

Interim Performance Evaluation: Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla Growing Communities in Sava, Madagascar

United States Department of Labor
Bureau of International Labor Affairs



Date: June 5, 2019

Author: Mei Zegers

This report was prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) under Contract Number 1605DC-18-F-00393. The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to DOL, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement of the same by the U.S. Government.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
Acronyms	ii
Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	7
2. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology	7
2.1. Evaluation Purpose and Scope	7
2.2. Evaluation Questions	8
2.3. Methodology	8
2.4. Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality.....	10
2.5. Strengths and Limitations.....	11
2.6. Project Description	11
3. Results	13
3.1. Relevance	13
3.2. Effectiveness.....	19
3.3. Efficiency.....	41
3.4. Impact.....	45
3.5. Sustainability Prospects	45
Lessons Learned and Promising Practices	47
4. Conclusions.....	48
5. Recommendations	50
Annex A: Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR)	55
Annex B: References	69
Annex C: List of People Interviewed and Details on Focus Groups	71
Annex D: Field Work Itinerary Overview.....	79
Annex E: Stakeholder Workshop Agenda and Participants.....	83

Agenda	83
Participants.....	85
Annex F: Results of Group and Plenary Work Preliminary Results Workshop.....	87
Annex G: Evaluation Questions with Locations of Answers in the Report.....	90
Annex H: Overview of Madagascar Child Protection Structure	93
Annex I: Interview and Focus Group Discussion Guide	95
Annex J: Tag Cloud Indicating Frequency of Comments on Evaluation Subjects ..	107

Acknowledgements

The evaluator would like to commend the US Department of Labor, International Labor Organization, and the entire project team for their input into the evaluation process. The project staff was helpful and supportive in organising the mission. Many thanks also go to government officials, the Sustainable Vanilla Initiative, project implementing partners, civil society organisation representatives, representatives of community-based organizations, households, and children for their participation and open sharing of information.

Acronyms

BI	Base Institutionnelle (Institutional Base)
BC	Base Communautaire (Community Base)
Cellule de Veille	Fokontany level child protection cell (fokontany watch cell)
CISCO	District Education Office
CLLTE	Comité Local de Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfants (Local Committee to Fight Child Labor)
CLMS	Child Labor Monitoring System
CMEP	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
CNLTE	Comité National de Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfants (National Committee to Fight Child Labor)
CNPE	Comité National de la Protection des Enfants (National Child Protection Committee)
CPE	Comité de la Protection des Enfants (Child Protection Committee)
CRLTE	Comité Régional de Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfants (Regional Committee to Fight Child Labor)
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
CURSA	Centre Universitaire Régional de la Sava
Dina	Local bylaws developed by communities. The courts approve the Dina to ensure that they can be enforced. (also referred to as <i>Dinam-paritra</i>)
DPMS	Direct Participant Monitoring System
DRC	Direction de la Communication
DREN	Direction Régionale de l'Éducation (Regional Education Office)
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
Fokontany	Smallest administrative unit – below the commune level
GAP	Good Agricultural Practices
GEM	Groupement des Entreprises de Madagascar (Organization of Employers of Madagascar)
GEVM	Groupement des Exportateurs de Vanille de Madagascar Vanilla Exporters Organization of Madagascar
ILAB	United States Department of Labor (USDOL) Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILO	International Labour Organization (Bureau International du Travail – BIT)
INSTAT	Institut National des Statistiques (National Statistics Institute)
IPEC	International Program for the Elimination of Child labor
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MFR	Maison Familiale Rurale
MPPSPF	Ministère de la Population, de la Protection Sociale et de la Promotion de la Femme (Ministry of Population, Social Protection and Women)
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
OFCT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor & Human Trafficking
OPTE	Observatory on Child Labor
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
PNV	Plateforme Nationale de la Vanille (National Vanilla Platform)

PRCP	Plateforme régional de concertation pour le pilotage de la filière vanille (Regional Platform of Vanilla Collectors and Producers)
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
RPE	Réseau de Protection des Enfants (Child Protection Network)
SAVABE	Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla Growing Communities in Sava
SVI	Sustainable Vanilla Initiative
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USDOL	United States Department of Labor

Project Location in Madagascar



Executive Summary

Child labor in Madagascar presents a continuing challenge.¹ This includes child labor in vanilla growing areas of the country. The Sava region is the principal vanilla growing area in Madagascar. Many factors play a role in influencing the prevalence of child labor.² Within this context, the “Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla Growing Communities in Sava” (SAVABE) project was launched to significantly reduce child labor in the vanilla producing areas of the Sava region.

United States Department of Labor (USDOL) Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) signed a Cooperative Agreement providing US\$4,000,000 to the ILO as primary grant recipient. The ILO ensures overall project management and coordination to support implementation of SAVABE. The Sustainable Vanilla Initiative (SVI)³ is a grant sub-recipient, which the ILO has entrusted the responsibility for the technical implementation of one of the four long-term outcomes. The period of performance was planned from November 1, 2016 and is slated to end July 31, 2020. This report presents the midterm evaluation of the SAVABE project conducted from March-April 2019. An independent international evaluator carried out the evaluation.

The purpose of the SAVABE midterm evaluation is to:

- Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the validity of the project design and extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host government and other national stakeholders;
- Determine whether the project is on track toward meeting its objectives, identifying the challenges and opportunities encountered in doing so, and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges and opportunities;
- Assess the effectiveness of the project’s strategies as well as its strengths and weaknesses in project implementation, and identify areas in need of improvement;
- Provide conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations; and
- Assess the project’s plans for sustainability at local and national levels and among implementing organizations and identify steps to enhance its sustainability.

The evaluation reviews and assesses all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with the ILO and covered the period from project launch through the time of evaluation fieldwork.

USDOL and the ILO developed a set of specific questions to guide the evaluation. The questions address issues within the following categories: 1) project design, including relevance, validity, and adequacy; 2) progress and effectiveness in achieving project

¹ Note that the figure quoted in the report does not provide a numerical estimate for children ages 5 through 14. Bureau of International Labor Affairs, US Department of Labor (2019), Child Labor and forced Labor Reports – Madagascar (2017). Available at <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/madagascar>. Website accessed March 30, 2019.

² Ibid., ILO, Project Document: Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla-Growing Communities in Sava Region, Madagascar (SAVABE Project) (Antananarivo: ILO, 2018).

³ Sustainable Vanilla Initiative (2019), Available from <https://www.idhsustainabletrade.com/initiative/sustainable-vanilla-initiative/> Website accessed 16 March, 2019.

objective, outputs, and outcomes; 3) efficiency of resource use, monitoring, and evaluation (M&E), and 4) ownership strategy for sustainability.

Methodology

The evaluation primarily used a triangulation approach combining analysis of documents, interviews, focus group discussions, and observations with a diverse range of national and Sava region stakeholders. The fieldwork took place in March 7-25, 2019. The evaluator used a purposive, non-random sampling method to select groups and individual interviewees. The selection criteria included identifying sites locations where the project experienced relative success and those that were more challenging.

The evaluator conducted a total of 28 individual and group interviews with ILO officials and project staff, USDOL staff overseeing the project, government officials, key project implementing partners, and their members. The evaluator also conducted 15 focus group discussions with civil society groups, including the Comité Régional de Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfants (Regional Committee to Fight Child Labor [CRLTE]), Comité Local de Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfants (Local Committee to Fight Child Labor [CLLTE]), other local officials and educators, beneficiaries, and children.

Thirty-five participants (including key stakeholders) attended a preliminary results stakeholder workshop where the evaluator presented and discussed her preliminary findings and the stakeholders provided further reflections and made recommendations. The evaluation followed United Nations ethical interviewing guidelines. The qualitative data software analysis tool, Atlas.ti, was used in combination with categorizing, triangulating, and synthesizing the raw data in accordance with the questions in the TOR.

Project Description

The project's overall objective is to significantly reduce the prevalence of child labor in the vanilla producing areas of the Sava region. The project works with local implementing partners to carry out activities in 32 of the 86 communes in the Sava region.

The project has four long term outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Vanilla exporters, collectors, and preparers significantly reduce child labor in the production of vanilla at the farm, collection, and preparation levels in Sava.
- Outcome 2: Law enforcement and child protection officials enforce child labor laws and policies and ensure care of victims in the vanilla-producing areas of Sava.
- Outcome 3: Community members monitor child labor and refer victims to relevant authorities and services.
- Outcome 4: Beneficiary households do not use child labor to supplement income.

Results

Project Design

The SAVABE project is highly relevant in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country and is generally well designed. There is a high level of interest in the project among vanilla value chain actors, national and local government, development partners, and civil society.

Special care in the design should be taken when developing indicator definitions. Notably, indicator definitions should accurately cover the expected level of results that are implied from project initiatives, including the minimum acceptable duration of training. Though quality of training is essential, for real understanding and behavior change to occur, more than four hours is needed. The exact number of hours should be determined based on the subject matter and the training needs/capacities of the participant(s).

Effectiveness

There were many delays during the period from start-up to the midterm evaluation. In seven of the intended 32 project communes, the Committees to Fight Child Labor (CLLTE), which coordinates at commune level, were not yet established at midterm.

While many of the delays are due to external circumstances (such as a teacher's strike and elections), evidence from interviews, focus groups, and documentation indicate that internal factors also play a role. These include lengthy procedures to identify and hire staff, the identification and confirmation of local implementing partners, and logistical and other challenges in organizing field work in the implementation sites. The baseline survey, at the midterm evaluation, had not yet been finalized and included several challenges to validity and reliability of the results.

Based on triangulation of the evaluation findings, the evaluation identified low project visibility and challenges regarding communications and coordination with the wide range of actors associated with the project. Many stakeholders commented on these issues during the Preliminary Results Stakeholder Workshop. Coordination and communication with and among the regional government, vanilla industry, civil society, and social service providers need attention. In accordance with their objectives, stakeholders expect the project to take the leading role in this.

Planned organized mapping exercises for the start-up period (i.e., beyond listing available services and partners in mission reports) are only now underway though they should have been an early priority.

Though the use of good practices and lessons learned and participation of stakeholders in project design was good, this was less continued during implementation. There is a need to track good practices and lessons learned using monitoring evidence from the collection of quantitative data, stories, and case studies.

Efforts to strengthen the enabling environment are underway and appear to be going in the right direction, but dissemination and awareness raising of associated materials—Dina,⁴ Code of Conduct, Letter of Engagement—need very intensive ongoing work. Much remains to be done on social behavior change communications. The evaluator notes that the traceability system still requires substantial attention to become fully operational.

Based on the limited evidence due to delays, the evaluation concludes that the training modules have good potential to achieve positive results. Issues regarding security in vanilla plantations were found to play an important role in project effectiveness, eventual impact, and

⁴ Local bylaws developed by communities. The courts approve the Dina (also referred to as *Dinam-paritra*) to ensure they can be enforced).

sustainability. Security on the plantations is a major problem as the theft of vanilla vines and individual vanilla pods is common, including at night. Children may be involved in guarding fields and adults are afraid to leave their fields unattended to participate in meetings and training.

The evaluation further found that the project focus has deviated somewhat to cover issues on child protection at the fokontany level; this is beyond the project's capacity and objectives. However, child labor referral methods must be integrated into any functional child protection system. At present, a functional system is not yet present in the region.

The establishment of child labor committees is underway but capacity strengthening and ongoing technical support should be intensified. Ownership and long-term sustainability will be at risk if the intensity and duration of support necessary for the committees is not provided.

The ILO's position as the project's prime grantee was not maximized. Its extensive experience with a broad range of subjects having direct and less direct links with child labor in value chains was not utilized. Aside from child labor experts who can provide solid and regular technical support, the ILO also has specialists who could be more involved. These would include specialists on the informal economy/economic empowerment, occupational safety and health (OSH), and social protection. The evaluation notes that OSH can help improve decent work conditions for older children as well as adults.

Efficiency

The evaluation finds that the project is ambitious given the physical terrain and breadth of activities at the community level. To increase learning, eventual replication of activities, and effectiveness, the evaluation recommends focusing on a few communes to develop effective models. Documenting the processes will be essential to scaling up in public, private and other partnerships.

The evaluation further notes that efficiency is hampered due to team coordination issues, team building needs, and staffing levels. Planning is not smooth, and time is spent on planning short-term and office issues which can be improved through more strategic methods. This means good time allocation to the discussion of different subjects during meetings, with a focus on planning the methods for achievement of results. Decision-making on practical matters should be handled swiftly and delegated where possible. Stakeholders also mentioned the large amount of time spent preparing USDOL and ILO required paper deliverables instead of working on the ground carrying out deliverables.

Sustainability

That the project is being implemented without a well-developed national and local strategy for the vanilla value chain hampers the speed and extent of results. The lack of such a strategy with an accompanying road map also impedes sustainability. While there is a national framework on child labor, little is adapted to the specificities of the Sava region in this regard. Project implementation, coordination, and sustainability planning would benefit from the development of appropriate related frameworks applicable to the region.

Recommendations

Please refer to the main report for estimated needed priority and resource levels and responsible actors. For implementation of the recommendations, the evaluator requests that stakeholders consult the more detailed version in the body of the report.

- 1) **Include in future projects a full *intensive livelihood service provision plan with indicator definitions* that fully describe the expected measures** to obtain DOL approval/agreement and to ensure quality and an adequate level of service provision.
- 2) **Increase efforts to identify and build on country and international experience (good practices and lessons learned) with child labor and substantially strengthen technical support from the ILO.** Include intensive technical and management support from country and regional office and headquarters. Increase learning from Madagascar from ILO cocoa, cotton, lychee, and other agriculture initiatives around the world, and from SVI member companies' public-private partnerships.
- 3) **Strengthen the traceability system** to verify the existence or non-existence of child labor. Make adaptations in the traceability system to ensure that it adequately covers child labor along the vanilla value chain.
 - a) Work more intensively with the CLLTE and other service providers in the communities.
 - b) Include collector registration incentives. This is foreseen in Outcome 1 but remains a challenge as it also involves addressing issues of taxation and fees.
 - c) Increase focus on innovative and well-designed social behavior change initiatives.
- 4) **Increase focus on Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) in similar projects.**
 - a. If funding is available, conduct OSH study of specific conditions and consequences for child health in vanilla value chain and its dangers, including night work for security and pollination. Relate these to existing child labor laws in Madagascar.
 - b. Include OSH approaches that can reduce the level of hazardous work for children in household training modules. Review how the ILO Global Action Guide on improving safety, health, and working conditions in agriculture can be adapted.
- 5) **Increase focus at the fokontany level in line with SAVABE's development goal on child labor** instead of a broader approach on child protection at this stage. However, work toward an integration of child labor into a fully functioning child protection referral system in the Sava region.
- 6) **Address issues related to security in the production of vanilla as they apply to SAVABE project implementation.**
- 7) **Initiate renewed high-level coordination of project activities, processes, and visibility with strong role of the ILO and sub-grantee SVI.** Improve communications about the project, advocacy, and awareness raising overall (vertically and horizontally along the value chain and with related partners). Ensure that key stakeholders are well informed of progress and provide suggestions to strengthen SAVABE implementation

processes. Increase and conduct regular national level consultations with government ministries, private sector, and other development partners. This should include a project steering committee involving high level government representatives.

- 8) **Shift focus intensively to mapping** commune and regionally based government, civil society, and private sector services to link efforts to withdraw from child labor. Mapping should function as a stepping stone toward development of the referral system with clear details on how and where services can be accessed.

In addition to recommendation 2:

- 9) **Focus project financing more intensively on a sample of four to five communes which can then serve as models** for eventual scaling up. Link experiences to project documentation and information sharing efforts. Establish a well-organized system to record good practices, stories, and case studies based on practical progress made. Such information can be used to exchange experiences and build a community of learning on child labor, and other decent work aspects in the value chain should be a component of ongoing efforts.
- 10) **Address staffing levels and team building needs to improve project effectiveness and efficiency.** Two additional Malagasy staff members should be added to the team for the success of the project. At the higher level, a communications expert should be assigned to help the project director address project visibility and communications challenges. An additional staff member should be assigned to cover one of the two project components that is currently covered by a single person. A formal team building exercise that includes concrete work planning exercises should be carried out to strengthen team coordination.
- 11) **Policy development and road map for the Sava region.** SAVABE and its partners should provide advocacy and inputs to develop the social (including decent work) components for a vanilla policy/strategy.
- 12) **Project extension (no cost) with handover to a national expert at the end of the currently projected end of project period of July 2020.** To ensure a solid transition to national ownership with sustainability improvements, work intensively to transfer the project director role to an experienced Malagasy project director from July 2020. This extension should be a phaseout period of the SAVABE project with well-organized initiatives focused on sustainability.

1. Introduction

Child labor in Madagascar presents a continuing challenge.⁵ The 2012 National Child Labor survey found that, in the majority of Madagascar's seven vanilla-producing regions, the rates of child labor participation exceeded the national average.⁶ The number of economically active children in the seven regions was 594,000, 588,000 (89 percent) of whom worked in agriculture, including in the vanilla industry.

The Sava region is the principal vanilla growing area in Madagascar. An International Labour Organization (ILO) survey estimated in 2012 that approximately one third of the children between the ages of 15 and 17 work in the production and processing of vanilla in the country's Sava Region.⁷ The report states that many factors influence the prevalence of child labor.⁸ The most direct cause is poverty. The absence of local vocational and skills training and the desire to keep vanilla production costs low are additional factors.⁹ Other causes include insecurity in vanilla growing locations, which results in communities adding children to the pool of persons guarding plantations. Several other background factors discussed in the relevance section of this report further contribute to child labor in the vanilla value chain.

Within this context, the "Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla Growing Communities in Sava" (SAVABE project) was launched to significantly reduce child labor in the vanilla producing areas of the Sava region, the principal vanilla growing area in Madagascar.

United States Department of Labor (USDOL) and the ILO signed a Cooperative Agreement providing US\$4,000,000 to the ILO as the primary grant recipient with the Sustainable Vanilla Initiative (SVI) as sub-grantee project partner. ILO ensures overall project management and coordination to support implementation of SAVABE. The period of performance was planned from November 1, 2016 and is slated to end July 31, 2020. This report presents the midterm evaluation of the SAVABE project, which was conducted from March-April 2019. An international independent evaluator carried out the evaluation.

2. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology

2.1. Evaluation Purpose and Scope

The purpose of the SAVABE midterm evaluation is to:

⁵ Note that the figure quoted in the report does not provide a numerical estimate for children aged 5 through 14. Bureau of International Labor Affairs, US Department of Labor (2019), Child Labour and forced Labor Reports – Madagascar, 2017. Data available at <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/madagascar>. Website accessed March, 30 2019.

⁶ The incidence of child labor is 22.7% (68,000 children) in Sava. INSTAT Madagascar, Child Labor in Madagascar in 2012: Report on the National Employment and Informal Economy Survey (ENEMPSI-2012). Antananarivo: INSTAT Madagascar.

⁷ The study was largely qualitative and did not include information about children less than 12 years old. Note that the field work for the study was done in 2011 and the study published in 2012. Programme International pour l'abolition du travail des enfants (IPEC) (2012), États des lieux du travail des enfants dans la filière vanille dans la région de la Sava 2011. Antananarivo: OIT.

⁸ Ibid., ILO, Project Document: Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla-Growing Communities in Sava Region, Madagascar (SAVABE Project). Antananarivo: ILO, 2018.

⁹ To facilitate reading, the evaluator uses the single term "plantation" to refer to all sites where vanilla is grown, regardless of whether they are small or large surface areas.

- Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the validity of the project design and the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host government and other national stakeholders.
- Determine whether the project is on track toward meeting its objectives, identify the challenges and opportunities encountered in doing so, and analyze the driving factors for these challenges and opportunities.
- Assess the effectiveness of the project's strategies, strengths, and weaknesses in implementation and identify areas in need of improvement.
- Provide conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations.
- Assess the project's plans for sustainability at the local and national levels and among implementing organizations and identify steps to enhance its sustainability.

The interim evaluation provides key stakeholders with information to assess and revise work plans, strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements, and resources as needed. The evaluation results, conclusions, and recommendations will serve to inform project adjustments if need be and inform stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future child labor elimination projects.

Scope

The evaluation reviews and assesses all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with the ILO. All activities implemented from project launch in November 2016 through the time of evaluation fieldwork in March-April 2019 were considered.

Intended Users

The evaluation will provide USDOL Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), the grantee, other project stakeholders, and stakeholders working to combat child labor more broadly with an assessment of the project's experience in implementation, its effects on project participants, and an understanding of the factors driving project results.

2.2. Evaluation Questions

USDOL and the ILO developed a set of specific questions to guide the evaluation. This is included in the Terms of Reference (TOR) in Annex A. The questions address issues within the following categories: 1) project design, including relevance, validity and adequacy; 2) progress and effectiveness in achieving the project objective, outputs, and outcomes; 3) efficiency of resource use, monitoring, and evaluation (M&E); and 4) sustainability and ownership.

2.3. Methodology

The evaluation primarily used a triangulation approach combining analysis of documents, interviews, focus group discussions, and observations with a diverse range of national and Sava region stakeholders. The documents reviewed included the project document, the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP), progress reports, project outputs, previous research, and a range of contextual material.

A set of guidelines for the Evaluation Questions were developed for use with the different types of stakeholders (Annex G). A mostly semi-structured interview approach was used with stakeholders other than those directly employed in the project. Interviews with project staff were more structured but still allowed room for semi-structured discussions and reflections on the part of the interviewees.

Evaluation Schedule and Preliminary Results Workshop

The evaluation was conducted in March and April 2019. In the preparation phase, the evaluators provided inputs to the TOR, reviewed project documents, developed the methodology and interview guides, conducted preparatory interviews, and jointly agreed with project staff on the mission schedule. See Annex D for schedule details.

The fieldwork in Madagascar took place from March 7-25, 2019. The fieldwork culminated in a stakeholder workshop on March 25, where the evaluator presented and discussed preliminary findings. Stakeholders provided further reflections on the project's successes and challenges and made recommendations which were taken into consideration and are reflected in the evaluation report recommendations.

Data Collection and Analysis

The evaluation questions provided in the TOR were used to develop a Data Collection Matrix showing the evaluation questions and main sources of data to be used to answer those questions. The matrix then formed the basis for developing a detailed list of information to be collected and guides and protocols for the stakeholder interviews.

The evaluator used the following methods to gather primary and secondary data:

Key Informant Interviews: The evaluator conducted a total of 28 individual and group interviews with ILO officials and project staff, USDOL staff overseeing the project, government officials, key project implementing partners, and their members. Several of the stakeholders in this group were interviewed more than once to ask follow-up questions. To obtain additional information and allow for better triangulation, some interviews were also conducted by Skype after the fieldwork in Madagascar was completed.

The evaluator conducted 25 focus group discussions with civil society groups, including the Comité Local de Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfants (Local Committee to Fight Child Labor) (CLLTE), Comité Régional de Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfants (Regional Committee to Fight Child Labor) (CRLTE) other local officials and educators, beneficiaries, and children. The list of persons interviewed appears in Annex C.

Preliminary Results Stakeholder Workshop: 35 participants, including key stakeholders and SAVABE project staff, attended the workshop. A list of participants is provided in Annex E.

Sampling Methodology

The evaluator used a purposive, non-random sampling method to select groups and individual interviewees. Prior to the field mission, the evaluator shared a set of planning guidelines on site selection and itinerary organization.

In addition to interviews with project staff, ILO officials, and national government officials, the evaluation team selected project sites in consultation with project staff. The selection sought to provide a representative coverage of activities and maximize the quality of data collected. The selection criteria included a focus on sites where the project has experienced relative success and sites that were more challenging; and coverage of sites of operation of the main implementing partner organizations.

Data Analysis

An analysis of qualitative interviews and group discussions was conducted. In addition, the evaluator reviewed project-related data on progress, including outputs and outcomes, baseline and other written materials, and tools SAVABE had commissioned. The Atlasti qualitative data software analysis¹⁰ was used for this purpose. Prior to the fieldwork, the evaluator prepared a coding mechanism based on the evaluation criteria and questions to be answered. The codes were entered in the software to allow for a thorough analysis of all relevant notes and documents. Interview and focus group notes were organized under the relevant codes in Atlasti daily.

The analysis also incorporated quantitative data obtained from project documents and reports to the extent available. The analysis of the results is based on triangulation of data collection methods and stakeholder perspectives to strengthen the credibility and validity of the findings.

2.4. Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality

The evaluation followed United Nations ethical interviewing guidelines. Names of respondents are not directly attributed to comments in the report and confidentiality is assured.

The evaluation criteria used in the analysis of the project design and its monitoring and evaluation plan are based on the evaluation standards of the UN Evaluation Group, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) guidance on the Results Based Management standards for project design, and the ILO Policy Guidelines on Results Based Evaluation.¹¹

¹⁰ Atlasti.com (provided by evaluator).

¹¹ United Nations Evaluation Group, Norms and Standards for Evaluation (New York: UNEG, 2016); United Nations Development Programme, Results Based Management Handbook, October 2011 (ILO, 2012). ILO Policy Guidelines on Results Based Evaluation.

2.5. Strengths and Limitations

Strengths

The evaluation schedule afforded a good overview of the activities of the project to date. The project team managed the logistics and schedule well and most meetings occurred on schedule, with some slight delays due to travel challenges.

Adjustments were easily made in line with local realities encountered during the field work. With a few exceptions, the group discussion sizes were manageable (8-12 participants) as planned and afforded quality discussion and equal participation.

The stakeholder workshop was successful and drew active participation of the various stakeholders.

Limitations

Fieldwork for the evaluation lasted two and a half weeks. Difficulty accessing some project sites meant that substantial time was necessary to travel to and from field locations. To gain a solid understanding of project conditions, the evaluator visited several such distant sites. However, the evaluator did not have enough time to visit all project sites and could not take all sites into consideration when formulating findings.

