help build its capacity to institutionalize child labor training by incorporating it into the human resource training mandate.

The Fiji Trade Union Congress (FTUC), on the other hand, worked to establish a national working committee on child labor. A FTUC representative noted that the teachers union could be an especially effective mechanism to reach isolated communities with child labor awareness-raising activities. While FTUC trained trade union organizers on child labor topics that they try to incorporate in their community organizing activities, more capacity-building is required for them to be effective. Future projects might build on MAP 16 by working with the national working committee to strengthen the teachers union to reach isolated communities with child labor awareness messages.

India

In India, one way to scale up the incorporation convergence measures in state planning documents is to bundle them as *a benefit package* for vulnerable families and make the *benefit package* available through the State Child Protection Society (SCPS) that is implemented under Mission Vatsalya.[35] The Ministry of Women and Child Development launched Mission Vatsalya, formerly known as the Child Protection Services Scheme, in 2021. Mission Vatsalya ensures children's safety and security. Since all states signed an agreement with the federal government to implement *Mission Vatsalya* and since SCPS has the mandate to protect children and adolescents from dangerous or illegal work, any future project could leverage SCPS to scale up the convergence measures. While projects can work with SCPS at the federal and state levels, it would be important to gain the support of the federal level before working with states.

Stand-alone child labor surveys are necessary to accurately estimate and understand the dimensions of child labor in the different geographies and sectors and to develop effective child labor prevention strategies at the state and district levels. Under the National Child Labour Project (NCLP), child labor surveys were conducted in previous years. However, after NCLP was incorporated in the country's education for all initiatives (Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan) in 2016, child labor specific data were not collected.[36]

To address this issue, MAP 16 worked with key NGOs to advocate for resources to conduct child labor surveys at the state and district level. As a result, the Parliamentary Standing Committee investigated and acknowledged the gap in child labor data.[37] At the same time, NCLP was combined with the Ministry of Education's Samagra Shiksha program that aims to improve education effectiveness up to grade 12.[38] To ensure child labor surveys are conducted at the state and district level, any future projects should continue to collaborate with NGOs to advocate for the need of accurate and timely child labor data.

MAP 16 was able to incorporate actions to address child labor in the Uttar Pradesh action plan. To scale up the incorporation of child labor knowledge in more states' action plans, project staff believe the most effective approach would be to collaborate with the Ministry of Education that has the responsibility of child labor along with the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Women and Child Development, and Panchayati Raj to develop a national level child labor policy.[39] Once the national child labor policy is developed and approved, the states

[35] https://wcd.nic.in/sites/default/files/GUIDELINES%20OF%20MISSION%20VATSALYA%20DATED%2005%20JULY%202022_1.pdf
[36] https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/centre-has-no-data-on-child-labour-since-nclp-was-merged-with-samagra-shiksha-abhiyan/article65631877.ece
[37] https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/centre-has-no-data-on-child-labour-since-nclp-was-merged-with-samagra-shiksha-abhiyan/article65631877.ece
[38] https://samagra.education.gov.in/#:~:text=Samagra%20Shiksha%20%2D%20an%20overarching%20programme,schooling%20and%20equitable%20learning%20outcomes.
[39] Panchayati Raj is the system of local government in Indian villages.

would follow by implementing state-level child labor policies and incorporating them into their action plans. While the ILO and any future projects could play a critical role in assisting the government to develop national child labor policy, it is not clear whether the government is committed to developing a national-level child labor policy.

Niger

Key capacity-building achievements in Niger included the updating of the National Action Plan for Child Labour (NAPCL) and creating ownership, awareness-raising about child labor in the agriculture sector, training employers, trade unions, and labor inspectors on child labor, and creating a national steering committee for child labor. While updating the NAPCL and creating ownership has the potential to scale up child labor initiatives in Niger, the ILO stopped work on the NAPCL based on a decision of the United Nations to suspend the work of its agencies due to the political situation. Once the political situation improves, it will be important for the ILO to finish updating the NAPCL and support its implementation.

Stakeholders told the evaluation team that the project helped raise awareness about child labor among employers in the construction sector, farmers utilizing children as agricultural labor, and stakeholders in the mining sector regarding hazardous work and child labor. To scale up awareness-raising, future projects might consider the following:

- **Targeted Awareness-Raising:** Organize community awareness programs in areas at high risk for child labor, involving local leaders, community representatives, and influential figures to disseminate information and raise awareness about child labor issues.
- **Multi-Media Campaigns:** Utilize a range of media channels, including radio, television, and social media platforms, to disseminate messages and information about child labor in the agriculture sector. The key target audiences include poor and isolated farming communities, agriculture entrepreneurs and businesses, and government agriculture employees such as extension workers.
- **Collaborative Partnerships:** Form partnerships with local NGOs, community-based organizations, and educational institutions to facilitate the delivery of awareness programs and interventions, leveraging their networks and resources to extend the reach of MAP 16 awareness campaigns.

To build on and scale up the training that MAP 16 provided labor inspectors, employers, and trade unions, future projects might consider developing an online professional development platform. Labor inspectors, employers, and trade unions can take child labor courses and access relevant child labor information, case studies, and best practices. In addition, and to complement the professional development platform, future projects might implement mentorship and peer-to-peer learning initiatives that allow experienced professionals to guide and support newer members, promoting knowledge transfer and capacity-building.

3.4 IMPACT

Impact Questions
What have been the most important effects (positive, negative, intended, or unintended) of the four main components and research on child labor risk indicators carried out under RILAC?[40]

[40] Note that for RILAC, the evaluation will be looking at general project-wide impact and effects, intended or unintended based on information from one KII with RILAC POC in Peru, limited document review, and online survey responses from 2 of the 6 RILAC countries (Argentina and Mexico).

Impact Questions
What could be done differently in the future to strengthen positive effects and improve on areas where the project was not as effective?

3.4.1 EFFECT-LEVEL ACHIEVEMENTS

An effect is a consequence of an action. In project design terms, effects are the results of achieving project outputs such as services or products. Effects, also known as outcomes, are the precursor to achieving impact at the overall project objective or goal level. The following section examines the most important effects achieved for each outcome.

OUTCOME 1: Improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

An important effect-level achievement under Outcome 1 is that the research and global reports helped increase awareness about child labor and forced labor. One ILO representative explained that the research gave the ILO "teeth" for its recommendations to address child labor and forced labor. The project also managed to reach agreements with six countries to conduct child labor surveys and with three countries to conduct forced labor surveys and report on their findings.

OUTCOME 2: Improved application of knowledge in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor.

ILO representatives told the evaluation team that they believe that the communication materials, and digital products produced under Outcome 2 helped create awareness about child labor and forced labor. However, as one ILO representative explained, even though we assume awareness was created, the project did not have the means in place to actually determine the effects that the communication activities and products had on target audiences.

OUTCOME 3: Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking through national, regional, and global initiatives.

MAP 16 collaborated with RILAC to develop and implement the CLRISK model in 11 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and two countries in Africa. ILO representatives told the evaluation team that since the CLRISK model has not been fully implemented, it is too early to say what effects it has had on child labor. In theory, an important anticipated effect is that that these countries will have a statistical evidence base for where child labor probably exists and can take the appropriate steps to respond. Another is that key stakeholders such as trade unions and employers can use information from the CLRISK model to take actions to address child labor.

According to an ILO representative who provided technical support to the development of the CLRISK model in Argentina, the government has used information from the model to improve its Buena Cosecha program. The CLRISK model helped the government adjust services at existing care centers to accommodate children during vacations and during peak harvest times as well as identify areas where new care centers should be established.

In India, the project achieved effect-level changes under Outcome 3, where the project supported the state government in Uttar Pradesh to incorporate child labor activities into its action plan. It also collaborated with state administrators, the Workers Information and

Support Centre (WISC), Jan Shikshan Sansthan, and community volunteers working to link child labor families with government social services

Stakeholders identified the following important effects:

- MAP 16 program helped local government officials focus on the rehabilitation of rescued children. Instead of only focusing on routine raids and rescues, local government officials reported efforts to return the children to schools and link families to social protection schemes.
- The project helped local government officials understand the importance of raising awareness about child labor in communities. These officials reported that they are conducting more campaigns in vulnerable communities to create awareness about child labor.
- The project involved women members of self-help groups and members of the village government in training and capacity-building that helped ensure that children stayed in school or that working children returned to school.
- In addition to creating awareness about child labor, MAP 16 was highly effective in ensuring that the benefits of government schemes such as housing, health, and food subsidies reached the families of child laborers in several communities in Bihar state.

SO 3.4 aims to improve the capacity to address child labor in 10 additional countries. The most important effect-level achievements are discussed below for each country covered by this evaluation.

Argentina

The project in Argentina conducted research on child labor and family dynamics, the effects of child labor and adolescent work, child labor prevention using the social protection system, child labor and gender, and forced labor and labor exploitation in the forestry sector.

Overall, the stakeholders who were interviewed in Argentina noted that the research that the project conducted was important and will eventually have an impact on public policy. However, they also noted that it is still early, and much of the research has not been used yet to affect policy. One exception is that the Secretary of Social Security used the results of child labor in the social protection system to extend the coverage of social security benefits from 16 years to 18 years of age, which was not envisioned when the research was conducted.

In addition to the research, the project conducted regional workshops to disseminate and discuss the results of the research. A representative from the Federal Public Revenue Administration told the evaluation team that his team used information from the workshop to develop an inspection protocol for division inspectors to help them identify child labor cases. An inspection protocol to guide inspections did not exist previously.

Participants of the regional workshops in Jujuy and La Pampa noted that the most significant effect or result of the workshops was that these two provinces validated the national inspection administration procedures and standards. An important effect-level change from the forestry research dissemination workshop was the provincial labor ministry in Corrientes and Misiones increased awareness about forced labor in the forestry sector and, as a result, increased the number of inspectors responsible for conducting inspections of forestry-related enterprises.

Fiji

Nearly unanimously, stakeholders in Fiji opined that creating awareness about child labor was the project's most important effect-level achievement. For example, prior to MAP 16, many

people in the villages that the project reached did not understand the concept of child labor and what are acceptable and unacceptable jobs for children. This was the first time these communities received information about child labor. The awareness-raising led to reporting and referring child labor cases to the appropriate authorities. One government representative told the evaluation team that he noticed an increase in the number of child labor cases reported to his department. He credits this to the MAP 16 interventions.

Trade unions believe that the formation of the trade union national working committee on child labor and linking the teachers trade union with key ministries, such as Ministry of Employment, Productivity, and Industrial Relations and the Ministry of Women, Children, and Social Protection, was the most important achievement of MAP 16.

Kosovo

The project achieved important effect-level changes in Kosovo, such as the child labor regulatory framework. including the hazardous child labor and light work lists that will serve as the foundation of the new administrative instruction on child labor. To supplement the regulatory framework, the project worked closely with stakeholders to develop additional documents that serve as guidelines to support child labor case management. These include:

- Standard Operating Procedures for Children in Hazardous Child Labor
- Guide for Implementation of Standard Operating Procedures for Children in Hazardous Child Labor
- Hazardous Child Labour in Agriculture and Forestry (comprehensive guide for municipal agriculture advisors on activities prohibited for children in the agriculture, and forestry sectors)
- Guide for Municipal Advisors for Agriculture and Rural Development
- Analysis of Costs for Managing Cases of Child Labor in Kosovo
- Standard Operating Procedures for Investigation and Adjudication of Cases Related to Hazardous Child Labour

Another important effect-level change was the capacity-building on child labor prevention that the project conducted in the agriculture and education sectors. Agriculture advisors and schoolteachers play an important role is disseminating child labor information to communities, especially parents and children. Based on collaboration, including training, from MAP 16, the Kosovo Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Rural Development now requires its subcontractors to pledge not to use hazardous child labor.

Niger

Although work on the NAPCL was suspended due to the political situation, many stakeholders signaled the NAPCL as the most important effect-level achievement. The training for the tripartite partners, especially the labor inspectors, was also noted as an important achievement because the inspectors play a crucial role in enforcing child labor laws. According to the labor inspectorate officials, the training improved the inspectors' abilities to identify cases of child labor in the field, ask relevant questions about age and working conditions, and take measures to protect the children. It also helped the labor inspectors to better understand and enforce international conventions, such as ILO Convention 182, which prohibits the worst forms of child labor.

An important unanticipated effect noted by stakeholders was that MAP 16 activities increased the awareness of children about child labor and their rights, including their right not to work in hazardous conditions.

Serbia

Both project staff and stakeholders noted that one of the project's most important effect-level achievements was raising awareness about child labor. At the national level, the project brought different government and non-government organizations together to discuss child labor, which increased awareness. One stakeholder noted that "we have become more sensitive to the issues about child labor. We thought we did not have child labor. but once we understood what child labor is and the negative consequences, we are more aware." In rural areas, where child labor appeared to be widespread, the project helped communities understand it, including what kinds of work are acceptable and what kinds of work are not acceptable for children and the reasons why.

The project also provided funds to incorporate child labor questions into the labor force survey (under Outcome 1) that stakeholders noted was an important achievement because it provided data on child labor that can help decisionmakers understand the prevalence of child labor in different parts of the country and in what sectors it is highest, such as agriculture. However, stakeholders are not sure yet how the results of the survey will be used by government decisionmakers, especially due to the fact that the data acquired through the child labor survey strongly differs from the official data on the presence of child labor collected by the labor inspectorate and CSW.

The project also developed three important protocols and guidelines to address child labor:

- **Special protocol and an accompanying set of instructions that provide guidance to labor inspectors on addressing child labor**, which were adopted by the Ministry of Labor. The purpose of the special protocol and instructions are to regulate procedures and provide guidelines to the Labor Inspectorate for adequate prevention and timely response to child labor.
- Government of Serbia adopted a revised **General Protocol for Protection of Children against Abuse**, which incorporates the issue of child labor for the first time. This revision ensures that the issue of child labor is now integrated into the wider child protection framework in Serbia, which is that main framework in the country for identifying children in need and providing services to them. it now defines child labor per international standards, provides a government-wide standard definition of child begging, and integrates Labor Inspectors into the child protection system in the Serbian government.
- Guidelines for social protection agencies, organizations, and professionals on how to protect children from child labor, which were adopted by the Serbian the Ministry of Labor and Ministry for Family Care.

Sri Lanka

Under the outcome focused on ascertaining evidence on child labor, the project analyzed the National Child Protection Authority hotline data and delivered the findings to the Sri Lanka Department of Labour (DOL). Although DOL has not acted on the report yet, several key stakeholders commented that the findings of the analysis on child labor contains important information and can be highly valuable to guide both policy and programs. The project also produced a child labor communication strategy that DOL is currently using. Although the dissemination of the strategy's key messages has been limited, DOL representatives told the evaluation team that the communication strategy was an important achievement of MAP 16 because it helped raise the awareness about child labor. There is also increased realization among government officials that, to be effective, child labor awareness programs need to be implemented at the provincial level and involve local decisionmakers and community leaders.

Another important effect-level achievement noted by education stakeholders was the school-to-work manual for parents that was approved by the Ministry of Education (MOE). The manual was used to train more than 2,400 parents in 20 schools and, according to ministry representatives, is still being used to train parents on child labor. According to a recent evaluation conducted by the MOE, the awareness of parents about child labor and their role to guiding their children's career paths significantly improved after the trainings.

Timor-Leste

Most stakeholders who were interviewed commented that the awareness-raising activities was the most important effect of MAP 16 in Timor-Leste. Through these activities, the project provided valuable information to children, parents, teachers, and community police about child labor and the importance of attending school. Disseminating the results of the child labor survey and KAP study to government officials helped increase awareness about the causes and consequences of child labor. Several stakeholders told the evaluation team that as a result of the awareness-raising activities, they believe the number of children who sell on the streets have decreased.

Stakeholders also mentioned both the child labor survey and KAP study as important achievements. The survey report presented data in ways that can help decisionmakers understand the dimensions of child labor in Timor-Leste and the means to combat it because, as one stakeholder noted, "Once we know that we have child labor in Timor-Leste in high numbers, we can think of actions and plans to respond." The KAP study report is significant because, as another key stakeholder explained, "It goes beyond reporting on the numbers of children involved in child labor activities to include the root causes and driving factors of child labor that will help the government and development partners understand how to address child labor."

OUTCOME 4: Strengthened partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor and human trafficking

The project provided funding to establish the Alliance 8.7 website and conduct key activities, such as side events at global conferences, advocacy activities, dissemination of the global estimates reports, and Alliance 8.7 meetings. In particular, the website hosts a range of information about the Alliance 8.7, including impact stories that tell the histories of victims of child labor and forced labor and how they overcame these difficulties with the support of project interventions. The impact stories were noted by both ILO and USDOL representatives as important achievements. An ILO official told the evaluation team that MAP 16 provided invaluable support to Alliance 8.7, which helped it achieve over 500 organizations that have signed on to Alliance 8.7 as partners and 27 countries that have met the criteria to be considered pathfinder countries.

MAP 16 also provided funds to establish and help jump-start GBNFL and support research and communications activities as well as workshops, webinars, and meetings. However, GBNFL did not work directly at the country level with MAP 16 target countries that was a limitation since businesses prefer to engage at the country level. According to one ILO representative, the lesson learned is that there needed to be a stronger alignment between GBNFL and those MAP 16 target countries willing to address forced labor, so GBNFL could have supported this effort.

Another noteworthy achievement under Outcome 4 is the joint publication and dissemination of the ILO-UNICEF Child Labour: Global Estimates 2020, Trends and the Road Forward.

3.4.2 LEVERAGING EFFECTIVENESS

As discussed under Section 3.4.1, the project achieved many of the planned effect-level changes reflected in the outcomes as well as some unanticipated effect-level changes, such as the Argentina Secretary of Social Security using the results of the child labor in the social protection system research to extend the coverage from 16 years to 18 years of age.

The most prudent way to strengthen effect or outcome level changes is to identify these achievements early during implementation, understand the reasons why they have been achieved, and invest more resources to strengthen and scale them to the extent possible. To identify the outcome achievements, projects require flexible M&E systems that measure outcome achievements. One way to accomplish this is to ensure that the M&E system includes appropriate outcome level indicators that are sensitive to changes. In addition, projects should include processes, such as periodic CMEP reviews, to identify outcome achievements and the reasons for success and develop strategies to build on the success to scale them. This process basically boils down to investing in success.

For example, in Argentina, MAP 16 achieved all of its planned outputs and thus its two outcomes. Stakeholders commented that the research conducted under Outcome 1 was highly relevant and important while the dissemination of the research findings and other capacity-building activities helped the country make important advances in addressing child labor. At the same time, tripartite stakeholders told the evaluation team that more capacity-building could have been achieved with more resources. To strengthen these positive effects, MAP 16 might have decided to invest more resources in Argentina.

Likewise, the most prudent way to address areas where projects are less successful at achieving planned and unplanned effects is to identify underachievement and understand the reasons for the underperformance. Again, projects require M&E systems that can quickly capture underachievement and its reasons so project management can make adjustments. If the project is struggling to achieve certain outcome indicator targets, management might decide to shift resources to outcomes that are performing better. In multi-country projects, if a project is struggling to achieve all of its outcome indicator targets (and outputs) in one country, project management might decide to end the project activities early and shift recourses to another, better performing country. This boils down to understanding what is not working and making midcourse adjustments to help ensure success.

For example, in Serbia the project developed important policies that the government was not ready to approve. Rather than continuing to invest resources in these activities, the project shifted its efforts to focus on policy tools that did not require government approval and to raising awareness in communities, which stakeholders considered to be highly effective. In Sri Lanka, MAP 16 canceled six of its 11 outputs due a lack of interest by the government. An early assessment of project performance in Sri Lanka, including a frank discussion with the government, could have led to a decision to realign and refocus effort and resources on government priorities or end project activities early if the government was not interested.

3.5 EFFICIENCY

Efficiency Questions
What factors affected the project's efficiency (e.g., delays, changes in host governments, turnover of project staff, COVID-19), and how did the project respond to these factors?

3.5.1 FACTORS THAT AFFECTED PROJECT EFFICIENCY

During interviews with project staff and key stakeholders, several factors were noted as creating inefficiencies. These included the COVID-19 pandemic, turnover of key government personnel, national elections and political turmoil, and slow government decision making. These factors caused project activities to be postponed and rescheduled, which resulted in delays. In turn, the delays contributed to inefficiencies. Summarized below are the factors affecting efficiency, along with illustrative examples from the target countries and how the project responded.

COVID-19

Project staff as well as the majority of stakeholders who were interviewed identified the COVID-19 as an important factor that created inefficiencies, especially in the early stages of the pandemic. Many project activities had to be postponed and rescheduled, which caused delays. To adjust to COVID-19 restrictions, the project shifted meetings and trainings from face-to-face formats to virtual formats using video conferencing applications. The shift to virtual formats caused delays, and conducting meetings and trainings virtually took more time than traditional face-to-face formats.

- At the global level, the project relied mostly on e-mail communication to finalize research reports. This proved to be less efficient than face-to-face meetings.
- In Serbia and Timor-Leste, the project initially decided to delay activities until the pandemic subsided. When it became apparent that the pandemic would last longer than expected, the project shifted to virtual meetings and trainings. However, government agencies lacked the technologies required to manage these virtual formats.
- In Timor-Leste, the COVID-19 restriction meant everyone had to stay at home. The project could not implement activities as planned, so many were delayed.

While the majority of stakeholders who were interviewed believe that the virtual formats were less effective than the face-to-face format, they agreed that the virtual formats allowed the project to continue to conduct meetings, trainings, and other key activities when movement and public gatherings in the target countries were restricted in order to avoid spreading the virus. Stakeholders also noted that using virtual formats to conduct certain activities in the future could be a viable option when face-to-face formats are not feasible due to high costs, distances, and other logistical obstacles.

Elections and Politics

- In Kosovo, the government's decision to transfer the Social Services Division to the Ministry of Justice delayed work on the hazardous work list by about one year. It also delayed the child labor database.
- In Niger, due to the political situation and unrest, the ILO placed work on the National Action Plan for Child Labour and other key activities on hold. In addition, changes in government personnel also delayed some project activities.
- In Serbia, after the general elections in 2022, it took eight months to form the new government, which meant the project paused many of its activities until the government was formed. In addition, the labor minister changed three times in two years, along with all assistant ministers and other members of the minister's cabinet. The project had to then restart its conversations with the new minister and get approvals to continue to work on project activities requiring government support.

- In Sri Lanka, the political crisis in 2022 generated an economic crisis that caused the project to suspend certain activities for nearly eight months. The economic crisis included shortages of fuel and power. In response to mass protests, the government set curfews and restricted movement. Fuel shortages and curfews meant that the project and its stakeholders had to restrict travel.
- In Timor-Leste, the elections caused inefficiencies because once the election campaigning started, it was very difficult to engage government officials in official dialogue or approval processes. Subsequently, once the new government was formed, the project had to restart conversations with new officials to explain the project and what activities had been implemented previously, such as the various policy documents.

Turnover of MAP 16 Project Staff

- The project experienced turnover of staff both at the global level and at the country level. This, of course, caused some degree of inefficiency. The first project director left the project in November 2022 and was replaced by the Serbia national project coordinator, who departed the project in September 2023 and was replaced by the third project director. The M&E officer left the project in October 2022 and was replaced by a new M&E specialist, who went on maternity leave in September 2023. She was temporarily replaced by the third M&E officer.[41] At the country level, the national project coordinators turned over at least once in Argentina, India, Jordan, Kosovo, Niger, Serbia, and Sri Lanka.

Collaboration on Research Reports

- At the global level, the project collaborated with UN agencies and NGOs to produce reports on child labor and forced labor. These included the 2021 Global Estimates of Modern Slavery, Forced Labour, and Forced Marriage (ILO, OIM, and Walkfree); and Ending Child Labour, Forced Labour and Human Trafficking in Global Supply Chains (ILO, OECD, IOM, UNICEF). While ILO research staff noted that the collaboration to produce these reports was important, the process of sharing draft reports, providing comments, and making changes took an extraordinary amount of time and effort, resulting in delays.
- In Timor-Leste, the project collaborated with UNICEF on the finalization of the child labor survey and the KAP study. UNICEF representatives told the evaluation team that local consultants who worked on these research projects lacked experience, which meant it took more reviews and revisions than it normally would have taken to ensure the quality of the corresponding reports.

CMEP Process

- At the global level, it took approximately 18 months to complete the CMEP (project document approval) process. The MAP 16 grant was awarded to the ILO in December 2016. The global CMEP was conducted in April 2018. Next, country-level CMEPs were conducted for Colombia and Jordan in Washington DC in August 2018 and for India in New Delhi in December 2018. The CMEP process included developing results frameworks and monitoring plans and then validating them with stakeholders. The project document was finalized in July 2018. According to both ILO and USDOL

[41] Note that the M&E specialist will return to her position after her maternity leave is finished.

representatives, the project design/CMEP process is both demanding and highly time consuming.

- In India, one of the major events that caused delays that created inefficiencies was the revision of the project's logical framework. The framework was revised because the original framework was too ambitious. One ILO representative explained that during the design phase, project designers must assess the project timeframe, budget, and government interest and resources, to determine what is feasible and not overly ambitious.

Interpretation Processes

- In Mongolia, the ILO research staff had to depend on interpretation services to work with government statistical personnel to plan and conduct the child labor and forced labor surveys. The interpretation process doubled and sometimes tripled the amount of time required to train statistical personnel in survey methods and tools and to plan and conduct the surveys.

3.6 SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability Questions
Which of the project's components (1, 2, and 4) are most likely to be sustained and transferred to communities or relevant institutions when the project ends? Likewise, in general terms, what country-level outcomes for the nine countries included in the evaluation are most likely to be sustained?

3.6.1 LIKELIHOOD OF SUSTAINING PROJECT OUTCOMES

The likelihood of sustaining project outcomes are described below.

OUTCOME 1: Improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

The project produced a range of survey and data tools that exist and are available to countries to use. Also, according to ILO representatives, the tools will eventually have to be updated. The International Advisory Board, which MAP 16 established to provide expert review of the research activities, shows promise to continue to provide research support to the ILO once MAP 16 ends.