The evaluation is not a formal impact assessment. Findings for the evaluation are based on information collected from background documents and interviews/focus groups discussions (FGDs) with stakeholders, project staff, and beneficiaries. The accuracy of the evaluation findings will be determined by the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources.

The ability of the evaluator to determine efficiency is 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.

2.6. Project Description

The project's overall objective is to significantly reduce the prevalence of child labor in the vanilla producing areas of the Sava region. To achieve this goal, the project aims to address challenges regarding weak organization and governance of the vanilla sector, and insufficient action by government, social partners, and civil society to protect children and uphold their rights in Sava. This includes addressing issues regarding norms in vanilla-growing communities that generally accept and encourage child labor;¹² and strengthening incomes through livelihoods initiatives and reducing reliance on child labor.

The project has four long-term outcomes (see Annex A for a full list of the outcomes, sub-outcomes, and outputs):

- Outcome 1: Vanilla exporters, collectors, and preparers significantly reduce child labor

¹² ILO, Project Document: Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla-Growing Communities in Sava Region, Madagascar (SAVABE Project) (Antananarivo: ILO, 2018).

in the production of vanilla at the farm, collection, and preparation levels in Sava.

- **Outcome 2:** Law enforcement and child protection officials enforce child labor laws and policies and ensure care of victims in the vanilla-producing areas of Sava.
- **Outcome 3:** Community members monitor child labor and refer victims to relevant authorities and services.
- **Outcome 4:** Beneficiary households do not use child labor to supplement income.

The Sustainable Vanilla Initiative (SVI)¹³ is a grant sub-recipient to which the ILO has entrusted the responsibility for the technical implementation of long-term outcome 1. The ILO is responsible for long term outcomes 2, 3, and 4.

The project has an international director and four Malagasy specialists. Three specialists focus on business and coalition-building, enforcement of laws, awareness raising, capacity building, and livelihoods. The fourth is the monitoring and evaluation specialist.¹⁴

The project works with contracted local implementing partners to carry out activities in 32 of the 86 communes in the Sava region. Various implementing partners are responsible for different types of project activities ranging from training to research to the development of various awareness raising activities and other tools.

Other important Malagasy partners are from various government agencies such as the National Vanilla Platform (PNV), Regional Platform of Vanilla Collectors and Producers (PRCP), and Regional Committee to Fight Child Labor (CRLTE).

While it is not possible to cite the many activities planned under the project, some key aspects are cited below.

Outcome 1: Vanilla exporters, collectors, and preparers significantly reduce child labor in the production of vanilla at the farm, collection, and preparation levels in Sava.

- Analyzing and subsequently improving vanilla sector governance.
- Strengthening the traceability system that identifies commercial agreements to avoid child labor among exporters, collectors, preparers, and producers of vanilla.
- Ensuring adherence to the Vanilla Sector Code of Conduct, including a letter of engagement with specific provisions against child labor.
- Organizing vanilla sector-level consultations on the best mechanism(s) to track and prevent child labor and refer and provide services to victims of child labor.
- Mainstreaming child labor awareness raising across the sector in programs set up by the vanilla exporting companies, their collectors, preparers, and producers.

Outcome 2: Law enforcement and child protection officials enforce child labor laws and policies and ensure care of victims in the vanilla-producing areas of Sava.

- Mapping all local entities involved in the fight against child labor in Sava.
- Capacity strengthening of regional labor law enforcement, child protection, and district and commune authorities to enforce laws and implement policies, referral, and

¹³ Sustainable Vanilla Initiative, Available from <https://www.idhsustainabletrade.com/initiative/sustainable-vanilla-initiative/> (2019). Website accessed March 16, 2019.

¹⁴ There is one finance and administrative assistant and one driver.

intervention systems on child labor. Training of labor inspectors/controllers, police (*gendarmerie*), educators, child protection and agriculture agents, and others.

- Coordination strengthening among the regional government, vanilla industry, civil society, social service providers, and the regional labor union.
- Providing support services to victims of child labor in partnership with local entities.

Outcome 3: Community members monitor for child labor and refer victims of child labor to the relevant authorities and services.

- Mapping available community-based services.
- Awareness raising, working with and training actors in the vanilla sector, CRLTE, CLLTE, community groups, and community members.
- Creating and strengthening the Child Labor Monitoring Committee (CLLTE) in project areas.
- Scaling up a child labor monitoring system (CLMS).
- Amending and disseminating the Dina¹⁵ (*Dinam-paritra*) to integrate child labor and set out the responsibilities of the implementers.

Outcome 4: Beneficiary households do not use child labor to supplement household income.

- Providing training in improved agricultural practices and financial management to 15,000 households. Adapting and providing access to financial instruments and services.
- Implementing vocational training program and raising awareness of child labor with 450 children (ages 14 to 17) from beneficiary households.
- Establishing a Vanilla Agronomy and Quality Center, with related activities on developing training modules, a joint pilot project on good agricultural practices, the training cooperatives
- Developing adapted financial instruments for producers, such as savings and loans groups or mobile banking.
- Tracking application and benefits of Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) training and new financial instruments implementation.
- Strengthening governance and (formation of) cooperatives and services.

3. Results

3.1. Relevance

The SAVABE project is highly relevant in the cultural, economic, and political context of the country. A study on the prevalence of child labor in the vanilla value chain with data collected in 2011 indicated the need to address this issue.¹⁶ Increased demand of buyers in other countries for products made in decent work conditions drew the attention of decision makers in Madagascar and, thus, foreign companies dealing in vanilla. In 2017, vanilla was assessed as the country's top export earner at \$894 million and represented 26 percent of the total value

¹⁵ See Acronyms and Terms List.

¹⁶ Programme International pour l'abolition du travail des enfants (IPEC), États des lieux du travail des enfants dans la filière vanille dans la region de la Sava 2011 (Antananarivo: OIT, 2012).

of Madagascar's exports.¹⁷ International reticence to buy vanilla from Madagascar could pose a real threat to the level of vanilla exports. As a result, a project focusing on eliminating child labor in the vanilla industry is appropriate.

The project is aligned with the country's National Action Plan to Eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labor (2004–2019) and the ILO's Decent Work Country Programme 2015–2019.¹⁸ The project design and theory of change itself are well suited to the priorities and policies of the host government and other national stakeholders. Evidence is further provided from national government and most key Sava regional stakeholders interviewed. As one government representative noted, "*The project design is very interesting and can really bring some relief to reduce child labor in the vanilla value chain. There needs to be really good tools to achieve this.*" The consensus was support for the project concept and its overall design. Some officials also pointed out the fact that the mere existence of the project is already an indication that the country is serious about addressing child labor in the vanilla value chain.

Many government and other key stakeholders¹⁹ at the national and regional levels noted that they had been consulted or otherwise participated in the project design. They appreciated their involvement at those early stages and believed and desired to be involved in project implementation. However, several mentioned they have not been as involved as they would like due to low project visibility and lack of joint activities. This point was also reiterated during the plenary discussions in the Evaluation Stakeholders' Preliminary Results Workshop. Stakeholders wanted to be involved in joint planning and development of synergies to implement different components of the project's design. All stated, however, they were still willing to be more involved if such opportunities were made available by the project.

Some individuals in government and among private and community stakeholders do continue to be reticent about the project overall—not because of the project's concept and design. Rather, they are not yet convinced of the existence of child labor in the vanilla value chain.

Some comments made to the evaluator by these stakeholders indicated a lack of understanding of the project. This was reflected in comments such as: "*We wonder what the real added value of this project is as compared to other initiatives that the private sector and other projects area already doing;*" and "*We need to really know if this project properly fits with the local development needs regarding child labor in the vanilla chain.*" Those who were not convinced of the issue of child labor made statements such as, "*We do not think there is really a big problem of child labor in vanilla. Children are not good at this kind of work which needs high skills, so children only do easy things that do not count as child labor.*"²⁰ Such persons indicated that they recognized the need to address the issue of child labor in the vanilla value chain, but that they knew of many others who did not. The ILO and USDOL should follow up

¹⁷ Observatory of Economic Complexity (2019), Madagascar 2017 data. Available from: <https://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/profile/country/mdg/>. Website accessed March 28, 2019.

¹⁸ Government of Madagascar et OIT Madagascar (2015), Programme Pays Pour le Travail Decent 2015 - 2019 Madagascar. Antananarivo: Government of Madagascar et OIT Madagascar.

¹⁹ From the private sector, UN, NGO and others from civil society

²⁰ While two interviewees noted the usefulness of "small hands" for pollination, two groups of farmers noted that they do not think it is wise to use children for this as it is difficult to do pollination properly without damage and the crop is too valuable to waste.

with the project on this issue since visibility, advocacy, awareness, and project success are so strongly intertwined.

Though the project's theory of change and design are largely relevant and valid, it is not adequate to address the issue of child labor in the vanilla value chain.²¹ As many stakeholders pointed out, there are many issues beyond the scope of the project that also influence the level of child labor. These include access to and quality of education in the area; insecurity due to theft in vanilla plantations; and poor physical infrastructure in many of the Sava region's vanilla growing areas.²² Investments in the region to address these issues can substantially contribute to improving the environment so child labor can more effectively and quickly be eliminated.

Nevertheless, the project design, if implemented in accordance with its planning, could theoretically contribute substantially to reducing child labor in the vanilla value chain. As a government official stated, *"The project is very interesting and can really provide some relief regarding the level of child labor."* Another stated, *"We are not yet seeing any palpable results."*

The project design did correctly identify the principal barriers in the fight against child labor in vanilla growing areas, namely, barriers the project could help address other than some of the larger contextual factors.

Evaluation interviewees and focus group discussion (FGD) members²³ often mentioned the same points that had been identified in the SAVABE Project Document as bottlenecks to eliminating child labor in the vanilla value chain. The key barriers were identified as:

- Growing and curing vanilla is labor intensive.
- Industry has insufficient controls on labor practices within its supply chain.
- Labor inspection is weak or absent.
- Price instability and long periods of low prices of vanilla increase vulnerability of producers, including due to low diversification of livelihood levels.
- Need to train the next generation of vanilla farmers.
- Perceptions of child labor as a normal part of socialization and the value of education due to low quality and accessibility.

The four project components were well conceived to address these key issues. For example, SAVABE includes training farmers to diversify their production so as not to be overly dependent on vanilla. This is an important aspect given the volatility of vanilla prices. Even among farmers there is a recognition that the current high prices may not last.

The components are interrelated. This is noteworthy as in many projects the main components are not well integrated or fail to so in a synergistic manner. Nevertheless, there are some aspects that could have been planned differently to further increase coherence and validity of the design and its implementation. These aspects are discussed below.

²¹ EQ (I) 1

²² Insecurity leads to reliance on children to assist with protecting plantations. Poor infrastructure contribute to poor access to health care, education, production and marketing of vanilla. These in turn contribute to continuing poverty and reliance on child labor to cover income needs.

²³ In the remainder of the report where the evaluator refers to interviews and FGDs she is referring only to persons interviewed or in FGDs during the evaluation and not to any other persons.

Challenges to Project Design

Lack of emphasis on general education: One of the challenges to the project design is the dropping of the original plan to provide direct support so children who are engaged in, or at risk of child labor, can access education. That is, the project has no specific direct support to reintegrate child laborers back into general education or to keep in school children at risk of dropping out. The existing design does include support for vocational and skills training for 450 adolescents and support for activities such as strengthening Parent Teacher Associations.

In past USDOL-funded projects that provided services to individuals, there was a component to support children returning to traditional general education. In direct service projects, there was also a vocational and/or skills component for older children legally allowed to work. In the SAVABE project; however, while there is a vocational/skills education component for 450 children who are eligible to work, there is no support for access to general education. It was decided during the early stages of the project to focus more on economic empowerment training for households. SVI noted in its comments that the decision to drop the access to education support was taken without consulting SVI member companies as another PPP project that included such support was shown to be effective in the Sava region.

The project mostly focuses on economic empowerment training for households to alleviate poverty and facilitate less dependence on child labor. Many interviewees and FGD members mentioned repeatedly that, while the training is good and useful, a time gap remains. In other words, there is a period between the trainings and resulting (potential) financial benefits. Some types of training (e.g., horticulture training) may yield quick economic returns, but it still takes time to realize large increases in income that could offset the reliance on child labor. In the meantime, it is difficult to avoid child labor due to continuing poverty.

Indicator definition: Many households (15,000) are targeted with livelihoods services through the project. Several interviewees noted that this number is quite high. They questioned whether the project could assure quality services to achieve tangible results with this many beneficiary. The evaluator noted that the definition of the indicator for a household to be counted as having received livelihoods services lacks clarity. The definition states that a beneficiary household will be counted if it has benefitted from at least one of the following livelihoods services:

- Good Agricultural Practices (GA) production training and child labor prevention (Sub-outcomes 4.1.1 and 4.1.2)
- Deposit accounts (VSLA, mobile banking, microcredit, etc. - Sub-outcome 4.2)
- Financial management training (Sub-outcome 4.2.1).

During the evaluation field work, the evaluator found that all except one of the beneficiary groups reported receiving just one or, at the most, two sessions of between two and four hours each. At this stage, households are already counted (as part of the 15,000) as having benefitted even after attending these short sessions. While there appear to be some useful results from these sessions, counting households after only such a short module leads to an uncertain level of impact quality. Beneficiaries, implementing partners, and project staff did say that additional modules were planned, but the type and duration have yet to be determined. Thus, much remains to be seen regarding additional training and the impact of

such training on livelihoods. It would have been better if the definition included more specific detail on the level of livelihoods services to be counted.

Unclear project focus: At the commune and fokontany levels, the project's focus and coverage were unclear. Project staff and implementing partners indicated, however, that this had been clearly explained. Beneficiaries and CLLTE members made statements such as, *"The project made promises to help the most vulnerable households, but people are still waiting until now;"* *"People have a lot of expectations, but these are not well managed. People do not really understand what the project can and cannot do for them;"* and *"We talked about reintegrating the children who dropped out of school, but they only talked a little about how this would be done and it doesn't seem to be a priority."*

Lack of Inclusion of Children: Including a sizable group of children in the project would have:

- 1) Directly removed or prevented children from child labor.
- 2) Modeled direct methods for removing and preventing child labor based on past good practices and lessons learned in child labor projects.
- 3) Focused on meeting the financial needs of vulnerable households until the flow of financial benefits from training.
- 4) Helped the project learn more about the causes of child labor from direct beneficiaries and find solutions. This would have improved understanding of the context in which child labor occurs in a specific project location.
- 5) Allowed the project to gather credible case stories.
- 6) Built credibility with community committees.
- 7) Helped ensure that children go to school and parents avoid child labor while awaiting financial benefits from training.

In fact, aside from the 450 children in the vocational/skills training, children are not very visible as compared to those in other child labor elimination projects. Their voice in the design and implementation is not evident. This is the case despite the Convention of the Rights of the Child's recognition of children's right to participate in decisions that affect them.²⁴ Aside from those involved in SAVABE's project implementation, other interviewees noted this absence, saying, *"Children's voice is not present. The door should be open for them to participate."*

The lack of children's participation may be due, in part, to the absence of a general education component.²⁵ In practice, in many child labor projects, children may not have much involvement in the overall project design, but they are visible during implementation. There are often school-based children's clubs and other groups that provide inputs into decision making on various project activities and as representatives in awareness raising. Children are often their own best advocates and awareness raisers.²⁶ The SAVABE project does plan to

²⁴ As detailed in Lansdown, *Every Child's Right to be Heard: A Resource Guide on the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, General Comment No 12*. London/NY: Save the Children, UNICEF, 2011.

²⁵ Other than the training of the 450 children in vocational and skills training.

²⁶ ILO (2019) *Youth in Action Against Child Labour*. Available from website accessed <https://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Campaignandadvocacy/Youthinaction/lang--en/index.htm>. Website accessed March 10, 2019. UNICEF (2010), *Advocacy Toolkit: A guide to influencing decisions that improve children's lives*. New York: UNICEF.

use the ILO's SCREAM methodology,²⁷ which will include children. At midterm, however, this has not yet commenced.

Site Selection: Several interviewees and FGDs mentioned the number and types of communes that were selected for the project.²⁸ Government representatives and child labor committee members at different levels noted that the project should have covered all 86 of the communes in the Sava Region. This is not realistic given the project's budget.

The evaluator believes that getting quality results from even 32 communes is challenging. The project reported that they had conducted orientation visits to these seven communes. However, the establishment of the CLLTE, which form the foundation for working in these communes, had not yet been initiated. In fact, at midterm, the project had not yet started implementing training activities in seven of the 32 communes. These remaining communes are quite remote, so effectively working in these locations is likely challenging. One interviewee who knows the area well noted that these very remote locations have higher child labor rates due to poverty and inadequate education alternatives. The evaluator was not able to independently verify this. Nevertheless, it was significant that the interviewees had such high expectations that SAVABE could have covered 86 communes but were not fully informed of the actual reasons for the scope of the project.

Extent of Project Adaptation to the Context and Needs of Local Communities

Thus far, SAVABE has not yet adapted its strategy to the context and needs of local communities beyond the original contextual adjustments already identified in the project CMEP. This is primarily because much of the field work has only recently begun. Several interviewees noted that the project must be flexible, but given the level of field work in the communes so far, there has not yet been a need for changes.

It is worth pointing out that some project implementing partners do build flexibility into their operational strategies. Positive Planet, which is responsible for financial management training, uses a highly agile approach. Its strategy is to have general modules that are first adapted with input from staff originally from the Sava Region. The training modules are never considered "ready," but are continually adapted and improved according to realities on the ground as implementation of the modules progresses. Likewise, one of the implementing partners carrying out agriculture/skills training pointed out that its modules are updated with knowledge acquired from previous training participants. The implementing partner noted that many of the farmers had useful knowledge which they shared to improve training.

²⁷ ILO's Supporting Children's Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media (SCREAM) program is an education and social mobilization initiative to help educators promote understanding and awareness of child labor among young people.

²⁸ The two commune selection criteria are high levels of vanilla production and high prevalence of child labor in the production of vanilla. An additional consideration is whether there are other actors already working in the communes to avoid redundancy of services. The level of child labor prevalence was estimated in consultation with government and actors in the vanilla value chain and not based on a detailed baseline during project inception.

3.2. Effectiveness

The project experienced notable delays in almost all its activities, though some positive results can be identified. Beneficiary trainings have begun; most have only recently begun, according to persons met during the evaluation. Various committees have been created or are being strengthened and the Dina has been adapted to include a focus on child labor. Awareness raising, traceability, code of conduct, and other tools are being developed, tested, and/or disseminated.

Overall, the project is not on track to meeting its objectives and is not likely to achieve all the expected results within the project implementation period. There have been many reasons for the delays, including lengthy procedures to identify and hire staff, identification and confirmation of local implementing partners, and logistical challenges in organizing field work. Some factors beyond the project's control also affected the delays, including elections, a teachers' strike, and a bubonic plague epidemic.

The evaluator verified progress against the Project Work Plan and found that few activities were carried out as originally planned. Interviewees and FGD participants also confirmed the delays. In many cases, although initial contacts at the regional and commune levels may have been done several months ago, concrete activities began only shortly before the evaluation took place. This was true for training with beneficiaries and CLLTE according to those met during the evaluation field work.

Although training had originally been planned for the beginning of 2018, in only one case did beneficiaries state that they received a two-hour training in 2018. Everyone else stated that they had received their trainings in 2019. The training lasted two to four hours, though, as explained in the subsection on Outcome 4, participants felt they learned useful information at the outset.

The evaluator could identify little anecdotal evidence of reduction in child labor due to project activities. This is largely due to the delays and limited training to date but also because, so far, case studies or stories about significant changes have not yet been collected. Nevertheless, in two focus groups, a few participants did point out that they are changing aspects of their children's work. One participant pointed out that, instead of the children getting up at 4:00 am to make breakfast, the parents are doing it themselves. Another said that, before the training, even though it was short, he had been afraid to talk to his brother about sending his son to school instead of work. Now, he was able to do so, and the boy is back in school.

Visibility, Awareness Raising, and Partnerships

Aside from contextual challenges cited earlier, other aspects have also influenced project delays. Such challenges are mostly centered around visibility, communication, and coordination challenges of the project. Various stakeholders mentioned these factors multiple times, including during discussions in the Midterm Evaluation's Preliminary Results Workshop. These factors will be detailed further in the remainder of the report.²⁹

²⁹ Also note the prominence of this point in the Tag Cloud in Annex J, which shows the frequency with which interviewees raised subjects during the interviews.

The project did a noteworthy job prior to and during inception to involve and introduce itself to major government and private sector stakeholders. At the project's interim, however, with few exceptions, interviewees expressed their concerns that this was not sufficiently continued until just prior to the interim evaluation. Interviewees referred to a lack of information and updates about project progress beyond brief interactions. Some government and private sector interviewees indicated they were unaware of any palpable project results at midterm. Several national and regional government and private sector interviewees noted that they had asked for more information but that it was not forthcoming. Although the project conducted a useful internal evaluation and meeting with some of the major stakeholders in November 2018, it was perceived as insufficient and did not include many of the main actors, including private sector and community representatives.

Particularly noteworthy is the unusual sequencing of some of the activities pertaining to project visibility, advocacy, and awareness raising. Normally, there is a high focus on these activities during the first half of the implementation period. This is because it helps justify the need for the project and cooperation of the actors (government and other immediate stakeholders and development partners)—vertically along the value chain and horizontally at each level. Yet, these activities did not receive the high-level of intensive focus from the beginning. Behavior change often requires lengthy and repeated interaction with stakeholders.

Good practices and lessons learned on behavior change indicate that early and participatory interaction is needed.³⁰ In fact, the most effective methods are centered around what is called Social Behavior Change (SBCC) which includes effective, intensive, and participatory approaches. Efforts such as providing prizes and certificates to communities for achieving results in different areas such as health and the environment have proven successful in Madagascar for many years.³¹

Associated with this factor, interviewees' comments often focused on the need for all stakeholders to be more involved with the project. An example of such comments was, "*Elected officials are also concerned and should be involved, in fact, everybody should be more involved for this (child labor elimination) to work.*" Some interviewees from other international and national development partners, government, and private sector expressed a desire to be more involved. They had comments such as, "*We ask SAVABE to look at us a little. We in the committee are ready to work. The project needs to tell us what to do,*" and "*If we are proposed to do something, we can do it, and actively. Especially if it concerns support to families. We really want to apply things.*"

The project's April 2019 Technical Progress Report (TPR) was just being prepared at the time of field work. As a result, the only detailed information available was from the September 2018 TPR. This information was dated by March 2019 when the field work for this evaluation took place. The SAVABE project team did provide needed updates on overall progress, as summarized in Table 1. It is evident from the table that much work remains to be done though

³⁰ Steering Committee 2018 International SBCC Summit, Shifting Norms, Changing Behavior, Amplifying Voice, What Works? Nusa Dua, Indonesia: Steering Committee 2018 International SBCC Summit. McGowan, A. (0215), The Social Behaviour Change Communication (SBCC). Available from <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/iesf/blog/social-behaviour-change-communication-sbcc> (2015). Website accessed March 29, 2019.

³¹ See Chapter 7 in AED, The Champion Community Initiative. Origins, Principles, and Potential (Washington, DC: AED, 2006).

some results are becoming visible. The evaluator did not delineate the details on progress for each outcome, sub-outcome, or output individually. The project will soon provide its latest Technical Progress Report (TPR), which will offer more details about overall progress. Instead, the evaluation focused on key successes and challenges across project activities.

One evaluation question focused on ascertaining the benefits of providing services directly to beneficiaries as opposed to channeling them through existing social programs carried out by vanilla actors or other NGOs. The evaluator found it difficult to determine this. This was due, in part, to implementation delays, which made it difficult to assess enough results from which to draw conclusions. Further, the lack of a mapping exercise that would have provided information on what vanilla actors and other NGOs are doing made it harder to find adequate information against which to compare SAVABE's results. The evaluator held meetings with some exporters and an NGO (Save the Children) project director who also engaged in providing socioeconomic support. The focus of these meetings was not to quickly assess what they were doing. This was not possible given the short meetings. A justified comparison would have required a more in-depth comparative analysis.

Some interviewees argued that the risk of relying only on the private sector for socioeconomic support of vanilla value chain actors is that, hypothetically, they can then dictate the price of the products they buy. Though this may be true, the extent to which this is an issue is not easily verifiable without a more in-depth comparative analysis.

Mapping and Engaging Other Development Participants

The project was to carry out several mapping activities as cited in the CMEP:

- “The project will *first* map all local entities involved in the fight against child labor in Sava.”³²
- “The project will *first* identify the targets of the awareness raising activities and map available community-based services.”³³
- “Mapping of communes/villages/districts and existing committees—how they work and who heads/belongs.”³⁴

Mapping information collection was to start from the inception phase and continue throughout the period when SAVABE first approached the communes. So far, mapping has only been done informally, according to stakeholders. No written overview, formal or informal, summarising the findings has yet been prepared, nor have strategies been developed on creating synergies.

³² OIT (Undated), Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla Growing Communities in Sava (SAVABE), Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP). Antanarivo: OIT, page 8.

³³ Ibid., 9.

³⁴ Ibid., 38.