MAP 16 supported six countries to carry out child labor data collection, analysis, and reporting activities, including Mongolia, Nigeria, and Serbia that are included in this evaluation. The project worked closely with the countries' statistics offices to conduct these activities, building capacity and creating ownership. It also encouraged countries to integrate child labor modules into existing household surveys as a way to sustain them.

The personnel of the statistics offices noted during interviews that while the project helped strengthen their capacity to conduct future child labor data collection activities (e.g., surveys and studies), conducting these kinds of activities in the future will require resources that they do not have in their budgets. ILO representatives also noted that it will be difficult for most countries to conduct child labor research without external donor assistance.

The project produced quantitative reports on child labor and forced labor (both general and sector specific), research reports on child labor and forced labor in supply chains (including prevalence), a global report on emerging areas of vulnerability, and country-level core child labor indicator sets. These reports and studies exist and are available on the ILO website for use by all actors involved in efforts to address child labor and forced labor. Given the dynamic and changing nature of both child labor and forced labor, these reports and studies will have to be repeated to remain up-to-date and relevant, which will require donor financing.

OUTCOME 2: Improved application of knowledge in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor.

The knowledge products and materials produced under Outcome 2 exist and are available. In particular, the knowledge mobilization and storytelling tools have been converted to training modules to be hosted by the ILO International Training Centre and offered to ILO staff. Also, the Alliance 8.7 website is operational and hosts a range of key impact stories. On the other hand, since the project did not track use and application of the different knowledge products, the evaluation team was not able to determine whether these products actually increased knowledge and/or whether they are being used to address child labor and forced labor.

OUTCOME 3: Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations, and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking through national, regional, and global initiatives

SUB-OUTCOME 3.1: Increased capacity of sugar and fishing stakeholders to improve policies.

As discussed in the project performance section, MAP 16 collaborated with Cornell University to develop and revise a handbook to detect forced labor in the sector. At the time of the evaluation, the handbook was under final review by the ILO. According to a USDOL representative, the handbook, which is based on ILO Convention 188, will need to be updated. In the short-term, USDOL can use the Strengthening Decent Work in Fishing project to keep the handbook updated. However, a plan to keep the handbook updated in the long term needs to be developed. One possibility is to institutionalize it within the U.S. Coast Guard.

SUB-OUTCOME 3.2: Increased capacity at regional level in at least two regions to combat child labor and forced labor.

Map 16 provided support to RILAC to implement CLRISK in 11 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and two countries in Africa.[42] While most stakeholders believe the CLRISK model is highly useful, they also note that it depends on reliable data, including child labor survey data if available, which is a challenge in many countries in the region. The models have to be updated with current data, so they are able to accurately predict child labor in geographic areas and sectors. ILO, USDOL, and many stakeholders acknowledge that governments, particularly the statistical offices, do not have the funds to keep the models updated.

One promising option to sustain the model is the institutionalization of CLRISK maps. In Peru, for example, the Ministry of Development is using CLRISK maps as a public policy tool and have the data available on its website. In Argentina the maps have been used to assess risk levels within the Buena Cosecha program, while Mexico used maps to assign risk to the municipalities that have applied the model. Furthermore, in Guatemala, the National Association of Coffee (Anacafé) used the CLRISK map to match territories at risk of child labor with its own map of coffee-producing areas where they conduct educational programs to prevent child labor. And in Jamaica, the maps have been used to target social protection programs to vulnerable communities.

While the institutionalization of CLRISK maps show promise in the short to medium term, countries in the region will require donor resources to implement the CLRISK model and develop the kinds of mapping noted above. One option is the USDOL Global Accelerator Lab

[42] The CLRISK model was developed before the MAP 16 project. Other key donors supporting RILAC include AECID, AACID, and ABC.

project that can continue to provide support to RILAC. Longer-term sustainability of the model is less certain.

Another issue that could threaten sustainability is turnover of statistics office personnel. As personnel who were trained on the CLRISK model depart, new personnel will have to be trained. According to ILO representatives, many of the statistics offices do not have dedicated resources to train new personnel. To help address this issue, information regarding the CLRISK model, including maps and documents, are available on the RILAC website.[43]

SUB-OUTCOME 3.3: Improved country capacity to address child labor in India.

Under the discussion of effect-level changes in India, the evaluation team confirmed that the project supported the state government in Uttar Pradesh to incorporate child labor activities into its action plan. Since Uttar Pradesh is required to implement the action plan, it should be sustained during the plan's implementation period. The Uttar Pradesh action plan on eliminating child labor can serve as a model for other states to follow because it is a large state with the highest number of parliamentarians in India and, thus, yields important political influence. Also under Outcome 3, the collaboration with district administration officials, WISC, Jan Shikshan Sansthan, and community volunteers to link eligible child labor families with government services shows strong promise to continue after the MAP 16 project ends.

OUTCOME 3.4: Improved country capacity to address child labor in target countries under this evaluation.

SO 3.4 aimed to build country capacity in 10 additional countries that were added later in project implementation. The following section discusses the sustainability potential for outcomes for the seven countries covered by this evaluation: Argentina, Fiji, Kosovo, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste.

Argentina

The MAP 16 project in Argentina conducted a range research activities and produced and disseminated reports to stakeholders. These reports have been published on both ILO and government websites and thus are available to government policymakers and other organizations. However, according to stakeholders who were interviewed, the research has not yet translated into concrete policy changes.

The project also developed a range of child labor knowledge products that were disseminated and are available for use. The seminars and meetings were one-time events and will not continue. The provincial governments do not have resources to conduct more of these seminars and meetings in the future. Furthermore, both national and provincial-level government representatives explained that the ILO should organize and conduct future meetings and workshops because national and provincial governments do not have a culture of collaboration. The ILO is respected and can convene key tripartite actors.

The training on child labor shows more promise of being institutionalized and sustained by both employers and trade unions. The project worked with the largest manufacturing business association in Argentina, Argentina Industrial Union, to develop a training course based on research that it intends to provide to its members in about 40 percent of the provinces. Likewise, the project worked with trade union federations to develop training materials that they will incorporate into their ongoing training programs. However, trade union

[43] https://www.iniciativa2025alc.org

representatives told the evaluation team that they have limited budgets to provide training to their affiliates in all of the provinces.

Fiji

In Fiji, MAP 16 developed the draft National Child Labour Plan, draft National Action Plan to Eliminate Child Labour, and hazardous work and light work lists. While many stakeholders believe that the new government will eventually approve these plans and policies, they cannot be considered sustained until accepted and implemented by the government.

The project supported the development of a child labor component for the paperless labor inspection information system that is being used on a trial bases. However, according to government stakeholders, the full implementation of the system requires additional resources such as computers and other hardware that are not in the government's budget.

The project also helped develop a labor inspection protocol or guidelines that is being used by labor inspectors and shows signs of being sustained at least in the short to medium timeframe. In general, the child labor awareness campaigns that the project supported were effective but will be difficult to sustain due to a lack of funding available in government budgets.

Kosovo

Under Outcome 1, the regulatory framework achievements including the hazardous child labor and light work lists show strong promise to be sustained once the government approves them. A threat, however, is that if it takes for the government longer than one year to approve the new administrative instruction, many stakeholders are concerned that these policies could lose their relevancy.

MAP 16 trained and certified five persons to deliver child labor case management training. Since the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare accredited the training and has the capacity to certify more trainers, case management capacity will likely be sustained. On the other hand, the online database is not functioning because the Centre for Social Work (CSW) does not have enough social workers to enter data. According to one CSW representative, donors have overloaded CSW with online databases for different cases such as gender violence, domestic violence, trafficking, child abuse, children without parental care, children involved in delinquency, and children in street situations.

It appears that teacher capacity-building is sustainable. The Ministry of Education, which adopted the ILO child labor training methodology, will continue to provide child labor training to teachers as part of their professional development. Teachers will receive professional development credits for the child labor training. The training the project provided to labor inspectors, police, forestry inspectors, and agriculture inspectors shows promise of sustainability: the different institutions can use this to continue to provide child labor training. For example, the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare can provide training to labor inspectors and police through the Kosovo Institute of Public Administration while the Ministry of Agriculture can provide training to municipal agricultural advisors and forestry and agriculture inspectors. In fact, the project reported municipal agriculture advisors are utilizing hazardous child labor list drafted by MAP 16 in outreach activities to farmers It should be noted that while the project intended to train employers, they were not trained due to a lack of interest. The project reported that it sent the training materials to the Kosovo Chamber of Commerce to use at a later date, but it is not clear if or how these materials will be used.

The training provided to judges and prosecutors was inadequate and will not be sustained. In discussions with the Academy of Justice representatives, which is the leading institution in providing the training for judges and prosecutors, they stated that they will not be able to follow up with capacity-building of judges and prosecutors on child labor because the training was not relevant. While MAP 16 provided child labor training guidelines and modules, the Academy of Justice representatives told the evaluation team that these training documents are not what they need to train and do not intend to use them. Instead, they would have preferred to have had assistance to compile judgements on child labor cases, study them, and develop a unified approach to dealing with child labor cases.

It appears that the child labor awareness activities will not be sustained. First, the evaluation team was not able to ascertain any evidence that the general public awareness (public service announcements) and awareness-raising about hazardous work in the agriculture sector was effective. In the opinion of the stakeholders who were interviewed, the general public awareness messages were not crafted in ways to change people's attitudes and behavior. One stakeholder said that "it is not enough to inform people about child labor. You have to touch their emotions to make them act." Other stakeholders thought the project should have used a more diverse range of media to reach the public. Most importantly, it does not appear that the ministries that deal with child labor have plans to continue the child labor outreach campaign (public service announcements).

Niger

While work on the NAPCL has been suspended due to the political situation, stakeholders mentioned it as one of the most sustainable achievements of MAP 16. The training and awareness-raising activities in agriculture, construction, and mining sectors were effective but will likely not be sustained due to a lack of resources. Likewise, the training for labor inspectors helped increase their awareness about child labor and how to identify child labor cases, but it will be difficult to continue to train the inspectors since the labor ministry does not have a specific training budget for child labor. On the other hand, the National Committee to Combat Child Labor will most likely be sustained once MAP 16 ends.

Serbia

The project produced a recommendation report to align labor law with international standards, amended decree on hazardous child labor, and a draft list of light work. These products exist and will likely be incorporated into the new labor law once it is passed. If so, they will be sustained as integral elements of the new law. The project developed amendments of instruction to protect children that were signed by the Ministry of Labour, Employment, Veteran and Social Affairs (MOLEVSA) and provided training for supervisors of social workers and social protection officers to support the implementation of the amendments. Since the amendments were formally accepted by MOLEVSA, they are considered sustained.

The project helped the Republic Institute for Social Protection develop an accredited training course (Child Labor Identification, Prevention and Recognition) that it can offer, but—as noted by both representatives of ILO and CSW—it is not clear where the resources would come from to conduct the course. The project also developed advocacy and communications materials that it is using to raise awareness about child labor. The materials have been disseminated and are available to be used by government and other organizations working to address child labor. It is not clear to the evaluation team if the materials will continue to be used once the MAP 16 project ends.

Sri Lanka

The project conducted an analysis of the National Child Protection Authority hotline data and delivered the report to the Sri Lanka Department of Labour (DOL) that did not show much interest so sustainability so it should not be considered sustained. The project also produced training materials and trained labor inspectors, child services officers, and police. While stakeholders opined that the training was appropriate and useful, the government does not have resources to conduct future training.

DOL is using the communication strategy that the project helped develop and the Ministry of Education approved the school to work manual for parents that is still being used to train parents in especially rural areas where the prevalence of child labor is highest. Both of these products appear to be sustainable in the short to medium term.

Initiatives that will not be sustained include the plan to improve LISA because the government has plans to replace it with a more effective and useful labor monitoring system; policy recommendations because DOL has not shown interest in implementing them; and the Alliance 8.7 road map because the government considered it to be redundant with other SDG monitoring activities.

Timor-Leste

The project finalized the child labor survey that was conducted in 2016. While somewhat outdated, the information is available to key stakeholders to use to address child labor. The National Action Plan for Child Labour (NAPFL) has not been approved by the government yet.[44] Until it is approved and implemented, it cannot be considered sustained. The hazardous work decree and revised hazardous and light work lists, labor inspection protocol, and minimum age standards were developed, but the government has not yet approved them so they cannot be considered sustained until the government approves and implements them.

The awareness-raising activities the project identified key government and civil society actors, developed training materials, and trained these key child labor actors. While stakeholders reported that the awareness-raising and training activities were highly appropriate and an important step to addressing child labor, they believe more training is necessary. However, neither government nor civil society organizations have the resources to continue the training.

OUTCOME 4: Strengthened partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

Outcome 4 primarily consisted of collaborative efforts under Alliance 8.7, Global Business Network on Forced Labour (GBNFL), and ILO-UNICEF long-term strategic collaboration. Both ILO and USDOL representatives acknowledge that both Alliance 8.7 and GBNFL will require donor support in the near to medium term to continue to operate. In particular, the Alliance 8.7 will require donor resources to manage the increase in the number of pathfinder countries as well as donor funds to help the pathfinder countries to develop and implement roadmaps to achieve SDG 8.7. Although GBNFL intends to eventually reach self-sufficiency through membership fees, it will continue to require donor support for the foreseeable future. In the short term, the USDOL funded Global Accelerator Lab project is providing financial support to the Alliance 8.7 and GBNFL.

[44] The approval has further been delayed by the 2023 parliamentary elections and subsequent structural changes.

4. LESSONS LEARNED AND PROMISING PRACTICES

This section describes lessons learned and promising practices that USDOL, ILO, and other grantees should consider in future projects.

4.1 LESSONS LEARNED

1. **Ensuring Technical Assistance for Country-Level Research.** Projects with research objectives and activities in multiple countries require expert technical support to ensure high-quality research and world-class research reports. The technical support needs to be built into project activities and budget to ensure resources are available. Many of the project's target countries intended to conduct both qualitative and quantitative research on child labor and forced labor topics. Some of these countries, however, did not possess strong national capacity to conduct the research. While ILO FUNDAMENTAL's research unit provided important support to many of the countries, the unit was short-staffed and, in some cases, was only involved in providing comments on draft research reports instead of being involved in the design of the research activities and providing technical assistance during data collection and analysis.
2. **Facilitating Research and Policy Dialogue**. Projects with both child labor and forced labor research and policy objectives require participation from both researchers (e.g., statistics offices) and policy decisionmakers in target countries. Important policies do not stem from the research that the statistics offices and other research organizations produce alone. Instead, significant policies result from a dialogue between the statistics offices and policy decisionmakers regarding the research findings. Furthermore, these kinds of projects are more effective when global research supports target country capacity-building activities including developing or improving child labor and forced labor data to inform policies.[45]
3. **Designing for DE&I**. It is important to include diversity, equity, and inclusion (DE&I) principles in the original project design so these principles are well-articulated, coherent, and built into the M&E system and work plans. Also, project staff need to be trained in these principles. The MAP 16 midterm evaluation found that the project did not include a strong gender and inclusion approach in the components. While the project tried to capture efforts to address gender, equity, and inclusiveness in the TPRs, there was not enough time left in the project to redesign it to incorporate a coherent DE&I strategy.
4. **Assessing Political Willingness**. It is critical to identify the likelihood where and when the lack of political willingness to approve and act on child labor and forced labor policies will occur and to develop strategies to address it. Political unwillingness to approve key child labor and forced labor polices proved to be an obstacle in several MAP 16 target countries. It is important that projects are able to anticipate the lack of political will to approve and act on policies and develop proactive advocacy strategies to address political unwillingness. If political unwillingness cannot be effectively addressed, projects require strategies to shift efforts to what can be achieved such as child labor and forced labor inspection protocols and awareness-raising activities.

[45] It should be noted that ILO research is intended to support policy decisions.

5. **Ensuring Linkages and Synergies**. To maximize the impact that a project has, it is important that a project's main components be linked in ways to create synergies. The MAP 16 project design lacked linkages and synergies between its main components or outcomes. For example, much of the research under Outcome 1 was conducted in countries that were not selected as capacity-building countries under Outcome 3. The communication activities undertaken under Outcome 2 were not directly linked to the capacity-building countries under Outcome 3. Only two of the MAP 16 capacity-building countries were Alliance 8.7 pathfinder countries under Outcome 4. MAP 16 would have benefited from clear country selection criteria and allocating financial resources strategically to create linkages and generate synergies between the different outcomes.
6. **Ensuring Adequate Resources**. Large global projects require adequate financial resources in each of its target countries to achieve impact. MAP 16 operated at the global level and in 13 countries. Of these 13 countries, eight were included in this final evaluation. The average budget amount per country of these eight countries was $358,399, which stakeholders believe was too small to have an impact. Large global projects like MAP 16 need to ensure that the target countries are strategically selected using clear criteria and have the number of financial resources and time to achieve outcomes and have an impact on child labor and forced labor in the countries.
7. **Requiring a Full-Time M&E Officer**. Large and complex projects like MAP 16 require a full-time M&E officer, preferably designated as key personnel. The MAP 16 project did not have a full-time M&E officer. The project would have benefited from a full-time M&E officer given the complexity of the project design that consisted of four main outcomes, nine sub-outcomes, and 31 outputs. The project was implemented in 13 countries. In those 13 countries, the project had a total of 47 outcomes, 119 outputs, and 376 activities. A full-time M&E officer would have been more effective at managing the project's information system and supporting the MAP 16 target countries to report on their achievements (outcomes, outputs, and activities). In addition, A full-time M&E officer could have facilitated the process of identifying key lessons and working with project management to apply them to improve project performance.
8. **Simplifying M&E Systems**. Large global projects can be more effectively monitored and reported on if the number of indicators are limited to the most essential to document achievements and make important decisions. In most cases, the essential indicators are at the effect or outcome levels. The MAP 16 M&E system included 60 outcomes and 150 outputs to track and report on, which at times overburdened project staff. In hindsight, MAP 16 would have benefited from a simpler and more streamlined M&E system that collected information and reported on primarily outcome indicators and only the most essential outputs.
9. **Determining Country Needs and Interest.** It is critical to conduct some sort of an assessment prior to beginning activities in countries to determine the need for the proposed interventions and whether government and non-government stakeholders are interested in these interventions. MAP 16 developed policies and plans in some countries that were not priorities for governments (Fiji, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste). The project also had to modify its plans to update the child labor survey questionnaire in India due to a lack of interest. Understanding country priorities and needs can allow projects to implement interventions that government value and, at the same, avoid spending time on interventions that governments do not intend to support.

4.2 PROMISING PRACTICES

1. **Human Impact Stories**. Human impact stories, which are factual accounts of life experiences told by the persons themselves, are effective mechanisms to communicate messages to broad audiences. They are effective because persons tell their life stories in their own words that allows audiences to share the experience. MAP 16 produced 10 human inspiring impact stories about the experiences of former child laborers and victims of forced labor including the problems they faced and how they overcame their problems. The impact stories appear on the ILO's Alliance 8.7 website.
2. **Child Labor Modules**. The integration of child labor modules within on-going national labor force surveys creates efficiency and ensures sustainability of data collection efforts. MAP 16 developed a child labor module designed to be added to national labor force surveys.[46] The child labor module was incorporated in national labor force survey in Serbia. The integration of a child labor module in the national survey promotes sustainability because many countries have the mandate to conduct labor force surveys about every four to five years meaning that the child labor survey module will also be repeated every four to five years. Some child labor questions such as hazardous work and household chores can be added to the labor force survey. Furthermore, since many labor force surveys already ask adults questions about employment and own-use production, it might be sufficient to decrease the age range to include children.
3. **International Advisory Board**. International advisory boards (IAD), consisting of academic institutions, international research specialists, and representatives of international organizations, serve as an important platform for research cooperation and dialogue on child labor and forced labor issues. MAP 16 established the IAD to review and comment on the various research projects, reports, and tools. More specifically, the IAB provided MAP 16 technical and strategic advice and guidance regarding child labor and forced labor statistics and research.
4. **Flexible Project Approach.** Large and complex projects require flexibility to make mid-course corrections based on changes in the operating environments. MAP 16 maintained sufficient flexibility to allow for constant adaptations and adjustments to political situations, changes requested by stakeholders and project partners in the target countries, suggestions made by the ILO FUNDAMENTALS management and technical teams to add or modify tools and other products, and requests made by USDOL to add target countries.
5. **Participatory Approaches.** Involving key stakeholders, such as statistics office personnel, in the development of data collection and other research tools, builds capacity and ownership while ensuring that the tools meet the needs of the countries. MAP 16 took specific steps to involve the statistics office personnel and local researchers in the development of a variety of research tools. These stakeholders were able to provide insight and recommendations that ensured that the tools were tailored to meet local needs. In addition, the process of developing the tools strengthened the capacity of these local stakeholders to use the tools.
6. **Project Team Capacity-Building**. Internal capacity-building activities builds capacity and creates cohesion among project team members. MAP 16 created the "Master of Arts MAP 16" as a way to identify project team learning needs and develop events to help

[46] Note that child labor questions are integrated into labor force surveys by modifying the main questionnaire. For example, reducing the age of the respondents in some sections and adding sections on household chores and hazardous work.

meet those needs. The events typically involved a resource person within the ILO who would conduct the learning events. The learning events included the presentation of the MAP 16 midterm evaluation, regional information sharing (Africa, Europe), preparing the technical progress reports, role of labor inspection in child labor, COVID-19 and child labor among street children, and the new child labor questionnaire. These events helped build team spirit and provided a productive working space for Geneva-based and country-based staff to meet and discuss issues.

7. **Child Labor Risk Identification Model**. The ILO collaborated with the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLAC) to develop the child labor risk identification model (CLRISK) that aims to help countries identify territories where there are higher probabilities of child labor so they can determine the most relevant multisectoral actions to address child labor. The model does not require that new data be collected. Instead, the model's methodology uses existing data such as child labor surveys, national census data, other sector surveys, and a range of administrative data that have been collected and are available. One of the major challenges in the region is the lack of reliable data. The CLRISK model presents an opportunity to address this weakness by providing another statistical tool available to countries.
8. **Building on Existing Initiatives**. Building on the existing initiatives rather than developing new ones creates efficiency and helps ensure success because it does not generate more work for stakeholders. For example, in Argentina, MAP 16 did not develop new training for labor inspectors, employers, and trade unions. Instead, the project built on the training that these organizations had already planned by adding child labor topics, content, and tools. In addition, the project helped labor inspectors include child labor in their inspections. While the project invested resources in developing the child labor content and tools, it did not have to invest resources in conducting new training since the trainings were planned and budgeted. This approach also promotes sustainability since these organizations can continue to use the child labor content and tools in future training and capacity-building events.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation team's conclusions, based on the findings, are organized according to the evaluation questions under the evaluation's main categories: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, impact, efficiency, and sustainability.

RELEVANCE

- MAP 16 was relevant and effectively responded to the needs of the countries.
- The project design had an inherent weakness. The design lacked coherence and missed opportunities for collaboration and did not incorporate a strong gender and inclusiveness strategy.
- MAP 16 project was not designed to emphasize coherence but was designed to be flexible and allow the ILO to respond to research needs and opportunities and requests from a variety of countries.

COHERENCE

- The project collaborated effectively with organizations at both the global and country levels.
- At the global level, the project collaborated with United Nations agencies such as UNICEF and IOM to develop global research reports.

- The project was less successful at developing linkages with Alliance 8.7 action groups and civil society organizations at the global level.
- At the country level, MAP 16 collaborated and coordinated effectively with child labor and forced labor actors in the majority of the target countries.
- The one exception was the collaboration with UNICEF. Although MAP 16 collaborated with UNICEF on research initiatives in Fiji, India, Niger, Serbia, and Timor-Leste, the project was not able to develop a long-term strategic partnership with UNICEF in any of the countries as called for in the CMEP.

EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT

OUTCOME 1

- Countries understand that they have the duty and the tools to monitor progress to address child labor.
- Research and global reports helped increase awareness about child labor and forced labor and provided a strong evidence base to support ILO recommendations to address child labor and forced labor.

OUTCOME 2

- The project developed a range of digital products to communicate child labor and forced labor knowledge to broad audiences.
- While it is difficult to measure the effect of these activities and products, they played an important role in increasing awareness about child labor and forced labor.

OUTCOME 3

- MAP 16 supported RILAC to develop the CLRISK model for 13 countries that has been used on a limited basis to inform policies and programs.
- In India, the project worked with Uttar Pradesh to incorporate child labor activities in its state action plan and helped link child labor families to government social services in Bihar state.
- In Argentina, research on child labor shows potential to inform public policy while child labor training modules have been incorporated into on-going training programs a large employer organization and three trade union federations.
- In Fiji, Niger, Serbia, and Timor-Leste, the project raised awareness about child labor and developed important policies and protocols that have not yet been approved by governments.
- In Serbia, key regulatory changes were adopted such as the protocol and instruction for the social system and the specific protocol for the labor inspectorate on addressing child labor cases.
- In Kosovo, the project developed child labor regulatory framework that includes hazardous child labor and light work lists that will serve as the foundation of the new administrative instruction on child labor.
- Also in Kosovo, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Development now prohibits its sub-contractors to use hazardous child labor (based on the hazardous child labor list) and incorporated training on hazardous child labor in its farmer training program.

OUTCOME 4

- MAP 16 provided funding to establish the Alliance 8.7 website that hosts a range of information about the Alliance 8.7 including impact stories.
- The project provided funds to establish and help jump-start the ILO's GBNFL and supported GBNFL research and communications activities as well as workshops, webinars, and meetings.
- MAP 16 disseminated the joint ILO-UNICEF joint publication Child Labour: Global estimates 2020, trends and the road forward.
- The project supported Alliance 8.7 and its efforts to raise awareness about Target 8.7 of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) and countries' duties to monitor progress on the achievement of SDG target 8.7.

EFFICIENCY

- The project operated in an efficient manner. It produced outputs and achieved outcome indicator targets with the planned amount of human and financial resources.
- The COVID-19 pandemic was the most important hindering factor. The pandemic caused the project to postpone and reschedule activities and shift training and policy dialogue activities to virtual formats that caused some delays.
- Other important hindering factors were national elections, politics, and changes in key government personnel, which caused delays.