Table 1 - Summary of Reported Outcomes/Outputs and Results at Midterm

Outcomes, Sub-outcomes/ Outputs	Activities Mapping	Status of the Activities
Outcome 1 - Vanilla exporters, collectors and preparers significantly reduce child labor in the production of vanilla at the farm, collection and preparation levels in Sava.		
Sub-outcome 1.1: Vanilla exporters implement a system that ensures child labor monitoring throughout the supply chain.	Organize consultative meetings, workshops, and training with exporters on Code of Conduct implementation. Organize consultative meetings, workshops and trainings with collectors and preparers to develop and sign a Code of Conduct/commitment letter.	Guide to apply the Code of Conduct produced in 2018 was submitted to stakeholders. Final version should be available before July 2019. So far in 2019: (i) stakeholder consultation workshop for the validation of the letter of commitment, (ii) production of the letter of commitment in Malagasy and reproduction in enough numbers, ((iii) statement on the binding force of the signature of the letter, (iv) production and CRLTE validation of the child labor inspection form
Sub-outcome 1.2: Exporters implement a structured referral and care system to be used for victims of child labor by vanilla exporters, collectors, preparers and producers.	Organize consultative meetings with all stakeholders on a system design for referrals and care of child labor victims Develop system for referrals and care for victims of child labor from input of the consultative meetings.	Consultations with exporters and collectors were conducted in 2018. SVI and the ILO clarified the method for setting up a referral and management system for the supply chain in March 2019.
Sub-outcome 1.3: Vanilla exporters ensure that collectors and preparers implement effective systems and programs to prevent child labor.	Work through the Plateforme Régional de Concertation Pour le Pilotage de la Filière Vanille (PRCP), CRLTE, Direction de la Communication (DRC) and supply chain partnership programs for collectors and preparers to sign Letter of Commitment on combatting child labor. Establish model commercial contracts that include clause on good practices on child labor.	The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the elaboration, implementation of training strategy, awareness of child labor among collectors, preparers and vanilla producers in the Sava Region has been published. In collaboration with component 3 of the project. The analysis of bids is underway.
Output 1.3.1: Vanilla collectors and preparers are trained on ways to prevent child labor.	Adapt training materials on child labor to collectors and preparers. Train trainers from supply chain partnership programs collectors and preparers on good agricultural practices to prevent child labor.	In collaboration with component 3 of the project, the ToR for the development and implementation of the training strategy, awareness raising has been published.
Output 1.3.2: Vanilla producers	Create training materials on child labor adapted to vanilla	Meeting organized in 2019 for CRLTE's action plan to

who participate in supply chain partnership programs are trained on ways to prevent child labor.	producers; assess programs and adjust materials as needed. Organize training of trainer sessions with partnership programs and farmer associations or networks on child labor prevention	include awareness raising, support and unannounced monitoring at the company level. Awareness tools for companies developed and produced and distributed in 2018.
Output 1.3.3: Implement a system of traceability throughout the vanilla supply chain.	Meet with sector representatives. Develop a pilot model. Validate system by sector officials and government authorities. Implement system within the PRCP (to be confirmed).	CRLTE engaged with other actors in the implementation of the One Stop Window. 38 collectors/preparers have signed letters of engagement. Pilot test of the child labor traceability method conducted in 2018 with 2 exporters and evaluated. An adapted version on child labor in the vanilla value chain is being developed.

Outcome 2: Law enforcement and child protection officials enforce child labor laws and policies and ensure care of victims in the vanilla-producing areas of Sava		
Sub-outcome 2.1: Increase capacity of law enforcement agencies and service providers responsible for care of victims	“Procedures Manual to Enforce Child Labor Laws in Sava Region” with the Regional Child Labor Committee (CRTLE) development.	The contract with the first consultant was not completed. The work will be assigned to another consultant whom the project will recruit. The TORs for this recruitment are being drafted
Output 2.1.1: Increase knowledge of the labor inspectorate, PMPM, gendarmerie and RPE of the procedures for enforcement of the laws on child labor and care of victims.	Develop and distribute awareness raising tools building on the revised procedures.	This activity is postponed until 2019, pending the development of the procedure manual.
	Organize training and awareness raising workshops for local representatives of the key ministries responsible for child labor and obtain consensus on how to coordinate efforts to enforce laws in their respective areas of oversight.	Implemented in 2018. 48 participants trained, including representatives of target communes.
	Organize information sessions on child labor and integrating law enforcement efforts at district level for regional and district labor inspectors and staff.	Related activities were implemented through the celebration World Day Against Child Labor in 2018 and during the participatory process of revision of Dinam-paritra.

	Organize a workshop on best practices for child labor prevention and the role of the CRLTE in Sava and in other regions of Madagascar for CRLTE.	The project reported that this activity was implemented through the workshop "Alliance 8.7" on 25/10/2018 in Antananarivo. The CRLTE President, assisted by the Secretary General of the Sava Region, shared the best practices of the fight against child labor with other actors and other officials in the regions of Madagascar. (Note from the evaluator: no written information resulting from the workshop on the best practices and role of the CRLTE in Sava is yet available)
	Support Child Protection Network (RPE) to undertake awareness raising and training of social services providers (NGOs and public services such as health workers) in Sava on children's rights, child protection/labor, monitoring and referral system.	(Note that this activity relies heavily on the mapping exercise which has not yet been done. Mapping was originally planned for end 2017 and first quarter 2018. Not yet done.) This activity will be implemented in 2019 using the result of the mapping and the resulting procedure manual and tools.
	Support capacity building for CRTLE for community child protection (RPE/CLLTE) for monitoring and referrals related to child labor.	Activity carried out as part of a vanilla festival, from 27 to 30 September 2018. The CLLTE were formed; 188 child labor cases identified by 4 CLLTE; 49 Child Protection Committees (CPE) created in 7 communes
Sub-outcome 2.2: The Regional Child Labor Committee (CRTLE) effectively coordinates child labor law enforcement entities at the regional level	Map the social services and providers of services in Sava (database with both paper-based and electronic data available).	Contract with consultant signed in March 2019. & Activity 2.1.4.5, Research on involvement of children in other sectors
	Create a database on child labor and referrals based on the Ministry of Labor's Division for the Prevention, Abolition and Monitoring of Child Labor and ORTE models.	Only the equipment purchased so far
Output 2.2.1: Increase CRLTE capacity to track and report child labor	Provide limited hardware and equipment support to the Regional Directorate for Child Labor (computer, server, printer, motorbikes and bicycles).	Purchase of computer equipment, Computer and electronic database installed at partner level

	Train the Regional Directorate for Child Labor (labor inspectors and monitors and district heads) on the Guide for Labor Inspection in the Informal Sector.	Training conducted on 26-27 / 11/2018 The workshop took place on November 26-27, 2018 in Sambava.
Sub-outcome 2.3: Increase trade union capacity to promote children's rights and engage in social dialogue in Sava	Identify all existing trade unions in Sava region. Organize information sessions on child rights and social dialogue for trade union representatives in Sava Region. Revise their actions plans to include child labor. Provide technical assistance to support social dialogue among workers, employers and labor inspectors on child labor issues.	The only trade union in vanilla was identified in February 2019 and is called SIMPALA (a vanilla trade union) Workshop on 27-28 February 2019 with 41 relevant stakeholders The principal aspects were identified in February 2019 and detailed action plans will be developed this year.
Outcome 3: Community members monitor child labor and refer victims to relevant authorities and services		
Sub-outcome 3.1: Increase capacity of community to raise awareness, prevent, and report child labor	Train trainers in community on awareness raising and track follow-up awareness raising activities post "training of trainers." Conduct awareness-raising for community leaders, vanilla producers	Trainers of awareness trainers will be identified and trained through a service provider. Community leaders and vanilla growers sensitized on the fight against child labor during the Dina (dinam-paritra) amendment process in January-April 2018
Output 3.1.1: Distribute regional ordinance on vanilla (Dinam-paritra), to include child labor, to targeted communities	- Amend the regional Convention on vanilla to include child labor and establish actions to be taken by the local Dina to combat child labor. - Organize a consultation meeting with the community leaders to review the revised Convention and distribute copies.	- The activity was carried out in January-April 2018 Dinam-paritra has been amended. 2800 copies produced and distributed - From 2019 as part of awareness raising as this was postponed. due to the teachers' strike at national and regional level during 2018; Will be entrusted to a service provider in 2019
Output 3.1.2: Child protection committees monitor education and work status of children at high risk of child labor	Create/strengthen the Child Monitoring and Tracking Committees within the 32 target communities. Train the members of the local CLLTE and any other interested committees (schools, community leaders) on prevention and reporting case of child labor Provide copies of the procedures' manual to the CLLTE. CLLTE will monitor education and work status of children.	25 CLLTE created. A training was carried out in 2018. However, the capacity remains relatively low, a recycling should be done in 2019 1 CLLTE began to take on this responsibility. But the majority of CLLTEs still need follow-up training to be able to follow the situation of children. Monitoring of education and work status of children by CLLTE began after training in November 2018 and continue in 2019

Outcome 4: Beneficiary households do not use child labor to supplement household income		
Sub-outcome 4.1 Beneficiary households have increased income	Track beneficiary household outcomes ensuring that child labor does not contribute to the income increase.	Project indicates that this is an impact indicator, measurable at project end though tracking could be initiated at present. For efficiency may be postponed to end.
Sub-outcome 4.1.1 Beneficiary households adopt Good Agricultural Practices (GAP)	Implement pilot programs on good agricultural practices with focus on eliminating and preventing child labor	Starting to list the number of (6,496) households that are “about to” ³⁵ put into practice training dispensed since November 2018,
Sub-outcome 4.1.2: Producer skills building programs are improved and expanded	Conduct needs assessment among producers, collectors, preparers and exporters to identify skills areas for improvement. Develop materials and tools Create regional demonstration plots and training sites based on identified needs. Train trainers to participate in supply chain partnership programs.	Training modules on good agricultural practices developed by CURSA (see output 4.1.4 below) 20 trainers were trained on these modules. 9 893 households trained on good agricultural practices to date, having obtained at least two training sessions each. (Note indicator definition challenges in Relevance Section 4.1)
Sub-outcome 4.1.3: Producer group services to members are strengthened to improve production and incomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assess organization and services of local cooperatives and other farmer organizations through interviews with members and organizations heads. -Collect and organize the best tools and practices used for organizational development including governance and models for cooperative service provision. - Train trainers through supply chain partnership programs and strengthening cooperatives. Connect the cooperatives, collectors, preparers and exporters.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8 trainers were trained in October 2018 by an ILO cooperative expert on the use of the capacity building tools of cooperatives. Translation of these tools in Malagasy language, to facilitate its understanding with the target beneficiaries. - Consultant's report on good practices on the strengthening of technical, commercial and institutional capacity of producer organizations (November 2018). SAVABE is using the information. - Training modules developed. -ToR on 3 pilot projects to strengthen producer group technicians' capacity of developed. Centre Universitaire Régional de la Sava (CURSA) is preparing proposal to implement.

³⁵ Wording provided by SAVABE project staff

<p>Sub-outcome 4.2: Beneficiary households manage their income more effectively</p>	<p>Organize workshop with community leaders, microfinance organizations or other local banking institutions and producers to examine existing financial institutions, local financial services providers and regional regulating authorities.</p> <p>Develop or adapt financial tools corresponding to needs of vanilla producers</p> <p>Track beneficiary households to determine if they deposit funds in credit association, microfinance, mobile banking, etc.</p>	<p>Positive Planet International mandated by the SAVABE project to develop a regional strategy for the financial inclusion of small vanilla producers, development of financial products and training of vanilla producers.</p> <p>Consultative workshops with exporters, banks and microfinances institutions, producers, local authorities, and NGOs in October and November 2018, validation workshop on 21 February 2019. The Final regional strategy paper includes recommendations and roles and responsibilities. Tools in financial education for vanilla producers available since the end of March 2019. 3 918 beneficiary households “use or are about to use savings”³⁶ so far.</p>
<p>Sub-outcome 4.2.1 Beneficiary households have increased knowledge of financial management</p>	<p>Train trainers from supply chain partnership programs who are willing to implement or training for financial management for vanilla producers.</p>	<p>9,893 households received their first training in financial education</p>
<p>Sub-outcome 4.3: Beneficiary children have greater access to secondary education, especially vocational training</p>	<p>Develop vocational training center "package" that will include award of a technical certificate, with focus on agronomy and vanilla production that builds on agronomy models tested in the field in existing programs.</p> <p>Conduct pilot on vocational training.</p>	<p>Two vocational training centers have been established with the following training modules:</p> <p>140 children aged 14 to 17, victims or at high risk of child labor in the vanilla sector are enrolled in the vocational training centers, including 34 girls. One of these is with 80 children in conflict with the law, mostly for vanilla theft.</p>

Note: The information in Table 1 was provided by the SAVABE Project Team.

³⁶Wording provided by SAVABE project staff.

While the project field work has been delayed, carrying out the various types of mapping at an early stage—especially the first one to map all local entities involved in the fight against child labor in Sava—would have been useful.

At midterm, in March 2019, the project had just signed a contract with a consultant who is expected to work on “mapping the social services and providers of services in Sava (database with both paper-based and electronic data available).” This person is also supposed to cover other types of child labor issues in the region. While it is unfortunate, the mapping exercises were not implemented in detail in early project stages. Hopefully, the assignment of a consultant will give impetus to the exercise.

The mapping of community-, commune-, and regionally-based services, to which efforts on withdrawing children from child labor can link is important. For example, there are government programs to reintegrate children into school to which SAVABE and its partners can refer children.³⁷ In the period 2018-2022, the government is targeting 400,000 children in the country through this program. Of course, it will need to be determined how the government reintegration program functions in the designated localities.

Naturally, after the mapping, the information should be concretely used for the referral system of child laborers being developed with the support of SAVABE. This means the mapping report needs to function as a stepping stone toward development of the referral system with details on how and where services can be accessed. Communities should be able to use the referral system easily, so needed tools should be simple and clear and, preferably, updated digitally using mobile phones.³⁸

While many major stakeholders were identified in project documents and CMEP, specifics are still missing. In addition, there are many actors, including exporters and other development entities, who carry out a range of development activities in the Sava region. Based on this mapping exercise, a plan to develop synergies with these other actors could have been carried out beyond the stakeholders already included in the project documentation.

The evaluator found, for example, that several exporters work with groups of producers and/or fair trade organizations to ensure organic goods are produced from work in decent conditions. The evaluator met several such exporters directly through the project or informally.³⁹ Given that many persons in the region—who travel to and from Sava—have associations, it was possible for the evaluator to meet such persons informally in hotels, on the airplane, and in their showrooms. The number of households that exporters support may be small, though at least one works with some 600 families.

A development partnership between Symrise, Unilever, GiZ, and Save the Children⁴⁰ supports vanilla growing households with economic empowerment and child protection initiatives. Other entities of interest include the Maison Familiale Rurale (MFR). MFR is an association of rural

³⁷ Repoblikan'i Madagasikara (2017), Plan Sectoriel de l'Education (2018-2022), Version Finale. Antananarivo: Repoblikan'i Madagasikara (Gouvernement de Madagascar), p. 53.

³⁸ In some countries (e.g., Philippines, Ethiopia, Uganda), this is already developed or under development.

³⁹ Buyers, exporters and their foundations such as Firminich, Trimeta, Vanille Vanille; Givaudan Association; Floribys, and others.

⁴⁰ Symrise, Sustainable Delight: Initiative for Vanilla Farmers Makes Final Round of GreenTec Awards (2017). Available from <https://www.symrise.com/newsroom/article/sustainable-delight-initiative-for-vanilla-farmers-makes-final-round-of-greentec-awards/>. Website accessed 3 April, 2019.

families who work to improve the education and training of their children and youth so they succeed in their professional and social integration⁴¹ Exchanges on good practices and lessons learned from other projects—such as the ILO project that focuses on Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) and labor inspection in the lychee value chain—can also be useful.⁴² Each region in Madagascar has its own socio-cultural, climatic, and other specificities, so learning from good practices of local actors is another area of interest.

Many activities have only recently begun, hence, it is difficult to identify details of successes at midterm. However, some activities are beginning to show positive effects in each of the four main outcome areas (project components).

Outcome 1 - Vanilla exporters, collectors, and preparers reduce child labor

A series of consultations were conducted with vanilla value chain actors on the development and implementation of several activities. These included the Code of Conduct and letter of engagement, Dina adjustment, child labor inspection form, awareness raising, a referral system, and training strategy.

The main actors in the value chain are:

- Vanilla producers;
- Vanilla collectors and (often illegal) commissioners who buy from producers, connect producers with collectors, and receive commission costs;
- Preparers who process and transform the vanilla beans from raw (green vanilla) to final product (prepared vanilla);
- Export companies; and
- International buyers.

The latter are often referred to in Madagascar as “importers” as they import the vanilla into other countries.

Traceability of Child Labor System

The project is implementing a vanilla supplier registration process that is intended, in part, to track the existence of child labor in the vanilla value chain. A pilot study on implementing traceability of child labor was implemented with two exporters. In one case, the exporter implemented the pilot test fully, while in the other it was only partially implemented. In the latter case, this was because of the complexity of the process and the cost associated with implementation. The next step is for lessons learned from the pilot test to be implemented and the child labor traceability to be scaled up.

To meet legal requirements, exporters already work with collectors on a traceability system to identify sources of the vanilla and production aspects. The agency ECOCERT⁴³ works with

⁴¹ Maisons Familiales Rurale, available from <http://www.mfrmadagascar.com/?cat=3> (2019). Website accessed March 23, 2019.

⁴² ILO, Food and agriculture global value chains: Drivers and constraints for occupational safety and health improvement. Volume 2 - Three case studies (Geneva: ILO, 2017).

⁴³ Note that ECOCERT is the agency’s full name and is not an acronym <http://www.ecocert.com/en/the-group/index.html>

the vanilla companies on the certification process resulting from traceability. ECOCERT has also supported SAVABE in tracing child labor free vanilla.

The overall traceability system comprises a large amount of data, even without including data on child labor. The evaluator was shown a thick stack of booklets to be filled in for different types of information, on issues such as organic production, that did not yet include child labor verification. In the case of both pilot test exporters, the child labor traceability has been added to the existing system.⁴⁴ The 2012 ILO study found that exporters did not employ children directly. Likewise, legal collectors do not use child labor because they transport the vanilla in vehicles, though it is possible that children may be used for loading and unloading.

The traceability system goes only as far as the collectors and does not measure child labor during production. As one collector pointed out, this means that *“we need to rely on the producers’ honesty to provide us with true information on child labor at their level.”* The collectors cannot go to the plantations and conduct checks to determine if and when there is child labor. This is primarily because, at least in the case of conventional (i.e., legally sold) vanilla at the government determined time, it is sold in markets. So, collectors do not go directly to plantations. Illegally sold vanilla, usually outside the mandated season, is not part of any traceability system. Such vanilla passes through illegal back channels and requires control through the gendarmerie (local police).

Though both the pilot study exporters interviewed stressed they were willing to engage in the traceability of child labor and other work, they pointed out the high cost factor. As they noted, the existing system, with little to no evidence of the benefit of tracking child labor, was both complex and costly. The idea that certification may eventually be useful to ensure that vanilla is produced without child labor and, therefore, more easily sold, is not seen as immediately relevant. While there is a recognition that child labor is eventually *“bad for business and also bad for children and their families,”* the lack of perceived urgency does not provide a counterbalance to the cost factor added by including traceable child labor. One interviewee from the private sector stressed that they know that child labor is against Malagasy law. SVI has also emphasized this and the illegality of child labor in its communications with exporters.

At the time of field work for the midterm evaluation, 38 collectors/preparers had signed letters of engagement committing to avoiding child labor in their products. Regardless of the development of these initiatives, much remains to be done to implement them. While the project has drafted Terms of Reference (ToR) for the implementation of several of these activities, and some pilot testing work has been carried out, training and awareness raising still need to be adapted and scaled up.

The project is currently in the process of fine-tuning awareness raising materials in conjunction with the work being done under the other outcomes. Some of the materials are based on the development of materials through a public competition. While competitions involve people in the development of materials, the quality may not always meet necessary standards. For example, in one image, a person is shown carrying a heavy bag. Several interviewees pointed out, however, that it looked like an adult stealing vanilla instead of a child carrying a heavy load. This is because the art work does not clearly depict the person as a child.

⁴⁴ According to interviewees involved in the pilot test.

Another aspect mentioned by some private sector interviewees is the need for a clearer picture of the health and other dangers of child labor in the vanilla value chain. While the definitions for the baseline survey provide a general list of hazardous activities in Madagascar and describes the relevant laws and regulation on child labor, OSH specificities on vanilla value chain work are still missing. Interviewees indicated that more should be known about the impact of vanilla value chain work activities on children’s physical and mental health. A short study examining the impact on children of night work, working with hot materials in green vanilla bean processing, carrying loads, and related issues would be useful for the project to conduct. This would facilitate arguments against child labor during awareness raising sessions and more effective OSH interventions.

In several other child labor projects (ILO projects in Kenya, Cambodia, and Indonesia), the evaluator observed the application of OSH approaches in agriculture.⁴⁵ These methods were intended to improve work conditions to enable older children to work in acceptable and decent work conditions. Where financial incentives to work in agriculture are high, as is currently the case in vanilla, efforts should be undertaken to improve work safety. Such approaches can benefit adults working in the vanilla value chain. (Refer to the end of the subsection on Outcome 4 for further details and suggestions).

Outcome 2 – Enforcement of laws and regulations and care for child labor victims

A formal mapping of local entities working on child labor elimination or other related services in Sava was seen as part of Outcomes 2 and 3. As already discussed, mapping out the various service providers and law enforcement persons helps ensure implementation of laws, regulations, and needed care for victims.

Strengthening coordination among regional government, vanilla industry, civil society, social service providers, and the regional labor union requires much more effort. Providing effective support services to victims of child labor in partnership with local entities will require a refocus on coordination and networking. All key stakeholders insisted that this aspect needs more of the SAVABE project’s attention. Comments included, *“We need something like a steering committee. We should meet around a table to talk about what is happening,”* *“We have not received any reports from SAVABE, so I do not know what is happening. They ask me for information but then I do not hear from them,”* and *“They promised to send me information about the project but I have not yet received it.”* These comments were not from the sub-grantee, but from government and others. The evaluator noted a reticence among the staff to share but could not ascertain the reason for this.

Efforts to coordinate and support social dialogue among the key actors—including the one trade union—started informally during the project design and inception stages. For some time, efforts slowed due to various project delays. Nevertheless, information sharing on child labor law enforcement efforts was carried out primarily during the Dina’s participatory revision process on child labor. Project staff indicated that they had also exchanged some information among key actors during the 2018 World Day Against Child Labor. Work on coordination and law enforcement picked up again with training on child labor issues for 48 local government

⁴⁵ Including tools such as ILO, Global Action Guide for WIND: Work Improvement in Neighbourhood Development Practical approaches for improving safety, health and working conditions in agriculture (Geneva: ILO, 2014).

officials in late 2018. In February 2019, labor inspectors, controllers, and district heads were trained in guidelines for labor inspection in the informal sector. During the evaluation, some regional and local officials requested additional information and support on those issues.

The project has begun supporting the CRLTE to enable its members to carry out their work (transport, office machines). In addition, 25 CLTE and 49 CPE have been formed in the communes and given some training. According to project staff, implementing partners and committees met, but the amount and duration of training has been very limited. Some training with labor inspectors and labor controllers has been implemented, though new staff going to the Sava region will also need to be trained. At the least, SAVABE must coordinate with the local Directorate on Labor to verify that internal training is provided to new staff on child labor issues.

Likewise, CLLTE and CPE representatives the evaluator met during the evaluation pointed to the many impediments to their work, including the lack of adequate social behavior change tools for use with community members.⁴⁶ They also discussed the difficulties in accessing the remote parts of their localities and the need for practical items such as raincoats, flashlights, bicycles, and other items. Several CLLTE members mentioned that the more remote fokontany and households are most likely to engage in child labor.

The time and transportation cost members need to allocate to CLLTE work was a major challenge given that CLLTE members receive no stipend. Many committee stakeholders mentioned that they lose income while engaging in this work as opposed to their productive work and they are not provided with financial incentives to do so. Furthermore, given that many of the CLLTE members also work in vanilla production, they cited security challenges with carrying out their work on child labor (see also the sub-section on security issues). The project staff did point out that, when the CLLTE was organized, members were told that their work would be voluntary. Financing local committees is always a challenge; achieving balance between compensating members for their costs and/or motivating them financially and ensuring sustainability after financing stops is difficult.

In addition to the delays across the project, the procedure manual to enforce child labor laws in the Sava region was deferred because the consultant assigned did not complete the work. The ToR is currently being redrafted and a new consultant will be hired to implement this activity. Consequently, the development of awareness raising tools on the procedure manual has also been postponed.

A planned database on child labor and referrals is not yet functional. So far, equipment has been purchased but a system, including training on data collection and entry, has not yet been developed.

⁴⁶ Referred to as “awareness raising” in most of the current report.

Outcome 3: Community members monitor and refer for child labor victims

Awareness raising is embedded in all four project components. Outcome 3 emphasizes awareness raising, identifying, and monitoring child labor cases through strong CLLTE. In Outcome 3, the focus is mostly at the community level. While some activities are well underway, quite a few are only just starting. For example, the training of trainers (ToT) on awareness raising is yet to commence. The Dina has been amended to address child labor and 2,800 copies of it have been produced and distributed to the public active in the vanilla value chain. A consultative awareness raising exercise on the Dina is still pending.

Although the project has developed some awareness raising materials and the evaluator noted some posters and other materials in a few places visited, this was still limited. In two locations, interviewees pointed out that they were still waiting for awareness raising materials though they have been promised that they would receive them. The distribution process was still underway during evaluation field work. In fact, CLLTE and CPE members noted that they wished they had T-shirts to identify themselves and give them credibility.

Though 25 CLLTE were created, there are still 7 communes to be covered and their CLLTE to be established. Further training of the CLLTE is needed in the existing communes and extended to the new communes.

Referral System

The community monitoring system of identified child laborers is still being developed and should be fully implemented. While a form to register identified cases has been prepared, the evaluator believes it is not suited to meeting expected project results.

The form is based on a UNICEF supported child protection victim case identification form. It includes spaces for registering cases of child victims of rape, violence, neglect, and other forms of abuse, as well as child labor.

SAVABE staff told the evaluator that local officials did not believe that child labor was the only issue that needed attention at the community level. Other child protection issues also require referral and services. SAVABE thus determined that a general child protection form would be appropriate and useful. It is not surprising that commune and fokontany representatives mentioned these additional needs. Their expectations from the project are in line with local realities which go beyond child labor. Community expectations are further compounded by the fact that the project calls fokontany committees “Child Protection Committees.”⁴⁷

The challenge is that SAVABE cannot establish a referral system for all the other types of victims identified on the form. While there is a nominal referral system in place for such cases in the region, it is not yet fully functional. The District Population Office indicated that a lack of resources is the principal reason for that situation. The Sava region has also not yet benefitted from UNICEF’s support in putting in place a functioning child protection system. At the time of writing, Sava was not yet one of the core regions where UNICEF is working, though the region

⁴⁷ “CPE” terminology is out of step with the terminology the government, with the support of UNICEF, uses for the components of the child protection system structure at the different administrative levels in Madagascar. Annex 4 provides a short overview of the child protection structure and terminologies in the country.

does engage in some local activities.⁴⁸ SAVABE's CPE terminology can cause confusion when the focus is on improving the child protection referral system in the Sava region since other terms are used.

Thus, including spaces on the SAVABE supported form to register cases other than child labor is challenging. Registering such cases on the form creates expectations among community members and, most of all, among affected households and children that they will be helped. These forms are not about simply identifying victims. They are the foundation for an entire referral and monitoring system up to and including the child's treatment back in his or her own community and home post direct services. This means, for example, if a child rape is reported, there should be a referral, response, and follow up to the case. This part of the form should either be suppressed, or a fully functional child protection system should be developed and implemented in the Sava Region without delay. The project should be embedded in a child protection framework/approach and work toward integrating child labor in a fully functioning child protection system in the Sava region.

Outcome 4: Beneficiary households – livelihoods and financial management⁴⁹

One of the project's potentially stronger components is centered in Outcome 4. Though most of the training started only recently, it appears to be going in the right direction. However, delays have prevented an effective assessment at this time.

As discussed below, the baseline and endline may not adequately determine the impact of the livelihoods component on decreases in child labor. The project database and associated monitoring, if implemented well, are more likely to identify trends in the reduction of child labor.

Two activities under Outcome 4 were canceled. One was to convene relevant stakeholders to develop a regional strategy for improved access to secondary education for youths 14 to 17 years of age. The second was to develop methods and guidance for supply chain programs to identify opportunities to improve access to especially secondary and technical education. These activities were cancelled after discussion with USDOL because they did not directly contribute to SAVABE project results and because such actions are the government's responsibility.

SAVABE has identified three service providers for training beneficiary households. Two of these are now providing training in good agriculture practices, and the third financial management.

The project has identified and is tracking (monitoring) household beneficiaries under Outcome 4. So far, 9,893 beneficiaries have been identified as having met the requirements for the indicator on direct services. As discussed in Section 4.1, this means they have participated in at least two trainings, one on good agricultural practices and the other on financial management. However, participants may be counted after receiving a training module of only two hours for each of the two types of training.

The number of training hours per beneficiary household should be tracked to identify the level and type of training needed and its effects on household incomes. Beneficiary groups met

⁴⁸ As UNICEF interviewees indicated to the evaluator.

⁴⁹ EQ (II) 2

during the evaluation reported a total of two to four hours of training so far. Each session lasted about two hours (in project parlance, a module). According to project staff, the intention is to conduct sessions two to three times a month for six months in each locality. The extent to which this is feasible and carried out must be monitored and evaluated at the end of the project. The project indicated that the number and type of modules was dependent on the needs of the localities.

The content of the training modules on good agricultural practices was developed in cooperation with CURSA,⁵⁰ the Sava Region University Center on Natural Resource Development, which has included a focus on vanilla production and processing. The training modules were developed, in part, by collecting good practices and lessons learned from experienced vanilla producers. Modules on other agriculture diversification practices have also begun.

The evaluator could not access the contents of the modules as they were not shared with her during field work. Usually, projects have a set of information on outputs, including awareness raising, available training, and other materials to share with the evaluator. The evaluator asked to see project outputs, including the training materials, several times. The first request for project outputs was sent in the form of guidelines during preparatory work for the evaluation. Then, the evaluator sought training materials during field work. The project contended that the materials were under construction and consisted primarily of guidelines in Malagasy. This stance was unclear since as the tools were already available in draft form. Another stakeholder promised to provide the materials but did not. The project eventually shared training materials upon receiving the first draft of the evaluation report. However, due to the timing of receipt of the materials, the evaluator could not validate them or properly factor them into the analysis.

During field work, the evaluator relied mostly on beneficiaries' perceptions of the training. The implementing partners who trained the beneficiaries also provided some reactions to the modules. Training began in November 2018, though most of the beneficiaries indicated that they only received a module since January 2019.

Given that the beneficiaries were all experienced farmers, the evaluator then asked to cite anything from the agriculture training they did not already know. Although the training was short, they easily cited several examples and stressed its value. Examples on vanilla growing practices included, *"Before we used to just plant the vines anywhere in the forest but now we know more about spacing and it is better organized," "We learned about how to avoid using chemicals in vanilla production,"* and *"We learned that it is not good for the soil and the environment to burn the fields."* Further, *"We learned how important it is to measure the vines and how to better put part in the earth and the best times for planting them"* and *"Before we used to pollinate all the flowers, now we know that we should not pollinate all of them."* For beneficiaries learning about agricultural diversification, they also mentioned the best times for planting and using compost.

The training implementing partners stressed that, although the modules were useful, climate and soil conditions differ in the various communes. Accordingly, module contents had to be

⁵⁰ CURSA, Presentation (2019). Available from <http://www.cursa-antalaha.com/presentation/>. Website accessed April 1, 2019.

adapted to local realities by encouraging participants to share their experiences with others. Though some interviewees thought beneficiaries might be reluctant to do so, implementing partners noted that they were able to share their experiences. Implementing partners further noted the usefulness of adjusting the training modules with the information thus acquired; one said it was already trying to do so.

All beneficiaries indicated that they had learned—or wished to learn—about financial management. They said that managing their incomes is a challenge because financial rewards are had only once a year in the case of vanilla. In the case of horticulture, it can be two to three times a year depending on the crop and local conditions. Managing a relatively large financial gain is difficult. Though some beneficiaries had already received some training on the subject, others stated their wish to learn. The evaluator did not directly ask them if they wanted such training; focus group participants brought it up on their own. Other subjects of interest were livestock raising, pisciculture, and horticulture.

The tracking of application and benefits of training in Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) and new financial instruments has only recently started. Beneficiaries told the evaluator they are starting to apply what they have learned to the extent that it is applicable to the season.

CURSA is establishing a Vanilla Agronomy and Quality Centre. It is a capacity building entity (not a physical structure) that develops training modules, training of trainers, and cooperative technicians in the vanilla sector. CURSA develops training modules and training of trainers in vanilla production and preparation techniques. The quality of the results of this work can only be assessed after trainees complete and implement the training. SVI was not aware of the status of the Vanilla Agronomy and Quality Centre and believed it was abandoned. However, SVI did express interest in such a centre supporting development and implementation of training after the project ends.

At the time of the evaluation, cooperative formation directly with communities had not yet started. However, an ILO expert had visited the project and preparations had begun. The evaluator could not evaluate this without implementation of the planned activities.

Absence of Vanilla Value Chain Policy and SAVABE Project Implementation

Government, project, and several private sector stakeholders told the evaluator that the absence of an overall policy strategy for the vanilla value chain posed a challenge to the implementation of SAVABE. The vanilla sector was gradually liberalized between 1995 and 1997, but a national policy and/or strategy for the vanilla sector has yet to be developed.

According to a recent World Bank supported analysis of the vanilla value chain,⁵¹ the absence of a strategy has resulted in an unorganized sector with an increasing number of informal actors. Applicable laws and regulations are in place, but they are disparate, and most are not directly oriented to the vanilla value chain. Disorganization makes any attempt at addressing social and other issues in the vanilla value chain more difficult.

SAVABE is partially intended to strengthen the enabling environment vis-a-vis child labor issues. It also seeks to formalize informal actors at production and other levels by supporting

⁵¹ A. Chakib and R. Andrianantoandro, Rapport de Diagnostic de la Filière Vanille (Antananarivo: World Bank, 2018).

the formation of cooperatives. The absence of a unifying framework on the vanilla value chain makes these and other actions more difficult. If there were an overarching government strategy, development actors would be able to justify their efforts to address the issues. Such a strategy should include concrete steps, roles, and responsibilities to address child labor issues and decent work. Consequently, the evaluation agrees with the interviewees that having a unifying policy on the vanilla value chain is important to providing a framework for social and economic actions in the sector. Though development of a vanilla strategy is outside the scope of the SAVABE project, the evaluator maintains its potential usefulness.

The World Bank report is a valuable document that sets out the main issues affecting the value chain and the need for a policy, but it does not focus on social development issues. For example, the extent to which social issues (e.g., child labor) may also influence the economic success of vanilla is only briefly discussed. In the report, respondents questioned previous reporting on the prevalence of child labor and the non-existence of child labor in formal vanilla companies.⁵² They also indicated that child labor only occurs in family settings.

Baseline Survey

At the time of the midterm evaluation, only a draft of the baseline survey on the prevalence of child labor was available. The evaluator reviewed the draft survey and noted several issues that still needed to be addressed. Some of these are already under discussion and are expected to be resolved in the next draft.

The baseline survey is at least six months overdue. It should have been done during the project's inception period (i.e., the first six months), prior to implementation work. If one were to count from the project's inception, it is more than six months late. Normally, baselines serve two main purposes:

- 1) To provide a starting point against which to compare changes in population at the end of the project (with an endline survey), and
- 2) To provide information to guide project planning and implementation. Initial data were used to some extent within the project. At the time of this writing, there were still major stakeholders who had not seen any or recent versions of the report. Regardless of this situation, the baseline survey information can still be used to inform planning for the remainder of the SAVABE and other child labor in vanilla initiatives.

Early project planning recommended that the baseline be done at the earliest project stage, but because of delays in project start-up, it was not done. Ultimately, it was decided at the second CMEP workshop that the study be carried out in the communities in May 2018. The principal reason was because vanilla producers and some of their children are very active in preparing for the green vanilla sales campaigns during this period. Children may be guarding the fields or engaged in other related work, instead of finishing the school year and passing their final exams. Thus, May was deemed the most appropriate time of the year for collecting data in the field and observing or hearing about child labor in real situations.

⁵² Ibid., 31.

Positive aspects of the baseline are that gender is considered, a background on Madagascar's relevant laws and regulations on child labor is provided, the different processes in the vanilla value chain are included, and some of the key actors are described.

Nevertheless, there is a lack of information sharing on the baseline survey. Several private sector and government stakeholders have repeatedly asked to be more involved with its development and commenting on the baseline methodology and results. Some evaluation stakeholders also raised this same issue about weak information sharing on other subjects. Involving the private sector in the development of the baseline could bias results. However, the consulting agency conducting the baseline study, and/or the ILO are not obliged to accept any inputs they consider biased. Sharing information in a piecemeal or delayed manner creates doubt as to the quality and correctness of the eventual findings. This means that report content may be challenged, unless its process is perceived as scientific. This situation could have been avoided if clear agreements on the baseline process, including with whom information can be shared, had been made at the beginning. The fact that it is possible to share information during the process has been shown in other projects involving the private sector (e.g., a project in Malawi on child labor in tobacco cultivation).⁵³ The private sector in Malawi—local and international buyers—fully accepted the study results as valid.

Some clarifications are needed for the next draft of the baseline report. These include clear explanations of how the extrapolation of data from the household surveys was implemented to arrive at the numbers cited in the report. Further, there must be clarification on whether the extrapolation extends to all 86 communes in the Sava region despite only using a sample of households from the 32 SAVABE project communes. Given that specific criteria were used to select the 32 SAVABE communes, it is possible they are different from the non-selected communes. If the extrapolation covers all the communes, there should be a justification of how the final numbers were arrived at.

Other challenges included the use of questions focusing on the seven days prior to the survey. This line of questioning is typical to ensure that data on activities are clear and correct. In the case of seasonal work, however, this can give a skewed result.

For comparability of the data, the same baseline methodology should be used for the endline. Similarly, endline data collection should take place at the same time of the year as the baseline (i.e., May-June 2020). Given the time needed for analysis and draft writing, this would not allow enough time to prepare the report prior to the project's end. If there is a project extension, it may be useful to carry out such an endline during the extension. Otherwise, the large investment in such a study should be reconsidered and weighed against the potential benefit at this time.

Security in Vanilla: Unexpected Issues for Children and Consequences for Training/ Meetings

⁵³ A baseline survey had been carried out with the support of the Eliminating Child Labor in Tobacco Growing Foundation in 2011 by Khulisa (Baseline Study on the Prevalence of Child Labour in Three Tobacco Growing Districts within Malawi).

One issue that stakeholders at all levels mentioned many times during the evaluation was the huge challenge regarding security at the vanilla plantations.⁵⁴ In some locations, children guard the plantations at night with risks to their own safety. They are also encouraged to steal vanilla. Involvement in such crimes carries grave risks, including beatings or even more severe physical attacks if caught. Engaging children in crime is a worse form of child labor as per ILO Convention 182.

SAVABE provides vocational/skills training for 80 children who have been convicted and imprisoned in Antalaha. Prison conditions are poor; built to accommodate only 285 persons, there are 2,080-2,085 individuals serving terms in that facility. Fortunately, children are housed separately from adults, an improvement over previous conditions.

According to prison supervisors, most of the children are accused or convicted of vanilla theft. The evaluator could not assess the quality and usefulness of the training as it had only just started prior to her visit. Nevertheless, the youths, in a FGD, were enthusiastic about the kinds of training they were being offered. All were happy about their choices of training subject and gave concrete reasons why the training was beneficial to their future.

Despite some supplementary feeding of the children enrolled in SAVABE's training program, the nutrition of the children in prison is very poor. Without extra support, the only food available to both children and adults is boiled cassava. With SAVABE's support, a slightly more diversified addition is made to the meal. Prison officials noted that, despite this support, the children come to training on an empty stomach because breakfast cannot be provided due to lack of funding.

At the same time, many other imprisoned children awaiting trial do not receive the supplementary feeding. These children are envious of the SAVABE supported children who have already been convicted. The complexity of these issues is evident from discussions with the children, prison supervisors, and trainers. Identifying other resources to improve nutrition such as providing a simple breakfast of bread and tea for all the children in the prison would be helpful.⁵⁵

It is not evident that diversion to address children accused or convicted of vanilla theft has been considered in the design and implementation of SAVABE. Diversion is the channeling of young people from the criminal justice system into community programs that make them accountable for their actions.⁵⁶ In practice, this means that children in conflict with the law are engaged in community service and other types of activities. Some agencies provide such children with training and life skills development to help mitigate dependence on crime. Diversion can be a good investment and is less costly than imprisonment.

At this stage, however, SAVABE cannot directly support the development of diversion initiatives as they are beyond the project's scope. In addition, several persons indicated to the

⁵⁴ Other illegal behavior influences the vanilla value chain. This includes producers selling and collectors/commissionaires buying vanilla early before the start of the official season. This situation causes restlessness and insecurity among community members as they need to both protect their crops and relieve themselves of accumulated debts.

⁵⁵ Prison officials calculated that this simple breakfast would cost approximately \$80 per day to feed all 140 children currently at the prison.

⁵⁶ UNICEF (undated), Malawi Fact Sheet: Diversion of Children in Conflict with the Law (Lilongwe: UNICEF), 1.

evaluator that prison is not enough punishment for children involved in vanilla theft. This means that the issue is not easy to address since there is much social distress surrounding vanilla security issues. Nonetheless, it can be useful to identify and link to similar initiatives in other parts of Madagascar.⁵⁷

The work of children guarding the fields remains a major issue, according to evaluation interviewees and FGDs. While adults more commonly guard the fields, children are also involved even if not always at night. Thieves may be armed and may be known to the children. This causes additional distress to the children as they fear such persons when not in the fields.

As in many other types of work, simply not allowing children to engage in child labor will not necessarily solve all the issues. Adults sometimes need to be away from their fields and may not easily find persons to guard their fields while away. In one situation, a group recounted how thieves had gone to steal vanilla vines in their fields while the farmers had been called to a meeting. Persons aware of the meeting had been complicit in the situation. As a result, they stated that even attending the evaluation FGD was risky. The same applies to attending training sessions that are well announced in advance. The question is, who will guard the fields while adults attend SAVABE training? It is not surprising, then, for parents to place their children to guard the fields temporarily.

Gender and Environmental Sustainability⁵⁸

The project has only been able to address gender in a limited manner. Project and implementing partners' field staff are mostly male. In the various committees and among household trainees met during focus groups, there was also a preponderance of men. For the vocational/skills training in the school visited there was a roughly equal presence of girls, at least in the focus group. In the case of the prison, as expected, there were more boys.

In fact, gender encompasses the challenges facing not only girls and women, but also boys and men. Thus, it is important to examine the difficulties boys face as they are pushed or drawn into exploitative situations (e.g., vanilla theft and risks as night guards at vanilla plantations).

Both project and implementing partners told the evaluator that they were continuing efforts to hire women for project teams. However, the difficult working conditions make it hard to recruit and retain females on staff.

CRLTE and CLLTE members are government officials or volunteers. Greater effort could be made to motivate more women to participate in the committees. This is important because girls also work in vanilla or they are engaged in secondary activities influenced by vanilla work in the region. For example, in stone quarries especially during the vanilla harvesting and processing season, there is a demand for building materials as the value chain is flush with cash. Likewise, stakeholders also reported an increase in commercial sexual exploitation of children during this period.

⁵⁷ UNICEF (2019) also has a toolkit with further details. Toolkit on Diversion and Alternatives to Detention Available from https://www.unicef.org/tdad/index_55653.html Website accessed April 1, 2019.

⁵⁸ EQ (II) 5

Gender is not just about having more females on staff and in committees. While the project had a relatively good gender analysis in the baseline survey, the evaluator could not assess gender issues in other SAVABE work. This is mostly because she could not access the various training modules. In the case of awareness raising materials, much remains to be done.⁵⁹

According to CURSA, implementing partners, and beneficiaries, various aspects of environmental protection have been integrated into the training modules. These include how, where, and when to plant the vanilla vines as well as avoidance of pesticides. The extent to which learning will be applied remains to be seen after more training is provided and learning implemented.

Direct Beneficiary Monitoring

The project is implementing a Direct Participant Monitoring System (DPMS) to track data on all project indicators and ensure timely and accurate reporting. The project engages field workers to identify and track the beneficiaries, currently referred to in the monitoring system as “participants,” instead of “beneficiaries.” Overall, the system is beginning to work with some delays. There are some challenges regarding the collection and detailed analysis of the data. This is largely due to project delays and the difficulties of the physical terrain. The terrain also makes data verification difficult. The delay of the DPMS was also mentioned in the evaluation Preliminary Results Workshop as one of the challenges.

Normally, the DPMS data—including services provided to households— should be available on an ongoing basis. However, the system is not yet fine-tuned to allow for this. Overall data on the number of beneficiary households were available to the evaluator at the end of the field work (March), but details on services provided to the beneficiary households were not yet available. Details were expected later for the April Technical Progress Report.

3.3. Efficiency

Project Monitoring and Evaluation System and Technical Support

As discussed above, project delays impacted the timeline of the project. It is highly unlikely that the project can achieve the planned results within the remaining time. The project did not adapt to the challenges that arose due to delays; it just continued implementing the project in sequence with the work plan. As indicated previously, raising visibility and awareness as well as the mapping exercises were not sequenced in accordance with the original work plan.

The evaluation took place exactly when the project was in the process of crunching its data for the upcoming TPR. This meant that updating the information was in progress. No presentation to provide an overall update on progress was provided at the beginning of the evaluation, because the information was not yet available. This made it difficult to grasp the overall scope of the activities during the evaluation field work, especially at the beginning. In fact, the evaluator only received an overview of current results per outcome after leaving Madagascar.

⁵⁹ It should be noted that a young female student designed a good poster that featured a girl as the subject.

Despite this situation, the evaluator did interact extensively with the M&E specialist who also accompanied her to the field (though not personally present during interviews and FGDs). Thus, it was possible to arrive at a general conclusion that the M&E DPMS is starting to function, though with delays. A review and reorientation of information sharing on M&E progress is necessary. This will facilitate strategic work planning on a regular basis and allow reporting back to key stakeholders between TPR reports.

The number and type of training provided so far is quite limited. Though, as data collection becomes more intensive, this may change. A final evaluation should review the situation at that time.

A main challenge with the M&E system is the intensity and varied level of monitoring and technical support provided to the project. USDOL has been very active and engaged in monitoring and support calls on average once a week to every two weeks. The calls were intended to be time bound but continued because USDOL noted that the quality of the deliverables needed improvement. Some stakeholders noted that the formal reporting requirements of the USDOL and ILO keep staff focused on paper deliverables; instead, action should be focused on realizing the deliverables with constant adaptation and recalibration in line with learning in the field.

This intensive level of contact is debatable. Some deem the interactions essential to ensuring the quality of the project, while others insist it leads to inefficiency and unnecessary stress. The calls were considered time consuming and placed performance stress on the staff. Staff was unanimous on this matter, though several also pointed out that there is a need for guidance. The evaluator understands the importance of timely and high-quality deliverables and the need for the calls to ensure this.

The agreement was for the ILO country office and/or ILO headquarters to be included in these calls, but this has been irregular for some time. The role of the ILO in ensuring timely and quality deliverables could be stepped up to maximise the use and added value of its technical expertise and oversight.

The ILO's technical support has been variable. There have been interactions and support from the country office, including a field visit. ILO specialists were included at the development stage of CMEP and consulted on statistical and other aspects. A cooperatives development expert came to Madagascar to provide inputs and training. Other specialists from the ILO fundamentals office and the Madagascar country office also provided support. At the same time, several interviewees noted that the level of technical support from the ILO on project management and technical implementation should have been higher. To achieve a higher level of strategic thinking on project implementation, greater support was cited as an essential input.

The evaluator notes that more intensive sharing of past good practices and lessons learned from other child labor projects in Madagascar and elsewhere would help strengthen the capacity of project staff. This would include learning from the M&E experiences of other projects, especially those with a child labor in agriculture component. This could, for example, be done through Skype briefing calls from experienced child labor experts in ILO headquarters and elsewhere. Though the project has a work plan, this does not preclude being innovative and improving implementation.

Available and Balanced Funding to Achieve Project Objectives

The overall project budget is relatively small given the challenges of covering the very difficult terrain. That is, while a review of the budget indicates it is generally balanced⁶⁰ and correctly and adequately allocated to activities, the cost of effectively reaching the communes was underestimated. Though the project is working with local implementing partners, it is not based in the remote areas of the different communes. In addition, at the time of the evaluation field work, 7 of the 32 communes were not reached yet. Given that these are very remote communes within which there are even harder to reach localities, it would have been useful to have proportionately more funding available for these areas.

Given this situation, the evaluator considered several issues for the project to achieve its results and address the expectations of key government and private sector stakeholders. As previously stated, there were many voices among interviewees stressing that the project should cover all 86 communes. Several also stressed that hazardous child labor in vanilla affects the remotest communes the most.⁶¹ Reducing the number of communes is not advisable, unless all partners are fully in agreement. For this reason, it is still advisable to cover all 32 planned communes, though discussions may determine if it is possible to continue with only the 26 communes covered so far.

It is also recommended to focus project financing more intensively on a sample of four to five communes which can then serve as models for eventual scaling up. Private sector interviewees indicated that they are interested in seeing effective models to address child labor in the vanilla value chain. They noted that such models engage with communities, particularly those implementing organic vanilla initiatives. The current project approach, delays, and inaccessibility of the project locations mean that to effectively develop such models, a reorientation of focus is needed.

Continually exchanging experiences and building a community of learning on child labor and other decent work aspects in the value chain should also form an important component of the model development efforts. Unless additional funding can be identified, this would mean scaling back the intensity of some of the planned activities in other communes.

Availability of Funding⁶²

The availability of funding from the ILO Office in Antananarivo to the project level has improved over time though there are still challenges affecting implementation. Decision making on project financial disbursements are centralized in the ILO Office in Antananarivo.

Given the location of the project, this means that it is not easy to prepare and coordinate the required multiple procurement proposals given that some suppliers are not based in the Sava region. Recent steps undertaken to assign a person to the ILO Antananarivo office to support the project on processing applications and disbursements has begun to facilitate the situation. Nevertheless, there are still challenges to access even small amounts to pay advances and other costs. Staff and others regularly need to advance the cost of overnight per diem when

⁶⁰ EQ 3, part 1.

⁶¹ The SAVABE baseline survey sample size and methodology does not allow for a statistically viable determination of whether this is factually true.

⁶² EQ 3, Part 2.

visiting the field. The project does have a petty cash system, but the amounts allowed are small. Streamlining and allowing a larger petty cash amount to cover recurring costs (e.g., for field work) would be useful.

Resource Management⁶³

The efficiency of resource management, including time, human, and logistical resources, was variable. Aspects relating to delays have already been discussed. Overall, work planning could be improved. According to different interviewees, much time is devoted to discussing logistics; less time is spent planning implementation.

Internal team issues take up quite some time. While efforts have been undertaken to address them through informal team building efforts, there is still much room for improvement. Consequent to previous team building efforts, there is some progress in this regard, but challenges regarding internal and external coordination and communications persist. Frequent disagreements suggest the need for better communications and renewed focus on quality delivery within a tight time frame. A formal externally facilitated team building effort that includes concrete work planning exercises is needed to strengthen team coordination. Team building should include focus on better ways to resolve differences of opinion and problem-solving techniques. It should be added that all team members recognize and try to address these issues in their own ways. Staff are still stressed, however, and their work and quality has suffered.