SUSTAINABILITY

OUTCOME 1

- The data collection and analysis tools exist and are available to countries to use but they will eventually have to be updated, which will require donor support.
- The International Advisory Board shows promise to continue to provide research support to the ILO once MAP 16 ends.
- The project trained and worked closely with the countries' statistical offices to build capacity and create ownership but they will require resources to conduct future research.
- The various global reports on child labor and forced labor exist and are available on the ILO website but given the dynamic and changing nature of child labor and forced labor, these reports and studies will have to be updated to remain relevant, which will require donor financing.

OUTCOME 2

- The knowledge mobilization and storytelling tools are in the process of being converted to training modules to be hosted by the ILO International Training Centre and offered to ILO employees.
- The Alliance 8.7 website is operational and hosts a range of resources including the global reports and impact stories.
- The evaluation team was not able to determine the impact that the communication products have had on increasing knowledge and whether they were used to address child labor and forced labor issues.

OUTCOME 3

- The policies and plans (national action plans to address child labor, regulatory frameworks, lists of hazardous child labor and decrees, and lists of light work for children) were developed but have not yet been approved by governments in Fiji, Serbia, Niger, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste. Until they are approved and implemented, they cannot be considered sustained.
- The inspection guidelines and other protocols are being used in Fiji, Kosovo, Serbia, and Timor-Leste and should be considered sustained in the short to medium term. Additionally, as noted above, in Kosovo, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Development now prohibits its sub-contractors to use hazardous child labor (based on the hazardous child labor list) and incorporated training on hazardous child labor in its farmer training program.
- Training and awareness-raising will be the most difficult to sustain. While both training and awareness-raising were considered relevant, effective, and useful, government agencies, employers' organizations, and trade unions appear to lack resources in many of the MAP 16 countries (Fiji, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste).
- One exception is Argentina where the project built training into ongoing activities of a large employer's organization and three trade union federations.

OUTCOME 4

- Alliance 8.7 will require donor support in the near to medium term to continue to operate.
- GBNFL intends to eventually reach self-sufficiency through membership fees but will continue to need donor support for the foreseeable future.
- It appears that the ILO has adequate donor support in the short to medium term, to keep Alliance 8.7 and GBNFL operational.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ILO AND USDOL

1. **Ensure compelling cause and effect logic in project designs.** Project designs should have a compelling cause-and-effect logic built into the theory of change and results framework. The design should also ensure strong strategic linkages between its main components or outcomes to ensure that the overall project objectives are achieved. The linkages should ensure that the project's main components are working together to create important synergies. Global activities and products should be directly linked to, and support, country-level interventions. To create strategic linkages that generate synergies, the implementing teams should work together to develop the outcomes in ways that create shared responsibilities. For example, an outcome might be developed that requires the research, communication, and country teams to work together to produce and communicate research findings to key decisionmakers in countries, with the aim of changing or improving policies.
2. **Streamline the CMEP/project document approval process.** The CMEP process should be streamlined so that the approval of the project document is approved in a reasonable amount of time (six to nine months). It took USDOL 18 months to approve the MAP 16 project document, which the evaluation team believes is too long. Granted, ILO did not have key personnel in place for nearly six months, and the CMEP process is complex. Nevertheless, such a long review and approval process for the project document, which is

the foundational document for USDOL-funded projects, can negatively affect the project's timeline and implementation. Based on the MAP 16 experience, USDOL should meet with the ILO to review the CMEP process—especially the project document review and approval process—to determine how it can be streamlined in ways that meets USDOL quality requirements while expediting the approval process, so implementation can begin as soon as possible after the grant is awarded.

3. **Build DE&I principles into the project design.** Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DE&I) principles should be built into project designs. It is most effective to design projects to include DE&I principles, so these principles are well-articulated, coherent, and built into the project document, results framework, and M&E and work plans from the beginning of the project. In addition, project staff should be trained in these principles so that they understand them and how they can be addressed by project interventions. It should be noted that including DE&I principles does not only mean to disaggregate data and report by gender and vulnerable groups. Rather, the incorporation of these principles requires a mindset shift to ensure project interventions are designed to reach vulnerable groups and that the roles of women and men are understood and factored into the interventions (e.g., the role of women in household economies and how this might affect child labor).
4. **Limit the number of indicators for large and complex projects.** Large and complex projects with a large number of outcomes and outputs should limit the number of indicators to those that are essential to measure project performance in achieving outcomes and to make decisions. Each indicator represents effort and cost to collect indicator data, analyze them, and report on indicator target achievements. Project M&E systems that have a large number of indicators can overwhelm project staff and divert time away from implementing project interventions. Nevertheless, an essential number of indicators are critical to assess project performance and to provide information to adjust project interventions when necessary. The most prudent approach would be to develop, during the project design process, a coherent set of outcome indicators and targets that accurately "indicate" whether the outcome is achieved. The project should focus its efforts on collecting, analyzing, and reporting on these outcome indicators. However, if the project believes it is helpful to track certain outputs, it should do so—but in a way that does not detract from the outcome indicators. In most cases, the project should not be required to report on the output indicators.
5. **Ensure that complex projects have full-time M&E officers.** Projects, especially large global projects, should have a full-time M&E officer to manage the project's M&E system. Ideally, the M&E officer would be classified as *key personnel*. The M&E officer should be responsible for leading the development of the M&E system, including the indicators and targets, data sources, data collection methodologies and activities, and data analysis. The M&E officer should also be responsible for overseeing data collection and analysis processes, providing technical support to the target countries, and reporting on the achievement of indicator targets. Most importantly, the M&E officer should work with the rest of the project team to identify lessons and good practices that can be used to adjust the project's interventions and strategies on a timely basis.
6. **Develop strategies to identify and address challenges.** Projects should develop a process to identify challenges that impede achievement of outcomes and develop strategies to address those challenges that might include shifting effort and resources to other outcomes that show more promise. This process might consist of identifying where the project is having, or not having, success in achieving indicator targets and the reasons, which can be done through project monitoring and CMEP reviews. For example, if a project is struggling to achieve its policy outcomes due to political unwillingness or a lack of

interest by governments, the project could develop an advocacy strategy to try to address the reasons for the political unwillingness. If addressing the reasons for political unwillingness is not feasible, the project might shift resources to other outcomes that are performing better. Rather than continue to invest project resources in outcomes that are likely not to be achieved, projects should invest in those outcomes that show more promise based on the country context.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USDOL

7. **Ensure projects have adequate resources and duration to achieve impact.** Large global projects should have adequate resources and sufficiently long implementation periods, so they are able to achieve the intended impact. In addition, the selection of the target countries should be based on strategic criteria. These criteria might include the potential to link global interventions and products with country-level interventions, interest and willingness of target country governments to support the objectives of the project, and the ability to leverage the investments and achievements of previous project or current projects. The MAP 16 project was a large and complex global project that operated in 13 countries as well as at the global level. The general consensus of many stakeholders is that both the amount of the budget and the length of the project in most of the countries were not sufficient to achieve the intended impact and that the selection of the countries was not based on clear criteria that ILO and USDOL agreed upon.
8. **Conduct regular CMEP reviews.** Projects should conduct regular CMEP reviews to assess project performance, discuss key lessons learned including challenges in the operating environment, and determine the relevance of the project design (activities, outputs, outcomes, indicators, and indicator targets). This assessment will allow USDOL and the grantee to determine whether the project design needs to be adjusted and resources reallocated in order to respond to challenges in the operating environment such as the political unwillingness to approve policies, security concerns, and lack of interest of stakeholders in the project's interventions. Any changes in the project's outcomes, outputs, activities, and indicators should be documented and the appropriate changes made in the CMEP document so it remains up-to-date. USDOL can also use the CMEP reviews to ensure that all outcomes and sub-outcomes have indicators and indicator targets to assess performance. Of the 12 outcomes and sub-outcomes in the MAP 16 project design, only three had indicators with indicator targets registered in the CMEP.[47] The review will also allow the project to identify key learnings and use them to improve the project's interventions.
9. **Conduct a problem analysis as the foundation for project design.** USDOL grantees should be required to conduct a thorough problem analysis that would lay the foundation for choosing project interventions and developing the theory of change and results framework. The problem analysis should identify the primary problem that the project intends to address as well as the main causes and consequences. The problem analysis is typically conducted by a project design team using a diagram or "problem tree" that shows the cause-and-effect relationships between the causes and consequences. The problem analysis would help ensure strong cause-and-effect logic and the integration of the interventions that are eventually reflected in the project's outcomes. It would also help the project design team avoid predetermining interventions that are not based on an analysis of the problem. When USDOL initially developed the CMEP, it required its grantees

[47] The MAP 16 project design consisted of 13 outcomes and sub-outcomes. However, SO 3.4, the 10 additional capacity-building countries, were not required to have LogFrames with outcome indicators.

to develop a problem tree during the first CMEP workshop. It might consider reintroducing a streamlined version of the original requirement.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ILO

10. **Encourage MAP 16 target countries to finalize and approve policies and tools.** The ILO should use its presence and influence to encourage governments to finalize and approve important policies, plans, and tools developed under MAP 16, so they have the intended impact on child labor and forced labor.
    Following are the pending policies, plans, and tools by country:

FIJI

- National Child Labour Policy
- National Action Plan on Child Labour 2017–2025
- Hazardous Occupations Prohibited to Children under 18 Years of Age Order of 2013
- List of light work for children
- List of work in artistic, performing, and entertainment Industries
- Joint inspection protocol for child labor

NIGER

- National Action Plan on Child Labour

SERBIA

- Child labor module integrated in labor force survey
- Amended decree on hazardous child labor
- Decree on light work for children, including list of light work

TIMOR-LESTE

- National Action Plan of Child Labour
- Hazardous work list decree law
- Labour Inspection guidelines and reporting formats (including definitions of light work and hazardous work)
- Minimum age standards

11. **Conduct pre-implementation assessment to determine needs and interest.** Projects should assess the interest, willingness, and ability of governments and other social partners to participate in a project before initiating project activities in the country. For example, if the ILO is considering conducting research in a particular country, the assessment would determine the need for the research and whether government and non-government stakeholders are interested in using the results of the research to inform policy. The assessment would help avoid situations that occurred in MAP 16 where governments were not interested in some of the project's interventions: policy in Fiji, Serbia, and Timor-Leste; research in India; judicial training in Kosovo; research, policies, and Alliance 8.7 activities in Sri Lanka. With this information, projects can modify the planned interventions to focus on what the governments and other stakeholders are interested in and willing to support if it falls within the mandate of the project. If not, the project might choose not to implement the activities in that country. The project should also take into account the possibility of change in government willingness/priorities and anticipate measures to adapt or re-mobilize partners.

12. **Provide adequate research support to target countries.** Global research projects that are implemented in multiple countries should include specific strategies that provide technical support and, when necessary, oversight to the research activities in the target countries to ensure high-quality research and research reports. The technical support should be built into workplans and budgets to ensure both human and financial resources are available to provide technical support to country-level research activities that begin at the research design phase and continue through data collection and analysis to the final reports.

Table 4. Recommendations and Supporting Evidence

Recommendation	Evidence	Report Section
1. Ensure compelling cause-and-effect logic in project designs.	The project design did not have a tight cause-and-effect logic reflected in the results framework, which led to a lack of coherence between the components.	Pages 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 72
2. Streamline the CMEP/project document approval process.	The CMEP/project document approval process took 18 months.	Pages 25, 26, 27, 61, 73, 78
3. Build gender and DE&I principles into the project design.	MAP 16 was not designed to include gender and DE&I principles.	Pages 23, 24, 69, 72
4. Limit the number of indicators for large and complex projects.	The project had 60 outcomes and 150 outputs (and their indicators), which placed a burden on the M&E system.	Pages 19, 20, 26, 27, 63, 70
5. Ensure that complex projects have full-time M&E officers.	The project did not have a full-time M&E officer to manage the complex MAP 16 M&E system and TPR reporting requirements.	Pages 18, 63, 70
6. Develop strategies to identify and address challenges.	The project did not have a specific strategy to identify and respond to challenges or shift efforts to focus on more promising interventions.	Pages 22, 35, 39, 41, 69, 72
7. Ensure projects have adequate resources and duration to achieve impact.	The project was implemented in 13 countries, many of which had limited resources and implementation periods that were insufficient to achieve an impact.	Pages 22, 23, 24, 69, 75
8. Conduct a problem analysis as the foundation for project design.	The project did not conduct a problem analysis to inform the theory of change and results framework, both of which were weak.	Pages 24, 73
9. Conduct regular CMEP reviews.	Map 16 did not conduct regular CMEP reviews to assess project performance and make the necessary changes to project design.	Pages 24, 27, 73
10. Encourage MAP 16 capacity-building countries to finalize and approve policies and tools.	MAP 16 ended in several countries that had not formally approved key policies, plans, and tools.	Pages 35, 39, 41
11. Conduct pre-implementation assessment to determine needs and interest.	In some countries, the project did not assess government and other social partners' interest before implementing activities that could have ensured the project addressed the needs and priorities of countries.	Pages 21, 35, 39, 41, 70

Recommendation	Evidence	Report Section
12. Provide adequate research support to target countries.	Several countries would have benefited from more involvement of the FUNDAMENTALS research unit in the design and conduct of research activities.	Pages 18, 19, 68

ANNEXES

ANNEX A. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- Award Notice: Grant Number IL- IL-30147-16-75-K-11, September 2016
- Award Modifications (#1 to #9)
- MAP 16 Project Annual Workplans (Argentina, Fiji, India, Kosovo, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Timor-Leste)
- MAP 16 Project Midterm Evaluation Report, March 2021
- Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
- Federal Financial Reports (2017 to 2023)
- ILAB Management Procedures and Guidelines 2022
- Project Federal Award Terms and Conditions
- Statement of Work: The Measurement, Awareness-Raising, and Policy Engagement Project to Accelerate Action against Child Labor and Forced Labor (MAP 16), November 2016
- Project Document: The Measurement, Awareness-Raising, and Policy Engagement Project to Accelerate Action against Child Labor and Forced Labor (MAP 16), November 2018
- Technical Progress Reports and Annexes (13 Reports: April 2017 to April 2023)
- Regional Initiative: Latin America and the Caribbean Free of Child Labour

ANNEX B. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference

August 14, 2023

Final PERFORMANCE Evaluation (pe) OF Measurement, awareness-raising and policy engagement to address child labor and forced labor (MAP 16) PROJECT

SUBMITTED TO
United States Department of Labor
Bureau of International Labor Affairs
200 Constitution Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20210
www.dol.gov/ilab

PREPARED BY
NORC at the University of Chicago
55 East Monroe St
30th Floor
Chicago, IL 60603
www.norc.org

Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor under contract number 1605DC-18-A-0023 This material does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

1. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). ILAB's mission is to promote a fair global playing field for workers in the United States and around the world by enforcing trade commitments, strengthening labor standards, and combating international child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

OCFT works to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking around the world through international research, policy engagement, technical cooperation, and awareness-raising. Since OCFT's technical cooperation program began in 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated funds annually to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects in more than 90 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL support sustained efforts that address child labor and forced labor's underlying causes, including poverty and lack of access to education.

This evaluation approach will be in accordance with DOL's Evaluation Policy.[48] OCFT is committed to using the most rigorous methods applicable for this qualitative performance evaluation and to learning from the evaluation results. The evaluation will be conducted by an independent third party and in an ethical manner and safeguard the dignity, rights, safety and privacy of participants. The quality standards underlying this evaluation are: Relevance, Coherence (to the extent possible), Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact (to the extent possible), and Sustainability.[49] In conducting this evaluation, the evaluator will strive to uphold the American Evaluation Association Guiding Principles for Evaluators.[50] OCFT will make the evaluation report available and accessible on its website.

PROJECT CONTEXT

According to 2020 Global Estimates, approximately 160 million children around the world are engaged in child labor (CL), and slightly less than half (79 million) are performing hazardous work that places their health, safety or moral development at risk.[51] Since 2000, the number of children in child labor has decreased by nearly 68 million due largely to awareness-raising and national efforts. However, the decrease in child labor had slowed down considerably by 2016.[52] Since then, there has in fact been a total increase of 8.4 million children in CL. Further, the number of children aged 5-17 years in hazardous work has risen by 6.5 million since 2016.

Sub-Saharan Africa has nearly 87 million children in child labor, more than the rest of the world combined, with a CL prevalence rate that is three times that of Northern Africa and Western

[48] For more information on DOL's Evaluation Policy, please visit https://www.dol.gov/asp/evaluation/evaluationpolicy.htm

[49] From Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use by the Organization for Economic Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) Network on Development Evaluation. DOL determined these criteria are in accordance with the OMB Guidance M-20-12. For more information, please visit: https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf

[50] For more information on the American Evaluation Association's Guiding Principles, please visit: https://www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51

[51] ILO 2020 Global Estimates available at https://data.unicef.org/resources/child-labour-2020-global-estimates-trends-and-the-road-forward/

[52] ILO 2016 Global Estimates available at https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/publication/wcms_575499.pdf

Asia, the region with the second highest prevalence. Children in countries affected by conflict situations and disasters face a much higher vulnerability and risk to be in child labor.

Forced labor is also a major challenge, as 2021 Global Estimates indicate there has similarly been an increase in prevalence since 2016, with 27.6 million people in situations of forced labor.[53] The majority of the victims of forced labor are exploited in the private sector. High-risk sectors include construction, agriculture, fishing, manufacturing and domestic work.

In 2015, all 193-member countries adopted the Agenda 2030 and the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which include a specific target to address child labor and forced labor. SDG target calls for immediate and effective measures to eradicate child labor in all its forms by 2025 and to end forced labor, modern slavery, and human trafficking by 2030.

To achieve the target for SDG 8.7, evidence-based policy choices at all levels of government is required. Alliance 8.7 was established and launched during the UN General Assembly in September 2016 as a global partnership initiative to accelerate action, drive innovation, leverage resources and disseminate knowledge. Alliance 8.7 represents a renewed commitment of the international community to join forces and to foster long-term public policy-driven solutions prevent and eliminate child labor, and forced labor, modern slavery and human trafficking.

PROJECT SPECIFIC INFORMATION

The Measurement, Awareness-Raising, and Policy Engagement Project to Accelerate Action against Child Labor and Forced Labor (MAP 16)[54] aims to help build and apply the critical knowledge needed to inform policy choices to combat child labor and forced labor and to support measures to address these challenges globally, regionally and in selected countries and policy sectors. In support of this effort, the project addresses four inter-related areas: research on child labor and forces labor, advocacy for policy change and communication focused on target audiences, capacity-building and action in countries and regions, and the support to global action through partnerships.

The MAP 16 project design consists of the following four outcomes that address empirical research and development of survey methods and tools, awareness-raising, capacity-building of governments, and policy engagement.

- Outcome 1 – Improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor and human trafficking
- Outcome 2 – Improved application of knowledge in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor
- Outcome 3 – Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor and human trafficking through national, regional and global initiatives
- Outcome 4 – Strengthened partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor and human trafficking

[53] ILO 2021 Global Estimates available at https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---ipec/documents/publication/wcms_854733.pdf

[54] For more information, visit the MAP16 project page: https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/measurement-awareness-raising-and-policy-engagement-map-16-project-child-labor-and

The MAP 16 Project is funded by USDOL's Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Trafficking (OCFT) and is implemented by the ILO's Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS) supported by the Research and Evaluation (R&E) Unit, including; the Advocacy and Partnership Unit (A&P); and the Solutions and Innovation Unit (S&I).

The project works globally on research and capacity-building.

Research activities involved the development of tools for measuring child labor and forced labor according to latest measurement standards as well tools for researchers (among others, the mixed methods toolkit) and piloting these tools in several countries. Moreover, capacity-building activities were embedded in research development, strengthening the capacity of national stakeholders to conduct research on child labor and forced labor. Under Outcome 1, research has been carried out in several countries, including Argentina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo, Mexico, Mongolia, Nigeria, Panama, Uganda and Vietnam.[55] Moreover, research has been carried out through collaboration with the Regional Initiative Latin America and the Caribbean Free of Child Labor (RILAC) in Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, and Peru. Regional exchange between RILAC and the Africa Initiative has promoted South-South Cooperation and piloting experiences of a risk model for Malawi and Côte d'Ivoire.

Finally, the project carried out capacity-building activities also under Outcome 3 of the project in 13 priority countries that include Argentina, Colombia, Fiji, India, Jordan, Kosovo*, Mauritania, Montenegro, Morocco, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste, as well as RILAC.

2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

The purpose of final performance evaluations covered under this contract includes, but may not be limited to, the following:

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

In addition, this evaluation will:

- Objectively rate the level of achievement of each of the project's major outcomes on a four-point scale (low, moderate, above-moderate, and high).

The final evaluation will focus on Argentina, India, Kosovo, Fiji, Mongolia, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste. In addition, at a more limited scale, it will cover the research and RILAC components in Argentina, Mexico, Nigeria and Panama.

[55] The project had originally planned to conduct research in Burma, Chile and in Philippines but while initial work was started in both countries, the research projects were not fully completed.

INTENDED USERS

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

3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

RELEVANCE (AND VALIDITY)

1. The midterm evaluation found the design was lacking coherence and that some opportunities for collaboration among the components had been missed. Acknowledging the project was designed with very separate components (outcomes), how did the project respond to the finding that opportunities for collaboration had been missed?
2. Do the project's four distinct components, including component #3's sub-components, respond to the needs in each country/objective? How might the project design be improved?
3. How has the project addressed the mid-term evaluation recommendation to incorporate a gender perspective? How has the project addressed equity and needs for inclusion of underrepresented groups in project activities?
4. How could the project design phase (both prior to award and during the CMEP process) have been improved to support a well-designed project?

COHERENCE

5. To what extent has the project established links and coordinated with other efforts to address child labor and forced labor by key tripartite plus organizations? How could the project improve coordination and collaboration with these organizations?

EFFECTIVENESS

6. To what extent did the project address the midterm evaluation finding regarding the lack of clear roles and responsibilities of project staff?
7. To what extent did the project achieve the targets for each component and sub—component? For Components 3.3 and 3.4, to what extent did the project achieve the country-level outcomes for those countries included in this final evaluation? What are the key internal or external factors that limited or facilitated the achievement of these components, sub-components, and country-level outcomes?
8. How can future project interventions build on and scale the achievements, including the facilitating factors, while addressing the limiting factors? For Component 1 research in Mongolia and RILAC and capacity-building in Fiji, India, and Niger will be assessed.

IMPACT (INTENDED AND UNINTENDED EFFECTS)

9. What have been the most important effects (positive, negative, intended, or unintended) of the four main components and research on CL risk indicators carried out under RILAC ?[56]
10. What could be done differently in the future to strengthen positive effects and improve on areas where the project was not as effective?

EFFICIENCY

11. What factors affected the project's efficiency (e.g., delays, changes in host governments, turnover of project staff, COVID-19) and how did the project respond to these factors?

SUSTAINABILITY

12. Which of the project's components (1,2, and 4) are most likely to be sustained and transferred to communities or relevant institutions when the project ends? Likewise, in general terms, what country-level outcomes for the nine countries included in the evaluation are most likely to be sustained?

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

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

A. APPROACH

The evaluation approach will be qualitative and participatory in nature and use project documents including CMEP data to provide quantitative information. Qualitative information will be obtained through the review of key documents and key informant interviews. The evaluation will conduct field visits to Argentina, India, and Kosovo to conduct interviews. The team will conduct remote interviews with key stakeholders in Mongolia, Niger, Fiji, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste.

The information ascertained from CMEP data analysis, document reviews, and key informant interviews will be triangulated and used to provide relevant and accurate responses to the evaluation questions. In addition, the participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among stakeholders and project participants.

The evaluation approach will be independent in terms of the membership of the evaluation team. Project staff and implementing partners will generally only be present in meetings with stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries to provide introductions. The following additional principles will be applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives will be triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions.
2. Efforts will be made to include parents' and children's voices and beneficiary participation, especially in India, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing

[56] Note that for RILAC, the evaluation will be looking at general project-wide impact and effects, intended or unintended based on information from one KII with RILAC POC in Peru, limited document review, and online survey responses from 2 of the 6 RILAC countries (Argentina and Mexico).

children following the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor[57] and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children.[58]

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

B. EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will consist of:

1. Lead evaluator
2. Evaluation manager
3. Assistant national evaluators for India, Kosovo, Mongolia, and Niger.
4. As appropriate, an interpreter fluent in necessary languages for remote interviewing.

One member of the project staff may travel with the team to make introductions in Argentina, India, and Kosovo. This person should not be involved in the evaluation process, or interviews. The responsibility of the interpreter in each provincial locality is to ensure that the evaluation team is understood by the stakeholders as far as possible, and that the information gathered is relayed accurately to the evaluator. The interpreter should be impartial and independent from the grantee in order to mitigate potential bias.

The lead evaluator will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with (Contractor), USDOL, and the project staff; assigning the tasks of the national consultants; assigning the tasks of the interpreter for the field work (as applicable); directly conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; analysis of the evaluation material gathered; presenting feedback on the initial results of the evaluation to the national stakeholder meeting, and preparing the evaluation report.

C. DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

1. Document Review

- Pre-field visit preparation includes extensive review of relevant documents.
- During fieldwork, documentation will be verified and additional documents may be collected.
- The evaluator shall also review key CMEP outcome and OCFT Standard Output indicators with the grantee. This will include reviewing the indicator definitions in the CMEP's Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) and the reported values in the Technical Progress Report (TPR) Annex A to ensure the reporting is accurate and complete.
- Documents may include:
    - CMEP documents and data reported in Annex A of the TPR,

[57] http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026
[58] https://www.unicef.org/media/reporting-guidelines

- Baseline and endline survey reports or pre-situational analyses,
- Project document and revisions,
- Project budget and revisions,
- Financial Reports (FFRs)
- Cooperative Agreement and project modifications,
- Technical Progress and Status Reports,
- Project Results Frameworks and Monitoring Plans,
- Original work plan and most current revised work plan,
- Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports,
- Management Procedures and Guidelines,
- Research or other reports undertaken (KAP studies, etc.), and,
- Project files (including school records) as appropriate.

2. Question Matrix

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

3. Interviews with Stakeholders

Informational interviews will be held with as many project stakeholders as possible. The evaluation team will solicit the opinions of, but not limited to: children, youth, community members in areas where awareness-raising activities occurred, parents of project participants, teachers, government representatives, employers and private-sector actors, legal authorities, union and NGO officials, the action program implementers and partners, and program staff regarding the project's accomplishments, program design, sustainability, and the working relationship between project staff and their partners, where appropriate.

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

- OCFT staff responsible for this evaluation and project prior to the commencement of the field work
- Headquarters, Country Director, Project Managers, and Field Staff of Grantee and Partner Organizations
- Government Ministry Officials and Local Government Officials who have been involved in or are knowledgeable about the project
- Community leaders, members, and volunteers
- School teachers, assistants, school directors, education personnel
- Project participants (children withdrawn and prevented and their parents)
- International NGOs and multilateral agencies working in the area

- Other child protection and/or education organizations, committees and experts in the area
- U.S. Embassy staff members

4. Data Collection and Fieldwork

The evaluators will visit a selection of project sites in Argentina, India, and Kosovo. For Argentina, the evaluators will assess the RILAC research and Component 3 capacity-building activities. For India and Kosovo, the evaluators will assess Component 3 capacity-building activities. The final selection of field sites to be visited will be made by the evaluator. Every effort should be made to include some sites where the project experienced successes and others that encountered challenges, as well as a good cross section of sites across targeted sectors. During the visits, the evaluator will observe the activities and outputs developed by the project if appropriate.

The evaluator will use remote data collection methods to assess Component 3 capacity-building activities in Fiji, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste evaluations. The evaluator will also use remote data collection methods to assess Component 1 research activities in Mongolia and RILAC activities in Peru. Zoom, Microsoft Teams or other software will be used to conduct virtual KIIs with key stakeholders.

The evaluator will also disseminate an online survey to project participants in the 9 priority countries, plus Panama and Nigeria (for Component 1 research) and RILAC (Mexico). A draft of the survey questionnaire will be shared with the Grantee for their review prior to dissemination. The survey will be disseminated using Qualtrics software and survey links will be sent via email to participants for whom email addresses are available. For countries where there are limited participant email addresses, the evaluator will work with the grantee to identify alternative means of dissemination.

5. Outcome Achievement and Sustainability Ratings

The evaluator should objectively rate the level of achievement and potential for sustainability of each of the project's outcomes on a four-point scale (low, moderate, above-moderate, and high).

Achievement

"**Achievement**" measures the extent to which a development intervention or project attains its objectives/outcomes, as described in its performance monitoring plan (PMP).

For assessing the achievement of program or project outcomes, the evaluation team should consider the extent to which the objectives/outcomes were achieved and identify the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives/outcomes. ***For this final evaluation,*** the evaluation team should consider to what extent the project is likely to meet or exceed its targets and/or achieve outcomes and sub-outcomes for components without targets by project end.

Project achievement ratings should be determined through triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data. The evaluation team should collect qualitative data from document reviews and key informant interviews through a structured data collection process, such as a survey or rapid scorecard.

Interviews can also provide context for the results reflected in the Data Reporting Form (Annex A) submitted with the Technical Progress Report (TPR). The evaluation team should also analyze quantitative data collected by the project on key performance indicators defined in the Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) and reported on in the TPR Data Reporting Form. The

evaluation team should consider the reliability and validity of the performance indicators and the completeness and accuracy of the data collected. The assessment of quantitative data should consider the extent to which the project achieved its targets and whether these targets were sufficiently ambitious and achievable within the period evaluated. The evaluation team should assess each of the project's objective(s) and outcome(s) according to the following scale:

- **High:** met or exceeded most targets, outcomes or sub-outcomes for the period evaluated, with mostly positive feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Above-moderate:** met or exceeded most targets, outcomes or sub-outcomes for the period evaluated, **but** with mostly neutral or negative feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Moderate:** missed most targets, outcomes or sub-outcomes for the period evaluated, **but** with mostly positive feedback from key stakeholders and participants.
- **Low:** missed most targets, outcomes or sub-outcomes for the period evaluated, with mostly neutral or negative feedback from key stakeholders and participants.

Sustainability

"**Sustainability**" is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. When evaluating the sustainability of a project, it is useful to consider the likelihood that the benefits or effects of a particular output or outcome will continue after donor funding ends. It also important to consider the extent to which the project takes into account the actors, factors, and institutions that are likely to have the strongest influence over, capacity, and willingness to sustain the desired outcomes and impacts. Indicators of sustainability could include agreements/linkages with local partners, stakeholder engagement in project sustainability planning, and successful handover of project activities or key outputs to local partners before project end, among others.

The project's Sustainability Plan (including the associated indicators) and TPRs (including the attachments) are key (but not the only) sources for determining its rating. The evaluation team should assess each of the project's objective(s) and outcome(s) according to the following scale:

- **High:** strong likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources [59] are in place to ensure sustainability;
- **Above-moderate:** above average likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources are identified but not yet committed;
- **Moderate:** some likelihood that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and some of the necessary resources are identified;
- **Low:** weak likelihood that that the benefits of project activities will continue after donor funding is withdrawn and the necessary resources are not identified.

In determining the rating above, the evaluation team should also consider the extent to which sustainability risks were adequately identified and mitigated through the project's risk management and stakeholder engagement activities. ***For final evaluations***, the evaluation team should assess the risk environment and its expected effects on the project outcomes

[59] Resources can include financial resources (i.e. non-donor replacement resources), as well as organization capacity, institutional linkages, motivation and ownership, and political will, among others.

after the project exits and the capacity/motivation/resources/linkages of the local actors/stakeholders to sustain the outcomes produced by the project.

D. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CONFIDENTIALITY

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure a maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners, stakeholders, communities, and project participants, implementing partner staff will generally not be present during interviews. However, implementing partner staff may accompany the evaluator to make introductions whenever necessary, to facilitate the evaluation process, make respondents feel comfortable, and to allow the evaluator to observe the interaction between the implementing partner staff and the interviewees.

E. STAKEHOLDER MEETING

Following the field visits, field exit briefings will be organized by the evaluator to brief USDOL on any issues encountered with the visits. Such information can be relayed via email upon agreement between USDOL and the evaluator. After all data collection is completed and a draft of the report has been shared with USDOL and the grantee, a virtual stakeholder meeting will be organized by the project and led by the evaluator to bring together a wide range of stakeholders, including the implementing partners and other interested parties to discuss the preliminary evaluation results. The list of participants to be invited will be drafted prior to the evaluator's visit and confirmed in consultation with project staff during fieldwork. ILAB staff will participate in the stakeholder meeting virtually if available. ILAB and project staff may coordinate with relevant US Embassy representatives for their participation, as well.

The meeting will present the major *preliminary* results and emerging issues, discuss project sustainability and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders, including those not interviewed earlier. The agenda of the meeting will be determined by the evaluator in consultation with project staff. Some specific questions for stakeholders may be prepared to guide the discussion and possibly a brief written feedback form.

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

- Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary findings
- Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the findings
- Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality

A debrief call will be held with the evaluator, the grantee and USDOL prior to the stakeholder workshop to provide stakeholders with preliminary results and solicit feedback as needed for the meeting.

F. LIMITATIONS

During the fieldwork in Argentina, India, and Kosovo the evaluators may not have enough time to visit all project sites or interview all stakeholders. As a result, the evaluators will not be able to take all sites or stakeholder opinions into consideration when formulating the findings. All efforts will be made to ensure that the evaluators are visiting or interviewing a representative sample of sites/stakeholders, including some that have performed well and some that have experienced challenges.

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

Furthermore, the ability of the evaluator to determine efficiency will be limited by the amount of financial data available. A cost-efficiency analysis is not included because it would require impact data which is not available.

G. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Contractor is responsible for accomplishing the following items:

- Providing all evaluation management and logistical support for evaluation deliverables within the timelines specified in the contract and TOR;
- Providing logistical support for travel associated with the evaluation with support from the Grantee;
- Providing quality control over all deliverables submitted to ILAB;
- Ensuring the Evaluation Team conducts the evaluation according to the TOR;

The Evaluation Team will conduct the evaluation according to the TOR. The Evaluation Team is responsible for accomplishing the following items:

- Receiving and responding to or incorporating input from the grantees and ILAB on the initial TOR draft;
- Finalizing and submitting the TOR and sharing concurrently with the grantees and ILAB;
- Reviewing project background documents;
- Reviewing the evaluation questions and refining them as necessary;
- Developing and implementing an evaluation methodology, including document review, KIIs and FGDs, and secondary data analysis, to answer the evaluation questions;
- Conducting planning meetings or calls, including developing a field itinerary, as necessary, with ILAB and grantees;
- Deciding the composition of field visit KII and FGD participants to ensure the objectivity of the evaluation;
- Developing an evaluation question matrix for ILAB;
- Scheduling meetings during the field visit and coordinating logistical arrangements (if applicable);
- Providing short field work exit briefings either verbally or in writing;
- Presenting preliminary results verbally to project field staff and other stakeholders as determined in consultation with ILAB and grantees;
- Preparing an initial draft of the evaluation report for ILAB and grantee review;
- Presenting draft findings from the draft report to ILAB, the grantee and other stakeholders as appropriate in a virtual workshop;
- Incorporating comments from ILAB and the grantee/other stakeholders into the final report, as appropriate.
- Developing a comment matrix addressing the disposition of all of the comments provided;
- Preparing and submitting the final report in English;
- Preparing and submitting the final Info Brief in English and Spanish.

ILAB is responsible for the following items:

- Launching the contract;

- Reviewing the TOR, providing input to the evaluation team as necessary, and agreeing on final draft;
- Providing project background documents to the evaluation team, in collaboration with the grantees;
- Obtaining country clearance from U.S. Embassy in fieldwork country;
- Briefing grantees on the upcoming field visit and working with them to coordinate and prepare for the visit;
- Reviewing and providing comments on the draft evaluation report;
- Approving the final draft of the evaluation report;
- Participating in the pre- and post-trip debriefing and interviews;
- Including the ILAB evaluation contracting officer's representative on all communication with the evaluation team;

The grantee is responsible for the following items:

- Reviewing the TOR, providing input to the evaluation team as necessary, and agreeing on the final draft;
- Providing project background materials to the evaluation team, in collaboration with ILAB;
- Preparing a list of recommended interviewees with feedback on the draft TOR;
- Participating in planning meetings or calls, including developing a field itinerary, as necessary, with ILAB and evaluator;
- Provide assistance (if applicable) with scheduling meetings during the field visit and coordinating logistical arrangements;
- Helping the evaluation team to identify and arrange for interpreters as needed to facilitate worker interviews;
- Reviewing and providing comments on the draft evaluation reports;
- Organizing, financing, and participating in the stakeholder debriefing meeting;
- Helping the evaluation team to identify in-country ground transportation to meetings and interviews;
- Including the ILAB program office on all written communication with the evaluation team.

H. TIMETABLE

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

Task	Responsible Party	Date
Evaluation launch call	DOL/OCFT	6/12/23
Background project documents sent to Contractor	DOL/OCFT	6/19/23
TOR Template submitted to Contractor	DOL/OCFT	6/14/23
Contractor and Grantee work to develop draft itinerary and stakeholder list	Contractor and Grantee	6/21/23 – 7/8/23
Logistics calls—Discuss logistics and field itinerary	Contractor and Grantee (DOL/OCFT as needed)	6/12/23 – 7/6/23
Contractor sends minutes from logistics call	Contractor	6/19/23

Task	Responsible Party	Date
Draft TOR sent to DOL/OCFT and Grantee	Contractor	6/30/23
DOL/OCFT and Grantee provide comments on draft TOR	DOL/OCFT and Grantee	7/14/23
Fieldwork budget submitted to DOL/OCFT	Contractor	8/11/23
Fieldwork budget approved by DOL/OCFT	DOL/OCFT	8/18/23
Finalize field itinerary and stakeholder list for workshop	DOL/OCFT, Contractor, and Grantee	8/7/23
Cable clearance information submitted to DOL/OCFT	Contractor	8/7/23
Final TOR submitted to DOL/OCFT for approval	Contractor	8/4/23
Question matrix submitted to DOL/OCFT for review	Contractor	7/28/23
Final approval of TOR by DOL/OCFT	DOL/OCFT	8/11/23
Submit finalized TOR to Grantee	Contractor	8/11/23
Interview call with DOL/OCFT	Contractor	8/7/23 – 8/25/23
Interview call with Grantee HQ staff	Contractor	8/7/23 – 8/25/23
Fieldwork for all 9 countries	Contractor	8/11/23– 9/30/23
Field exit briefing notes submitted to DOL/OCFT for India, Argentina and Kosovo	Contractor	9/19/23
Field exit briefing notes submitted to DOL/OCFT for the 6 remote countries	Contractor	10/9/23
Preliminary results workshop with grantee and DOL/OCFT	Contractor	10/9/23
Global Stakeholder Validation Workshop for Preliminary Findings	Contractor	10/19/23
Draft report (2-week review draft) submitted to DOL/OCFT and Grantee	Contractor	11/10/23
DOL/OCFT and Grantee/key stakeholder comments due to contractor after full 2-week review	DOL/OCFT	11/27/23
Revised report (Draft 2) in redline (2-week review draft) submitted to DOL/OCFT and Grantee demonstrating how all comments were addressed either via a comment matrix or other format	Contractor	12/11/23
DOL/OCFT and Grantee/key stakeholder comments due to contractor after full 2-week review	DOL/OCFT and Grantee	1/5/24
Final version of report in redline submitted to DOL/OCFT and Grantee demonstrating how all comments were addressed either via a comment matrix or other format	Contractor	1/15/24

Task	Responsible Party	Date
DOL/OCFT and Grantee provides concurrence that comments were addressed	DOL/OCFT and Grantee	1/23/24
Final report submitted to DOL/OCFT and Grantee	Contractor	1/26/24
Final approval of report by DOL/OCFT	DOL/OCFT	2/2/24
Draft infographic/brief document submitted to DOL/OCFT	Contractor	2/16/24
DOL/OCFT and grantee comments on draft infographic/brief	DOL/OCFT	3/1/24
Revised infographic/brief submitted to DOL/OCFT	Contractor	3/8/24
Final approval of infographic/brief by DOL/OCFT	DOL/OCFT	3/15/24
Editing and 508 compliance of final report and brief/infographic by contractor	Contractor	3/15/24 – 3/29/24
Final report and infographic/brief submitted to DOL/OCFT (508 compliant)	Contractor	4/2/24
Final approval of report and infographic/brief by DOL/OCFT (508 compliant)	DOL/OCFT	4/6/24
Final edited approved report and infographic/brief shared with grantee (508 compliant)	Contractor	4/6/24

1. EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

A first draft of the evaluation report will be submitted to the Contractor per the timeline detailed in the Timetable section. The report should have the following structure and content:

1. Table of Contents
2. List of Acronyms
3. Executive Summary (no more than **ten pages** providing an overview of the evaluation, summary of main results/lessons learned/emerging good practices, and key recommendations)
4. Evaluation Objectives
5. Project Description
6. Listing of Evaluation Questions
7. Findings
    a. The findings section includes the facts, analysis, and supporting evidence. The results section of the evaluation report should address the evaluation questions. It does not have to be in a question-response format, but should be responsive to each evaluation question.
8. Conclusions and Recommendations
    a. Conclusions: interpretation of the facts, including criteria for judgments

b. Lessons Learned and Emerging Good Practices[60]

c. Key Recommendations—critical for successfully meeting project objectives and/or judgments on what changes need to be made for sustainability or future programming

9. Recommendations (citing page numbers for evidence in the body of the report, listing out the supporting evidence for each recommendation, and identifying party that the recommendation is directed toward.) The key recommendations must be **action-oriented and implementable**. The recommendations should be clearly linked to results and directed to a specific party to be implemented. It is preferable for the report to contain no more than 10 recommendations, but other suggestions may be incorporated in the report in other ways.

10. Annexes –

a. List of documents reviewed;

b. Interviews (including list of stakeholder groups; without PII in web version)/meetings/site visits;

c. Stakeholder workshop agenda and participants;

d. TOR, Evaluation Methodology and Limitations;

The total length of the report should be approximately 75 pages for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

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

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

[60] An emerging *good practice* is a process, practice, or system highlighted in the evaluation reports as having improved the performance and efficiency of the program in specific areas. They are activities or systems that are recommended to others for use in similar situations. A *lesson learned* documents the experience gained during a program. They may identify a process, practice, or systems to avoid in specific situations

ANNEX C. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation team, with input from ILO and USDOL, developed 12 evaluation questions to guide the MAP 16 project final evaluation. The evaluation questions are organized according to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OEDC) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability).[61]

Relevance: The extent to which the project's objectives and design respond to the needs of beneficiaries and institutional needs, including their policies and priorities.
1. The midterm evaluation found the design was lacking coherence and that some opportunities for collaboration among the components had been missed. Acknowledging the project was designed with very separate components (outcomes), how did the project respond to the finding that opportunities for collaboration had been missed? 2. Do the project's four distinct components, including component #3's sub-components, respond to the needs in each country/objective? How might the project design be improved? 3. How has the project addressed the mid-term evaluation recommendation to incorporate a gender perspective? How has the project addressed equity and needs for inclusion of underrepresented groups in project activities? 4. How could the project design phase (both prior to award and during the CMEP process) have been improved to support a well-designed project?
Coherence: The compatibility of the project interventions with other interventions in a country, sector, or institution.
5. To what extent has the project established links and coordinated with other efforts to address child labor and forced labor by key tripartite plus organizations? How could the project improve coordination and collaboration with these organizations?
Effectiveness: The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.
6. To what extent did the project address the midterm evaluation finding regarding the lack of clear roles and responsibilities of project staff? 7. To what extent did the project achieve the targets for each component and sub-component? For Components 3.3 and 3.4, to what extent did the project achieve the country-level outcomes for those countries included in this final evaluation? What are the key internal or external factors that limited or facilitated the achievement of these components, sub-components, and country-level outcomes? 8. How can future project interventions build on and scale the achievements, including the facilitating factors, while addressing the limiting factors? For Component 1, research in Mongolia and RILAC and capacity-building in Fiji, India, and Niger will be assessed.

[61] https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

Impact: The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.
9. What have been the most important effects (positive, negative, intended, or unintended) of the four main components and research on CL risk indicators carried out under RILAC ?[62] 10. What could be done differently in the future to strengthen positive effects and improve on areas where the project was not as effective?
Efficiency: The extent to which the project intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.
11. What factors affected the project's efficiency (e.g., delays, changes in host governments, turnover of project staff, COVID-19), and how did the project respond to these factors?
Sustainability: The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue, on project resources' end.
12. Which of the project's components (1, 2, and 4) are most likely to be sustained and transferred to communities or relevant institutions when the project ends? Likewise, in general terms, what country-level outcomes for the nine countries included in the evaluation are most likely to be sustained?

EVALUATION TEAM

The core evaluation team consisted of the evaluation manager, lead evaluator, and four assistant evaluators. Ridhi Sahai, who served as the project manager, was responsible for managing the evaluation, including providing quality control oversight to deliverables, working to resolve operational issues, and acting as the point of contact between USDOL and NORC. Dan O'Brien served as the lead evaluator and was responsible for developing the data collection instruments and protocols, conducting interviews with stakeholders, analyzing data, and preparing the draft and final versions of the evaluation report. Dan conducted field work in Argentina and conducted virtual interviews with project and ILO staff in Geneva, with USDOL representatives in Washington DC, and with key stakeholders in Fiji, and Serbia. The four assistant evaluators collected data in specific countries. Driton Zeqire and Shankar Talwar conducted fieldwork in Kosovo and India, respectively. Manzo Rio-Rio Aminou conducted virtual interviews in Niger while Pyone Myat Thu conducted virtual interviews for Timor-Leste. Shankar Talwar also conducted virtual interviews with stakeholders in Sri Lanka. The evaluation team was also supported by two mixed-methods analysts, Mayumi Rezwan and McKinzie Davis, who assisted with coordination of data collection logistics and data analysis.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND SCHEDULE

EVALUATION APPROACH. The evaluation team used a mixed-methods evaluation design consisting of document reviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and an online perception survey. Evaluation fieldwork was conducted in person for Argentina, India, and Kosovo. Fieldwork was conducted remotely for Geneva, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste using video conference platforms such as Zoom and Microsoft Teams. The lead evaluator also interviewed RILAC representatives in Peru, Costa Rica, Argentina, and Mexico as well as

[62] Note that for RILAC, the evaluation will be looking at general project-wide impact and effects, intended or unintended based on information from one KII with RILAC POC in Peru, limited document review, and online survey responses from 2 of the 6 RILAC countries (Argentina and Mexico).

representatives of statistics offices in Mongolia and Nigeria where MAP 16 supported child labor and forced labor surveys.

The evaluation team used semistructured interview protocols, making adjustments based on interviewees' background, role in the project, and relevant knowledge. The evaluation team conducted key informant interviews with project staff and key stakeholders based in the ILO office in Geneva and those based in each of the six target countries. In addition, the evaluation team conducted focus group discussions with stakeholders in Kosovo and Niger. The team also obtained quantitative data from the project's documents and technical progress reports.

In addition to the document reviews and key informant interviews, NORC implemented an online perception survey using the Qualtrics platform. The lead evaluator used the findings from the survey to further triangulate data with the document reviews and key informant interviews data to strengthen the credibility and validity of the results. The lead evaluator incorporated the key findings of the online survey in the main evaluation report. The complete analysis of the online perception survey appears in Annex G.

EVALUATION SCHEDULE. The evaluation team developed the terms of reference (TOR), including key evaluation questions, methodology, data collection matrix, and tools between June and July 2023. The team conducted document reviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, data quality analysis, and the online perception survey between August 2023 and November 2023. After the first round of analyses, the team organized a workshop with relevant USDOL and ILO staff in November 2023 to solicit feedback on the preliminary findings from the evaluation and fill any information gaps for finalizing analyses. The evaluation team analyzed data and wrote the evaluation report between November and December 2023.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

DATA COLLECTION. The evaluation team developed the evaluation questions with input from USDOL and the MAP 16 project team. The evaluation questions were used to develop data collection guides and protocols. The data collection methods used by the evaluation team include:

DOCUMENT REVIEW. The evaluation team read numerous project documents and other reference publications, including the project document, monitoring and evaluation plan, technical progress reports (TPRs) and their annexes, cooperative agreement, project modifications, financial reports, and other supporting project materials obtained during the fieldwork component. Overall, the document reviews provided important background information for the evaluation. Annex A shows a complete list of documents reviewed.

KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS. The evaluation team interviewed 190 key informant stakeholders, including 91 females and 99 males. The following table shows the number of interviews for each country disaggregated by gender. A complete list of key informant interviewees by country is listed in Annex B.

Location and Interviewees	Male	Female	Total
Geneva			
MAP 16 HQ staff (full and part time)	5	4	9
Other ILO Staff	2	2	4

Location and Interviewees	Male	Female	Total
Argentina			
MAP 16 and ILO staff	2	1	3
Stakeholders	13	13	26
Costa Rica			
ILO, RILAC representative	0	1	1
Fiji			
MAP 16 and ILO staff	0	1	1
Stakeholders	11	10	21
India			
MAP 16 and ILO staff	1	2	3
Stakeholders	17	6	23
Kosovo			
MAP 16 and ILO staff	0	1	1
Stakeholders	14	12	26
Mexico			
Secretary of Labor/ILO point person/RILAC	1	0	1
Mongolia			
ILO staff	0	1	1
National Statistics Office	0	2	2
Niger			
MAP 16 and ILO staff	2	0	2
Stakeholders	4	3	7
Nigeria			
ILO consultant	0	1	1
Stakeholder (labor inspectorate)	0	2	2
Peru			

Location and Interviewees	Male	Female	Total
ILO, RILAC representative	0	1	1
Serbia			
MAP 16 and ILO staff	1	2	3
Stakeholders	1	13	14
Sri Lanka			
ILO staff	1	0	1
Stakeholders	3	4	7
Timor-Leste			
MAP 16 and ILO staff	1	2	3
Stakeholders	17	3	20
United States			
DOL staff	3	4	7
Total	99	91	190

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS. The evaluation team conducted focus group discussions (FGDs) in India and Kosovo. In India, the local evaluator conducted three focus group discussions with 24 representatives of civil society organizations working in skills development activities, Panchayat, and self-help groups. In Kosovo, the local evaluator conducted four focus group discussions with 22 representatives of the agriculture, education, child protection, and statistics sector and agencies. The following table shows the number of focus group discussion for each country, disaggregated by gender.

Country	Male	Female	Total
India			
FGD 1: Civil Society Organization (skills)	2	1	3
FGD 2: Panchayat (village government)	4	8	12
FGD 3: Self-help group members	0	9	9
India Total	6	18	24
Kosovo			
FGD 1: Agriculture—Municipal Advisors	4	1	5

Country	Male	Female	Total
FGD 2: Education—Teachers	3	1	4
FGD 3: Child Protection Officers	2	6	8
FGD 4: Kosovo Agency of Statistics	1	4	5
Kosovo Total	10	12	22
Grand Total	16	30	46

ONLINE PERCEPTION SURVEY. The evaluation team administered an online perception survey to project stakeholders using the Qualtrics platform. The survey was translated into the relevant languages, and personalized survey links were sent to participant email addresses or phone numbers, when applicable. The survey was sent to 1,757 stakeholders, 331 stakeholders responded for a response rate of 19 percent. However, of the 331 who responded, only 198 provided responses that could be used. The other 133 either did not participate in training provided by MAP 16 or did not finish the survey. So the effective utilization rate was only 11 percent. The survey was disseminated on October 9, 2023, and closed on November 8, 2023. The detailed survey analyses appear in Annex G.

DATA ANALYSIS. Qualitative data collected through interviews and the document reviews were analyzed using a matrix analysis to categorize, triangulate, synthesize, and summarize the raw data captured from the interview notes. Quantitative data collected from the TPRs were analyzed by comparing end-of-project indicator targets to actual achievements and calculating variances. The results of the data analysis provided tangible blocks of information, which the lead evaluator used to write the evaluation report. The wealth and variety of information collected allowed for high-level reinforcement and synthesis across sources to obtain a more cross-cutting and comprehensive analysis of the evaluation questions.