Staffing levels should be addressed to relieve some of the stress and improve project effectiveness and efficiency. The evaluator notes that two additional Malagasy staff members should be added to the team for the success of the project. At the higher level, a communications expert should be assigned soon to support the project director in addressing project visibility and communications challenges. Communication in the form of awareness raising is integral to all the project components, more so in some parts than others. Having a well-qualified and effective communications specialist to coordinate all these elements and promote visibility will be very useful. The project director can then focus on supervision, coordination, reporting, and other tasks.

Currently, one staff member is responsible for two of the project components. The remaining components each have one assigned staff member. This situation leads to a loss of focus on each of the two components as the staff member is over-extended. Both these components are very important and deserve their own fully allocated staff member. This means that, after assessing the expertise of the staff member responsible for Outcomes 2 and 3, the staff member should be assigned to only the outcome in which his/her capacity is higher. An expert with high level capacities in the other outcome should be hired as soon as possible.

Installing a project steering committee, as originally planned in the SAVABE project document, would allow for a more concerted project monitoring and strategically oriented process. A steering committee has a different role than the review meeting suggested in the CMEP which was held for the first time in December 2018. Steering committees are common in ILO projects

⁶³ EQ 3.3 4.

and usually include high level officials who can ensure the project fit with higher level and broader strategies of relevance to project success.

3.4. Impact

So far, there is insufficient evidence to be able to indicate whether beneficiaries' improved living conditions will considerably reduce child labor in the target communities by project's end. This is because many of the project's efforts are only now being more fully implemented. Consequently, interviewees and focus groups had few comments on possible impact.

Regardless of the limited evidence on impact so far, there are indications that intensified efforts may eventually lead to a reduction in child labor. Beneficiaries and stakeholders interviewed—staff and implementing partners—all believe that, if the project is fully implemented, it can lead to changes. These changes would be due to changes in living conditions, but also to the other project components such as greater awareness.

3.5. Sustainability Prospects⁶⁴

So far, the project's sustainability orientation is based on the overall project design to develop and strengthen capacities of key actors and processes along the value chain. This includes both vertically at each level of the value chain as well as horizontally among actors at each level. To date, an updated and more concrete sustainability plan up to and including project phase-out has not yet been prepared.

The issue of project networking and partnerships has already been extensively discussed in previous sections. This issue is crucial to ensuring the sustainability of the project's components. There is almost no disagreement⁶⁵ on the project components so it is a matter of increasing collaboration, visibility, openness, and long-term vision.

To achieve a stronger context for effective project implementation and long-term ownership among government and private sector actors, a new impetus is required. The evaluator conducted some follow up discussions with ILO headquarters staff and other project related persons just prior to and after field work. During these discussions a concept crystalized that can serve several purposes at once. That is, to hold an intensive working group consultation to launch a sustainable strategy for the Sava region on eliminating child labor in the vanilla value chain that includes but also goes beyond the SAVABE project. The consultation could eventually result in a road map that extends coverage to child labor challenges in the Sava region overall.

Madagascar is the first country to actively sign up and hold a planning workshop to realize the goal of SDG 8.7 on “taking immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking, and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour...”⁶⁶ The meeting was held in October 2018.⁶⁷ It would be very useful to

⁶⁴ EQ V.

⁶⁵ With the exception of some export companies that are not yet convinced of the need for the project.

⁶⁶ Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN), Indicators and a Monitoring Framework: Launching a data revolution for the Sustainable Development Goals (2019). Available from: <http://indicators.report/targets/8-7/> Website accessed April 5, 2019.

⁶⁷ ILO Governing Body, Update on the Alliance 8.7 of the 203 Agenda for Sustainable Development. 335th Session, Geneva, 14–28 March 2019 (Geneva: ILO, 2019).

hold a consultation on child labor in the Sava region at the earliest possible date. This should include special attention to strengthening the implementation of the SAVABE project and its sustainability strategy. This approach would build on the ILO's experience developing child labor free zones in other countries.

The consultation could include:

- Bringing value chain and other child labor focused actors together from government, private sector, civil society, and international development partners;
- Mapping the initiatives of relevant actors, their good practices and lessons learned on child labor issues (including beyond vanilla due to the linkages with other types of child labor);
- Providing an opportunity to heighten the visibility of the SAVABE project;
- Organizing sub-groups to discuss methods to address the different forms of child labor and develop road maps;
- Integrating the road maps to achieve an Alliance 8.7 child labor free region in Sava;
- Identifying partners to implement the road map components, including assimilating the SAVABE project in the road map; and
- Discussing the role and methods to ensure the sustainability of the SAVABE project initiatives.

This proposal for a Sava region child labor road map goes beyond the overall goal of the SAVABE project and holding the consultation would need additional funding. It could fit well with SAVABE CMEP's planned bi-annual feedback meetings with main stakeholders, staff, implementing partners, and representatives of direct beneficiaries.⁶⁸ Those meetings (one has been held so far) are intended to ensure that corrective measures take place in a participatory manner and future actions are planned in light of lessons learned with effective and coordinated involvement of all parties concerned.

Engaging in the development of the road map would have the benefit of substantially addressing some of the challenges facing the project. That is, to improve visibility, communications, mapping, and to identify good practices and lessons learned, collaboration, and ownership for sustainability. Further, such a consultation, if well covered by the media, can show the seriousness of eliminating child labor in the vanilla value chain.

As several stakeholders noted, it is important to associate all actors on child labor in the Sava region, even while focusing most strongly on the vanilla value chain. Some mentioned other points, for example, "*The actors are waiting for the ILO to take the lead and coordinate more strongly on this issue.*" ILO experience and expertise on child labor is recognized, so its presence can and should be articulated through more visible technical support to the staff and implementers of the SAVABE project.

In this context, there is a need to identify additional resources for replicating and scaling up the models being developed. Within the Delivering as One UN orientation, links with agencies such as UNICEF, UNDP, and others should be strengthened, with UNICEF for the child

⁶⁸ OIT (Undated), Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla Growing Communities in Sava (SAVABE), Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP). Antananarivo: OIT

protection referral component and with the UNDP on governance (e.g., law enforcement and other aspects).

Further developing SAVABE's sustainability strategy, especially if in the context of a well-developed road map arising out of joint consultations, is likely to increase ownership and lead to sustainability of the activities on fighting child labor in the vanilla value chain.

Lessons Learned and Promising Practices

Good Practices

1) Intensive interactions with key stakeholders during project design and inception period.

The key stakeholders involved in the project design and start-up period effectively identified and involved other important actors. These actors then played an important role in determining the directions the project should take. This is important as it led to early buy-in to the project, but also high expectations for continued involvement.

2) Focus on range of actors in the vanilla value chain, including exporters

The project design is oriented toward change in vertical and horizontal parts of the vanilla value chain. Rather than fixate on change on separate levels, a broad group of actors at each level is addressed. The four project components have cross-cutting links that tie the actors together. At each level, horizontal efforts were designed to address the needs of actors who could effectively eliminate child labor. While some components have a higher orientation on one level of the value chain—such as component four on livelihoods for producer households—they are still interlinked.

Lessons Learned

1) **Need for continuous verification of technical support for the project implementation team.** The project is complex as it addresses an entire value chain on a new subject area (vanilla) in remote locations. No single person has all the needed types of expertise to implement such a project. While efforts to address the challenges can be intensive, teams in such situations need a great deal of technical support from the primary grantee. In this case, the ILO is well placed and has the experience to tap into and provide technical support. This would include verifying good practices and lessons learned from other child labor projects, in Madagascar and elsewhere, to help inform the SAVABE project on an ongoing basis.

2) **Indicator definitions should fully describe the expected measures needed to ensure which level of service is acceptable (at a minimum) for households or beneficiaries to be counted.** Counting households after only short modules of two to four hours, for example, leads to uncertain impact quality. Details on measuring implementation of training should also be defined.

3) **There should be continued and repeated engagement with key stakeholders throughout the project to ensure expectations are realistic.** Focus is needed on continued transparency and buy-in to build capacity and sustainability.

4. Conclusions

Design

The evaluation concludes that the SAVABE project is generally well designed. There is a very high level of interest in the project among vanilla value chain actors, national and local government, development partners, and civil society.

Special care in the design should be taken when developing indicator definitions. Notably, indicator definitions should accurately cover the expected level of results that are implied from project initiatives, including the minimum acceptable duration of training.

Arguably, direct short-term service to the most vulnerable households to assist with education while awaiting the impact of increases in economic empowerment activities could have been useful. Such assistance could have contributed to helping the neediest families bridge their income gap, learn lessons, and gain additional support for the project from communities.

Effectiveness

The evaluation notes that the many delays during start-up through the midterm evaluation means that the expectations of the stakeholders, including project partners and the donor, cannot be met within the planned project life. In fact, in 7 of the intended 32 project communes the CLLTE that form the foundation for coordination at commune level have not yet been established.

While many of the delays are due to external circumstances, such as a teacher's strike and elections, evidence from interviews, focus groups, and documentation indicate that other factors also play a role. These include lengthy procedures to identify and hire staff, the identification and confirmation of local implementing partners, and logistical challenges in organizing field work.

Based on triangulation of the evaluation findings, the evaluation identified low project visibility and challenges regarding communications and coordination with the wide range of actors associated with the project. Many stakeholders—including during the Preliminary Results Work—commented on these issues. They were disturbed by the lack of information sharing and thought these project aspects should be strengthened. Thus, the evaluator concludes that effective coordination, visibility, and communications are still limited and needs substantial strengthening. Coordination and communication with and among the regional government, vanilla industry, civil society, and social service providers need attention.

Planned organized mapping exercises for the start-up period—i.e., beyond listing available services and partners in mission reports—are underway now, though they should have been an early priority.

Though the use of good practices and lessons learned and participation of stakeholders in project design was good, this was not continued in the same way during implementation. There is a need to track good practices and lessons learned using monitoring evidence from quantitative data, stories, and case studies. Such information can be used in awareness raising materials and to develop good practices for future development initiatives.

Efforts to strengthen the enabling environment are underway and appear to be going in the right direction, but dissemination and awareness raising of associated materials—Dina, Code of Conduct, Letter of Engagement—require intensive ongoing work. Much remains to be done in social behavior change communications.

The evaluator notes that the traceability system still requires substantial attention to become fully operational.

The evaluation further concluded that the project focus has deviated somewhat to cover issues on child protection at the fokontany level; but this is beyond the project's capacity and objectives. Nevertheless, child labor referral methods must be integrated into a functional child protection system. At present, there is no such system in the region.

The evaluator could not assess the quality of training modules with households and adolescents as training had just started prior to the evaluation field work. She also did not receive written documents showing the modules, since she was told that these were still under development. Although the modules were provided at the time of the first review of the draft evaluation report, evidence from the focus groups suggests the training modules can potentially achieve positive results. The extent to which this potential will be realized will need to be documented and assessed during monitoring, documentation of cases, and the final evaluation.

Issues regarding security in vanilla plantations were found to play an important role in project effectiveness, eventual impact, and sustainability.

The establishment of child labor committees is underway, but capacity strengthening, and ongoing technical support should be intensified. The evaluator notes that a high level of interaction and training is needed to ensure the adequate motivation and capacity of CLLTE members. Ownership and long-term sustainability will be at risk if the intensity and duration of support is not provided. The evaluator notes that the remaining time for this activity to reach the necessary quality level is very short.

The project did not maximize the ILO's extensive experience with a broad range of subjects directly and less directly linked to the child labor value chain. Aside from child labor experts who can provide solid and regular technical support, the ILO also has specialists who could be more involved. These would include specialists on the informal economy/economic empowerment, occupational safety and health (OSH), and social protection. The evaluation notes that OSH could help improve decent work conditions for older children as well as adults.

While the project did receive some inputs on cooperative development and child labor surveys, there are additional resources that can be consulted. This does not mean that specialists all need to go to Madagascar. Malagasy experts on child labor and local communications/behavior change specialists were not yet utilized.

Given the sampling methods for the baseline, the evaluator is not fully confident that a methodologically matching endline study (if conducted) will be enough to draw conclusions. A separate impact study of what participants were able to implement after the end of the project may provide a better measure, especially as much of the training involves seasonal work. Benefits may take time to materialize.

Efficiency

The evaluation finds that the project is ambitious given the physical terrain and breadth of activities it is carrying out. To increase learning, eventual replication of activities, and effectiveness, the evaluation recommends that the project focuses on only a few communes to develop effective models. Documenting the processes will be essential to scaling up in public, private, and other partnerships.

The evaluation further notes that efficiency is hampered because of team coordination issues, team building needs, and staffing levels. Planning is not smooth, and time is spent on planning short term and office issues which can be improved through more strategic planning methods. Stakeholders mentioned the large amount of time spent preparing USDOL and ILO required paper deliverables instead of working on the ground carrying out deliverables. Inadequate staff on a project that is expected to work intensively with a broad array of actors in many localities interfere with effectiveness.

Sustainability

That the project is being implemented without a well-developed national and local strategy for the vanilla value chain hampers the speed and extent of results. The lack of such a strategy with an accompanying road map also impedes sustainability. Although there is a national framework on child labor, little is adapted to the specificities of the Sava region. Project implementation, coordination, and sustainability planning would benefit from the development of appropriate frameworks that are applicable to the Sava region. Eventual lessons learned and good practices can then be replicated to other vanilla growing areas of Madagascar and even help eliminate child labor more generally in Madagascar.

5. Recommendations

Project design

- 1) Include in future projects a full *intensive livelihoods service provision plan* with indicator *definitions* that fully describe the expected measures to obtain DOL approval/agreement and ensure quality and an adequate level of service provision. The associated indicator definitions should describe the expected duration, quality, and type of training content that, at a minimum, should be able to count a beneficiary (individual or household) for project reporting on livelihoods. (ILO, donors, implementing agencies; high priority; long term; low resource implications)

Strengthening effectiveness

- 2) Increase efforts to identify and build on country and international experience (good practices and lessons learned) with child labor and substantially strengthen technical support from the ILO. Include intensive technical and management support from the country and regional offices and headquarters. Increase learning from Madagascar, from ILO cocoa, cotton, lychee, and other agriculture initiatives around the world, and from SVI member companies' public-private partnerships. From within the vanilla value chain, identify entities already working on socioeconomic issues as well as their good practices and lessons (including on production and processing). Use the information to strengthen project staff capacities and integrate key aspects into

project implementation strategies where feasible and appropriate. Include methods such as Skype briefing calls from experienced child labor experts in ILO headquarters and elsewhere. (ILO/SAVABE, implementing partners; other vanilla value chain actors; high priority; short term; low resource implications)

3) Strengthen motivating factors for the traceability system to verify the existence or non-existence of child labor. Adapt the traceability system to ensure that it adequately covers child labor along the vanilla value chain.

a) Work more intensively with the CLLTE and other service providers in the communities. This includes focusing on the roles and responsibilities of labor inspectors/controllers (though they rarely go as far as the plantations) and of preparers and other formal enterprises in the vanilla value chain. Regarding informal value chain actors, local police and community security volunteers are already involved, but their role in the traceability system should be rendered more concrete through clear agreement on and written roles and responsibilities. (ILO/SAVABE, implementing partners; high priority; short term; low resource implications)

b) Include collector registration incentives. This is foreseen in Outcome 1 but remains a challenge as it also involves addressing issues of taxation and fees.

c) Increase focus on innovative and well-designed social behavior change initiatives. Concepts such as providing communities—below the fokontany level—with producer vanilla child labor free certificates, after verification from CLLTE and associated security personnel, could be tested. To set up such a system, criteria would need to be identified which, if met, would enable a community to receive the certification. The CLLTE may coordinate such efforts under the supervision of the CRLTE over the long term. That is, of course, if the CLLTE continues sustainably to work on the child labor issue. Certificates could be awarded during World Child Labor Day or other events. Involve experienced Malagasy experts with high-quality graphics/communications skills in the development of SBCC materials. Many innovative means can be integrated into the awareness raising processes to effect behavior change regarding child labor in the vanilla value chain. (ILO/SAVABE, implementing partners; high priority; short term; medium resource implications).

4) Increase focus on Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) in similar projects.

a) If funding is available, conduct OSH study of specific conditions and consequences for child health in vanilla value chain and its dangers, including night work for security and pollination. Relate these to the existing child labor laws in Madagascar. (ILO/SAVABE, SVI and other private sector representatives, medium priority; short term; medium resource implications).

b) Include OSH approaches in the household training modules to reduce the level of hazardous work for children. Review how the ILO Global Action Guide on improving safety, health, and working conditions in agriculture can be adapted and used in the context of the vanilla value chain. An analysis of OSH in the lychee value chain was conducted in Madagascar; this can provide some

examples of issues to consider in developing OSH in the vanilla value chain.⁶⁹ (ILO/SAVABE, medium priority; short term; medium resource implications).

- 5) Increase focus at the fokontany level in line with SAVABE's development goal on child labor**, instead of a broader approach to child protection. **Integrate child labor into a fully functioning child protection referral system** in the Sava region. With short term effect, reorient the child protection case identification form toward only child labor at this stage. The referral system can later be extended to include other types of child protection issues (neglect, abuse, other forms of exploitation) once it is evident that a complete and well-integrated child protection referral system can be put in place. Participate in advocacy efforts for fundraising so that a comprehensive child protection referral and monitoring system can be put in place. (ILO and its SAVABE project partners, UNICEF and other development partners, donors, implementing agencies; medium priority; short term for initial change of SAVABE orientation; long term for comprehensive child protection system implementation in the Sava region; low resource implications for SAVABE reorientation; high resource implications for the development and implementation of a comprehensive child protection system in the Sava region).
- 6) Address issues related to security in the production of vanilla as they apply to SAVABE project implementation.**
- a. Review solutions to ensure household adults can attend livelihoods, financial management, and other training without concerns about lack of security on their plantations while they are away. Consider innovative options such as having parents ask older children from the community to attend some the livelihoods training together with them initially. Then children continue the training and share the learning with parents and/or other community members. Conduct some of the training after school hours with older children who attend general education, then encourage them to share their knowledge with villagers. These initiatives would need to be tested to ensure that adults would be willing to learn from the children who attend the training in their stead.
 - b. Provide advocacy support to identify additional funding to improve the conditions of imprisoned children. Discuss with the relevant ministries and UNICEF options for eventual diversion of children accused or convicted of vanilla theft into alternative community programs that make them accountable for their actions. (ILO/SAVABE, donors, implementing partners; medium priority; short term; low resource implications)

Increasing visibility, coordination, and mapping

- 7) Initiate high-level visibility and coordination of project activities with assistance from the ILO and sub-grantee SVI.** Improve communications about the project, advocacy, and awareness raising overall (vertically and horizontally along the value

⁶⁹ Though the case study on lychees in Madagascar is quite detailed, particularly pages 179-190 are of interest. ILO (2017), Food and agriculture global value chains: Drivers and constraints for occupational safety and health improvement. Volume 2 - Three case studies / International Labour Office, GOVERNANCE Department. Geneva: ILO.

chain and with related partners). Ensure that key stakeholders are well informed of progress and participate in suggestions to strengthen SAVABE implementation processes. Increase and conduct regular national level consultations with government ministries, private sector, and other development partners. This should include the establishment of a project steering committee involving high level government representatives. (ILO/SAVABE, implementing partners; high priority; short term; low resource implications)

- 8) Map commune and regionally based government, civil society, and private sector services to child labor elimination efforts.** Mapping is a stepping stone to developing a referral system with clear details on how and where services can be accessed. The mapping exercise can also include collection of good practices and lessons learned from the entities included in the mapping exercise. (ILO/SAVABE, implementing agencies; high priority; short term; use existing project resources)

Efficiency

In addition to recommendation 2:

- 9) Focus project financing more intensively on a sample of four to five communes which can then serve as models** for eventual scaling up. Link experiences to project documentation and information sharing efforts. Establish a well-organized system to track good practices and collect stories and case studies based on practical progress made. Such information can be used to exchange experiences and build a community of learning on child labor, and other decent work aspects in the value chain should be part of ongoing efforts. Information can be used in awareness raising materials and to develop examples of good practice. (ILO/SAVABE, implementing partners; high priority; short term; low-medium resource implications if budget lines can be adjusted)
- 10) Address staffing levels and team building needs to improve project effectiveness and efficiency.** Two additional Malagasy staff members should be added to the team to ensure project success. At the higher level, a communications expert should be assigned to help the project director address project visibility and communication challenges. Communications in the form of awareness raising is integral to all the project components, more so in some parts than others. Having a well-qualified and effective communications specialist to coordinate all these elements and promote visibility will be very useful. The project director can then focus on supervision, coordination, reporting, and other tasks. An additional staff member should be assigned to cover one of the two project components that is currently covered by a single person. Both components are very important and deserve their own fully allocated staff member. A formal team building exercise should be carried out that includes concrete work planning exercises to strengthen team coordination (ILO/SAVABE, implementing partners; high priority; short term; medium resource implications)

Sustainability

- 11) Policy development and road map for Sava region.** SAVABE and its partners should provide advocacy and inputs to develop social (including decent work)

components for a vanilla policy/strategy. This could help policy development dialogue on social issues. In the lead up to an eventual policy/strategy on the vanilla value chain, hold an intensive working group consultation to launch a **sustainable child labor elimination road map for the Sava Region**. The consultation should go beyond the SAVABE project to cover child labor challenges in the Sava region overall. The road map could be linked to the Madagascar initiatives on Alliance 8.7.⁷⁰ As part of the consultations, discussions should be held on the elimination of child labor in vanilla, including among SAVABE partners and stakeholders. A sustainability strategy should be part of this process. (ILO/SAVABE, implementing partners; all other vanilla value chain actors, Government and civil society, *very high priority*; short term; medium resource implications).

12) Project extension (no cost) with handover to a national expert at the end of the project period, July 2020. To transition to national ownership with sustainability improvements, transfer the project director role to an experienced Malagasy project director from July 2020. This extension should be a phaseout period of the SAVABE project with well-organized initiatives focused on sustainability. The start of the road map should take place during this phase at the latest. This is to ensure a full handover to stakeholders who will remain in the Sava region after the project ends. The project should focus on government and other actors to address the current communications challenges within the project. (ILO/SAVABE, implementing partners; high priority; medium; low resource implications as no cost extension)

⁷⁰ To eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour.

Annex A: Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR)

I. 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 over \$900 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects in more than 90 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL 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. OCFT is committed to using the most rigorous methods applicable for this qualitative implementation 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. OCFT will make the evaluation report available and accessible on its website.

II. PROJECT CONTEXT AND INFORMATION

Child labor is widespread in Madagascar despite over a decade of efforts by government, social partners and civil society to combat it. The results of Madagascar's 2012 National Child Labor Survey, which was supported by the ILO, showed the island to have 2.03 million economically active children between the ages of 5 and 17 years, representing 28% of this age group. Children are engaged in various forms of labor, including in the worst forms of child labor in agriculture, fishing, mining and quarrying, construction, domestic service work, informal urban sector trades as well as in commercial sexual exploitation.⁷¹ The 2009-2013 political crisis set back efforts to tackle the problem and greatly increased children's vulnerability to economic exploitation. The 2009 coup d'état resulted in the suspension of most of the foreign aid, plunged the economy into crisis and saw a steep rise in poverty rates. Although there has been a return to political stability, the percentage of the rural population living below the poverty line remains over 80%.

Nationwide estimates of the number of children engaged in vanilla production are not available; however, the 2012 National Child Labor survey found that in the majority of Madagascar's seven vanilla-producing regions, the rates of child labor participation exceeded the national average.⁷² The number of economically active children in the seven regions was 594,000 of which 588,000 (89%) worked in agriculture, including in the vanilla industry. Commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC) and child labor in quarries and in other agricultural sectors such as clove growing are also found in Sava.

⁷¹ Child Labor in Madagascar in 2012: Report on the National Employment and Informal Economy Survey (ENEMPSI-2012) INSTAT Madagascar

⁷² The incidence of child labor is 22.7%, respectively (68,000 children) in Sava, 29% (29,000 children) in Diana, 28.5% (92,000 children) in Atsimo Atsinanana, 19.1 % (64,000 children) in Atsinanana, 42.2% (202,000 children) in Vatovavy Fitovinany, 30.3% (57,000 children) in Anosy and 25.3% (82,000 children) in Analanjirofo.

Child Labor in the Vanilla Value Chain in Sava

In 2011, following media reports highlighting child labor in the vanilla sector⁷³, the ILO Country Office of Antananarivo (Tana) commissioned a study to assess the situation in Sava, a region in the Northeast corner of the island where about 80% of the island's vanilla is grown. The study confirmed that there is child labor in the vanilla sector, estimating that approximately 20,000 children aged 12 to 17 work in the production of vanilla, accounting for nearly 32 percent of the sector's workforce.⁷⁴ The ILO study and other studies commissioned by industry⁷⁵ found:

- Children, both boys and girls, work on family-owned farms, as hired labor on neighboring farms, and at vanilla preparation sites.
- The nature of the work performed by children is generally not dangerous (no lifting of heavy weights, use of machetes, or chemicals) but working conditions need improvement. In children work long hours in vanilla cultivation during certain periods.⁷⁶
- No evidence of forced labor was found;
- Child labor was not found at the exporter processing facilities.

Effects of Child Labor in Vanilla Production on Education

Evidence from the ILO study and other research shows that work in vanilla is causing some children to miss school and may be among the reasons why many drop out from school before the mandatory education age of 14. Children work during school days, particularly during peak periods. There is evidence that secondary school students suffer absenteeism as they travel back to the farm to help during certain periods. Other factors besides the need to work also affect children's school attendance in vanilla-growing regions.⁷⁷ These include education fees, classroom sharing, school closures, and poor roads leading to schools. However, one important finding of the ILO study was that some children work as wage laborers in vanilla preparation operations during the long school break to earn money to cover their school fees. Excluding these children from wage employment without compensating the loss of their earnings or raising the children's and their household's awareness about the importance of education could have negative consequences on education access.