LIMITATIONS

The most significant limitation was conducting fieldwork in countries where MAP 16 activities ended and the national project coordinators were no longer available to contact stakeholders, schedule interviews, follow up with stakeholders to remind them about the interviews, and present the stakeholders to the evaluation team. This was the case in Argentina, Fiji, India, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste. To address this limitation in Argentina, the former national projector coordinator, who is coordinating another USDOL-funded project implemented by the ILO, agreed to take time to help schedule interviews and present the evaluation team to stakeholders. In Fiji, the project contracted the former national project coordinator to help schedule the interviews and follow up to remind the stakeholders about the interviews. In Sri Lanka, the ILO program manager, familiar with MAP 16, helped set up the interviews. Sri Lanka was the country with the lowest number of key informant interviews (five interviewees) and lowest response rate to the online perception survey (two respondents). In India, Kosovo, and Timor-Leste, the local evaluators scheduled the interviews without support from the ILO.

Another limiting factor was the remote fieldwork in Fiji, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste. In a few interviews, the signal was weak, which resulted in interference that made the conversation with stakeholders difficult to understand. To address this issue, the lead evaluator sent email messages to seek clarification on points in his notes, to ensure the notes represented what the interviewee intended to communicate.

The online perception survey sampling and effective utilization rate was yet another limiting factor. First, the evaluation team was limited by the participant lists provided from trainings, as some had missing or unusable contact information. As a result, participants from such lists may not have been reached by the survey. Further, some training lists only provided phone numbers instead of e-mail addresses, and in some instances, these lists were too large to feasibly reach out to every individual by phone. In these cases, the evaluation team took a random sample from these lists, and as a result, the remaining participants were not reached by the survey.

Despite these limitations, the evaluation team took concrete measures to ensure key stakeholders identified by the project as receiving training received the online survey and had an opportunity to respond. Nevertheless, on the 1,757 surveys sent to stakeholders, only 198 (11 percent) completed the survey in a manner that could be used by the evaluation team in the analysis.

ANNEX D. MAP-16 RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Critical Assumptions:

- **The govs are willing to cooperate with ILO to incorporate CL data collection and analysis into regular stat programs.**
- **Priorities of gov on CL and FL remain unchanged**
- **Potential social, economic, political, and environmental factors do not have significant negative influence in the achievement of project outcomes.**

Goal: 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

Project-Level Objective: The MAP Project will accelerate progress in support of efforts to eliminate child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking

Outcome 1: Improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking

Sub-outcome 1.1.A

Improved survey methods and data tools to support research on child

- 1.1 .1 SIMPOC questionnaire revised version developed.
- 1.1.2 Member States' reporting templates on child labor and hazardous work improved.
- 1.1.3 Manuals to estimate sample size for child labor and forced labor developed.
- 1.1.4 Core forced labor survey questions and question catalogue developed.
- 1.1.5 Forced labor question-naires and sampling tools piloted in 6 forced labor country/ sectorial surveys.
- 1.1.6 Recom-mendations/ suggestions/ proposals on the development and refinement of survey tools on CL and FL developed by the Project International Advisory Board.
- 1.1.7 Toolkit on mixed-methods approaches for child labor and forced labor research developed.
- 1.1.8 Methodology and criteria by which we can consider a country as approaching elimination of CL and sustain near-elimination.
- 1.1.9 Detailed training curriculum on research on child labor and forced labor designed.
- 1.1.10 Forced labor measurement guidelines submitted to the ICLS and published in English, French, and Spanish.

Sub-outcome 1.1.B. Increased Member States' sustainability of child labor data collection, analysis & reporting.

- 1.1.13. Strategic engagement with member states to improve and/or integrate child labor data collection into their regular statistical programs.

Sub-outcome 1.2
Improved data and evidence in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor and human trafficking.

- 1.2.1 Quantitative reports on forced labor, forced labor in illicit activities, forced marriage and children associated with armed forces developed.
- 1.2.2 Quantitative report on child labor in sugar (Panama), vanilla (Madagascar), and various crops (Burma) published.
- 1.2.3 Research methodologies on selected CL, and FL supply chains tested and published.
- 1.2.4 Global report on the prevalence of child labor in global supply chains developed and published.
- 1.2.5 Global report on the long-term impact of CL on education, health, future employment, and the economic and social costs associated with CL and FL developed and published.
- 1.2.6 Global report on emerging areas of vulnerability: CL and FL impact on inequality and informality developed and published.
- 1.2.7 Global country-level child labor indicators produced and communicated.

Critical Assumptions:
- **Users groups are willing to take up and use ILO knowledge products on CL and FL.**
- **Priorities of governments on CL and FL remain unchanged.**
- **Potential social, economic, political, and environmental factors do not have significant negative influence in the achievement of project outcomes.**

Outcome 2: Improved application of knowledge in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor.

Sub-outcome 2.1 Increased engagement between knowledge producers and end-users in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor.

2.1.1 Knowledge mobilization of key project research.

2.1.2 Digital resources to support knowledge mobilization developed and operating.

Sub-outcome 2.2

Increased awareness and engagement of the identified group in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor.

2.2.1 Storytelling and advocacy strategies developed.

Critical Assumptions:
- **The regional entities, businesses, governments, workers, employers, and civil society and other stakeholders are committed to eliminating child labor and forced labor through providing their own human and financial resources.**
- **Priorities of governments on CL and FL remain unchanged.**
- **Potential social, economic, political, and environmental factors do not have significant negative influence in the achievement of project outcomes.**

Goal: 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.

Project-Level Objective: The MAP Project will accelerate progress in support of efforts to eliminate child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

The MAP Project will increase knowledge, raise awareness, strengthen capacity, and support policy engagement in efforts to achieve SDG Target 8.7.

Outcome 3: Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' organizations, and relevant entities to combat CL, FL, and human trafficking through national, regional, and global initiatives.

Sub-outcome 3.1 Increased capacity of sugar and fishing stakeholders to improve policies.

3.1.1 Policy engagement on fishing sector (to be formulated).

3.1.2 Policy engagement on sugarcane sector (to be formulated).

Sub-outcome 3.2 Increased capacity at regional level in at least 2 regions to combat CL and FL.

3.2.1: Capacity of African regional initiative on child labor and forced labor strengthened.

3.2.2: Capacity of LAC regional initiative on child labor and forced labor strengthened.

Sub-outcome 3.3 Improved country capacity to address CL.

3.3.1 Colombia and 3.3.2 India and 3.3.3 Jordan See separated RF below.

Sub-outcome 3.4 Improved country capacity to address CL in 10 additional countries.

3.3.4.1 to 3.3.4.11 To be completed upon the planning phase at each country.

Critical Assumptions:

- **The partners, such as other UN agencies, businesses, etc., are willing to work in partnership, sharing knowledge, and are receptive to learn.**
- **Priorities of governments on CL and FL remain unchanged.**
- **Potential social, economic, political, and environmental factors do not have significant negative influence in the achievement of project outcomes.**

Goal: 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.

Project-Level Objective: The MAP 16 Project will accelerate progress in support of efforts to eliminate child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

Outcome 4: Strengthened partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

4.1.1 A side event at the IV Global Conference organized to showcase the regions' good practices and lessons learned.

4.1.2 Financial support to the communication strategy of the IV Global Conference on Child Labor and Forced Labor.

4.1.3: Alliance 8.7 action groups have been established.

4.1.4: Templatesa, guidance notes, and tools developed for operation of action groups.

4.1.5 Advocacy and communication materials developed to promote engagement in the Alliance 8.7.

4.1.6 NGO forum under the Alliance 8.7 held with the project technical and logistical support

4.1.7 Technical advice to the CLP Members in pilot countries engagement in the CLP at country level.

4.1.8 Advocacy and communication materials developed to support companies' engagement in the CLP at country level.

4.1.9 The Global Business Network on Forced Labor and Human Trafficking has been established.

4.1.10 Advocacy and communication materials developed to support companies' engagement in Global Business Network on Forced Labor and Human trafficking.

4.1.11. Joint ILO-UNICEF activities developed on child labor in humanitarian settings and migration context, under existing letter of intent, covering joint research, advocacy, knowledge dissemination and advocacy.

ANNEX E. ANALYSIS OF PROJECT PERFORMANCE

The follow analysis of MAP 16 performance is focused on the outcomes, sub-outcomes, and outputs. Project performance is assessed using the indicators and their targets listed in the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP) and reported in the technical progress reports (TPRs).

PROJECT OBJECTIVE

The overall project objective states: *The MAP 16 Project will accelerate progress in support of efforts to eliminate child labor, forced labor and human trafficking*. The evaluation team was not able to assess the achievement of the project objective's indicator target because indicators were not set. Nevertheless, based on the achievement of the project's outcomes, sub-outcomes, and outputs, the evaluation team believes that MAP 16 made an important contribution to efforts to eliminate child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

Outcome 1

Figure 1 shows Outcome 1 and its sub-outcomes (SOs). It also show the indicator, end-of-project indicator target, achievement, and overall performance status. It should be noted that Outcome 1 and SO 1.1 A and SO 1.2 do not have indicators to assess performance. Instead the evaluation team assessed the achievement of the outputs.

Figure 6: Outcome 1, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements

Outcomes and Indicators	Target	Achieved	Status
Outcome 1: Improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.			
SO 1.1. A: Improved survey methods and data tools to support research on child labor and forced labor and human trafficking.			
SO 1.1. B: Increased member states' sustainability of child labor data collection, analysis, and reporting			
Indicator: Number of member states that implement activities on child labor data collection, analysis, and reporting based on strategic engagements with the project.	5	6	+1
SO 1.2: Improved data and evidence in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor and human trafficking.			

Sub-outcome 1.1.A. has 15 output indicators focused on improved survey methods and improved data collection tools, as shown below in Figure 2. The project either met or exceeded 10 of the output indicators. Output 5, forced labor questionnaires and sampling tools, consists of three different output indicators. The project met or exceeded two of the output targets leaving one that was not achieved yet. Overall, the project has achieved a 67 percent of the output indicators under SO 1.1.A.

Figure 7: Sub-outcome 1.1.A Outputs, Targets, and Achievements

Outputs	Target	Achieved	Status
1. A SIMPOC questionnaire revised version	1	2	Questionnaire for stand-alone child labor surveys and modular questionnaire were completed.

Outputs	Target	Achieved	Status
2. Number of member states that report on child labor and hazardous work using templates developed by the project	5	5	Reporting templates used in Serbia, Mongolia, Mali, Nigeria, and Burkina Faso.
3. Number of manuals to estimate sample size for child labor and forced labor	1	1	Sampling manual for Phase I and Phase II were completed.
4. A set of questions and associated counting rules for identification of forced labor in forced labor surveys	1	2	Questionnaire and counting rules tested in Nigeria and Mongolia and finalized.
5. Forced labor questionnaires and sampling tools piloted in 6 forced labor country/ sectorial surveys	5	5	Countries that have designed forced labor surveys include Malawi, Brazil, Vietnam, Nigeria, Uganda, and Mongolia.
5.1. Number of governments or social partners who designed a national or sectoral forced labor survey and have an implementation plan with support of the project	5	6	Data collection completed in Brazil, Malawi, Nigeria, Uganda, Mongolia, and Vietnam.
5.2. Number of governments or social partners who collected data for a national or sectoral forced labor survey with support of the project 5.3 Number of governments or social partners who published survey reports with support of the project	4	1	Only one survey published thus far in Uganda. Brazil is preparing the publication of a survey. Others are being developed in Malawi, Mongolia, and Nigeria.
6. Number of the project International Advisory Board (IAB) meetings reports with recommendations, suggestions, and/or proposals on the development and refinement of survey tools	3	6	Six IAB meetings were conducted.
7. A toolkit on mixed-methods approaches for child labor and forced labor research	1	0	Ongoing. ILO is preparing a draft toolkit to be shared with USDOL.
8. A report on methodology and criteria by which we can consider a country as approaching elimination of child labor and sustain near-elimination	1	0	To date, case studies were completed in Sri Lanka and Costa Rica.
9. Detailed training curriculum on research on child labor and forced labor	1	0	Ongoing. ILO intends to make the training curriculum available online by October 2023.
10. Forced labor measurement guidelines submitted to the International Conference for Labour Statistics (ICLS)	1	1	Forced labor measurement guidelines completed and submitted to ICLS.
11. Forced labor measurement manual for implementing the guidelines	1	0	Ongoing. ILO plans to launch the manual in early 2024.
12. Technical assistance for data analysis activities at three- and four-digit ISIC and ISCO code levels	1	3	ILO provided three virtual workshops to USDOL on child labor measurement standards and indicators.
13. Number of member states that establish strategic engagements with the project to improve and/or integrate child labor data collection into their regular statistical programs.	6	6	To date, implementation agreement signed with Chile, Mexico, Serbia, Nigeria, Mongolia, and Burkina Faso.

Sub-outcome 1.1.B. As shown in Figure 1, the indicator for SO 1.1.B is the number of member states that implement activities on child labor data collection, analysis, and reporting, based on strategic engagements with the project. The project set a target of five and achieved six: Chile, Mexico, Serbia, Nigeria, Mongolia, and Burkina Faso.

SO 1.1.B. also has one output: the number of member states that establish strategic engagements with the project to improve and/or integrate child labor data collection into their regular statistical programs. The project set a target of six and achieved six: Chile, Mexico, Serbia, Nigeria, Mongolia, and Burkina Faso.

Sub-outcome 1.2. While SO 1.2 does not have an indicator to measure achievement, it does have seven outputs that provide some insight as to what was achieved, as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 8: Sub-outcome 1.2 Outputs, Targets, and Achievements

Outputs	Target	Achieved	Status
1. Quantitative reports on forced labor, forced labor in illicit activities, forced marriage, and children associated with armed forces	1	1	Global Estimates Modern Slavery, Forced Labour, and Forced Marriage report produced by ILO, IOM, and Walkfree.
2. Quantitative surveys on child labor in sugar (Panama), vanilla (Madagascar) and various crops (Burma) published	3	4	Surveys conducted as planned for sugar in Panama and vanilla in Madagascar. The surveys in Myanmar were canceled due to the political situation. Instead, surveys were conducted for child labor in cobalt mining in DRC and child labor and forced labor in the production of acai in Brazil. A survey in the Philippines was eventually canceled. Due to a heavy workload, the Institute of Labour Studies did not have the time and human resources to commit to the survey in 2023.
3. Number of research reports on selected child labor and forced labor in supply chains	3	3	Research reports produced for forestry in Argentina, electronics in Vietnam, and fishing in South Africa and Indonesia.
4. Global report on the prevalence of child labor in global supply chains	1	2	These include “Ending child labour, forced labour and human trafficking in global supply chains” published by the ILO, OECD, IOM, and UNICEF and the related methodological report.
5. Global report on the long-term impact of child labor on education, health, future employment, and the economic and social costs associated with child labor and forced labor	1	0	The drafting of the global report is ongoing.
6. Global report on emerging areas of vulnerability: child labor and forced labor impact on inequality and informality	1	1	The global report took the form of four papers examining vulnerabilities to child labor that formed a synthesis publication for the V Global Conference on Child Labor.
7. Number of country-level core child labor indicator sets produced and shared with USDOL	30	201	201 country-level core child labor indicator sets were produced in 134 countries.

The project met or achieved six of the seven output targets for an achievement rate of 86 percent. One of the most noteworthy achievements in the number of country-level core child

labor indicator sets (Output 7) where the project set a target of 30 and achieved 201 indicator sets in 134 countries. It should be noted that the country-level core child labor indicator sets are part of a larger effort to produce child labor indicators for monitoring progress, including the ILO STAT database on child labor, SDG 8.7.1 reporting, and the ILO-UNICEF Child Labour Global Estimates.

Outcome 1 Summary Performance Assessment

SO 1.1.B, increased member states sustainability of child labor data collection, analysis and reporting, was achieved since the project achieved its target of five member states that implement child labor or forced labor data collection and analysis activities. To assess SO 1.1.A and SO 1.2, the evaluation team had to assess achievement rates of the output targets for each SO. The output achievement rate for SO 1.1.A is 67 percent while the achievement rate for SO 1.2 is 86 percent that suggests both SOs have been mostly achieved. **Based on these achievements, the overall outcome of improved knowledge base on child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking has also been mostly achieved.**

Outcome 2

Figure 4 shows Outcome 2, its two SOs, the SO indicators, indicator targets, achievements against the indicator target, and the overall performance status. Outcome 2 had one indicator, the number of uses of knowledge products by stakeholders. The project set a target of 12 and reported that it achieved 12. In September 2022, the ILO released the Global Estimates of Modern Slavery as one its primary knowledge products. The project counted presentations (slide decks) and references to the publication in various articles and technical papers. These account for the 12 uses of knowledge products.

Figure 9: Outcome 2, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements

Outcomes and Indicators	Target	Achieved	Status
Outcome 2: Improved application of knowledge in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor.			
Indicator: Number of uses of knowledge products by stakeholders.	12	12	0
SO 2.1: Increased engagement between knowledge producers and end-users in support of efforts to eliminate child labor and forced labor.			
Indicator: Number of users that access the ILO and Alliance 8.7 websites and social media accounts for the knowledge products developed by the project.	6,000	123,000	+117,000
Indicator: Number of individuals who attended activities about project knowledge products.	2,250	2,500	+250
SO 2.2: Increased awareness and engagement of the target group in support of efforts to eliminate child labor.			

SO 2.1. This SO had two indicators. The first is the number of users that access the ILO and Alliance 8.7 websites and social media accounts for the knowledge products developed by the project. The project set a target of 6,000 users who access ILO and Alliance 8.7 and achieved 123,000. According to project staff, the indicator target was overachieved by so much because

when it was set, there were no baseline data available to help determine whether the targets were realistic. In addition, the International Year for the Elimination of Child Labour, which was not envisioned when the target was set, generated interest that drove a high number of users to the Alliance 8.7 website and social media.

The second indicator is the number of individuals who attended activities about project knowledge products. The project set a target of 2,250 and achieved 2,500 persons who attended activities about knowledge products. These include virtual events held online that started during the COVID-19 pandemic and continued afterwards.

In addition to the two indicators, SO 2.1 had two outputs shown below in Figure 5. Output 1, knowledge mobilization of project research, had four indicators covering production, dissemination, and use of the knowledge products. While the project reported an overachievement of materials produced and disseminated, it significantly underachieved on two outputs: number of ILO and non-ILO persons using the knowledge mobilization tool and the storytelling tool. The project set a target of 75 persons for each tool (150 combined) and only achieved 9 each (18 total).

According to project staff, the COVID-19 pandemic delayed the production of materials that, along with other issues, contributed to the underachievement of these two outputs. Furthermore, these tools were not adapted to the realities of ILO's work and ILO staff. Rather than continue with the knowledge mobilization and storytelling tools, the project decided to adjust the content to better meets the needs of ILO staff and convert the information to online training courses to be hosted by the ILO's International Training Centre in Turin. The courses will be offered to ILO employees free of charge. At the time of the evaluation, the training courses were being developed.

Figure 10: Sub-outcome 2.1 Outputs, Targets, and Achievements

Outputs	Target	Achieved	Status
1: Knowledge mobilization of key project research **1.1:** Number of complementary materials produced	9	11	Eleven complementary materials were produced such as summaries of the various global reports.
1.2: Number of activities conducted about project knowledge products	11	12	They organized 12 events to disseminate information from the global reports.
1.3: Number of users using the knowledge mobilization tool[63]	75	9	The knowledge mobilization tool is in the process of being converted to an online training course.
1.4: Number of users using the storytelling tool[64]	75	9	The storytelling tools are in the process of being converted into an online training course.

[63] Includes both ILO and non-ILO audiences.

[64] Includes both ILO and non-ILO audiences.

Outputs	Target	Achieved	Status
2: Number of digital products to support knowledge mobilization developed	5	5	The digital products include the Alliance 8.7 website, digital summaries of the Global Estimates of Modern Slavery publication, digital summaries of the Global Estimates of Child Labour publication, knowledge mobilization tool, and the pathfinder platform.[65]

SO 2.2. This SO does not have indicators that can be used to measure its achievement. To assess performance of this sub-outcome, the evaluators analyzed output indicator achievement. Figure 6 shows the output and its two indicators. The first indicator is the IPEC+ 2021 advocacy strategy, which the project reported as achieved. The second indicator is the number of impact stories produced. The project set of target of 10 stories and achieved 10, which are available on the Alliance 8.7 website.

Figure 11: Sub-outcome 2.2 Output, Target, and Achievement

Output	Target	Achieved	Status
1: Storytelling and advocacy strategies developed	1	1	The IPEC+ 2021 advocacy strategy was developed as planned.
1.1: IPEC+ 2021 advocacy strategy developed **1.2:** Number of impact stories produced	10	10	Ten impact stories were produced and are available on the Alliance 8.7 website: https://www.alliance87.org/stories

Outcome 2 Summary Performance Assessment

The project met its overall outcome indicator target of the number of uses of the knowledge products. It also significantly exceeded the indicator target for SO 2.1 (number of persons who accessed ILO and Alliance 8.7 websites) and exceeded the indicator target for SO 2.2 (number of persons who attended knowledge product events). While the project met one output target for SO 2.1, it did not achieve the other output target. Under SO 2.2, the project achieved its output targets. In addition, the project reached a large number of persons through the Alliance 8.7 website, physical and virtual events, and social media. However, it is not clear to what extent these achievements translated into the application of knowledge to address child labor and forced labor because the project did not have a mechanism in place to measure the extent to which the knowledge and knowledge products were used.

Outcome 3

Figure 7 shows Outcome 3 and its four SOs. The project did not develop an indicator for SO 3.1. While it did develop indicators for SO 3.2 and SO 3.3, the project did not set indicator targets. One possible explanation, according to USDOL representatives, is that the project decided to wait to establish indicators and targets given the uncertainty at the beginning of the project about how these outcomes would develop, but never returned to develop them.

[65] Project staff noted that the Alliance 8.7 website can be considered to be three or four separate digital products.

Figure 12: Outcome 3, Sub-outcomes, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievement

Outcomes and Indicators	Target	Achieved	Status
Outcome 3: Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations, and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking through national, regional, and global initiatives.			
SO 3.1: Increased capacity of sugar and fishing stakeholders to improve policies.			
SO 3.2: Increased capacity at regional level in at least two regions to combat child labor and forced labor.			
Indicator: Number of regions with increased capacity to address child labor.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SO 3.3: Improved country capacity to address child labor: Colombia, India, and Jordan.			
Indicator: Number of countries with increased capacity to address child labor or forced labor.	0	0	0
SO 3.4: Improved country capacity in 10 other countries.			
No LogFrame			

SO 3.1. Since SO 3.1 did not have an indicator and target, it was not possible for the evaluation team to assess indicator achievement. It should be noted that since the project did not address capacity in the sugar sector, increased capacity of sugar stakeholders is not relevant. For the fishing sector, the project collaborated with Cornell University to complete a third iteration of a handbook to detect forced labor in the sector. This iteration is more operational and provides guidance to users. At the time of the evaluation, the handbook was under final review by the ILO. However, it is too early to say whether the handbook increased capacity of fishing stakeholders to improve policies, although both ILO and USDOL representatives are highly optimistic about its potential to increase capacity.

SO 3.2. While SO 3.2 included an indicator, it did not have a target, making it difficult to assess achievement. Instead, the evaluation team reviewed its two outputs, shown below in Figure 8. The project met the first output target and significantly exceeded the second output target.

Figure 13: Sub-outcome 3.2 outputs, Target, and Achievement

Outputs	Target	Achieved	Status
1: Regional action plan on child labor, forced labor, modern slavery, and human trafficking endorsed by the African Union	1	1	Developed a regional action plan on child labor, forced labor, modern slavery, and human trafficking that was endorsed by the African Union.
2: Capacity of RILAC strengthened: number of risk assessment models validated with country participation	3	11	Developed child labor risk assessment models for 11 countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Jamaica, México, Paraguay, and Peru.

SO 3.3. SO 3.3 aimed to increase the capacity of Colombia, India, and Jordan to address child labor and forced labor. The project closed in Colombia and Jordan, leaving India, which is one

of the target countries for this final evaluation. In India, MAP 16 had a logical framework that listed three outcomes with indicators. To assess increased capacity to address child labor and forced labor in India, the three outcome indicators are analyzed below.

Figure 14: India Outcomes, Indicators, Targets, and Achievement

Outcomes and Indicators	Target	Achieved	Status
Outcome 1: Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations, and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking through national, regional, and global initiatives.			
Indicator: Number of government schemes planning documents relevant for child labor that incorporate convergence measures.	0	0	-8
Outcome 2: Improved capacity to collect and analyze child labor data at the state and district levels.			
Indicator: Number of state statistical offices that use the updated survey questionnaire.	3	0	-3
Outcome 3: Targeted state governments have strengthened capacity and knowledge base on child labor and its worst forms.			
Indicator: Number of government agencies at the state and district level that are incorporating the capacities and knowledge base developed with the project support in action plans/policies/programs on child labor.	3	1	-2

The indicator for **Outcome 1** was number of government schemes planning documents relevant for child labor that incorporate convergence measures.[66] The project set a target of eight. The project reported that it identified eight government schemes (education, health, skill development, employment, rural housing, financial inclusion, social welfare, and child protection programs) for inclusion in convergence measures in its three target states (Bihar, Chhattisgarh, and Uttar Pradesh). However, the evaluation team could not find evidence that any of the three target states' planning documents relevant to child labor incorporated convergence measures. The evaluation team did find evidence that the project took steps to pilot/implement convergence measures in Bihar. The project also reported that the convergence measures and other learnings from Bihar were incorporated in the draft of Uttar Pradesh's child labor policy.

The indicator for **Outcome 2** was the number of state statistical offices that used the updated survey questionnaire. It should be noted that India does maintain child labor data at the national level. It does not have a stand-alone child labor survey to capture child labor information nor does the national census have specific child labor questionnaires. The most recent data available on child labor come from the 2011 census, which is outdated.