Factors contributing to child labor in the vanilla value chain in Madagascar

There are many factors, some specific to vanilla production, that contribute to child labor in the sector:

- *Growing and curing vanilla is labor-intensive:* Vanilla production in Madagascar depends on labor-intensive tending, harvesting and curing processes. On small-holder farms, child labor is important to household economics as family labor and low-cost paid labor. In curing enterprises, child labor is regarded as a source of cheap, relatively efficient, and easy to manage labor.
- *Industry has insufficient controls on labor practices within its supply chain:* The supply chains are generally informal with many small-scale processors and traders and there is an absence

⁷³ The Sunday Times. "Bitter plight of the vanilla trade children." March 14, 2010.

⁷⁴ International Labor Organisation. État des lieux du travail des enfants dans la filière vanille dans la région de la Sava. 2012.

⁷⁵ Africa NOW Ethical Business Services 2011 Study: Child Labor Assessment -- Vanilla Madagascar. This study was undertaken on behalf of four members of the ETI Food Group. An assessment team travelled to Sava region in June 2010. The study interviewed a wide range of key informants, local government officials, local NGOs, small farmers and children. Small holder farms, vanilla plantations, vanilla markets, preparation sites and processing factories were visited.

⁷⁶ For example, children, in particular girls, are involved in the manual pollination of vanilla plants, a short but critical period in the production calendar.

⁷⁷ Challenges facing children in vanilla growing regions reflect a much larger national crisis. Approximately 1.5 million children of primary school age are out of school. Only 3 children out of 10 who start primary school complete the cycle. Two thirds of teachers have not received any formal training at all. Source: UNICEF Madagascar Briefing 2012

of effective industry-wide standards, policies, and adequate management and monitoring systems to effectively prohibit child labor or to address and remedy cases when they are found.

- *Labor inspection is weak or absent.* About 90% of the vanilla industry operators (nearly all operators except the exporter) are informal sector enterprises. In most cases, these informal enterprises are not registered with public authorities nor are their labor practices regularly monitored by labor inspectors.
- *Price instability and long periods of low prices of vanilla increase vulnerability of producers:* According to the ILO study, child labor is found in vanilla production in both price boom and bust periods. Price fluctuations and income uncertainty incentivize producers to keep production/labor costs low even in good times as a hedge against risk. This is because farmers are vulnerable to unexpected externalities – they lack resources –access to information, technology and financial services to build up savings and invest in insurance. Also, without diversified sources of revenue, their livelihoods are highly dependent on vanilla.
- *Need to train the next generation of vanilla farmers:* Producing good quality vanilla is a skill that is learned on the job, within family structures on farms and in curing operations and begins during childhood. The absence of vanilla vocational training and agricultural extension services as an alternative to informal training systems reinforces child labor practices.
- *Perceptions of child labor and the value of education:* Ingrained attitudes about the roles of children in rural areas frequently include the perception that work is a normal part of children's socialization and preparation for adulthood. In addition, because of the poor quality of education in rural schools in vanilla-growing communities and its perceived relevance to children's prospects⁷⁸, parents may not be willing to renounce the contribution children make to family livelihoods in favor of children's education.

Challenges Facing the Vanilla Industry in Madagascar and their link to child labor

Madagascar currently produces about 85% of the world's vanilla. This export crop (the second most expensive spice in the world) has the potential to lift the island's approximately 80,000 small holder vanilla farmers out of poverty and to provide sustainable incomes to many other small businesses that depend directly or indirectly on the industry. But the market isn't secure for Madagascar. Child labor in the vanilla value chain is recognized by vanilla exporters and international buyers as a threat to the sustainability of the industry on the island. Most of the international buyers of vanilla are based in North America and Europe where consumers increasingly want assurances that the goods they use are produced in ways that respect human rights and the environment and governments are increasingly enforcing standards on international businesses supply chain accountability⁷⁹. Leaders of the vanilla industry in Madagascar know that international buyers and multinationals will increasingly invest in other origins or turn to synthetic vanilla if substantial efforts are not made to deal with the issue of child labor in the sector. The threat level increased when, in 2014, vanilla grown in Madagascar was listed as a good produced by child labor by the United States Department of Labor (USDOL).

Unfortunately, child labor is not the only problem facing the industry. It is weighed down by numerous other challenges that also threaten its sustainability, including:

⁷⁸ With about 90% of the Malagasy economy is in the informal sector and underemployment levels high, youth and their parents may not perceive the employment related rewards of education.

⁷⁹ According to the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, companies should carry out due diligence in their entire supply chain. Core elements of this due diligence involve identifying, preventing and repairing human rights violations in the entire supply chain and actively reporting on these. In 2011, the US Department of Agriculture issued guidelines setting out a standard set of practices for independent, third-party monitoring and verification for the production, processing, and distribution of agricultural products or commodities to reduce the likelihood that agricultural products or commodities imported into the United States are produced with the use of forced labor or child labor. In February 2016, the American congress passed a bill barring the import of goods produced by forced labor from entering the United States.

- Decline in supply and quality of vanilla: The quality of vanilla beans produced in Madagascar, once the industry's gold standard, has been declining in recent years due poor production and processing practices⁸⁰, fueled by the insecurity of farmer vanilla holdings, price volatility, lack of supply chain transparency, and environmental degradation.
- Competition: Producers in other countries such as Uganda and Indonesia are posed to grab portions of its market share if Malagasy producers do not address quality and supply issues.
- Threat from artificial substitutes: Last, but not least, artificial vanilla stands as a ready substitute if high prices and poor-quality production is sustained.

III. Project Background

The Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla Growing Communities in SAVA (SAVABE) project aims to reduce child labor in the vanilla producing areas of the Sava region through a holistic set of interventions aimed at the labor demand and supply sides of vanilla growing. To address labor demand issues, the project assists vanilla exporters to implement the 2015 code of conduct to eliminate child labor in the country's vanilla supply chain by working with vanilla exporters to develop anti-child labor policies, building systems to monitor child labor in the production of vanilla, offering remediation services to children engaged in child labor, and raising awareness of the harmful effects of child labor. To complement these efforts, SAVABE trains law enforcement agents to enforce child labor laws and collaborates with local authorities to develop a child labor database to house information about child labor victims.

To address labor supply issues, SAVABE works with local communities to monitor child labor through child protection committees, provide educational services to 450 youth of 14 to 17 years of age who are engaged in or at risk of entering child labor, and implement school improvement projects. To address the poverty that contributes to child labor, the project targets 15,000 households with at-risk children to provide vocational training programs to teach them skills for in-demand jobs in their villages. It also helps establish village savings and loan programs for families to access credit to finance business ideas and activities to earn additional income.

The Project's results framework is provided below:

Outcomes, sub-outcomes and outputs
Outcome 1: Vanilla exporters, collectors and preparers significantly reduce child labor in the production of vanilla at the farm, collection and preparation levels in Sava
Sub-outcome 1.1: Vanilla exporters implement a system that ensures child labor monitoring throughout the supply chain
Sub-outcome 1.2: Exporters implement a structured referral and care system to be used for victims of child labor by vanilla exporters, collectors, preparers and producers
Sub-outcome 1.3: Vanilla exporters ensure that collectors and preparers implement effective systems and programs to prevent child labor
Output 1.3.1: Vanilla collectors and preparers are trained on means of preventing child labor
Output 1.3.2: Vanilla producers who participate in supply chain partnership programs are trained on means of preventing child labor
Output 1.3.3: Implement a system of traceability throughout the vanilla supply chain

⁸⁰ The quality of vanilla is diminished by early harvesting (a practice related to security in vanilla growing fields) and vacuum packing (a practice related to price speculation - collectors preserve vanilla pods until prices go up.)

Outcomes, sub-outcomes and outputs
Outcome 2: Law enforcement and child protection officials enforce child labor laws and policies and ensure care of victims in the vanilla-producing areas of Sava
Sub-outcome 2.1: Capacity of law enforcement agencies and service providers responsible for care of victims, including labor inspectorate, PMPM, gendarmerie and Child Protection Networks (RPE) is increased
Sub-outcome 2.1.1: The labor inspectorate, PMPM, gendarmerie and RPE have increased knowledge of the procedures for enforcement of the laws on child labor and care of victims
Sub-outcome 2.2: The Regional Child Labor Committee (CRTLE) effectively coordinates child labor law enforcement entities at the regional level
Sub-outcome 2.2.1: CRLTE capacity to track and report on child labor is increased
Sub-outcome 2.3: Trade union capacity to promote child rights and engage in social dialogue in SAVA is increased
Outcome 3: Community members monitor child labor and refer victims to relevant authorities and services.
Sub-outcome 3.1: Capacity of community to raise awareness, prevent, and report child labor is increased
Output 3.1.1: Regional ordinance on vanilla (<i>Dinam-paritra</i>), adapted to include child labor, is distributed to communities
Output 3.1.2: Child protection committees monitor education and work status of children at high risk of child labor
Outcome 4: Beneficiary households do not use child labor to supplement income
Sub-outcome 4.1 Beneficiary households have increased income
Sub-outcome 4.1.1: Beneficiary households adopt Good Agricultural Practices (GAP)
Sub-outcome 4.1.2: Producer skills building programs are improved and expanded
Sub-outcome 4.1.3: Producer groups (cooperatives, producer associations) services to members are strengthened to improve production and incomes
Output 4.1.1.1: Vanilla Quality Knowledge Center created to support improved and sustainable vanilla production and curing
Sub-outcome 4.2: Beneficiary households manage their income more effectively
Sub-outcome 4.2.1: Beneficiary households have increased knowledge of financial management
Sub-outcome 4.3: Beneficiary children have greater access to secondary education, especially vocational training

Purpose and Scope of Evaluation

Evaluation Purpose –

The purpose of the interim performance evaluation is to:

- Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the validity of the project design and the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host government and other national stakeholders;
- Determine whether the project is on track toward meeting its objectives, identifying the challenges and opportunities encountered in doing so, and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges and opportunities;

- Assess the effectiveness of the project's strategies and the project's strengths and weaknesses in project implementation and identifying areas in need of improvement;
- Provide conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations; and
- Assess the project's plans for sustainability at local and national levels and among implementing organizations and identifying steps to enhance its sustainability.

The interim evaluation will provide key stakeholders with information to assess and revise, as it is needed; work plans, strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements and resources. The scope of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with the International Labour Organization. All activities that have been implemented from project launch through the time of evaluation fieldwork will be considered.

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 experience in implementation, 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.

Evaluation Questions

Relevance

- 1) To what degree is the project design and its theory of change relevant, valid and adequate to address the key causes of child labor among project participants? Include specific attention to the question of whether SAVABE has been able to accurately determine the principal barriers to the fight against child labor in vanilla growing.
- 2) What are the challenges in the design if any?
- 3) How able is SAVABE to continually adapt its strategy to the context and needs of local communities?

Effectiveness

- 1) What successes and challenges have been achieved under each outcome area at the midpoint of the project? Is there any anecdotal evidence of the reduction in child labor as a result of project activities? What strategies/measures were undertaken to mitigate any challenges?
 - What efforts has the project taken to reduce child labor in the vanilla supply chain? Has the project encountered any barriers and how are they being addressed?
 - What are the results of the traceability study? Are there any good practices or lessons learned? (Please describe the project's vanilla supplier registration process.)
 - Is the anti-child labor awareness strategy implemented effectively?
 - What efforts have been made to meet livelihood targets? Please assess the quantity and nature of services provided and whether these services may help to reduce child labor in the vanilla sector.

- What are the project's strategies for reaching its target of 15,000 households by the end of the project?
 - To what extent have gender and environmental sustainability aspects been considered? What successes and challenges can be identified?
 - What are the benefits of providing services directly to beneficiaries rather than channeling them through existing social programs carried out by vanilla actors or other NGOs?
- 2) Regarding stakeholder involvement and partnerships, include review of challenges and/or successes in engaging with key stakeholders to build partnerships:
- How able is SAVABE to obtain the support of stakeholders at all levels for the cause it defends?
 - How effective is the participation of government, community, unions, and non-governmental partners.
 - How are vanilla actors in the private sector supply chain involved in the fight against child labor? Does the vanilla traceability system in place effectively reduce the prevalence of child labor in the vanilla supply chain? Do these vanilla actors (exporters, collectors and preparers) effectively implement the code of conduct on child labor as a tool to combat child labor?
 - Are local communities actively involved in the fight against child labor? Do the beneficiaries perceive the efforts undertaken as appropriate responses to the problem?
- 4) How is the project monitoring its project participants? Describe effectiveness of the DBMS system, including successes and challenges. Does the data collection system enable effective knowledge transfer and capacity building among stakeholders?
- 5) How *likely* is it that the project will achieve each of its planned goals and objectives *by the end of the project*? What adjustments could be made at the midpoint of the project towards achieving goals and objectives?

Efficiency

- 1) What project activities have experienced delays and why? How have the delays in project start-up and activity implementation impacted the overall timeline of the project? How has the project adapted to the challenges that have arisen from these delays?
- 2) What are the strengths and weaknesses of SAVABE's internal project monitoring and evaluation system? What steps have been taken to improve it if any?
- 3) How available and balanced is funding to achieve project objectives? How efficiently are resources managed including time, human and logistics resources?

Impact

- 1) Is there any evidence so far that, at the end of the project, the improvement of the living conditions of the beneficiaries will have considerably reduced child labor among the target communities?

Sustainability

- 1) To what extent is the project's engagement with and between key stakeholders (government, community, unions, private sector and non-governmental partners, communities) to build *partnerships* to combat child labor expected to be sustainable over the long term.

- 2) How likely is it that the project's ownership strategy project will lead to an effective sustainability of the implementation of activities on fighting child labor in the vanilla value chain?

IV. 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 field visits, interviews and focus groups as appropriate. Opinions coming from stakeholders and project participants will improve and clarify the use of quantitative analysis. The participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among stakeholders and project participants.

To the extent that it is available, quantitative data will be drawn from the CMEP and project reports and incorporated in the analysis. 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 generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor (<http://www.ilo.org/ipeinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026>) and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children (http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html).
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. The international evaluator
2. As appropriate an interpreter fluent in necessary languages will travel with the evaluator

One member of the project staff may travel with the team to make introductions. This person is not involved in the evaluation process, or interviews.

The international evaluator will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with (Contractor), USDOL, and the project staff; assigning the tasks of the interpreter for the field work; 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.

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.

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
- Documents may include:
 - CMEP documents and data,
 - Baseline and endline survey reports or pre-situational analyses,
 - Project document and revisions,
 - Project budget and revisions,
 - Cooperative Agreement and project modifications,
 - Technical Progress and Status Reports,
 - Project Results Frameworks and Monitoring Plans,
 - Work plans,
 - 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.

3. 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 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
- Implementers at all levels, including child labor monitors involved in assessing whether children have been effectively prevented or withdrawn from child labor situations
- 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 Field Visits

The evaluator will visit a selection of project sites. 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 CL sectors. During the visits, the evaluator will observe the activities and outputs developed by the project. Focus groups with project participants will be held, and interviews will be conducted with representatives from local governments, NGOs, community leaders and teachers.

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, a stakeholders meeting will be conducted by the evaluator that brings together a wide range of stakeholders, including the implementing partners and other interested parties. 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 may participate in the stakeholder meeting virtually.

The meeting will be used to present the major preliminary results and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, discuss project sustainability and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders, including those not interviewed earlier. It should be made clear to the participants when they are invited that the results will only be very preliminary and that the evaluator will not have had much time to analyse, reflect on and prepare the presentation. As such inputs from the participants are very important. 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:

1. Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main results
2. Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the results
3. Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality
4. If appropriate, Possible Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) exercise on the project's performance
5. Discussion of recommendations to improve the implementation and ensure sustainability. Consideration will be given to the value of distributing a feedback form for participants to nominate their "action priorities" for the remainder of the project.

A debrief call will be held with the evaluator and USDOL after the stakeholder workshop to provide USDOL with preliminary results and solicit feedback as needed.

F. Limitations

Fieldwork for the evaluation will last two weeks, on average, and the evaluator will not have enough time to visit all project sites. As a result, the evaluator will not be able to take all sites into consideration when formulating their results. All efforts will be made to ensure that the evaluator is visiting a representative sample of sites, 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.

The short period allocated to the field work is another challenge while elections are also expected to be held.

G. Evaluation sites to be visited:

Note: The following itinerary was an initial draft and is in the process of being refined. The actual itinerary will be included in the evaluation report. Please note that meetings in Antananarivo have been added prior to the field work to be conducted in Sambava.

Meeting and interviews with stakeholders, partners and project participants in the region:

Date	Institutions/ persons to meet	Place
March 11, 10 a.m.	The Region Chief	At the Region office, in Sambava
March 12, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.	The project team of SAVABE and SVI	At the project office, in Sambava
March 13, 2019 (9 a.m. to 10 a.m.)	The Regional Secretary General	At the Region office, in Sambava
March 13, 2019 (10.30 a.m. to 12 a.m.)	The Regional Development Director	At the Region office, in Sambava
March 13, 2019 (2 p.m. to 5 p.m.)	The members of CRLTE, Education sector, social affairs, NGO and associations	At the Labor office, in Sambava & in other locations TBD
March 15, 2019 (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.)	Exporters, preparers, collectors and their groupings or platforms (PRCP, GPAS, ASCOVA...)	In locations TBD -, in Sambava
March 20, 2019 (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.)	The project team of SAVABE and SVI	At the project office, in Sambava
March 21, 2019 (9 a.m. to 5 p.m.)	The project team of SAVABE and SVI	At the project office, in Sambava
March 25, 2019 (9a.m - 12 p.m.)	Evaluation workshop; Project team	Hotel Capricorne, in Sambava, & Project office, in Sambava

Meeting and interviews with stakeholders, partners and project participants in the communes to be visited

Date	Commune to be visited	stakeholders, partners and project participants to be met in each commune
March 14 (Belaoko Lokoho)	7.30 a.m. : Sambava to Belaoko Lokoho 9.30 a.m. : at Belaoko Lokoho 12.30 am: to Ambodiampana	<i>1st meeting & interviews with:</i> - The CLLTE members and - the Mayor <i>2nd meeting & interviews with:</i>
March 14 (Ambodiampana)	2 p.m. at Ambodiampana 5 p.m : Ambodiampana to Sambava	- The beneficiary households - The beneficiary children
March 18 (Antsahanoro)	7.30 a.m. : Sambava to Antsahanoro 2 p.m. from Antsahanoro to Antalaha	- GRADESS, the CSE and PF - LOVA Resources and animators
March 19 (Lanjarivo)	7.30 a.m. : Antalaha to Lanjarivo 1 p.m. from Lanjarivo to Sambava	- TEF MADA and animators <i>Interviews with:</i> - The members of Child Protection committees

E. Evaluation workshop

Location: Sambava (Hotel Capricorne)

Date: March 22, 2018 – from 9 a.m. to 12 a.m.

Workshop participants proposed by SAVABE:

1	Jean Pierre Singa Boyenge	Project Director	Sambava
2	Raoelinarivo Yvan Russell	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist	Sambava
3	Mamy Razafimanantsoa	Awareness and Capacity Building Specialist	Sambava
4	Heriniaina Randriamampianina	Livelihood Specialist	Sambava
5	Rabenantoandro Alciat Delphin	Administrative and Financial Assistant	Sambava
6	Mr Olivier Ralaiharonison	SVI - Sustainable Vanilla Initiative	Sambava
7	André Deriaud Rahajason	Coordinator of the NGO Gradess	Sambava
8	Razafindramora T. Betega	CSE in Antalaha, NGO Gradess	Antalaha
9	Andriamisanta Abson	Coordinator of NGO Lova Green Resources (training 15000 households)	Sambava
10	Andrianiaina Neilla	Coordinator of TEFMADA (Training 15000 households)	Sambava
11	Ramanahadray Dennis	Regional Direction of Technical Education and Vocational Training	Sambava
12	Mr Rostand, Regional Director	Regional Direction of Public Service, Labor and Social Laws	Sambava
13	Mr Edinho, Regional Director	Regional Directorate of Social affairs	Sambava
14	Mr Bosco, Chef de Service	CRLTE	Sambava
15	Sabotsy Samuel	Secretary General, SAVA Region	Sambava
16	Henri Rabenefitra	Secretary General of PRCP	Sambava
17	Mevazara Issouf	Vice-président de la PRCP-Vanille Sava	Sambava
18	The Regional Director	Regional Directorate of Agriculture	Sambava
19	The Regional Director, Teddy SERAMILA	DDR – Regional Development Directorate SAVA Region	Sambava
20	Joseph BENITSIAFANTOKA, Regional Director	Regional Directorate of Trade and Consumption	Sambava

21	Madame RAKOTOMANDIMBY	Voahangy Regional Directorate of National Education	Sambava
22	The Director	RAMANANDRAIBE EXPORTATION S.A. (exporter)	Antalaha
23	The Director	TRIMETA (exporter)	Sambava
24	Monsieur Levita René	Communication SAVA Region	Sambava
25	1 member of a beneficiary household	a household representative of Sambava	Sambava
26	1 member of a beneficiary household	a representative household of Andapa	Andapa
27	1 beneficiary child	a representative of beneficiary child	Sambava
28	1 members of CLLTE	A representative of CLLTE Ambodiampana	Sambava
29	1 members of CLLTE	A representative of CLLTE nosiharina	Sambava

G. Timetable

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

Task	Date
Evaluation launch call	Jan 22
DOL briefs ILO on evaluation	Jan 22
DOL sends email connecting MSI and project	Jan 24
DOL sends TOR inputs and draft evaluation questions to MSI and ILO	Jan 24
ILO sends edits to TOR/evaluation questions and draft agenda to MSI	Jan 28
Logistics call with DOL, MSI, and ILO	Feb 4
MSI sends draft TOR to OCFT and ILO	Feb 5
OCFT and project comments sent back to MSI	Feb 6
Final TOR sent to OCFT	Feb 8
Cable clearance information submitted to USDOL	Feb 11
Interview call with USDOL	Feb 15
Fieldwork	March 11-22
Post-fieldwork debrief call	March 25
Draft report to contractor for Quality Control review	April 8
Draft report to USDOL & Grantee for 48 hour review	April 15
Comments due to Contractor	April 18
Report revised and sent to Contractor	April 23
Revised report to USDOL	May 6
USDOL and stakeholder comments after full 2-week review	May 20
Final report to USDOL	May 27
Development of 1-page infographic	May 31
Editing	June 3
508 compliance review	June 5
Final edited report to COR	June 10
Final edited report to grantee and stakeholders	June 12

V. EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

The report should have the following structure and content:

- 1.1. Table of Contents
- 1.2. List of Acronyms
- 1.3. Executive Summary (no more than five pages providing an overview of the evaluation, summary of main results/lessons learned/good practices, and key recommendations)
- 1.4. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology
- 1.5. Project Description
- 1.6. Evaluation Questions
 - A. Answers to each of the evaluation questions, with supporting evidence included
- 1.7. Results, Recommendations and Conclusions
 - 1.7.1. Results – the facts, with supporting evidence
 - 1.7.2. Conclusions – interpretation of the facts, including criteria for judgments
 - 1.7.3. Key Recommendations - critical for successfully meeting project objectives – judgments on what changes need to be made for future programming
 - 1.7.4. Lessons Learned and Best Practices
- 1.8. Annexes - including list of documents reviewed; interviews/meetings/site visits; stakeholder workshop agenda and participants; TOR; etc.

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.

The total length of the report should be approximately 30 pages for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

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

While the substantive content of the 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.

Annex B: References

Various project reports and documents were reviewed including the project document, studies, CMEP, Technical Progress Reports and project output documents. Additional documents that are directly referenced in the evaluation report are listed below.

AED (2006), The Champion Community Initiative. Origins, Principles, and Potential. Washington, DC: AED. (See Chapter 7)

Bureau of International Labor Affairs, US Department of Labour (2019), Child Labour and forced Labor Reports – Madagascar. 2017 Data. Available at <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ilab/resources/reports/child-labor/madagascar> Website accessed 30 March, 2019.

Chakib, A. & Andrianantoandro, R. (2018), Rapport de Diagnostic de la Filière Vanille. Antananarivo: World Bank.

CURSA (2019), Presentation. Available from <http://www.cursa-antalaha.com/presentation/> Website accessed 1 April, 2019.

Government of Madagascar et OIT Madagascar (2015), Programme Pays Pour le Travail Decent 2015 - 2019 Madagascar. Antananarivo: Government of Madagascar et OIT Madagascar.

ILO (2014) Global Action Guide for WIND: Work Improvement in Neighbourhood Development Practical approaches for improving safety, health and working conditions in agriculture. Geneva: ILO

ILO (2017), Food and agriculture global value chains: Drivers and constraints for occupational safety and health improvement. Volume 2 - Three case studies / International Labour Office, GOVERNANCE Department. Geneva: ILO

ILO (2018), Project Document : Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla-Growing Communities in Sava Region, Madagascar (SAVABE Project). Antananarivo : ILO

ILO (2019) Youth in Action Against Child Labour. Available from website accessed <https://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Campaignandadvocacy/Youthinaction/lang--en/index.htm> Website accessed 10 March, 2019.

ILO Governing Body (2019), Update on the Alliance 8.7 of the 203 Agenda for Sustainable Development. 335th Session, Geneva, 14–28 March 2019. Geneva: ILO.

INSTAT Madagascar (2012) Child Labor in Madagascar in 2012: Report on the National Employment and Informal Economy Survey (ENEMPSI-2012). Antananarivo: INSTAT Madagascar.

Lansdown, G. (2011), Every Child's Right to be Heard: A Resource Guide on the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, General Comment No 12. London/NY: Save the Children, UNICEF.

Maisons Familiales Rurale (2019) Available from <http://www.mfrmadagascar.com/?cat=3> Website accessed 23 March, 2019.

McGowan, A. (2015), The Social Behaviour Change Communication (SBCC). Available from: <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/iesf/blog/social-behaviour-change-communication-sbcc> Website accessed 29 March, 2019.

Observatory of Economic Complexity (2019), Madagascar 2017 data. Available from: <https://atlas.media.mit.edu/en/profile/country/mdg/> Website accessed 28 March, 2019.

OIT (Undated), Supporting Sustainable and Child Labor Free Vanilla Growing Communities in SAVA (SAVABE), Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (CMEP). Antananarivo: OIT

Programme International pour l'abolition du travail des enfants (IPEC) (2012), États des lieux du travail des enfants dans la filière vanille dans la region de la Sava 2011. Antananarivo : OIT

Repoblikan'i Madagasikara (2017), Plan Sectoriel de l'Education (2018-2022), Version Finale. Antananarivo: Repoblikan'i Madagasikara (Gouvernement de Madagascar). P 53.

Sustainable Development Solutions Network (SDSN) (2019), Indicators and a Monitoring Framework: Launching a data revolution for the Sustainable Development Goals. Available from: <http://indicators.report/targets/8-7/> Website accessed 5 April, 2019.

Steering Committee 2018 International SBCC Summit (2018), Shifting Norms, Changing Behavior, Amplifying Voice, What Works? Nusa Dua, Indonesia: Steering Committee 2018 International SBCC Summit.

Sustainable Vanilla Initiative (2019), Available from <https://www.idhsustainabletrade.com/initiative/sustainable-vanilla-initiative/> Website accessed 16 March, 2019.

Symrise (2017), Sustainable Delight: Initiative for Vanilla Farmers Makes Final Round of GreenTec Awards. Available from <https://www.symrise.com/newsroom/article/sustainable-delight-initiative-for-vanilla-farmers-makes-final-round-of-greentec-awards/> Website accessed 3 April, 2019.

UNICEF (2010), Advocacy Toolkit: A guide to influencing decisions that improve children's lives. New York: UNICEF.

UNICEF (undated), Malawi Fact Sheet: Diversion of Children in Conflict with the Law. Lilongwe: UNICEF Page 1.

UNICEF (2019) also has a toolkit with further details. Toolkit on Diversion and Alternatives to Detention Available from https://www.unicef.org/tdad/index_55653.html Website accessed April 1, 2019.

Annex C: List of People Interviewed and Details on Focus Groups

Note: Several persons were interviewed more than once but are only cited once in the list of interviewees.

Date mars 2019	Nom et prénom	F	H	Organization et address ou nom de la communauté	Titre du poste ou type de personne(s) : responsable(s) local(aux), parent(s), enfant(s)
25/02	Agossou, Coffi		x	ILO	Country Director
27/02	USDOL Team			USDOL	Project Support and ME Staff
7/03	Jean-Pierre SINGA		x	OIT/SAVABE	CTA / SAVABE
	Michaela Nirina RANAIVO	x		UNICEF	Child Protection Specialist
	Aida GHORBEL			UNICEF	Child Protection Specialist
	Flora, RAKOTOMAHANINA	x		UNICEF	Regional Assistant Technical Specialist
	Tamoha Adreiannie	x		Ministère du Commerce	Directeur de Partenariat
	Jan GILHUIS		x	Sustainable Vanille Initiative/ IDH, The Sustainable Trade Initiative	Steering Comittee Member/Senior Programme Manager
	Henry W. TODD, Jr		x	Virginia Dare	Vice President International
	Hamish TAYLOR		x	IDH, The Sustainable Trade Initiative	Steering Comittee Member
8/03	Herman TANDRA			Direction Générale du Travail et des Lois Sociales	Directeur Général, Inspecteur du Travail et des Lois Sociales.
	Olivier RALAHAIRIVONISON		x	IDH, The Sustainable Trade Initiative	Business Coalition Building Specialist
	Mahafahatra VONINTSOA	x		IDH, The Sustainable Trade Initiative	Programme Developper, Madagascar

	Nestor RAVELOSO		x	ECOCERT	ECOCERT
	Agnes HIER	x		Positive Planet	Directeur Régional
11/03	RAZAFIMANANTSOA Mamy		x	OIT/SAVABE	Expert en renforcement de capacité et sensibilisation
	RAOELINARIVO Yvan Russell		x	OIT/SAVABE	M&E specialist
	Delphin ?			OIT/SAVABE	?
11/03	BE Christophe		x	Direction Régionale du Commerce et Consommation	Directeur Régional du Commerce et Consommation
	Samuel ABOTSY		x	Ministère de L'Intérieur et de la Décentralisation	Chef de Région a.i. Secrétaire Général
	Colonel BESOA, Sirnot		x	Gendarmerie Nationale Sava	Commandant du Groupement
	RaKOTOMANDIMBY Voahangy	x		DREN SAVA	Chef de Service Education Fondamentale
	Paul Edhino MARINJARA		x	Ministère de la Population	Directeur Régional de la Population, de la Protection Sociale et de la Promotion de la Femme SAVA
13/03	Nathalie ANDRIAMANGA	x		TRIMETA	DRH
13/03	RENE TIAZARA		x	TRIMETA	Directeur d'Agence
13/03	NDRIANASY Daniel		x	TRIMETA	Responsable administratif
13/03	ANDRIATAFANDRY Andry Nandraina		x	CRLTE SAVA	Contrôleur du travail
	RABARIJAONA Gildo Patric		x	Gendarmerie	Encadrement GAPS de la GN SAVA
	VIOLETTE Fify	x		CISCO Sambava	Adjoint pédagogique
	LEVITA René		x	Délégation de la communication Sambava	Délégué

	RAFIDIARISON Xavier		x	CRLTE SAVA	Chef de Service Régional du Travail, Inspecteur du travail
	RAZAFINDRATRAHINA Nolandrien		x	Direction Régionale du Tourisme SAVA	Chef de Service
	TOMBOZARA Jean Bosco		x	DRPPSPF SAVA	Chef de Service
	MINTY Fascina	x		SDPPSPF Sambava	Sécrétaire
	FENO Pierre Richard		x	Centre d'écoute et de conseil juridique (Population)	Premier responsable
	RABENEFITRA Henri		x	PRCP- Plateforme Régionale de Concertation et de Pilotage de la filière vanille	Sécrétaire Général
14/03 Antsirabe Nord	Bénéficiaires	11	10	Antsirabe Nord	
	CLLTE, Mairie		7	CLLTE, Mairie	CLLTE, Mairie
	RAKOTONDRAINIBE Hery Mampionona		x	TEF MADA	Coordonnateur régional, Andapa et Vohémar
	RAMILISON René		x	TEF MADA	Technicien Animateur
	RAZANAKA Edmond		x	TEF MADA	Technicien animateur
	TSIFANTARINA Jean Richard Chardin		x	ONG GRADESS	CSE – correspondant en suivi-évaluation
	MBOTIVOLA Tatiana	x	x	ONG GRADESS	Ancienne CSE – correspondante en suivi-évaluation
14/03 Ampanafena	RAHARIMANANA Jackson		x	ONG GRADESS	Point focal de collecte de données
	RANDRIANANTOSAVINA Hery Michel		x	FITAMA, et commune rurale	Maire
	JAOTOMBO		x	Fikamvanana VAHINY	Chef fokontany de Antsihoy

	MANAMBINA Marcelin		x	Fikambanana SAVASOA	Chef fokontany Ankapila
	TOTO Gerson		x	Fikambanana TANORA	Agent de perception
	Bénéficiaires	4	5	Bénéficiaires Ampanafena	Bénéficiaires
15/03 Ambodiampana	CLLTE	6	7	CLLTE, Mairie	CLLTE, Mairie
	Bénéficiaires (sensibilisation)	4	5	Membres Association Soarano Vanille	Membres Association Soarano Vanille
	Voire ci-dessus, les mêmes personnes prestataires de service pour les services directs, technicien animateur, point focal collecte de données			Prestataires de service pour les services directs, technicien animateur, point focal collecte de données	
15-03 Maroambihy	CLLTE		6	CLLTE	
	École (classe de 3eme)	13	17	École (classe de 3eme)	École (classe de 3eme)
18/03 Tanambao Daoud	Bénéficiaires	5	13	Bénéficiaires du projet	Bénéficiaires du projet
	BELALAHY Adrien		x	Commune rurale Tanambao Daoud	Adjoint au maire
	MOUSSAHIABOU Ben Mohammed		x	Tanambao Daoud	Secrétaire état civil, Tanambao Daoud
	TSARALAZA Eusibio		x	CLLTE Tanambao Daoud	Président CLLTE Tanambao Daoud
	BE Juliane	x		CLLTE Tanambao Daoud	Secrétaire
18/03 Bemanevika	Bénéficiaires	10	13	Bénéficiaires du projet	Bénéficiaires du projet
19/03 Tanandava	Bénéficiaires, CLLTE	7	10	Bénéficiaires du projet, CLLTE	Bénéficiaires du projet, CLLTE

19/03 Andapa	Apprenants	8	9	CFPA (Centre de Formation Professionnelle Agricole) Andapa	CFPA (Centre de Formation Professionnelle Agricole) Andapa
	CLLTE	1	7	Tanandava	CLLTE
	Partenaires	1	4	Tanandava	partenaires
	RAKOTONDRAINIBE Hery Mampionona		x	TEF MADA	Coordonnateur régional, Andapa et Vohémar
	SOAMIARY Cadra Noella	x		ONG GRADESS	CSE – correspondante en suivi-évaluation, Andapa
	RABETALATA Clarien		x	ONG GRADESS	PF – Point Focal de collecte de données
	RABEMIHARY Jean Cloter		x	TEF MADA	Techicien animateur
	RANDRIAMISISY Tony		x	TEF MADA	Superviseur
	TODISOA Marius		x	CFPA (Centre de Formation Professionnelle Agricole) Andapa	formateur
	NAMANA Edson		x	CFPA (Centre de Formation Professionnelle Agricole) Andapa	formateur
	HERVE DAMIS ZAFIMANANTENA		x	LTP (Lycée technique professionnel) Andapa	Adjoint du Proviseur de LTP ANDAPA
	RAHARINANTENAINA Yadina	x		DRETFP SAVA (Direction Régional de l'Enseignement technique et formation professionnelle)	Responsable communication

	RAMANAHADRAY Denis		x	DRETFP SAVA (Direction Régional de l'Enseignement technique et formation professionnelle)	Directeur Régional
	BEZINA Amalia	x		LTP (Lycée technique professionnel) et CFPA (Centre de Formation Professionnelle Agricole) Andapa	Proviseur de LTP ANDAPA et Chef du CFPA
	Tatiana Dasy	x		Save the Children	Programme Director
20/03 Antalaha	RANDRIANARIJAONA Tiana Andonandro		x	Société SOARARY	Responsable PRODUITS
	BENITSIAFANTOKA Joseph		x	Centre Universitaire Régional de la SAVA (CURSA)	Directeur
	TOMBOZAFY		x	Centre Universitaire Régional de la SAVA (CURSA)	Responsable administratif et financier
	Enfants/ jeunes, apprenants	2	15	Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Apprenants, bénéficiaires du projet SAVABE
	RATOLOJANAHARY Jacquelin Juldas		x	CFPFA ; Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Encadreur d'administration pénitentiaire
	RANDRIAMAHAZOSOA Tolotra Noé		x	Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Encadreur d'administration pénitentiaire
	HARIZO Gastelin Peter		X	CFPFA ; Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Formateur en culture maraîchère
	RANDRIANASANDRATRA Franco Liva Gabriel		X	Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Chef de centre Adjoint
	BESABOTSY Riveho Chafuer		x	CFPFA ; Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Gestionnaire du Centre, encadreur d'administration pénitentiaire

	BEMANDRO Armand		x	CFPFA ; Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Encadreur d'administration pénitentiaire
	SOCAMOMO Edouard		x	CFPFA ; Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Encadreur d'administration pénitentiaire
	RISTIER Georges		x	CFPFA ; Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Formateur, culture marâichère
	BEFALY Wilbert		x	CFPFA ; Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Formateur culture marâichère et produits de vanille
	RAKOTOMALALA Virina Niaina		x	CFPFA ; Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Formateur en maçonnerie
	RAVELOSON Savitana		x	CFPFA ; Centre Pénitentiaire Antalaha	Formateur menuiserie
20/03 Antalaha	VELOTODY Guillaume		x	Etablissement GERMAIN, Antalaha	Responsable de traçabilité
21/03	EUPHRASIE	x		EUPHRASIE, Antalaha	collecteur
22/03 Lanjarivo	Bénéficiaires	9	24	Bénéficiaires du projet	Bénéficiaires du projet
22/03	Anselme Dieu Donné RASOLOFONANTENAINA			LOVA Ressource	Technicien Animateur
22/03	JOELY Innocent Ellio		x	ONG GRADESS	CSE – correspondant en suivi- évaluation
22/03	RAMAMONJY Mariange	x		LOVA Ressource	Technicienne Animatrice
23/03	Dina Rasanjson			Domaine Ambohimanitra, Soaland Discovery	Responsable Manager, Guide on vanille production and processing, explanation of corporate social responsibility programming

26/03	Gianna Palmaro	x		Vanille Vanille	Exporter, corporate social responsibility project support to 600 families
04/04	Severine Deboos	x		ILO	Global Coordinator Enabling Environment for Sustainable Enterprises
06/04	Jean Marie Kagabo,		x	ILO	Senior Programme and Operations Officer (Africa),

Annex D: Field Work Itinerary Overview

JOUR	HEURE	LIEU	ACTIVITES	PERSONNES/ENTITE A RENCONTRER
09 Mars	9:30-12:00	Antananarivo	Interview	Ministère de Commerce, Tamoha Adreiannie 09
14 Mars	07:15	Sambava	Départ	
	09:00 – 10:00	Antsirabe-Nord	Focus group	Bénéficiaires services directs
	10 :00 – 11 :00			CLLTE, Mairie
	11 00 – 12 : 00		Focus group	Prestataires de service pour les services directs: Technicien-Animateur, Point focal collecte données.
	12 :00 – 13 :00			
	13 :00 – 13 :40	En route pour Ampanefena		
	14 :20 – 15 :15			Bénéficiaires services directs
	15 :15 – 16 :20	Ampanefena	Focus group	CLLTE + prestataires de services
	16 :20 – 18 :20			
		En route pour Sambava (nuitée à Sambava)		
15 Mars	07 :40 (Mimi resto)	Sambava	Départ pour Ambodiampana (si possible acheter à manger pour midi)	
	09 :30 – 10 :30	Ambodiampana	Focus group	CLLTE, Mairie
	10:40 – 11: 55		Focus group	Membres Association Soarano Vanille

	11:55 – 12 :30			Prestataires de service pour les services directs: Technicien-Animateur, Point focal collecte données.
	12 :45 – 13 :30	En route vers Maroambihy		
	13 :50 – 14 :55	Maroambihy	Focus group	CLLTE
	15 :00 – 15 :45		Focus group	Ecole (classe de 3 ^e)
	15 :45 – 17 : 30	Retour à Sambava (nuitée à Sambava)		
18 Mars	07 : 00	Sambava	En route pour Tanambao-Daoud	
	10 :20 – 11 :30	Tanambao-Daoud	Focus group (à Tanambao-Daoud, Antsahakajoy)	Bénéficiaires services directs
	10 :45 – 11 :40		Focus group (à Tanambao Daoud)	CLLTE
	11 :40 – 12 :53			Prestataires de service pour les services directs: Technicien-Animateur, Point focal collecte données.
	13 :10 – 15 :50	En route pour Bemanevika (nourriture à emporter)		
	15 :30 – 16 :40	Bemanevika	Focus group	Bénéficiaires services directs
	16 :40 – 17 :50	Retour à Sambava (nuitée à Sambava)		
19 Mars (Hôtel Benanana)	06 :30	Sambava	Départ pour Tanandava	
	09 :30 – 10 :30	Tanandava	Focus group	Bénéficiaires services directs
	10 :35 – 11 :35			CLLTE
	11 :35 – 12 :53			Prestataires de service pour les services directs: Technicien-Animateur, Point focal collecte données.
	13 :00 – 13 :55	En route pour CFP Andapa		
	14 :00 – 15 :05	CFP Andapa	interviews	Enfants bénéficiaires des formations professionnelles

	15 :10 – 16 :00	CFP Andapa	Focus group	Responsables du CFP
	16 :00 – 16 :30	Retour à Andapa (nuitée à Andapa)		
	16 :30 – 17 :40	Andapa	interview	Mme DASY Tatiana, Directeur de programme, Save the Children
20 Mars (Hotel Ocean Momo)	06 :30	Andapa	En route vers Antalaha	
	11 :00 - 12 :00	Locaux SOARARY VANILLE	Focus group	Exportateur : SOARARY VANILLE
	12 :00 – 13 :30			
	13:30 – 14:15	CFP Antalaha	Focus group, à la Maison central (prison)	Enfants bénéficiaires des formations professionnelles
	14 :20 – 15 :20	CFP Antalaha	Focus group	Responsables du CFP
	15 :40 – 16 :10	En route pour CURSA Antalaha		
	16 :10 – 16 :30	CURSA Antalaha	Focus group	Responsables CURSA ayant participé au développement des modules de formation et à la formation des formateurs sur les bonnes pratiques agricoles (Mr Tomobozafy ou Mr Benitsiafantoka)
	16 :35 – 16 :40		En route pour Ets Germain	
	16 :40 – 17 :50	Ets Germain	Focus group	Exportateur : Ets Germain
			Discussions avec Eglise du Projet	
Nuitée à Antalaha				
	07 :00	Antalaha	Départ pour Ampohibe	
	09 :40 – 10 :50	Ampohibe (au lieu de Marofinaritra)	Focus group	Bénéficiaires services directs

21 Mars	10 :50 – 11 :45		Focus group	Prestataires de services
	11 :50 – 14 :10		Retour à Antalaha	
	14 :20 – 15h30	Antalaha	interview	Collecteur ayant travaillé sur la problématique de la traçabilité et la sensibilisation sur la lutte contre le travail des enfants : Mme Euphrasie
	19 :00-		Interview Equipe de projet	
	Nuitée à Antalaha			
22 Mars	07 :00	Antalaha	Départ pour Lanjarivo	
	09 :30 – 10 :30	Lanjarivo	Focus group	Bénéficiaires services directs
	10 :30 – 12 :15			Prestataires de service pour les services directs: Technicien-Animateur, Point focal collecte données.
	12 :30 – 13 :55		Retour à Sambava	
23-24 Mars			Réunions de Suivi avec membres equipe	
04 April		Skype	Severine Deboos, Global Coordinator Enabling Environment for Sustainable Enterprises03 04.docx	
06 April		Skype	Jean Marie Kagabo, Senior Programme and Operations Officer (Africa),	

Annex E: Stakeholder Workshop Agenda and Participants

Agenda

25 November 2018

25 Mars 2019				
Heure	Thème	Intervenant	Facilitateur	Méthodologie
8h30-9h00	Accueil et distribution des formulaires	Equipe SAVABE	Rivo (SAVABE)	
9h00-9h10	Discours d'ouverture : OIT/SAVABE ; CRLTE ; Région SAVA	- le Directeur du projet, - le Président du CRLTE, - le SG Région SAVA	Rivo (SAVABE)	Discours
9h10 – 9h20	Présentations personnelles, présentation des objectifs, explication de l'organisation de l'atelier	Les participants	Mei Zegers (évaluatrice)/ Rivo	Tour de table, Présentation
9h20 – 9h30	Remplissage des formulaires « réussites et défis »	Mei Zegers (évaluatrice)/ Rivo (SAVABE)	Rivo	Travaux individuels
9h30 – 10h00	Présentation du résultat provisoire de l'évaluation	Mei Zegers	Rivo	Présentation
10h00-10h15	PAUSE-CAFE		Rivo	
10h15-11h00	Division des participants en groupes et travaux de groupes sur les « réussites et défis »	Mei Zegers	Rivo	Travaux de groupes
11h00–11h30	Restitution des travaux de groupes	Les groupes	Mei Zegers / Rivo	Présentation
11h30-12h10	Discussion et formulation des recommandations	Mei Zegers	Rivo	Présentation

12h10-12h20	Remarques finales	Mei Zegers	Rivo	Présentation
12h20-12h30	Discours de clôture	- le Directeur du projet, - le Président du CRLTE - le SG Région SAVA	Rivo	Discours
12h30	RAFRAICHISSEMENT - FIN DE L'ATELIER	Les participants	Equipe SAVABE	

Participants

1	Jean-Pierre BOYENGE	INGA	H	OIT/SAVABE, CTP	Sambava
2	RABENANTSOANDRO Alciat Delphin		H	OIT/SAVABE, Administrative and Finance Assistant	Sambava
3	RANDRIAMAMPIANINA Heriniaina		H	OIT/SAVABE, Livelihood Specialist	Sambava
4	RAOELINARIVO Russell	Yvan	H	OIT/SAVABE, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist	Sambava
5	RAZAFIMANANTSOA Mamy		H	OIT/SAVABE, Capacity Building and Awareness-raising Specialist	Sambava
6	Mei ZEGERS		F	Evaluatrice	USDOL
7	Olivier RALAIHARIVONISON		H	Coalition Building Specialist, SVI - Sustainable Vanilla Initiative	Sambava
8	VONINTSOA Mahafahatra		F	SVI - Sustainable Vanilla Initiative	
9	Jan GILHUIS		H	SVI/ IDH	Pays Bas
10	André RAHAJASON	Deriaud	H	Coordinateur de l'ONG Gradess et des CSE	Sambava
11	Fernandin TIANKAVANA		H	CSE basé à Sambava, ONG Gradess	Sambava
12	RAMANAHADRAY Denis		H	Direction Régional de l'Enseignement Technique et Formations Professionnelles	Sambava
13	Xavier RAFIDIARISON Inspecteur de Travail		H	Direction Régional de la Fonction Publique, du Travail et des Lois Sociales	Sambava
14	ANDRIATAFANDRY Andry Nandraina		H	membre du CRLTE	Sambava
15	MARINJARA Paul Edhino		H	Directeur Régional de la Population (DRPPSPF)	Sambava
16	TOMBOZARA Jean Bosco		H	Chef de Service Régional de la DRPPSPF et member du CRLTE	Sambava
17	SABOTSY Samuel		H	Secrétaire Général de la région SAVA	Sambava

18	RABENEFITRA Henri	H	Sécrétaire Général du PRCP	Sambava
19	RASOLONJATOVO Gaston	H	Chef de Service Régional d'Administration, financier et patrimoine; Direction Régionale de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage	Sambava
20	RAKOTOMANDIMBY Voahangy	F	Chef de Service; Direction Régionale de l'Education Nationale	Sambava
21	BENITSIAFANTOKA Joseph	H	CURSA	
22	LEVITA René	H	Délégué de la Communication SAVA	Sambava
23	BEZINA Amalia	F	Direction du Lycée technique d'Andapa	Andapa
24	NIRINASOA Andie Jennifer	F	Centre de Formation professionnelle agricole (CFPA)	Andapa
25	RAZAFIHERINIAINA Mahatradraibe	F	Centre de Formation professionnelle agricole (CFPA)	Andapa
26	VELONJARA	H	Conseiller communal, représentant des ménages bénéficiaires	Sambava (Farahalana)
27	1 membre d'un CLLTE, RABEARISOA	H	Président du CLLTE	Sambava (Nosiarina)
28	1 membre d'un CLLTE, Thore ' Gova	H	Chef fokontany, vice-président du CLLTE	Sambava (Farahalana)
29	RANDRIANASANDRATRA Franco Liva Gabriel	H	Direction Administration pénitentiaire	Antalaha
30	RAZAFINDRAMINO Adelphe	H	interprete	Sambava
31	TSIFANTARINA Jean Richard Chardon	H	CSE, GRADESS	Vohémar
32	SOAMIARY Cadre Noella	F	ONG, GRADESS	Andapa
33	ANDRIAMBOLOLONA Lahatra Herizo	H	LOVA RESSOURCES	Sambava/ Antalaha
34	RAKOTONDRAINIBE Hery Mampionona	H	Coordonnateur LOVA RESSOURCES	Sambava
35	JOELY Innocent Ellio	H	CSE, GRADESS	Antalaha

Annex F: Results of Group and Plenary Work Preliminary Results Workshop

Group 1 –

Successes in priority

- Private and public sector raised awareness; involvement of the Government
- CLLTE (Local Child Labor Committees) and recognition of local competencies
- Direct focus on the producers and their interests
- Focus on range of actors in the vanilla value chain including exporters
- Support for youth
- Participants begin to understand the importance of traceability
- Creating synergies between exporters and importers

Challenges in priority

- Lack of communications (information, education, communications) on the project activities
- Lack of collaboration and communications about progress
- Lack of focus on providing a solid basis for sustainability including: financing for after the project, transfer of competencies to local actors
- Lack of integration of the project interventions
- Household conditions and capacities: (low) level of improvement. Lack of material support including for child education in schools
- Lack of laws and regulations on traceability
- Difficulties mobilizing the collectors and producers
- Need to make better use of the existing expertise and partnerships
- Support for child victims that have been referred.