[66] Convergence measures is a term used in India to describe combining government social programs to create synergies that have more impact on poverty. The project uses convergence measures to describe the convergence or combining of key social services targeted at child labor families such as education, health, skill development, employment, rural housing, financial inclusion, social welfare and child protection.

To help ensure availability of recent child labor data, the project initially planned to update relevant sections of the National Child Labour Project (NCLP) survey questionnaire, which the government circulated in December 2017 that it expected district project societies to implement. However, due to a lack of interest, the project decided to abandon the plan to update the existing survey instruments. Instead, the project decided to conduct an analysis of child labor data in the Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS) and Time Use Survey (TUS) to estimate the status of working children below 18 years of age.

While the analysis was completed, USDOL and the ILO decided not to publish the results of the analysis to estimate the status of working children for several reasons. First, the PLFS asks questions about whether children either work or attend school but does not capture whether children are combining work and school, which is common. This is due to the questionnaire design. By not capturing information on children who combine work and school, PLFS misses a large number of children who attend school but also are involved in child labor. On the other hand, while the TUS captures the information on children who combine work and school, it does not collect information on industry or occupations that are important to measure child labor. Next, the analysis of the PLFS data reaches the conclusion that child labor is decreasing in India, which, according to USDOL and the ILO, is a claim that cannot be supported by the PLFS. Finally, the Government of India did not provide MAP 16 and the ILO an indication that it would approve the publication of the analytical report.

The indicator for **Outcome 3** was the number of government agencies at the state and district level that are incorporating the capacities and knowledge base developed with the project support in action plans/policies/programs on child labor. The project reported that it was able to work with the state government in Uttar Pradesh to incorporate child labor knowledge into its action plan. According to project staff, the states of Bihar and Chhattisgarh were not in the process of developing action plans.

Also under Outcome 3, the project trained university students on child labor issues. Nineteen persons responded to questions in the online perception survey about training relevance, effectiveness, and utilization (see Annex G for a complete presentation of the survey findings). Eighty-nine percent responded that the training was either highly relevant (31 percent) or relevant (47 percent). Sixteen percent thought the training was somewhat or not relevant. Sixty-eight percent believe that that the training was effective, and 26 percent thought it was highly effective. All 19 respondents reported using the new knowledge and skills. Seventy-nine percent often use them while 21 percent somewhat use them.

In addition to the three outcomes discussed above, MAP 16 in India consisted of 12 outputs as shown below in Figure 12.

Figure 15: India Outcomes, Outputs, Targets, and Achievements

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Outcome 1: Strengthened policies and improved capacity of governments, national authorities, employers' and workers' organizations, and other relevant entities to combat child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking through national, regional, and global initiatives.	
Output 1: Benefit package that bundles all government schemes relevant for children engaged in child labor and their families designed.	Completed

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Output 2: Report on the recommended budget allocations for the child labor benefit package that bundles relevant government schemes produced.	Not completed
Output 3: Technical support for the adoption of the child labor benefit package provided.	Completed
Output 4: National Policy on Child Labour revised.	Not completed
Outcome 2: Improved capacity to collect and analyze child labor data at the state and district levels.	
Output 1: Updated child labor survey questionnaire—technical support for CL estimates, assessment, and survey.	Changed to PLFS and TUS analysis: Completed
Output 2: Technical assistance for district-level child labor survey reports based on the updated survey questionnaire(s) delivered.	Changed to TA to analyze PLFS and TUS data: Completed
Output 3: Trainings implemented on updated child labor definitions, relevant concepts, and survey questionnaire.	Completed
Outcome 3: Targeted state governments have strengthened capacity and knowledge base on child labor and its worst forms.	
Output 1: A capacity assessment of the state-level stakeholders involved in child labor issues implemented.	Completed
Output 2: Trainings for national, state, and district-level stakeholders involved in child labor issues carried out.	Partially completed
Output 3: Lessons learned and best practices in eliminating child labor disseminated.	Completed
Output 4: Technical assistance to raise public awareness of child labor issues provided.	Completed
Output 5: Outreach activities to target child labor families in states/districts.	Completed

Outcome 1 included four outputs. The first output aimed to design a benefit package that bundled all government schemes relevant for children engaged in child labor and their families for the three target states of Bihar, Chhattisgarh, and Uttar Pradesh. The project mapped 55 government schemes and, in consultation with state officials, chose eight for inclusion in the benefit package for the three target states. Next, it conducted an analysis of these schemes that culminated in a report on bundling government schemes. This led to pilot activities in Bihar to determine how best to implement the schemes. To identify potential conflicts in the government schemes, such as differences in eligibility criteria, the project worked with community volunteers to consult households with child laborers in Chhattisgarh and Bihar. The results of these consultations (learnings and challenges) were shared with the district officials and used to modify the benefit package. The project reported that it provided technical support

to the three state governments to strengthen implementation of the schemes in the benefit package.

The second output intended to report on recommended budget allocations for the child labor benefit package. Under this output, the project planned to analyze child labor-related expenditures in the three states and develop a report on the required budget amounts to support the benefit package. These activities were canceled because the states did not want to share the financial information with the project. Instead, the project reviewed and analyzed the Government of India budget for 2023–2024, which includes a section on scheme allocation for the welfare of children.

The third output focused on providing technical support for the adoption of the child labor benefit package. The first step was to advocate that the target state governments adopt the child benefit package. The advocacy included working with labor commissioners in Chhattisgarh and Uttar Pradesh to write letters of support for the benefit package. The advocacy was directed at the district level administrations and Panchayat Raj. The project also conducted workshops with stakeholders in the target states to develop strategies to strengthen approaches to eliminate child labor in the state action plans.

The fourth output aimed to revise the national policy on child labor. The project developed a concept note on the need for revising the child labor policy that it shared with Strategic Development Goal 8.7 platform members in India. The project presented the concept note at a national event organized by the *Campaign Against Child Labour*. In addition, the project met with the Ministry of Labour and Employment to discuss the child labor policy and, more specifically, the draft report on estimation of working children in India using the Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS) and Time Use Survey (TUS) that are presented and discussed below under Outcome 2. Despite these efforts, the National Policy on Child Labour was not revised as planned because the revision requires more consensus among the various stakeholders.

Outcome 2 had three outputs. The first was an updated child labor survey questionnaire. As explained above, the project had to abandon the plan to update the NCLP child labor questionnaire due to a lack of interest. To address national data gap on child labor, the project conducted an analysis of the PLFS and TUS data. The analysis also aimed to enhance the capacity of the government and research institutes/academics to analyze child labor data. USDOL and the ILO decided not to publish the analytical report due to data quality issues.

The second output aimed to provide technical assistance for district-level surveys. Since the project shifted from updating the child labor survey questionnaire to an analysis of PLFS and TUS data, the project did not provide technical assistance to the three target states on district-level surveys. Instead, the project hired an expert consultant who helped analyze PLFS and TUS data and conducted district-level workshops in Chhattisgarh and Uttar Pradesh to present the results of the analysis of available data on child labor.

Under Output 3, the project provided training on updated child labor definitions and other child labor concepts. One of the major activities included the development of child labor and forced labor awareness-raising materials and conduct activities using the materials for villages in MAP 16 target districts in Chhattisgarh. These activities included a poster campaign, promotional banners for housing societies, and community meetings with village government and leaders. The project collaborated with the Indian Association for Women Studies (IAWS) to

conduct awareness-raising training for students and faculty in 18 universities as well as workshops for state and district-level government officials in the three target states.[67]

Outcome 3 consisted of five outputs. The first focused on implementing a capacity assessment of state-level stakeholders involved with child labor issues. The project issued a contract to one implementing partner in each target state to conduct a capacity assessment. Based on the assessment, the project developed, in collaboration with respective state labor departments, a training plan to build the capacity of key stakeholders in each state. The project provided technical support to Uttar Pradesh to revise its state action plan for elimination of child labor. The project also collaborated with line departments, police, NGOs working on child rights, and academia covering 50 districts to document best practices and challenges that fed into the draft revised State Action Plan of Uttar Pradesh.

Under Output 2, the project updated child labor training materials so they were consistent with ILO Conventions 138 and 182 and provided training to these stakeholders. The project also collaborated with the India Association of Women Studies (IAWS) to train university students online. The third output documented lessons learned and best practices in eliminating child labor and disseminated them as part of the program organized by the *Campaign Against Child Labour* in New Delhi. The project also disseminated lessons and best practices from field-level interventions to district officials, civil society organizations, community leaders, and other stakeholders in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, and Chhattisgarh. Finally, the project—with support from the ILO India's communication officer—developed and published an impact story taken from experiences in Bihar.

The project provided technical assistance to raise public awareness on child labor issues under Output 4. The project updated existing awareness-raising materials, translated them into Hindi. The project also collaborated with UNICEF to conduct the 2021 World Day Against Child Labor (WDACL) national webinar where government, trade unions, employers, and NGOs participated. In 2022 the project launched a poster campaign against child labor in collaboration with the State Government of Chhattisgarh, followed by selection of 10 Gram Panchayats in Balodabazar district for focused interventions through the Child Protection Committees (CPC). As a result, 5,224 children between the ages of 6 and 18 were identified and 10 percent reached as part of a survey implemented by the CPC. Families of the surveyed children were identified, and 1,987 applications were made under different social protection schemes.

State-level workshops to raise awareness were organized in 2023 in collaboration with trade unions and civil society organizations. In Bihar, the project collaborated with the Indian National Trade Union Congress (INTUC—Bihar) to organize a public awareness program in Gaya to disseminate MAP 16 learnings from pilot interventions and discuss strategies to eliminate child labor. A total of 150 people participated in the event, including representatives of the labor department, workers from hotel/roadside eateries, street vendors, domestic and construction sector, people's representatives, and school-going children. The output of the meeting was the adoption of a resolution by the trade union to include child labor elimination in its mandate.

Under Output 5, the project conducted outreach activities to target child labor families in the target states and districts. In Bihar, the project implemented a unique model of collaboration

[67] IAWS is a registered society which undertakes collaborative activities with universities, women's studies centers, and other institutions/organizations to promote discussion of sexual division of labor, gender, and the intersection of these with caste, class, region, religion and ethnicity

that included district administration officials as well as the Workers Information and Support Centre (WISC), Jan Shikshan Sansthan, and community volunteers working in collaboration to empower child labor families through outreach services linking eligible child labor families with government services.[68] The project linked 200 child labor families with government services. In addition, this collaboration resulted in children under the age of 18 years to be enrolled in age-appropriate classes or skills training programs.

Sub-outcome 3.4. SO 3.4 aims to build country capacity in 10 additional countries that were added later in project implementation. These countries were not required to develop results frameworks, activities mapping, and monitoring plans. Instead, the countries under SO 3.4 developed outcomes, outputs, and activities and reported on achievements. The following section discusses the outcome and output achievements for the countries covered by this evaluation. They are presented in alphabetical order: Argentina, Fiji, Kosovo, Niger, Serbia, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste.

ARGENTINA

Figure 16: Argentina Outcomes, Outputs, Targets, and Achievement

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Outcome 1: Improved knowledge and understanding of the causes and prevalence, consequences of child labor and adolescent work, and preventive policies through the analysis of the data provided by the EANNA and other national surveys and new research.	
Output 1: An in-depth report based on children and adolescents activities survey (EANNA) and other relevant national surveys' findings to better understand and size the prevalence of child labor and adolescent work.	Completed
Output 2: An empirical research study to better understand the effects of child labor and adolescent work on family dynamics.	Completed
Output 3: An empirical research study to prevent child labor and adolescent work through the social protection system.	Completed
Output 4: An empirical research study on child labor from a gender perspective.	Completed
Output 5: A set of recommendations from the results of the analysis on the determinants and consequences of child labor and adolescent work in Argentina.	Completed
Output 6: A rapid assessment about forced labor and other forms of labor exploitation in the forestry sector of Argentina.	Completed

[68] WISC is a trade union hub supported by the ILO for information and support services including trainings for vulnerable and crisis affected workers. Jan Shikshan Sansthan is a skill training initiative supported by Government of India for non-literates, neo-literates as well as school dropouts in rural regions.

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Outcome 2: Increased awareness on the prevalence, drivers, and effects of child labor and adolescent work through accessible knowledge products, knowledge-sharing, and evidence-based advocacy.	
Output 1: A set of knowledge products based on the findings developed and made available.	Completed
Output 2: Knowledge-sharing of key findings and among key stakeholders is facilitated and increased.	Completed
Output 3: Advocacy actions directed toward taking action for the abolition of child labor are promoted.	Completed

Under **Outcome 1,** MAP 16 in Argentina aimed for six outputs focused primarily on research and research products related to child labor and adolescent work as well as forced labor. These included a qualitative analysis of national survey data to improve the understanding on child labor and family dynamics and two empirical studies. The first study examined the perceptions of girls and boys about gender stereotypes and the sexual division of labor and tasks, as well as gender stereotypes among adult caretakers. The second study examined the statistical relationship between social protection measures, such as child allowances and conditional cash transfers, and child labor among households with working and non-working adolescents. Based on the research and consultations with stakeholders, the project developed briefs on policy options and recommendations.

In addition to the studies mentioned above, the project conducted a rapid assessment in the provinces of Corrientes and Misiones to understand the dimensions of forced labor and other forms of labor exploitation in the forestry sector. The ILO FUNDAMENTALS branch and SECTOR department supported the assessment. To disseminate the results of the rapid assessment, the project organized workshops in Corrientes and Misiones. All of these outputs were completed as planned.

Outcome 2 aimed to increase awareness regarding child labor and forced labor. Outcome included three outputs related to knowledge products, their promotion, and increasing capacity to undertake advocacy actions. The project reported conducting three different communication campaigns, including the use of innovative communication materials and approaches such as infographics to communicate research findings and YouTube videos. Under the second output, the project presented the findings from the qualitative analysis on child labor and family dynamics and the RILAC child labor risk identification model to the National Commission for the Eradication of Child Labor (CONAETI) and the Provincial Commission for the Eradication of Child Labor (COPRETI) in their five regional meetings (North-East, North-West, Cuyo, Central, and Patagonia). The project also disseminated the findings from the different studies through workshops and other activities aimed at informing public policies.

Under the third output, the project worked with the Argentine Industrial Union (UIA) to conduct regional workshops for the private sector on how to prevent child labor and protect adolescent workers in global value chains. It also conducted regional workshops for 35 labor inspectors to raise awareness about child labor and forced labor and its prevention. The workshops also aimed to improve inter-institutional coordination and collaboration.

MAP 16 worked closely with UIA and three large trade union federations (CGT, CTAT, and CTAA) to develop training modules on child labor that these organizations plan to incorporate into the ongoing training and meeting activities. Finally, the project provided technical assistance to the government, employers, and trade unions to update the list of hazardous child labor.

Also under Outcome 2, the project provided training to increase knowledge of the causes, prevalence, and consequences of child labor to labor inspectors, employers, trade unions, and other key child labor actors. Based on the online perception survey (see Annex G), the trainees believe the training was relevant and effective. Ninety-three percent opined that the training was either highly relevant (56 percent) or relevant (37 percent). Ninety percent also thought the training was either highly effective (37 percent) or effective (53 percent). Ninety-eight percent of trainees reported that they use the new skills and knowledge. About 58 percent use new knowledge and skills sometimes while 40 percent use new knowledge and skills often.

FIJI

Figure 17: Fiji Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Outcome 1: Support is provided for the review and endorsement development of Fiji National Child Labour Policy (NCLP) and National Action Plan to Eliminate Child Labour (NAPCL) and the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) in Fiji 2020.	
Output 1: Fiji National Child Labour Policy is reviewed and endorsed by the Fijian Cabinet.	Partially completed
Output 2: National Action Plan on Child Labour 2017–2025 is reviewed, endorsed, and implemented by the end of 2021.	Partially completed
Output 3: Incorporate child protection policies into government ministries' policies (include relevant provisions of NCLP and NAPCL into strategic plans of five relevant Fijian ministries; drafting and proposal).	Partially completed
Outcome 2: The legal framework on child labor in Fiji is up-to-date and in line with relevant international conventions.	
Output 1: Hazardous Occupations Prohibited to Children under 18 Years of Age Oder of 2013 is reviewed and updated. List of light work for children, and the list of artistic, performing, and entertainment industries are finalized.	Completed
Output 2: Fiji legislation is updated to ensure the definition of child labor is harmonized.	Canceled
Outcome 3: Improve the knowledge base on child labor and access to information for the prevention of the risks and dangers of WFCL by the population.	
Output 1: The national information system on child labor in Fiji is developed.	Completed
Output 2: Report on the characteristics of child labor in Fiji is developed, presented, and shared.	Ongoing
Outcome 4: Pilot actions to eradicate child labor and end child labor in all its forms.	

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Output 1: Labor inspection guidelines and reporting formats and action protocols for the worst forms of child labor developed and officers trained in 2020.	Mostly completed
Output 2: Targeted awareness campaigns on the child labor child protection conducted in collaboration with action groups and stakeholders.	Completed

The aim of **Outcome 1** was to support the development of the National Child Labour Policy (NCLP) and the National Action Plan to Eliminate Child Labour (NAPCL). Outcome 1 had three outputs that include the NCLP, NAPCL, and the incorporation of a child protection provision into the relevant government policies. While the project supported the revision of the NCLP—including drafting lists of hazardous occupations for children and light work for children, reviewing and revising the NAPFL, and developing draft child protection provisions—these policies have not been endorsed by the cabinet as planned. According to the project, the Employment Relations Advisory Board (ERAB) needed to submit these policies to the cabinet for endorsement. However, due to various reasons, ERAB did not meet regularly and failed to submit the policies to the cabinet.

A high-ranking official at Ministry of Employment Productivity and Industrial Relations (MEPIR) told the evaluation team that child labor was not a priority of the previous government, but it is for the current government. He explained that MEPIR will work with ERAB to submit the different child labor policy documents that the project helped produce and send them to parliament for approval.

Outcome 2, which aimed to update the national child labor framework, had two outputs. One was updating/developing the lists of hazardous occupations for children and light work for children in artistic, performing, and entertainment Industries. The second was harmonizing the definition of child labor. The lists were updated and finalized as planned. However, they have not been endorsed by the cabinet for the reasons mentioned above in Outcome 1. The second output was canceled for the reasons mention in Outcome 1.

For **Outcome 3**, the project intended to improve the knowledge base on preventing child labor. It had two outputs: the national child labor information system and a report on the characteristics of child labor. Under the first output, the project initially planned to provide support to MEPIR to develop agreements with government agencies to access and share data on child labor and support MEPIR and national authorities to develop a database with standard indicators to better assist victims of child labor. These activities were canceled because, according to project staff, the government advised the project not to proceed with this activity. Instead, the project helped MEPIR develop the child labor component for the overall paperless national labor inspection system. This was achieved, but the paperless labor inspection information system is a having minimal impact because MEPIR lacks all of the required hardware to make it fully operational. The ILO is continuing to provide assistance to MEPIR, so it can fully operationalize the system.

Regarding the second output, the project produced a report on the characteristics of child labor is called COVID-19 and Child Labour in Fiji: A Situational Assessment. The draft report is currently with ILO's FUNDAMENTALS Branch awaiting final edits required before finalizing.

MAP 16's **Outcome 4** included a range of child labor pilot activities. Its two outputs were labor inspection guidelines (and training) and awareness-raising campaigns. For the first output, the

project developed the labor inspection protocol for the worse forms of child labor (WFCL). The protocol was sent to the Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation (MWCPA) and Fiji Police Force that cleared it to be submitted to MEPIR. MEPIR intends to develop a paper to present the draft protocol to the Fiji cabinet for endorsement.

Although not formally approved by the cabinet, the project used the protocol to train labor inspectors, social welfare officers, police officers, teachers, municipality representatives, agriculture officers, medical personnel, and sugar sector officers. In total, 212 persons were trained (97 females and 115 males). In addition, the project worked with the MEPIR, Fiji Police Force, and MWCPA to jointly pilot the inspection protocol for child labor.

Under the second output, the project intended to conduct a training program for child labor focal points and provide support to Alliance 8.7 partners to organize the first-ever 2021 World Day Against Child Labor Campaign in Fiji. The 2021 World Day Against Child Labor Campaign was canceled due to COVID-19. Instead, the project organized a series of online events. These included pledges from the government, employers and trade unions, statements from the ILO and US Embassy about the importance of World Day Against Child Labor, a session on combatting child labor through labor inspection. ILO and UNICEF wrote an op-ed piece for the national media and collaborated on a practical guide for journalists that they can use to report on child abuse, neglect and exploitation such as child labor. The project also provided three business/entrepreneur trainings for women in the Qauia community, women dairy farmers in Naitasiri, and women entrepreneurs in the Western Province. Finally, the project provided technical support for the Revamping School Monitoring Programme and conducted interviews with students.

In addition to the training provided on the use of the joint inspection protocol, MAP 16 conducted training for employers and workers on national legislation on employment and protection of children. Based on the results of the online perception survey, stakeholders who were trained under Outcome 4 on how to eradicate and end all forms of child labor, believe the training was relevant and effective. Ninety-four percent thought that the training was either highly relevant (63 percent) or relevant (31 percent). Ninety-five percent believe the training was either highly effective (48 percent) or effective (47 percent). Ninety-eight percent of trainees reported that they use the new skills and knowledge. About 37 percent use new knowledge and skills sometimes, while 61 percent use new knowledge and skills often.

KOSOVO

Figure 18: Kosovo Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Outcome 1: Central and municipal framework for monitoring the prevalence of child labor and planning fact-based measures to address child labor is strengthened.	
Output 1: The cost for the state to manage a child labor case determined.	Completed
Output 2: Child labor indicators in the database of the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (MLSW) reviewed and updated in the digital database.	Completed
Output 3: Child labor monitoring system reviewed and updated reflecting the role of each institution at central and municipal level for identification, protection, and withdrawal of children from child labor, including the WFCL.	Completed

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Output 4: The capacity of institutions at municipal level on child labor monitoring increased.	Completed
Output 5: The child labor case management module extended as part of the social services platform.	Completed
Output 6: The hazardous child labor list updated, and the light work defined.	Ongoing
Output 7: A report on child labor situation in Kosovo prepared based on UNICEF's Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) data.	Completed
Output 8: The capacity of Kosovo Statistical Agency (KSA) to produce specific reports on child labor based on data generated from future surveys is strengthened.	Completed
Output 9: Data on hazardous child labor in agriculture and forestry available.	Completed
Output 10: Roadmap to prevent and eliminate child labor in agriculture developed.	Completed
Outcome 2: The role of the social protection system in preventing and protecting children from child labor is strengthened.	
Output 1: The standard forms of the Centre for Social Work (CSW) for case management of children victims of child labor reviewed.	Completed
Output 2: The capacity of professionals in the CSW for case management of children victims of child labor is strengthened.	Completed
Outcome 3: The role of the education system in preventing and protecting children from child labor is strengthened.	
Output 1: The capacity of school inspectors to monitor and evaluate performance of school based teams for drop-out prevention is strengthened.	Completed
Output 2: The capacity of municipal directorates of education to support schools in identification and elimination of barriers to education is strengthened.	Completed
Output 3: The module on prevention of school dropout in the existing education management information system enables real-time reports on number of children combining school and work.	Completed
Output 4: A ToT program and training a pool of trainers on implementation of the curriculum module youth at work.	Completed
Output 5: A ToT Program and training a pool of trainers on implementation of the SCREAM Package.	Completed
Outcome 4: Improved enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor including WFCL.	
Output 1: Representatives of employers' organizations and trade unions trained on the identification and prevention of child labor.	Partially completed
Output 2: Capacities of labor inspectorate to inspect and report cases of child labor are strengthened.	Completed
Output 3: Police, forestry inspectors, and agriculture development inspectors trained on the identification and protection of child labor.	Completed

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Outcome 5: The role of judiciary system in dealing with child labor cases is improved.	
Output 1: Capacities of prosecutors and judges to deal with cases of child labor are strengthened.	Completed
Outcome 6: Key institutions and the general public in Kosovo mobilized to take action against child labor.	
Output 1: Key institutions mobilized to take action against child labor.	Completed
Output 2: General public (including children) is informed on hazardous child labor in Kosovo, related risks, and possibilities for reporting child labor.	Completed
Output 3: At least 1,000 farmers received guidance on hazardous child labor in agriculture and forestry.	Completed

In Kosovo, MAP 16 had six outcomes. **Outcome 1** aimed to establish national and municipal child labor monitoring frameworks. It had 10 specific outputs. The project reported achieving the first three outputs that include determining the cost to manage a child labor case that took the form of policy research, updating child labor indicators in the digital database, and an updating the child labor monitoring system. Two outputs—increased capacity of municipal institutions to monitor child labor and amplified child labor case management—were mostly achieved. For the municipal institution capacity output, the project still needs to organize workshops for municipalities that have not established child protection teams. Under the amplified child labor case management, the promotion of the child labor database has been delayed because the Social Services Division was transferred to the Ministry of Justice. This is considered an administrative delay and does not threaten the achievement of the output. However, it should be noted that some stakeholders believe that social workers lack the capacity to use the database.

The hazardous child labor list has been completed but due to the transfer of the Social Services Division to the Ministry of Justice, the approval by the government has been delayed. The light work list has been completed and validated by stakeholders. It will be used as a guide for regulation of light work during the amendment of the labor law and for drafting the sub-legal acts on the regulation of light work. The project reported achieving the child labor situation report and increased capacity of Kosovo Statistical Agency (KSA) to produce quality reports. However, based on focus group discussions with KSA staff, the training that the project provided was not adequate to allow them to produce reports on child labor based on data generated from future surveys.

The project conducted and published an assessment on child labor in the agriculture sector, which means hazardous child labor data in the agriculture and forestry sectors are available. The assessment report is available on the ILO website. The last output, the roadmap to eliminate child labor in the agriculture sector, was completed in September 2023.

Under Outcome 1, the project provided training to strengthen the framework for monitoring the prevalence of child labor and fact-based planning measures to address child labor. Of the 13 persons who responded this questions about this training in the online perception survey, 62 percent rated the training as highly relevant while 38 percent rated it as relevant. Regarding effectiveness, 54 percent believe the training was highly effective and another 46 percent thought it was effective. The respondents also reported using new knowledge and skills from

the training. Seventy-seven percent say they often use them while 23 percent noted that they sometimes use them.

Outcome 2 focused on strengthening the social protection system and had two outputs that include the review of Centre for Social Work (CSW) child labor management forms and increased capacity of CSW personnel to manage child labor cases. The project reported that the CSW forms were reviewed and updated while a case management training manual was developed and used to train CSW personnel. To strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor, the project provided training to social services staff as well as training of trainers focused on case management to some of the CSWs (eight CSW did not participate in the MAP 16 project). Seven persons responded to the online perception survey about this training. Four opined that the training was highly relevant, two said it was relevant, and one person noted that it was somewhat relevant. Regarding effectiveness and utilization, two persons said it was highly effective and that they often use the new information, while five said it was effective and that they somewhat use the information.

Outcome 3 intended to increase the capacity of the education system to prevent child labor and protect children. It had five outputs that the project reported having achieved. It trained school inspectors and quality assurance coordinators in the municipal education directorates on child labor and school dropout prevention. The project also updated the module on prevention of school dropout by adding one indicator on child labor and linking it to other child protection systems. Under the last two outputs, the project trained education personnel on child labor that will serve as trainers including the implementation of the ILO SCREAM methodology (Supporting Children's Rights through Education, Arts and Media).

Based on the results of the online perception survey, the trainees believe the training to strengthen the education system to prevent child labor was relevant and effective. Of the 13 persons who responded to questions related to the training provided under this outcome, 69 percent said it was highly relevant and 31 percent it was relevant. Regarding effectiveness, 77 percent rated the training as highly effective while another 23 percent rated it as effective. Approximately 69 percent often use new knowledge and skills, while 31 percent use new knowledge and skills somewhat.

Outcome 4 was designed to improve the enforcement of child labor laws and had three outputs: train employers' organizations and trade unions on identification and prevention of child labor, strengthen capacities of the labor inspectorate to inspect and report cases of child labor, and train police, forestry inspectors, and agriculture inspectors on the identification of child labor and protection of children. While the project trained 11 representatives from employee unions, it did not train representatives from employers' organizations. Although the project invited them to participate in a planned training activity, they did not attend and did not provide an explanation. However, the project met with the Kosovo Chamber of Commerce and shared the training materials.

The project also trained approximately 48 labor inspectors on the use of the child labor identification and referral checklist, and trained police (22 persons), rural development inspectors (35 persons), and forestry inspectors (30 persons) on identification of child labor and the protection of children. Six persons responded to questions about training designed to improve enforcement of child labor laws in the online perception survey. Three persons thought the training was highly relevant, and three believed it was relevant. Regarding effectiveness and utilization, three persons noted that the training was highly effective, and

they often use new knowledge and skills; three noted it was effective and that they somewhat use them.

Outcome 5, which aimed to increase the capacity of the judicial system to address child labor, had one output to increase the capacity of judges and prosecutors to address child labor. The project reported that it prepared and validated training tools and trained 24 judges and four prosecutors and judges over two training events. Only one person responded to questions about this training in the online perception survey. The person thought the training was relevant and somewhat effective. However, according to judicial stakeholders, the Academy of Justice does not intend to use the training materials because they do not meet the needs of judges and prosecutors. Instead, the Academy would have preferred to have had assistance developing a unified approach to hearing and deciding child labor cases.

Outcome 6 was a child labor awareness-raising objective, which had three primary outputs including mobilizing institutions against child labor, informing the public about hazardous child labor, and providing information to approximately 1,000 farmers about hazardous child labor in the agriculture sector. The project organized a 90-minute webinar on child labor that was attended by 83 persons. It was also streamed on ILO Budapest and UN Kosovo Facebook pages that reached nearly 500 persons. The project also developed public service announcements on child labor and hazardous child labor in agriculture for television and social media. Finally, it provided information and guidance to nearly 10,000 farmers on hazardous child labor in the agriculture and forestry sectors, which significantly exceeded the target by 9,000 farmers.

Only four persons responded to questions about the training provided under Outcome 6. One person believes that the training was highly relevant and highly effective, while the other three said it was relevant and effective. Three of the respondents noted they are able to use new knowledge and skills often in their jobs.

NIGER

Figure 19: Niger Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Outcome 1: NAPCL is finalized, validated, adopted, funded, and implemented.	
Output 1: The NAPCL is updated to incorporate comments from the CEACR and other partners before its validation and adoption by the government.	On hold
Output 2: National ownership in view of the adoption, funding, and implementation of the NAPCL is strengthened.	On hold
Outcome 2: The fight against child labor in agriculture, and particularly toward the worst form of child labor, is strengthened.	
Output 1: The capacities of the Ministry of Agriculture to monitor the results of the FAO-funded project "reducing child labor for sustainable agriculture in Niger" and to design follow-up activities are strengthened.	Completed
Output 2: The capacities of mobile schools (*écoles rurales* alternatives) are strengthened.	Canceled
Output 3: Increased awareness of farmers and other agricultural stakeholders in pilot communities on hazardous work in agriculture.	Completed

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Outcome 3: Institutional capacities of key stakeholders are strengthened.	
Output 1: The capacities of employers' organizations are strengthened on child labor.	Completed
Output 2: The capacities of trade unions are strengthened on child labor.	Completed
Output 3: The National Steering Committee (NSC) on child labor and forced labor is set up and functioning.	Completed
Output 4: Capacities of the labor inspectors to eliminate child labor, including in the informal sector, are strengthened.	Completed

In Niger, the project had three outcomes. **Outcome 1**, which was the development of the National Action Plan on Child Labour (NAPCL), had two outputs. The first was to update the NAPCL, while the second was to strengthen national ownership of the plan. Following the Coup d'Etat of July 2023, the democratically elected government was dissolved, and instructions were given by the United Nations coordinator and the ILO Country Office Abidjan to suspend all support to the bodies and institutions created by the new military authorities. Therefore, the activities related to the validation of the NAPFL were suspended because they involved consultations with the government and parliamentarians.

Outcome 2, which aims to strengthen the agriculture sector to address child labor, had three outputs: strengthen national ownership of the NAPCL, strengthen the mobile schools, and increase awareness among farmers and other agriculture stakeholders about hazardous work in the sector. The project reported that awareness-raising workshops and other activities to strengthen ownership were completed. Regarding the second output, the project decided to cancel it due to security concerns where the mobile schools operate. The third output included radio debates to raise awareness; these were successfully completed. The 11 persons who responded to the online perception survey rated the training as either highly relevant (55 percent) or relevant (45 percent) and either as highly effective (73 percent) or effective (27 percent). Ten of the 11 respondents (91 percent) reporting often using the new knowledge and skills they acquired from the trainings.

Outcome 3 aimed to strengthen the capacity of key stakeholders and consisted of four outputs. The first three involved strengthening employer organizations, trade unions, and labor inspectors. The fourth output aimed to establish a national steering committee for child labor. The project reported that it organized and conducted workshops for employers, trade unions, and labor inspectors. Furthermore, it helped establish the national steering committee. The training that aimed at strengthening institutional capacities of ministries and social partners on the elimination of child labor was also rated highly. The eight persons who responded to the online perception survey rated the training as either highly relevant (62 percent) or relevant (38 percent) and either as highly effective (75 percent) or effective (25 percent).

SERBIA

Figure 20: Serbia Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Outcome 1: National framework for monitoring the prevalence of child labor is strengthened.	

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Output 1: Child labor data collection system is mainstreamed into existing labor force survey of the national statistical office and implemented every three years.	Partially completed
Output 2: Recommendations on how to better protect children in child labor in the streets submitted to the relevant stakeholders.	Canceled
Outcome 2: National legislations aligned with international standards on protection of children at work.	
Output 1: Recommendation report on how to align labor law provisions on protection of children at work with international standards submitted to the Ministry of Labor with stakeholders' inputs integrated.	Completed
Output 2: Amended decree on hazardous child labor is formally submitted to appropriate bodies.	Completed
Output 3: Draft list of the light work is developed in consultations with social partners and relevant stakeholders and submitted to appropriate bodies.	Completed
Output 4: Child labor provisions included in general and special protocols for protection of children against child labor and WFCL (follow-up to CLEAR).	Completed
Output 5: Legal instruments on hazardous child labor and light work are discussed with the new government and relevant stakeholders.	Canceled
Outcome 3: The role of the social protection system in preventing and protecting children from child labor is strengthened.	
Output 1: Social protection system has developed procedures of protection and prevention related to child labor.	Mostly completed
Outcome 4: Improved enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor, including WFCL.	
Output 1: Representatives of employers' organizations and trade unions trained on the identification and prevention of child labor, including its worst forms.	Completed
Output 2: Labor Inspectorate, police, Centre for Social Work, and prosecution officers trained on the identification and protection from child labor, including its worst forms.	Completed
Outcome 5: Communication of project achievements to the broader public.	
Output 1: Advocacy and communications material developed.	Completed
Outcome 6: Draft roadmap to eliminate child labor and WFCL for the period 2023–2025 is developed in consultations with relevant stakeholders.	
Output 1: National roadmap to eliminate child labor in Republic of Serbia developed in consultations with relevant stakeholders and submitted to appropriate institution.	Canceled

MAP 16 in Serbia had six outcomes. **Outcome 1** aimed to strengthen the national child labor framework. It had two main outputs. The first was to integrate the child labor survey into the labor force survey, and the second was a set of recommendations on how to protect children living and working in the streets. While the project developed and piloted the child labor module and trained the statistical office, the government has not yet approved its integration into the labor force survey. Under the second output, the project conducted a rapid assessment of the situation of street children in Belgrade and used the results to develop the

set of recommendations noted above. However, the project decided to cancel this output because, for political reasons, it determined that the members of the city council were not ready to approve the recommendations. The ILO intends to publish the rapid assessment report on its website.

Outcome 2, which aimed to align national laws with international standards of child protection, had five outputs. These included recommendations to align national laws with international standards, an amended decree on hazardous child labor, a draft list of light work, child labor provisions integrated into protocols, and discussions of legal instruments for hazardous and light work with the corresponding authorities. As planned, the project produced the recommendations report, the draft amended decree, and the draft list of light work. The recommendations report was submitted to the Ministry of Labour, Employment, Veteran and Social Affairs (MOLEVSA) as planned. The draft amended decree and the draft list of light work were also completed and submitted to the corresponding ministries. According to the project, once the new labor law is approved, the recommendations, amended decree on hazardous child labor, and the list of light work will likely be incorporated.

Output 4 aimed to amend a draft legal instrument on child begging within the Law on Public Peace and Order that was developed under the USDOL Country Level Engagement and Assistance to Reduce Child Labor II (CLEAR). The government adopted a new General Protocol for Protection of Children against Violence, including all child labor provisions developed previously by the CLEAR project. The protocol defines child labor per international standards, provides a government-wide standard definition of child begging, and integrates labor inspectors into the child protection system. On the other hand, Output 5 (discussing the hazardous work and light work legal instruments with the new government) was canceled. The light work decree would need to be incorporated into the new labor law envisioned for 2026, while the hazardous work decree lacks government support. Although this output was canceled, the decree was discussed with relevant stakeholders at the final event of the project in Serbia, which was held in October 2023.

Outcome 3 intended to strengthen the child social protection system and included one output, which was the development of a strong child social protection system. Under this output, the project collaborated with UNICEF to develop a set of indicators to identify child labor in the formal and informal economy (seasonal work in the agriculture sector). Through a series of consultative meetings and workshops, the project developed draft amendments of instruction to protect children; one for the Centers for Social Work (CSW) and another for the labor inspectorate. These were eventually signed by MOLEVSA. The project also revised the special protocol for labor inspection and developed a draft set of amendments of instruction for the protection of children during labor inspections.

The project provided seminars and training to social welfare actors aimed at strengthening social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor. Of the 11 persons who responded to the question about the relevance of this training, 45 percent thought it was highly relevant, while another 45 percent thought it was relevant. Nearly 91 percent responded that the training was highly effective (55 percent) or effective (36 percent). Although 82 percent reported that they sometimes use new knowledge and skills, only about 18 percent reported that they often use it. It should also be noted that the Republic Institute for Social Protection decided to accredit the training course (Child Labour, Prevention, Identification, and Intervention) and offer it to professionals working in the social protection system.

The only activity under this output that was not completed was the reporting software that the project hoped to develop in collaboration with MOLEVSA and UNICEF. Due to delays in developing the software, the project decided to cancel this activity.

Outcome 4 focused on the enforcement of child labor laws. It had two outputs: one is the training of employers and trade unions on the protection and prevention of child labor, and the other is training of social protection and prosecution officials on the same topic. It should be noted that the trainings were delayed several times due to the COVID-19 pandemic and restrictions on face-to-face meetings. Eventually the trainings were conducted online. In the trainings for employers and trade unions, approximately 28 representatives from these social partners participated. A total of seven trainings were conducted for labor inspectors, prosecutors, and supervisors from CSW. Nearly 115 persons were trained from these institutions.

Seven persons responded to the question about the relevance, effectiveness, and utilization of the training designed to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor. Four persons rated the training as highly relevant and effective, while three rated it as relevant, and another two persons rated the training effective. Two persons reported that they often use the new knowledge and skills in their work, and two other persons said that they sometimes use it. The other three persons reported that they do not use the newly acquired knowledge and skills.

Outcome 5 intended to communicate project achievements to the public and had one output that was designed to develop advocacy and communication materials. The project developed and disseminated both a PDF document and poster about the MAP 16 project. It also organized a workshop for World Day Against Child Labor in which the labor ministry, employers organizations, trade unions, and other institutions participated.

Outcome 6 and its output is the roadmap to eliminate child labor in Serbia. The activities under this outcome were initially delayed until the new government was formed and in place. However, the project decided that it was not feasible to develop the roadmap because child labor is not a high priority for the government at this time. There would need to be a ministry to anchor the roadmap but neither the Ministry of Family Care and Demography nor the Ministry of Human and Minority Rights and Social Dialogue—the most appropriate ministries in which to anchor the roadmap—have expressed an interest. However, it should be noted that the project did conduct an assessment of the 2018–2022 roadmap.

SRI LANKA

Figure 21: Sri Lanka Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Outcome 1: Evidence-based, targeted approach adopted to eliminate child labor, with particular attention to its worst forms.	
Output 1: A detailed and in-depth analysis of National Child Activity Survey (NCAS) data to identify characteristics, trends, and patterns of child labor.	Partially completed
Output 2: Package of innovative interventions for eliminating hazardous child labor through improving working conditions developed.	Competed
Output 3: Awareness-raising and communication strategy—and materials—developed targeting children in child labor, employers, families and communities, and other stakeholders.	Completed
Output 4: LISA used as an effective tool for monitoring and referring children in child labor.	Canceled
Output 5: Technical support provided to key stakeholders to strengthen school to work transition policy and practice.	Completed
Outcome 2: Relevant policy recommendations developed and adopted to address commercial sexual exploitation.	
Output 1: Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) study report published and disseminate.	Completed
Output 2: Policy dialogue conducted around the report.	Canceled
Output 3: Policy recommendations and action plan developed, linking child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking actors.	Partially completed
Outcome 3: Integrated coordination mechanism for SDG Target 8.7 building on existing coordination mechanisms activated.	
Output 1: Alliance 8.7 country coordination group established.	Canceled
Output 2: Mapping exercise conducted and links to other SDG coordination and monitoring mechanisms defined.	Canceled
Output 3: Localized indicators for SDG Target 8.7 developed and validated.	Canceled

Outcome 1, which focused on ascertaining evidence on child labor, had five outputs. These included analysis of the 2016 National Child Activity Survey (NCAS) data to show child labor trends, interventions to address hazardous child labor, child labor communication strategy, use of labor inspection system (LISA) to refer child labor cases, and technical assistance to strengthen the school-to-work program.

Regarding the first output, it should be noted that the project did not analyze the 2016 NCAS data. Instead, it analyzed data from the National Child Protection Authority hotline that provided an important source of information to understand child labor in the country. However, due to a small sample and confidentiality requirements, the project could not to publish the results. It did use some of the information to help develop the child labor communication strategy.

Under the second output, the project produced a package of materials and trained labor inspectors, child services officers, and police on how to use them. In total, the project conducted training events for 146 officials from DOL and the Department of Probation and the Police Department. The project also planned to produce 10 child labor impact stories but was unable to complete this activity. DOL could not provide case information to the project because it needed to protect the identities of the case victims. In hindsight, this was not an appropriate activity, given the sensitivity of the information.

> The online perception survey was sent to 17 stakeholders. Only two persons responded to questions about training relevance, effectiveness, and utilization. These two persons, one from the Ministry of Education and another from an employers' organization, believe that the training was relevant and effective. Only one person, however, reported using the new knowledge and skills acquired during training.

As noted above, the project produced a child labor communication strategy under the third output that DOL is currently using. Messages were posted on the DOL YouTube page, but the number of views have been minimal. Furthermore, the project contracted a service provider to conduct an awareness session for members of the media to promote the messages, but due to a miscommunication, the event was canceled.

Regarding the LISA output, the project decided to cancel it because DOL did not consider it an effective child labor monitoring tool. While DOL uses LISA to enter labor inspection data, it does not use it as a monitoring tool and is in the process of replacing LISA with another labor inspection monitoring tool. Thus, adding a child labor module to LISA did not make sense. Under the fifth output, the project developed a school-to-work manual for parents that was approved by the Ministry of Education (MOE). The manual was used to train more than 2,400 parents in 20 schools. Since the project ended, the MOE has continued to use the manual to train parents because, according to MOE officials, the manual is highly effective.

Under **Outcome 2** the project had three outputs that included publishing and disseminating the Commercial Sex Exploitation of Children (CSEC) study, policy dialogue based on this report, and an action plan with recommendations. It should be noted that the CSEC study was produced under the CLEAR project but was not approved by USDOL due to quality issues. The project improved the quality of the report and developed recommendations that the government could act on. However, by the time the project started to work on the study, the government had lost interest. Therefore, the project decided to cancel the second output, which was to engage in policy dialogue around the recommendations.

Outcome 3 consisted of three main outputs: the establishment of an Alliance 8.7 coordination group, mapping with links to SDG to facilitate monitoring, and localized indicators for SDG 8.7. The project decided to abandon the plan to establish an Alliance 8.7 coordination group because Sri Lanka has the Sustainable Development Council that is responsible for monitoring progress in achieving the SDGs, including SDG 8.7. Since the Alliance 8.7 coordination group output was canceled, the mapping and local indicator outputs were also canceled. In hindsight, the integrated coordination mechanism for Alliance 8.7 was not an appropriate outcome for the MAP 16 project in Sri Lanka since it would have been redundant.

TIMOR-LESTE

Figure 22: Timor-Leste Outcomes, Outputs, and Achievements

Outcomes and Outputs	Status
Outcome 1: Timor-Leste will have a solid knowledge and policy base on child labor that can be easily updated and expanded.	
Output 1: Finalization of report on child labor survey that was conducted in 2016.	Completed
Output 2: National Action Plan of Child Labour approved (NAPCL).	Mostly completed
Outcome 2: The legal framework on child labor in Timor-Leste is up to date and in line with relevant international conventions.	
Output 1: Hazardous work list decree law finalized and adopted.	Mostly completed
Output 2: Labour inspection guidelines and reporting formats and action protocols reviewed and revised to include definitions of light work and hazardous work.	Completed
Output 3: Minimum age standards promoted.	Completed
Outcome 3: Children, parents, employers, and the general public have a solid understanding of what child labor is and how it can be avoided.	
Output 1: Knowledge, attitude, and practices (KAP) survey conducted.	Completed
Output 2: Targeted awareness and communication campaigns linked with existing campaigns designed and implemented based on KAP survey findings.	Completed
Outcome 4: Key professional groups in government and civil society are well versed with child labor and have access to knowledge and procedures that allow them to take action as part of their daily work.	
Output 1: Targeted training for government stakeholder and civil society conducted.	Completed

Outcome 1, which was meant to strengthen both knowledge and policy bases for child labor, had two outputs. The first was the finalization of the child labor survey. The report on child labor was completed and disseminated in 2022. The second output was the National Action Plan on Child Labour (NAPCL). The NAPCL was completed and submitted to the Ministry of Economic Affairs for approval. However, due the formation of a new government after elections in March 2022, the approval of the NAPCL is pending. Based on interviews with high-ranking government officials, it appears that the new government is committed to approving these policies. The policies are currently with the Ministry of Coordinating Economic Affairs, but due to a complex process, the approval of the policies could be further delayed.

Outcome 2 aimed to ensure the national child labor legal framework meets international convention standards. It had three outputs. The first was the adoption of the hazardous work decree, while the second was labor inspection guidelines/protocols. The project developed these outputs, but they have not been adopted by the government yet. Although the inspection guidelines have not been formally adopted by the government, they are being used by the labor inspectors. The third was promoting the minimum age standards. The project promoted the minimum age standards by organizing seminars on ILO conventions and workshops for school inspectors and community policing officials. In addition to promoting the age standards, the

project submitted minimum age standards to the Ministry of Economic Affairs for endorsement, but they have not been endorsed yet.

Outcome 3 was focused on raising general awareness about child labor. It had two outputs that include a knowledge, attitudes, and practices (KAP) survey and awareness campaigns based on the KAP results. The KAP survey was conducted as planned. To promote awareness, the project organized a couple of workshops where the KAP findings were shared and discussed with the government.

Outcome 4 was meant to increase the knowledge among professionals, so they can recognize child labor and take the appropriate actions to address it. It had one main output, which was training for government and civil society professionals. The project had managed to map out professionals, develop training materials, and pilot the training. The project conducted training on child labor in 13 municipalities for parents, students, teachers, school inspectors, police, and labor inspectors. It should be noted that the training was conducted in municipality centers and not in the villages, which some stakeholders noted as a weakness. While the project made an effort to invite village representatives to the municipal-level training, it did not have sufficient resources to conduct the training in all the villages.

Seventeen persons responded to the questions in the online perception survey about training relevance, effectiveness, and utilization. Sixty-five percent opined that the training was highly relevant, while another 35 percent said it was relevant. They also thought the training was effective, with 35 percent responding that it was highly effective and 59 percent saying it was effective. Only one person thought the training was somewhat effective. Regarding utilization of the child labor information, 53 percent reported often using the information while 35 percent said they sometimes use it.

Outcome 3 Summary Performance Assessment

Outcome 3, which aims to strengthen policies and capacities of key actors to address child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking, is complex. It includes capacity-building in the sugar and fishing sectors, in the Latin America and Caribbean and Africa regions, in three priority countries, and in 11 additional countries. SO 3.1, which focused on the sugar and fishing sector, was partially achieved since the sugar research was dropped, and the handbook to guide fishing sector policy is a work in progress. The regional capacity-building work, SO 3.2, was achieved. SO 3.3, capacity-building in India, was largely achieved. Finally, the achievement of SO 3.4 is mixed. Several countries, such as Argentina and Kosovo achieved all or most of their outcomes and outputs while others, such as Fiji, Sri Lanka, and Timor-Leste experienced difficulty.

In summary, the analysis suggests that, overall, progress was made in strengthening policies and capacities of key actors to address child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking in Latin America and the Caribbean and Africa (regions) and in many of the countries listed under SO 3.4.

Outcome 4

Figure 18 shows Outcome 4 and its six indicators, indicator targets, achievements against the indicator target, and the overall performance status. It should be noted that the first indicator, number of pledges made at the IV Global Conference on Child Labor was determined by the ILO and USDOL not to be an appropriate indicator and thus was not reported on.

The project met or exceeded four of the other five indicator targets. It exceeded the number of collaborative actions taken under Alliance 8.7 by 10 actions, which include a range of actions

such as side events at global conferences, advocacy activities, the global estimates reports, and meetings. The project also exceeded its target for the number of the Global Report on Child Labour Estimates by one report. It produced Child Labour: Global Estimates 2020, Trends and the Road Forward as well as Methodology of the 2020 ILO-UNICEF Global Estimates of Child Labour.

The project met its target of four collaborative actions taken by businesses on child labor. These include the: 1) Platform for the Fight Against Child Labour by the Private Sector in Morocco; 2) a video on how to use this platform; 3) a hazardous work video; and 4) a side event at the 5th Global Conference on the Elimination of Child Labour called Scaling up Business *Due Diligence on Child Labour* that was organized by the Child Labour Platform.

Under Indicator 6, the Global Business Network on Forced Labor organized 37 actions on forced labor. These included five workshops with small businesses in Malaysia, 10 webinars, presentations at four events hosted by ILO member states or interested stakeholders, nine online events, two forums for business networks, and support of seven meetings of business network meetings. It should be noted, however, that GBNFL reports as an entity not by project. The 37 collaborative actions were not only actions taken with MAP 16 resources but includes actions taken using other project/donor resources. While MAP 16 resources were used to help establish GBNFL, they were not used to directly support countries, which is considered a limitation by ILO representatives.

The only indicator target that was not achieved was the number of countries in which ILO and UNICEF has a long-term strategic collaboration on child labor elimination. The project set a target of three countries where MAP 16 and UNICEF have long-term strategic collaboration. To date, ILO and UNICEF have not achieved this long-term strategic collaboration. The project reported that while cooperation with UNICEF on research and advocacy at the global level has increased, country-level collaboration depends on the political priorities of UNICEF national offices where child labor is only one aspect in a much broader child protection agenda. The other issue that surfaced when discussing the achievement of this indicator is that "long-term strategic collaboration" is not well defined in the CMEP and that it did not translate to work plan activities and outputs.

Figure 23: Outcome 4, Indicators, Indicator Targets, and Achievements

Outcome and Indicators	Target	Achieved	Status
Outcome 4: Strengthened partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.			
1. Number of pledges made at the IV Global Conference on Child Labor to address child labor.	N/A	N/A	N/A
2. Number of collaborative actions mobilized under the Alliance 8.7 (disaggregated by type: research, advocacy, direct intervention, and others).	36	46	+10
3. Global report on child labor estimates 2020–2021 developed and published jointly by ILO and UNICEF.	1	2	+1
4. Number of countries in which ILO and UNICEF has a long-term strategic collaboration on child labor elimination.	3	0	-3
5. Number of collaborative actions taken by business and employers' organizations on child labor with the support of the Child Labour Platform.	4	4	0
6. Number of collaborative actions taken by business and employers' organizations on forced labor with the support of the Global Business Network on Forced Labor.	0	37	+37

Outcome 4 also had six outputs, which are shown below in Figure 19 along with their targets and achievements. It should be noted that Outputs 1, 2, and 6 do not have targets. According to project staff, since Outputs 1 and 2 were completed in 2017 when the IV Global Conference on Child Labor was held, the project decided not to set targets and instead to report on them during the development of the CMEP. It is not clear why the project did not set a target for Output 6.

Figure 24: Outcome 4 Outputs, Output Targets, and Achievements

Outputs	Target	Achieved	Status
1. A side event at the IV Global Conference organized to showcase the regions good practices and lessons learned.	0	0	Completed in 2017.
2. Number of communication materials produced with the MAP 16 project support for IV Global Conference on Child Labor and Forced Labor.	0	0	Completed in 2017.
3. Number of Alliance 8.7 action groups that have developed key operational tools.	2	1	Operational tools developed for the Supply Chains group. The crisis and Humanitarian Affairs and Supply Chains and Migration groups stopped operating.
4. Number of templates, guidance notes, and tools developed for action groups.	6	3	Three templates developed for business networks instead of action groups since two stopped meeting (see above).

Outputs	Target	Achieved	Status
5. Number of advocacy and communication materials to promote engagement with the support the work under the Alliance 8.7 developed.	30	29	29 Alliance 8.7 Newsletter *Updates from Partners* between May and October 2022.
6. NGO forum under the Alliance 8.7 held with the project technical and logistical support.	0	2	Supported two NGO forums under Alliance 8.7.

Outcome 4 Summary Performance Assessment

The project met or exceeded all but one of its outcome indicator targets. Although it is slightly underachieving in three of the other four output targets, the underachievement is minimal. Thus, the project largely achieved the objective of strengthening partnerships to accelerate progress in combatting child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

ANNEX F. COMPLETE RESULTS OF THE ONLINE PERCEPTION SURVEY

TOTAL SAMPLE

Table 5. Individuals Included in Analysis

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Niger	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
Total sample	70 (100%)	102 (100%)	31 (100%)	48 (100%)	11 (100%)	30 (100%)	2 (100%)	37 (100%)	331 (100%)
Not included	27 (39%)	41 (40%)	12 (39%)	19 (40%)	2 (18%)	12 (40%)	-	20 (54%)	133 (40%)
Included	43 (61%)	61 (60%)	19 (61%)	29 (60%)	9 (82%)	18 (60%)	2 (100%)	17 (46%)	198 (60%)

Table 6. Reason for Not Including in Analysis

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Niger	Serbia	Timor-Leste	Total
Did not participate in MAP 16 trainings	21 (78%)	23 (56%)	4 (33%)	3 (16%)	-	7 (58%)	7 (35%)	65 (49%)
Selected "other" country	-	-	1 (8%)	8 (42%)	1 (50%)	-	3 (15%)	13 (10%)
Did not complete survey	6 (22%)	18 (44%)	7 (58%)	8 (42%)	1 (50%)	5 (42%)	10 (50%)	55 (41%)
Total	27 (100%)	41 (100%)	12 (100%)	19 (100%)	2 (100%)	12 (100%)	20 (100%)	133 (100%)

Table 7. Individuals per Outcome

	N (%)
Argentina	
OUTCOME B: Trainings to increase knowledge of the causes, prevalence, and consequences of child labor	39 (91%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above	4 (9%)
Fiji	
OUTCOME 4: Trainings on approaches to eradicate and end all forms of child labor	60 (98%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above	2 (3%)
India	
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen state government's capacity and knowledge on child labor	17 (89%)

	N (%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above	2 (11%)
Kosovo	
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen the education system to prevent and protect children from child labor	13 (43%)
OUTCOME 1: Trainings to strengthen framework for monitoring prevalence of child labor and fact-based planning measures to address child labor	13 (43%)
OUTCOME 2: Trainings to strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor	7 (23%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor	6 (20%)
OUTCOME 5: Trainings to improve the role of judiciary system in dealing with child labor cases	1 (3%)
OUTCOME 6: Trainings with Municipal Agriculture Advisors on child labor in agriculture and forestry	4 (13%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above …	2 (7%)
Niger	
OUTCOME 2: Trainings on child labor in agriculture	2 (22%)
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen institutional capacities of relevant ministries and social partners on the elimination of child labor	9 (100%)
Serbia	
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor	11 (61%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor	7 (39%)
Sri Lanka	
OUTCOME 1: Trainings to increase access to knowledge for key professional groups in government and civil society*	2 (100%)
Timor-Leste	
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to increase access to knowledge and procedures on child labor	8 (47%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above	9 (53%)

Note: One individual could participate in more than one outcome/training category.

SAMPLE PROFILE

Table 8. What is your gender?

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Niger	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
Male	16 (37%)	23 (38%)	13 (68%)	12 (41%)	6 (67%)	2 (11%)	-	11 (65%)	83 (42%)
Female	27 (63%)	38 (62%)	6 (32%)	16 (55%)	3 (33%)	16 (89%)	1 (50%)	6 (35%)	113 (57%)
Other/No answer	-	-	-	1 (3%)	-	-	1 (50%)	-	2 (1%)
Total	43 (100%)	61 (100%)	19 (100%)	29 (100%)	9 (100%)	18 (100%)	2 (100%)	17 (100%)	198 (100%)

Table 9. What kind of organization do you work for?

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Nigeria	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
Ministry of Labor/Ministry of Justice/ Ministry of Migration (National or Regional)	7 (16%)	10 (16%)	1 (5%)	1 (3%)	2 (22%)	4 (22%)	-	-	25 (13%)
Labor Inspectorate (National or Regional)	5 (12%)	-	-	-	2 (22%)	-	-	-	7 (4%)
Law Enforcement Agency (Police, National Guard, Military, Prosecutors, Judges, Lawyers, etc.)	3 (7%)	13 (21%)	-	2 (7%)	-	-	-	4 (24%)	22 (11%)
Anti-Trafficking Committee (National or Regional)	-	-	1 (5%)	-	-	-	-	-	1 (0%)
Educational Institution (Schools, Colleges, or Universities)	2 (5%)	17 (28%)	2 (11%)	8 (28%)	-	-	1 (50%)	4 (24%)	34 (17%)
Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)/Civil Society Organization (CSO)	6 (14%)	4 (7%)	12 (63%)	2 (7%)	-	1 (6%)	-	5 (29%)	30 (15%)
Media/Press Agency (Public or Private)	-	-	1 (5%)	-	-	-	-	1 (6%)	2 (1%)

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Nigeria	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
International Organization (ILO, UN, IOM, World Bank, etc.)	-	-	-	-	1 (11%)	-	-	-	1 (0%)
Employer or Employer Organization	2 (5%)	3 (5%)	-	-	2 (22%)	-	1 (50%)	-	8 (4%)
Workers' Organization or Trade Union	8 (19%)	1 (2%)	-	-	2 (22%)	1 (6%)	-	-	12 (6%)
National Statistics Agency	-	-	-	2 (7%)	-	-	-	-	2 (1%)
Other	10 (23%)	13 (21%)	2 (11%)	14 (48%)	-	12 (67%)		3 (18%)	54 (27%)
Total	43 (100%)	61 (100%)	19 (100%)	29 (100%)	9 (100%)	18 (100%)	2 (100%)	17 (100%)	198 (100%)

Table 10. How many total ILO MAP 16 trainings on child labor have you participated in so far?

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Niger	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
1 training	16 (37%)	43 (70%)	9 (47%)	12 (41%)	4 (44%)	7 (39%)	1 (50%)	11 (65%)	103 (52%)
2–3 trainings	15 (35%)	14 (23%)	7 (37%)	9 (31%)	2 (22%)	10 (56%)	1 (50%)	4 (24%)	62 (31%)
4 or more trainings	7 (16%)	4 (7%)	3 (16%)	7 (24%)	3 (33%)	-	-	-	24 (12%)
Do not know	5 (12%)	-	-	1 (3%)	-	1 (6%)	-	2 (12%)	9 (5%)
Total	43 (100%)	61 (100%)	19 (100%)	29 (100%)	9 (100%)	18 (100%)	2 (100%)	17 (100%)	198 (100%)

Table 11. In which year(s) did you participate in ILO MAP 16 training(s) on child labor?

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Nigeria	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
2019	5 (12%)	7 (11%)	3 (16%)	4 (14%)	1 (11%)	1 (6%)	-	-	21 11%)
2020	5 (12%)	5 (8%)	1 (5%)	4 (14%)	3 (33%)	2 (11%)	-	2 (12%)	22 (11%)
2021	12 (28%)	9 (15%)	2 (11%)	5 (17%)	6 (67%)	6 (33%)	1 (50%)	1 (6%)	42 (21%)

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Nigeria	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
2022	21 (49%)	21 (34%)	10 (53%)	19 (66%)	4 (44%)	2 (11%)	1 (50%)	8 (47%)	86 (43%)
2023	21 (49%)	34 (56%)	5 (26%)	13 (45%)	-	8 (44%)	-	6 (35%)	87 (44%)
Do not know	4 (9%)	1 (2%)	-	1 (3%)	-	2 (11%)	-	1 (6%)	9 (5%)

Note: More than one option could be selected.

RELEVANCE, EFFECTIVENESS, AND USE OF TRAININGS

Table 12. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor?

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Niger	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
Not relevant at all	-	-	1 (5%)	-	-	-	-	-	1 (0%)
Somewhat relevant	3 (7%)	4 (6%)	3 (16%)	1 (2%)	-	-	-	-	11 (5%)
Relevant	16 (37%)	19 (31%)	9 (47%)	20 (43%)	5 (45%)	8 (44%)	1 (50%)	6 (35%)	84 (39%)
Highly relevant	24 (56%)	39 (63%)	5 (26%)	25 (54%)	6 (55%)	9 (50%)	1 (50%)	11 (65%)	120 (55%)
Do not know	-	-	1 (5%)	-	-	1 (6%)	-	-	2 (1%)
Total	43 (100%)	62 (100%)	19 (100%)	46 (100%)	11 (100%)	18 (100%)	2 (100%)	17 (100%)	218 (100%)

Note: Totals exceed count of individuals because one individual could participate in more than one training category.

Table 13. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor?

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Niger	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
Somewhat effective	2 (5%)	3 (5%)	2 (11%)	1 (2%)	-	2 (11%)	1 (50%)	1 (6%)	12 (6%)
Effective	23 (53%)	29 (47%)	13 (68%)	19 (41%)	3 (27%)	6 (33%)	1 (50%)	10 (59%)	104 (48%)

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Niger	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
Highly effective	16 (37%)	30 (48%)	4 (21%)	26 (57%)	8 (73%)	10 (56%)	-	6 (35%)	100 (46%)
Do not know	2 (5%)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 (1%)
Total	43 (100%)	62 (100%)	19 (100%)	46 (100%)	11 (100%)	18 (100%)	2 (100%)	17 (100%)	218 (100%)

Note: Totals exceed count of individuals because one individual could participate in more than one training category

Table 14. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor?

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Niger	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
Do not use new knowledge and skills at all	-	-	-	-	-	2 (11%)	-	-	2 (1%)
Somewhat use new knowledge and skills	25 (58%)	23 (37%)	4 (21%)	14 (30%)	1 (9%)	11 (61%)	-	6 (35%)	84 (39%)
Often use new knowledge and skills	17 (40%)	38 (61%)	14 (74%)	32 (70%)	10 (91%)	4 (22%)	1 (50%)	9 (53%)	125 (57%)
Do not know	1 (2%)	-	-	-	-	1 (6%)	1 (50%)	-	3 (1%)
Missing response	-	1 (2%)	1 (5%)	-	-	-	-	2 (12%)	4 (2%)
Total	43 (100%)	62 (100%)	19 (100%)	46 (100%)	11 (100%)	18 (100%)	2 (100%)	17 (100%)	218 (100%)

Note: Totals exceed count of individuals because one individual could participate in more than one training category.

Table 15. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work.

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Niger	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	6 (14%)	34 (56%)	6 (33%)	28 (61%)	7 (64%)	8 (53%)	1 (100%)	4 (27%)	94 (45%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	24 (57%)	46 (75%)	12 (67%)	31 (67%)	9 (82%)	9 (60%)	-	5 (33%)	136 (65%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	7 (17%)	28 (46%)	3 (17%)	10 (22%)	6 (55%)	6 (40%)	1 (100%)	4 (27%)	65 (31%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	16 (38%)	20 (33%)	1 (6%)	18 (39%)	7 (64%)	5 (33%)	-	3 (20%)	70 (33%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	9 (21%)	28 (46%)	8 (44%)	24 (52%)	10 (91%)	6 (40%)	-	3 (20%)	88 (42%)
Other (please specify):	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	-	1 (2%)	-	-	-	5 (33%)	9 (4%)

Note: More than one option could be selected.

Table 16. Please select the reason(s) that best describe why you do not use the knowledge and skills acquired from these trainings.

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Niger	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
I did not gain new knowledge and skills from the training	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The training was not relevant to my work	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

	Argentina	Fiji	India	Kosovo	Niger	Serbia	Sri Lanka	Timor-Leste	Total
The training was not relevant to child labor issues in my country	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
There has not been an opportunity in my work yet to use the new knowledge and skills	-	-	-	-	-	1 (50%)	-	-	1 (50%)
The training content did not include enough practical guidance to use in my work	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The number of trainings was insufficient to gain the knowledge and skills needed for my work	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The training handouts/ materials did not provide sufficient guidance for my work	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	1 (50%)	-	-	1 (50%)

Note: More than one option could be selected.

ARGENTINA, BY OUTCOME

Table 17. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Argentina?

	Somewhat relevant	Relevant	Highly relevant	Total
OUTCOME B: Trainings to increase knowledge of the causes, prevalence, and consequences of child labor	3 (8%)	15 (38%)	21 (54%)	39 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	-	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)

Table 18. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat effective	Effective	Highly effective	Do not know	Total
OUTCOME B: Trainings to increase knowledge of the causes, prevalence, and consequences of child labor	2 (5%)	23 (59%)	13 (33%)	1 (3%)	39 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	-	-	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)

Table 19. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat use new knowledge and skills	Often use new knowledge and skills	Do not know	Total
OUTCOME B: Trainings to increase knowledge of the causes, prevalence, and consequences of child labor	23 (59%)	16 (41%)	-	39 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)

Table 20. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work.

	N (%)
OUTCOME B: Trainings to increase knowledge of the causes, prevalence, and consequences of child labor	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	6 (15%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	22 (56%)

	N (%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	7 (18%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	14 (36%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	9 (23%)
Other	1 (3%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (...	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	0 (.%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	2 (67%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	0 (.%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	2 (67%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	0 (.%)
Other	1 (33%)

Note: More than one option could be selected.

FIJI, BY OUTCOME

Table 21. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Fiji?

	Somewhat relevant	Relevant	Highly relevant	Total
OUTCOME 4: Trainings on approaches to eradicate and end all forms of child labor	4 (7%)	19 (32%)	37 (62%)	60 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	-	-	2 (100%)	2 (100%)

Table 22. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat effective	Effective	Highly effective	Total
OUTCOME 4: Trainings on approaches to eradicate and end all forms of child labor	3 (5%)	28 (47%)	29 (48%)	60 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	-	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)

Table 23. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat use new knowledge and skills	Often use new knowledge and skills	Missing response	Total
OUTCOME 4: Trainings on approaches to eradicate and end all forms of child labor	22 (37%)	37 (62%)	1 (2%)	60 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	-	2 (100%)

Table 24. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work.

	N (%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings on approaches to eradicate and end all forms of child labor	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	32 (54%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	44 (75%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	26 (44%)

	N (%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	19 (32%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	26 (44%)
Other	1 (2%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	2 (100%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	2 (100%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	2 (100%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	1 (50%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	2 (100%)
Other	0 (.%)

Note: More than one option could be selected.

INDIA, BY OUTCOME

Table 25. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in India?

	Not relevant at all	Somewhat relevant	Relevant	Highly relevant	Do not know	Total
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen state government's capacity and knowledge on child labor	-	3 (18%)	9 (53%)	4 (24%)	1 (6%)	17 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	1 (50%)	-	-	1 (50%)	-	2 (100%)

Table 26. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat effective	Effective	Highly effective	Total
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen state government's capacity and knowledge on child labor	2 (12%)	11 (65%)	4 (24%)	17 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	-	2 (100%)	-	2 (100%)

Table 27. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat use new knowledge and skills	Often use new knowledge and skills	Missing response	Total
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen state government's capacity and knowledge on child labor	3 (18%)	13 (76%)	1 (6%)	17 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	-	2 (100%)

Table 28. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work.

	N (%)
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen state government's capacity and knowledge on child labor	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	6 (38%)

	N (%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	11 (69%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	2 (12%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	1 (6%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	7 (44%)
Other	0 (.%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	0 (.%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	1 (50%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	1 (50%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	0 (.%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	1 (50%)
Other	0 (.%)

Note: More than one option could be selected.

KOSOVO, BY OUTCOME

Table 29. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Kosovo?

	Somewhat relevant	Relevant	Highly relevant	Total
OUTCOME 1: Trainings to strengthen framework for monitoring prevalence of child labor and fact-based planning measures to address child labor	-	5 (38%)	8 (62%)	13 (100%)
OUTCOME 2: Trainings to strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor	1 (14%)	4 (57%)	2 (29%)	7 (100%)
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen the education system to prevent and protect children from child labor	-	4 (31%)	9 (69%)	13 (100%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor	-	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	6 (100%)
OUTCOME 5: Trainings to improve the role of judiciary system in dealing with child labor cases	-	1 (100%)		1 (100%)
OUTCOME 6: Trainings with Municipal Agriculture Advisors on child labor in agriculture and forestry	-	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	-		2 (100%)	2 (100%)

Table 30. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat effective	Effective	Highly effective	Total
OUTCOME 1: Trainings to strengthen framework for monitoring prevalence of child labor and fact-based planning measures to address child labor	-	6 (46%)	7 (54%)	13 (100%)
OUTCOME 2: Trainings to strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor	-	5 (71%)	2 (29%)	7 (100%)
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen the education system to prevent and protect children from child labor	-	3 (23%)	10 (77%)	13 (100%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor	-	2 (33%)	4 (67%)	6 (100%)
OUTCOME 5: Trainings to improve the role of judiciary system in dealing with child labor cases	1 (100%)	-	-	1 (100%)

	Somewhat effective	Effective	Highly effective	Total
OUTCOME 6: Trainings with Municipal Agriculture Advisors on child labor in agriculture and forestry	-	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	4 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	-		2 (100%)	2 (100%)

Table 31. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat use new knowledge and skills	Often use new knowledge and skills	Total
OUTCOME 1: Trainings to strengthen framework for monitoring prevalence of child labor and fact-based planning measures to address child labor	3 (23%)	10 (77%)	13 (100%)
OUTCOME 2: Trainings to strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor	3 (43%)	4 (57%)	7 (100%)
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen the education system to prevent and protect children from child labor	4 (31%)	9 (69%)	13 (100%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor	2 (33%)	4 (67%)	6 (100%)
OUTCOME 5: Trainings to improve the role of judiciary system in dealing with child labor cases	1 (100%)	-	1 (100%)
OUTCOME 6: Trainings with Municipal Agriculture Advisors on child labor in agriculture and forestry	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	4 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	-	2 (100%)	2 (100%)

Table 32. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work.

	N (%)
OUTCOME 1: Trainings to strengthen framework for monitoring prevalence of child labor and fact-based planning measures to address child labor	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	9 (69%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	10 (77%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	6 (46%)

	N (%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	5 (38%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	8 (62%)
Other	0 (.%)
OUTCOME 2: Trainings to strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	4 (57%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	5 (71%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	1 (14%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	3 (43%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	3 (43%)
Other	0 (.%)
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen the education system to prevent and protect children from child labor	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	9 (69%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	11 (85%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	2 (15%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	6 (46%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	7 (54%)
Other	0 (.%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	4 (67%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	2 (33%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	0 (.%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	1 (17%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	2 (33%)
Other	0 (.%)
OUTCOME 5: Trainings to improve the role of judiciary system in dealing with child labor cases	

	N (%)
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	0 (.%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	0 (.%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	0 (.%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	1 (100%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	0 (.%)
Other	0 (.%)
OUTCOME 6: Trainings with Municipal Agriculture Advisors on child labor in agriculture and forestry	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	1 (25%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	2 (50%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	0 (.%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	1 (25%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	2 (50%)
Other	0 (.%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	1 (50%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	1 (50%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	1 (50%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	1 (50%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	2 (100%)
Other	1 (50%)

Note: More than one option could be selected.

NIGER, BY OUTCOME

Table 33. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Niger?

	Relevant	Highly relevant	Total
OUTCOME 2: Trainings on child labor in agriculture	2 (100%)	-	2 (100%)
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen institutional capacities of relevant ministries and social partners on the elimination of child labor	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	9 (100%)

Table 34. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor?

	Effective	Highly effective	Total
OUTCOME 2: Trainings on child labor in agriculture	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen institutional capacities of relevant ministries and social partners on the elimination of child labor	2 (22%)	7 (78%)	9 (100%)

Table 35. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat use new knowledge and skills	Often use new knowledge and skills	Total
OUTCOME 2: Trainings on child labor in agriculture	-	2 (100%)	2 (100%)
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen institutional capacities of relevant ministries and social partners on the elimination of child labor	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	9 (100%)

Table 36. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work.

	N (%)
OUTCOME 2: Trainings on child labor in agriculture	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	2 (100%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	2 (100%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	2 (100%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	2 (100%)

	N (%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	2 (100%)
Other	0 (.%)
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen institutional capacities of relevant ministries and social partners on the elimination of child labor	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	5 (56%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	7 (78%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	4 (44%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	5 (56%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	8 (89%)
Other	0 (.%)

Note: More than one option could be selected.

SERBIA, BY OUTCOME

Table 37. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Serbia?

	Relevant	Highly relevant	Do not know	Total
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor	5 (45%)	5 (45%)	1 (9%)	11 (100%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor	3 (43%)	4 (57%)	-	7 (100%)

Table 38. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat effective	Effective	Highly effective	Total
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor	1 (9%)	4 (36%)	6 (55%)	11 (100%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	7 (100%)

Table 39. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor?

	Do not use new knowledge and skills at all	Somewhat use new knowledge and skills	Often use new knowledge and skills	Do not know	Total
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor	-	9 (82%)	2 (18%)	-	11 (100%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	7 (100%)

Table 40. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work.

	N (%)
OUTCOME 3: Trainings to strengthen social protection systems in preventing and protecting children from child labor	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	5 (45%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	6 (55%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	4 (36%)

	N (%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	2 (18%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	4 (36%)
Other	0 (.%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	3 (75%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	3 (75%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	2 (50%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	3 (75%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	2 (50%)
Other	0 (.%)

Note: More than one option could be selected.

Table 41. Please select the reason(s) that best describe why you do not use the knowledge and skills acquired from these training.

	N (%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to improve enforcement of laws and policies related to child labor	
I did not gain new knowledge and skills from the training	0 (.%)
The training was not relevant to my work	0 (.%)
The training was not relevant to child labor issues in my country	0 (.%)
There has not been an opportunity in my work yet to use the new knowledge and skills	1 (50%)
The training content did not include enough practical guidance to use in my work	0 (.%)
The number of trainings was insufficient to gain the knowledge and skills needed for my work	0 (.%)
The training handouts/materials did not provide sufficient guidance for my work	0 (.%)
Other	1 (50%)

Note: More than one option could be selected.

SRI LANKA

Table 42. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Sri Lanka?

	Relevant	Highly relevant	Total
OUTCOME 1: Trainings to increase access to knowledge for key professional groups in government and civil society	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)

Table 43. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat effective	Effective	Total
OUTCOME 1: Trainings to increase access to knowledge for key professional groups in government and civil society	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)

Table 44. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor?

	Often use new knowledge and skills	Do not know	Total
OUTCOME 1: Trainings to increase access to knowledge for key professional groups in government and civil society	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)

Table 45. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work.

	N (%)
OUTCOME 1: Trainings to increase access to knowledge for key professional groups in government and civil society	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	1 (100%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	0 (.%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	1 (100%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	0 (.%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	0 (.%)
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	0 (.%)

TIMOR-LESTE, BY OUTCOME

Table 46. How relevant do you think these training(s) were to your work related to combatting child labor and worst forms of child labor in Timor-Leste?

	Relevant	Highly relevant	Total
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to increase access to knowledge and procedures on child labor	3 (38%)	5 (62%)	8 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	3 (33%)	6 (67%)	9 (100%)

Table 47. Overall, how effective do you think these training(s) were in improving your capacity to do work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat effective	Effective	Highly effective	Total
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to increase access to knowledge and procedures on child labor	-	4 (50%)	4 (50%)	8 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	1 (11%)	6 (67%)	2 (22%)	9 (100%)

Table 48. To what extent have you been able to use new knowledge and skills acquired in these trainings in your work related to combatting child labor?

	Somewhat use new knowledge and skills	Often use new knowledge and skills	Missing response	Total
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to increase access to knowledge and procedures on child labor	2 (25%)	4 (50%)	2 (25%)	8 (100%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	4 (44%)	5 (56%)	-	9 (100%)

Table 49. Please select what factors you believe contributed to your ability to use this new knowledge and skills for your work.

	N (%)
OUTCOME 4: Trainings to increase access to knowledge and procedures on child labor	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	1 (17%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	2 (33%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	2 (33%)

	N (%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	1 (17%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	1 (17%)
Other	1 (17%)
None of the above/My training is not represented above (Please briefly explain the training you participated in):	
The training content included practical guidance relevant to my work	3 (33%)
The training was relevant to child labor issues in my country	3 (33%)
I am required to use the learnings from the training in my work	2 (22%)
Although there are no requirements to use the learnings from the training, I feel motivated after the training to use learnings to improve my performance	2 (22%)
The training handouts/materials provided sufficient guidance for my work	2 (22%)
Other	4 (44%)

Note: More than one option could be selected.