Group 2

Successes in priority

- Vulnerable households are better prioritized and obtained some training.
- Capacity strengthening of the capacities of the CRLTE and CLLTE
- Improved cohesion of the actors focusing on child labor elimination
- Support with some materials for the CRLTE
- Putting CLTE (commune) and CPE in place (Fokontany)
- Vocational/skills training with children convicted of crimes (mostly in vanilla theft)

Challenges in priority

- Need for more concrete and palpable (project) actions
- Sustainability and financing of the CRLTE
- Decrease the barriers to collectors to become involved in fighting child labor
- Increase awareness raising and communications
- Distance and transport
- Collaboration with actors – project needs to involve a large number of actors

- Regulations and sanctions of uncooperative exporters – develop approaches and consequences
- Putting CPE in place at fokontany level

Group 3

Successes in priority

- Training centers established
- Committees established
- Decentralized structures
- Knowledge of the thematic area
- Local Dina
- Focus on responsibility

Challenges in priority

- Functioning of structures (low level)
- Lack of knowledge of the Dina, no reporting of child labor cases
- No support kits for victims (back to school and other support)
- Lack of awareness raising
- Poor roads

Group 4

Successes in priority

- Establishment of the CLLTE
- Establishment of training centres
- Explanation of project objectives
- Support to households
- Acceptance of households on fight against child labor
- Tools on awareness raising developed
- Regional strategy on the financial inclusion of producers

Challenges in priority

- Lack of media coverage
- Awareness raising of beneficiaries and communities on the fight against child labor
- Project visibility
- Problems with choice of intervention localities- poor access
- Lack of statistics on child labor prevalence in the region
- Lack of involvement of local authorities
- Delays in registering beneficiaries in the DPMS (Direct Participant Monitoring System)
- Short duration of project
- There is no trace of the concept (clarity) of child labor in the traceability system

Workshop Recommendations

(Note: from plenary discussions, not in any order of priority)

- Prepare for sustainability of results and integrate a regional and commune based program on the fight against child labor. To do this involve national ministries and insert the project in the existing dynamics and framework that are being developed (strategies, policies, etc.)
- Intensify (project) communications
- Reinforce project visibility. Also, to better inform stakeholders of their responsibilities.
- Increase awareness raising
- Develop an effective and well-functioning monitoring and support system on child labor
- Clarify the roles and responsibilities of different entities (associated with the project)
- Extend project financing, particularly with regard to direct support to beneficiaries
- Increase the partnership with the Regional Education Directorate or the Ministry of Education to reintegrate children back in school.
- Develop a policy/strategy to better structure the vanilla value chain.

Annex G: Evaluation Questions with Locations of Answers in the Report

Please note that the sequence of some of the questions has been adapted from the ToR to better fit the logic of the report structure.

Evaluation Questions	Answer Location
<p>(I) Relevance</p> <p>Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the validity of the project design and the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host government and other national stakeholders</p>	Section 3.1
<p>1) To what degree is the project design and its theory of change relevant, valid and adequate to address the key causes of child labor among project participants?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include specific attention to the question of whether SAVABE has been able to accurately determine the principal barriers to the fight against child labor in vanilla growing. 	Section 3.1
<p>2) What are the challenges in the design if any?</p>	Section 3.1
<p>3) How able is SAVABE to continually adapt its strategy to the context and needs of local communities?</p>	Section 3.1
<p>(II) Effectiveness</p> <p>Determine whether the project is on track toward meeting its objectives, identifying the challenges and opportunities encountered in doing so, and analyzing the driving factors for these challenges and opportunities; Assess the effectiveness of the project's strategies and the project's strengths and weaknesses in project implementation and identifying areas in need of improvement</p>	Section 3.2
<p>Outcome 1 – 4; Suboutcomes and Outputs</p>	Section 3.2 including Table 1
<p>1) Is the anti-child labor awareness strategy implemented effectively? (also at enabling environment level)</p>	Section 3.2 first part and including under the different sub-sections Outcome 1-4
<p>2) What efforts have been made to meet livelihood targets? Please assess the quantity and nature of services provided and whether these services may help to reduce child labor in the vanilla sector. What are the project's strategies for reaching its target of 15,000 households by the end of the project?</p>	Section 3.2 , Outcome 4 Sub-Section

3) Is there any anecdotal evidence of the reduction in child labor as a result of project activities?	Section 3.2, paragraph 3
4) What are the benefits of providing services directly to beneficiaries rather than channeling them through existing social programs carried out by vanilla actors or other NGOs?	Section 3.2, last paragraph before Table 1
5) To what extent have gender and environmental sustainability aspects been considered? What successes and challenges can be identified?	Section 3.2 Subsection on Gender and Environmental Sustainability
6) How is the project monitoring its project participants? Describe effectiveness of the DPMS system, including successes and challenges. Does the data collection system enable effective knowledge transfer and capacity building among stakeholders?	Section 3.2 on Participant Monitoring System
(III) Efficiency	Section 3.3
1) What project activities have experienced delays and why?	This is already integrated in various parts of Section 2 because there was a question about whether the project is on track.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How have the delays in project start-up and activity implementation impacted the overall timeline of the project? 	Ibid
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the project adapted to the challenges that have arisen from these delays? 	Ibid and in Section 3.3
2) What are the strengths and weaknesses of SAVABE's internal project monitoring and evaluation system?	3.3 Subsection Internal Project Monitoring and Evaluation System
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What steps have been taken to improve it if any? 	
3) How available (part 1) and balanced (part 2) is funding to achieve project objectives?	3.3 paragraph 2 for part 1 3.3
4) How efficiently are resources managed including time, human and logistics resources?	3.3 including Sub-section on Resource Management
(IV) Impact	
1) Is there any evidence so far that, at the end of the project, the improvement of the living conditions of the beneficiaries will have considerably reduced child labor among the target communities?	3.4
(V) Sustainability	3.5

Assess the project's plans for sustainability at local and national levels and among implementing organizations, and identifying steps to enhance its sustainability.	
1) To what extent is the project's engagement with and between key stakeholders (government, community, unions, private sector and non-governmental partners, communities) to build <i>partnerships</i> to combat child labor expected to be sustainable over the long term.	3.5 and previous sections
2) How likely is it that the project's ownership strategy project will lead to an effective sustainability of the implementation of activities on fighting child labor in the vanilla value chain?	3.5

Annex H: Overview of Madagascar Child Protection Structure

Note: The information below was translated and adapted from inputs provided by UNICEF Madagascar child protection team. Thank you to the team for the useful overview.

At the National level, there is the Comité National de la Protection des Enfants (CNPE) or National Child Protection Committee for the Protection of Children. This committee brings together national actors (ministries, UN, Civil Society Organizations-CSO). The CNPE is a monitoring and coordination body for the child protection system in Madagascar. The Ministère de la Population, de la Protection Sociale et de la Promotion de la Femme (MPPSPF) or Ministry of Population, Social Protection and Women provides the secretariat. Within the CNPE there are various commissions (e.g., Commission on Violence Against Children).

At District and Commune level, there is the Réseau de Protection des Enfants (RPE) Child Protection Network. This is a mechanism for the collaboration and coordination of actions between different child protection actors whose mandates are different but complementary. That is, they have a common goal to promote the rights of the child and the protection of children against all forms of violence, abuse and exploitation. This includes children deprived of a family environment and *victims of child labor exploitation*. This mechanism ensures the effectiveness of a collaboration between structures and public services to which the law gives the obligation and authority to protect children.

The mission of the RPE is to operationalize the child protection system at the local level. This includes contributing to the implementation of national strategies for the protection of children at the local level, eg: National Plan to Combat Violence.

The main roles of the RPE are:

- Preventing violence and abuse against children through awareness raising, community mobilization, identification of children at risk and monitoring the situation of children.
- Systematic collection of information on the situation of children including children victims of violence, abuse and exploitation.
- Coordinating and networking among the actors to encourage a good collaboration to address the problems at local level for the care of child victims or those who are in danger as quickly as possible.
- Make services accessible and known to children in danger victims and their loved ones.
- Referring cases to care services (psychological, medical and legal) and follow up.
- Respond to child protection issues in humanitarian emergencies and crisis situations
- Mobilize resources and organize advocacy for child protection (partnerships)

The RPE has 3 levels:

- At District level: the RPE BI that forms the Institutional Basis (BI) for the RPE
- At commune or district level: the RPE BC or Child Protection Network - Community Base
- At Fokontany level, there is the "Fokontany Child Protection Watch Cell

The RPE BI brings together stakeholders (public services, CSOs) involved at District level. It is coordinated / chaired by the District Head supported by the Regional District Population Service which acts as the focal point. All mayors are members of the RPE BI. The RPE BC brings together actors at the community level (public services, CSOs, community leaders, parents, children) and is coordinated by the Mayor supported by a member of the RPE. RPE BC coordinators are ex-officio members of the RPE BI. All Fokontany Chiefs of the Commune are members of the RPE BC. The RPE BI and the RPE BC are linked through their functions.

The Fokontany Watch Cell is led by the Fokontany Head. Its mission is to monitor and report cases of child maltreatment and cases of children at risk in the Fokontany to the focal point of the child protection network. The basic function of the watch cell is the identification of the child victims of abuse, as well as referral and monitoring them to the appropriate services through the RPE.

The members of the Fokontany Watch Cell are community volunteers and are identified according to the following criteria: commitment, interest in the protection of the child, knowledge of and recognized as such by the community.

Annex I: Interview and Focus Group Discussion Guide

For individuals who are not project staff

Introduction to the Interviews for all Stakeholders:

I have come to learn from you so that we can improve future programs on child labor. The purpose of evaluations is to determine:

- Where successes lie;
- Implementation difficulties arose;
- Causes of successes and difficulties;
- Possible solutions to make improvements in the remaining project period and so that lessons can be learned for the future.

The evaluator will start each meeting with general questions, such as:

- Please describe your activities as related to the project briefly. (This is not a requirement but is preferable. The brief description should take **no more than 10 minutes**, plus translation. Please note that this is included to provide an opportunity for the interviewees to explain their work in their own words, it serves as a type of ice breaker, and it also helps to set the scene for the consultant's questions.)
- What do you think was very good about the project?
- What challenges do you face in the project?
- Do you have any suggestions for improvements to the project for the remaining project implementation period?
- What do you think you will be doing after the project ends with regard to child labor, policies, awareness raising, advocacy, livelihoods, education, (etc. as appropriate depending on the interviewee).

These questions will be followed by questions on subjects not already covered during the semi-structured first phase of the discussion.

Questions Project Staff

(VI) Relevance
1) To what degree is the project design and its Theory of Change relevant, valid and adequate to address the key causes of child labor among project participants?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Include specific attention to the question of whether SAVABE has been able to accurately determine the principal barriers to the fight against child labor in vanilla growing.
2) What are the challenges in the design if any?
3) How able is SAVABE to continually adapt its strategy to the context and needs of local communities?

<p>(VII) Effectiveness What successes and challenges have been achieved under each outcome area at the midpoint of the project?</p>
<p>Outcome 1: Vanilla exporters, collectors and preparers significantly reduce child labor in the production of vanilla at the farm, collection and preparation levels in Sava</p>
<p><i>Sub-outcome 1.1:</i> Vanilla exporters implement a system that ensures child labor monitoring throughout the supply chain</p>
<p><i>Sub-outcome 1.2:</i> Exporters implement a structured referral and care system to be used for victims of child labor by vanilla exporters, collectors, preparers and producers</p>
<p><i>Sub-outcome 1.3:</i> Vanilla exporters ensure that collectors and preparers implement effective systems and programs to prevent child labor</p>
<p><u>Output 1.3.1:</u> Vanilla collectors and preparers are trained on means of preventing child labor</p>
<p><u>Output 1.3.2:</u> Vanilla producers who participate in supply chain partnership programs are trained on means of preventing child labor</p>
<p><u>Output 1.3.3:</u> Implement a system of traceability throughout the vanilla supply chain (Please describe the project’s vanilla supplier registration process. What are the results of the traceability study? Are there any good practices or lessons learned?)</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Law enforcement and child protection officials enforce child labor laws and policies and ensure care of victims in the vanilla-producing areas of Sava</p>
<p><i>Sub-outcome 2.1:</i> Capacity of law enforcement agencies and service providers responsible for care of victims, including labor inspectorate, PMPM, gendarmerie and Child Protection Networks (RPE) is increased</p>
<p><i>Sub-outcome 2.1.1:</i> The labor inspectorate, PMPM, gendarmerie and RPE have increased knowledge of the procedures for enforcement of the laws on child labor and care of victims</p>
<p><i>Sub-outcome 2.2:</i> The Regional Child Labor Committee (CRTLE) effectively coordinates child labor law enforcement entities at the regional level</p>
<p><i>Sub-outcome 2.2.1:</i> CRTLE capacity to track and report on child labor is increased</p>
<p><i>Sub-outcome 2.3:</i> Trade union capacity to promote child rights and engage in social dialogue in SAVA is increased</p>
<p>Outcome 3: Community members monitor child labor and refer victims to relevant authorities and services.</p>
<p><i>Sub-outcome 3.1:</i> Capacity of community to raise awareness, prevent, and report child labor is increased</p>
<p>Is the anti-child labor awareness strategy implemented effectively? (also at enabling environment level)</p>
<p><u>Output 3.1.1:</u> Regional ordinance on vanilla (<i>Dinam-paritra</i>), adapted to include child labor, is distributed to communities</p>

<u>Output 3.1.2:</u> Child protection committees monitor education and work status of children at high risk of child labor
Outcome 4: Beneficiary households do not use child labor to supplement income What efforts have been made to meet livelihood targets? Please assess the quantity and nature of services provided and whether these services may help to reduce child labor in the vanilla sector. What are the project's strategies for reaching its target of 15,000 households by the end of the project?
<i>Sub-outcome 4.1</i> Beneficiary households have increased income
<i>Sub-outcome 4.1.1:</i> Beneficiary households adopt Good Agricultural Practices (GAP)
<i>Sub-outcome 4.1.2:</i> Producer skills building programs are improved and expanded
<i>Sub-outcome 4.1.3:</i> Producer groups (cooperatives, producer associations) services to members are strengthened to improve production and incomes
<u>Output 4.1.1.1:</u> Vanilla Quality Knowledge Center created to support improved and sustainable vanilla production and curing
<i>Sub-outcome 4.2:</i> Beneficiary households manage their income more effectively
<i>Sub-outcome 4.2.1:</i> Beneficiary households have increased knowledge of financial management
<i>Sub-outcome 4.3:</i> Beneficiary children have greater access to secondary education, especially vocational training
4) Is there any anecdotal evidence of the reduction in child labor as a result of project activities?
5) What are the benefits of providing services directly to beneficiaries rather than channeling them through existing social programs carried out by vanilla actors or other NGOs?
6) To what extent have gender and environmental sustainability aspects been considered? What successes and challenges can be identified?
(VIII) Efficiency
1) What project activities have experienced delays and why?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How have the delays in project start-up and activity implementation impacted the overall timeline of the project? • How has the project adapted to the challenges that have arisen from these delays?
2) What are the strengths and weaknesses of SAVABE's internal project monitoring and evaluation system?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What steps have been taken to improve it if any?

3) How available and balanced is funding to achieve project objectives?
4) How efficiently are resources managed including time, human and logistics resources?
(IX) Impact
1) Is there any evidence so far that, at the end of the project, the improvement of the living conditions of the beneficiaries will have considerably reduced child labor among the target communities?
(X) Sustainability
1) To what extent is the project's engagement with and between key stakeholders (government, community, unions, private sector and non-governmental partners, communities) to build <i>partnerships</i> to combat child labor expected to be sustainable over the long term.
2) How likely is it that the project's ownership strategy project will lead to an effective sustainability of the implementation of activities on fighting child labor in the vanilla value chain?

Note: questions for other stakeholders are detailed and available in French below the list of questions for project staff. They are completely based on the evaluation questions.

Pour les personnes qui ne sont pas du personnel de projet :

Introduction aux entrevues pour tous les interviewés :

Je suis venu pour apprendre vos expériences avec le projet SAVABE afin que nous puissions améliorer les futurs programmes sur le travail des enfants. Les évaluations ont pour but de déterminer :

- Où se trouvent les succès ;
- Les défis qui sont apparus ;
- Causes de succès et de difficultés ;
- Des solutions possibles pour apporter des améliorations à la période restante du projet et permettre de tirer des enseignements pour l'avenir.

L'évaluateur commencera chaque réunion avec des questions générales, telles que :

- Veuillez décrire brièvement vos activités en relation avec le projet. (Ce n'est pas une exigence, mais préférable. La brève description ne devrait pas prendre plus de 10 minutes, plus une traduction. Veuillez noter que cela est demandé afin de donner aux personnes interrogées la possibilité d'expliquer leur travail dans leurs propres mots. Ceci est un type de brise-glace, et cela aide également à préparer le terrain pour les autres questions du consultant.)
- Qu'est-ce qui vous a semblé très bien dans le projet ?
- Quels défis avez-vous identifié dans le projet ?
- Avez-vous des suggestions pour l'amélioration du projet pour la période de mise en œuvre restante ?

- Que pensez-vous faire après la fin du projet en ce qui concerne le travail des enfants, les politiques, la sensibilisation, le plaidoyer, les moyens de subsistance, l'éducation, etc. (selon le cas, en fonction de la personne interrogée).

Ces questions seront suivies de questions sur des sujets non déjà abordés lors de la première phase semi-structurée de la discussion.

Questions Personnel du projet

(I) Pertinence

- 1) Dans quelle mesure la conception du projet et sa théorie du changement sont-ils *pertinents*, *valides* et *adéquats* pour atténuer les principales causes du travail des enfants parmi les participants au projet ?
 - Accorder une attention particulière à la question de savoir si SAVABE a été capable de déterminer avec précision les principaux obstacles à la lutte contre le travail des enfants dans la culture de la vanille.
- 2) Quels sont *les défis dans la conception* le cas échéant ?
- 3) Dans quelle mesure SAVABE est capable *d'adapter* continuellement sa stratégie au contexte et aux besoins des communautés locales ?

(II) Efficacité

Quels succès et quels défis ont été atteints sous chaque domaine de résultats à mi-parcours du projet ?

(Rappels)

Résultat 1 : Les exportateurs, les collecteurs et les préparateurs de vanille réduisent considérablement le travail des enfants dans la production de vanille à la ferme, ainsi que dans la collecte et la préparation à Sava

Sous-résultat 1.1: Les exportateurs de vanille mettent en place un système assurant la surveillance du travail des enfants tout au long de la chaîne d'approvisionnement.

Sous-résultat 1.2: Les exportateurs, les collecteurs, les préparateurs et les producteurs de vanille ont recours à un système structuré d'orientation et de prise en charge des victimes du travail des enfants.

Sous-résultat 1.3: Les exportateurs de vanille veillent à ce que les collecteurs et les préparateurs mettent en œuvre des systèmes et des programmes efficaces de prévention du travail des enfants

Output 1.3.1: Les collecteurs et les préparateurs de vanille sont formés aux moyens de prévenir le travail des enfants.

Output 1.3.2: Les producteurs de vanille qui participent à des programmes de partenariat dans la chaîne d'approvisionnement sont formés aux moyens de prévenir le travail des enfants.

Output 1.3.3: Mise en place un système de traçabilité tout au long de la chaîne d'approvisionnement en vanille (Veuillez décrire le processus d'enregistrement des fournisseurs de vanille du projet.

Question spécifique dans ce domaine :

- Quels sont les résultats de l'étude de traçabilité ? Existe-t-il des bonnes pratiques ou des leçons apprises ?)

Résultat 2 : Les responsables de l'application des lois et de la protection des enfants appliquent les lois et les politiques relatives au travail des enfants et assurent la prise en charge des victimes dans les régions de Sava productrices de vanille

Sous-résultat 2.1: Renforcement des capacités des services répressifs et des prestataires de services chargés de la prise en charge des victimes, y compris l'inspection du travail, le PMPM, la gendarmerie et les réseaux de protection de l'enfance

Sous-résultat 2.1.1: L'inspection du travail, le PMPM, la gendarmerie et le RPE ont une meilleure connaissance des procédures d'application des lois sur le travail des enfants et la prise en charge des victimes

Sous-résultat 2.2: Le Comité régional sur le travail des enfants (CRTLE) coordonne efficacement les entités chargées de l'application de la loi sur le travail des enfants au niveau régional

Sous-résultat 2.2.1: La capacité du CRTLE à suivre et à signaler le travail des enfants est accrue

Sous-résultat 2.3: La capacité des syndicats de promouvoir les droits de l'enfant et d'engager le dialogue social au sein de SAVA est accrue

Résultat 3 : Les membres de la communauté surveillent le travail des enfants et orientent les victimes vers les autorités et les services concernés.

Sous-résultat 3.1: Capacité de la communauté à sensibiliser, à prévenir et à signaler le travail des enfants est accrue

La stratégie de sensibilisation contre le travail des enfants est-elle mise en œuvre efficacement ? (Également au niveau de l'environnement favorable)

Résultat 3.1.1: L'ordonnance régionale sur la vanille (Dinam-paritra), adaptée pour inclure le travail des enfants, est distribuée aux communautés

Output 3.1.2: Les comités de protection de l'enfance surveillent le niveau d'éducation et le statut professionnel des enfants exposés à un risque élevé de travail des enfants

Résultat 4 : Les ménages bénéficiaires n'utilisent pas le travail des enfants pour compléter leur revenu

Questions spécifiques dans ce domaine :

Quels efforts ont été déployés pour atteindre les objectifs des activités génératrices de revenus ? Veuillez évaluer la quantité et la nature des services fournis et déterminer si ces services peuvent contribuer à réduire le travail des enfants dans le secteur de la vanille.

Quelles sont les stratégies du projet pour atteindre l'objectif de 15 000 ménages d'ici la fin du projet ?

Sous-résultat 4.1 Les ménages bénéficiaires ont augmenté leurs revenus

Sous-résultat 4.1.1: Les ménages bénéficiaires adoptent les bonnes pratiques agricoles (BPA)

Sous-résultat 4.1.2: Les programmes de développement des compétences des producteurs sont améliorés et étendus

Sous-résultat 4.1.3: Les services aux membres des groupes de producteurs (coopératives, associations de producteurs) sont renforcés pour améliorer la production et les revenus.

Résultat 4.1.1.1: Création du centre de connaissances sur la qualité de la vanille pour soutenir la production et le traitement améliorés et durables de la vanille

Sous-résultat 4.2: Les ménages bénéficiaires gèrent leur revenu plus efficacement

Sous-résultat 4.2.1: Les ménages bénéficiaires ont une meilleure connaissance de la gestion financière

Sous-résultat 4.3: Les enfants bénéficiaires ont davantage accès à l'enseignement secondaire, notamment à la formation professionnelle.

Autres

1) Existe-t-il des *preuves anecdotiques* de la réduction du travail des enfants résultant des activités du projet ?

2) Quels sont les avantages de *fournir des services directement* aux bénéficiaires plutôt que de les orienter par le biais de programmes sociaux existants menés par des acteurs de la vanille ou d'autres ONG ?

3) Dans quelle mesure les aspects liés au *genre et à la durabilité environnementale* ont-ils été pris en compte ? Quels succès et quels défis peuvent être identifiés ?

(III) Efficience

1) Quelles activités du projet ont *connu des retards* et pourquoi ?

2) Comment les retards dans le démarrage du projet et la mise en œuvre des activités ont-ils eu *une incidence sur le calendrier* général du projet ?

3) Comment le projet s'est-il *adapté aux défis posés par ces retards* ?

4) Quelles sont les *forces et les faiblesses du système interne de suivi et d'évaluation* des activités de SAVABE ?

- Quelles mesures ont été prises pour l'améliorer, le cas échéant ?

5) Dans quelle mesure *le financement est-il disponible et équilibré* pour atteindre les objectifs du projet ?

6) Quelle est *l'efficience de la gestion des ressources*, y compris du temps, des ressources humaines et des ressources logistiques ?

(II) Impact

- 1) Existe-t-il jusqu'à présent des preuves que, *à la fin du projet*, l'amélioration des conditions de vie des bénéficiaires aura considérablement *réduit le travail des enfants* dans les communautés cibles ?

(IV) Pérennisation

- 1) Dans quelle mesure *l'engagement du projet avec et entre les principales parties prenantes* (gouvernement, communauté, syndicats, secteur privé et partenaires non gouvernementaux, communautés) pour construire des partenariats visant à lutter contre le travail des enfants est-il censé être durable à long terme ?
- 2) Quelle est la probabilité que la stratégie du projet conduise à *une durabilité effective de la mise en œuvre des activités* de lutte contre le travail des enfants dans la chaîne de valeur vanille ?

Gouvernement niveau national, local, partenaires

(I) Pertinence

Selon vous :

- 1) Dans quelle mesure la conception du projet et sa théorie du changement sont-ils *pertinents, valides et adéquats* pour atténuer les principales causes du travail des enfants parmi les participants au projet ?
- 2) Quels sont *les défis dans la conception* le cas échéant ?

(II) Efficacité

Selon vous :

- 1) *Quels succès et quels défis ont été atteints sous chaque domaine de résultats dont vous êtes au courant à mi-parcours du projet ? (Voir liste si dessous nécessaire)*
 - Êtes-vous au courant de l'étude de traçabilité ? Existe-t-il des bonnes pratiques ou des leçons apprises ?
- 2) Existe-t-il des *preuves anecdotiques* de la réduction du travail des enfants résultant des activités du projet ?
- 3) Quels sont les avantages de *fournir des services directement* aux bénéficiaires plutôt que de les orienter par le biais de programmes sociaux existants menés par des acteurs de la vanille ou d'autres ONG ?
- 4) Dans quelle mesure les aspects liés au *genre et à la durabilité environnementale* ont-ils été pris en compte ? Quels succès et quels défis peuvent être identifiés ?

(III) Efficience

Selon vous :

- 1) Le projet connaît-il des retards de mise en œuvre jusqu'à présent ? Avez-vous des commentaires sur pourquoi ? Avez-vous des suggestions sur la façon dont elles peuvent être abordées ?
- 2) Quelle est l'efficacité de la gestion des ressources, y compris du temps, des ressources humaines et des ressources logistiques ?

(II) Impact

Selon vous :

- 1) Existe-t-il jusqu'à présent des preuves que, à la fin du projet, l'amélioration des conditions de vie des bénéficiaires aura considérablement *réduit le travail des enfants* dans les communautés cibles ?

(IV) Pérennisation

Selon vous :

- 1) Dans quelle mesure l'engagement du projet avec et entre les principales parties prenantes (gouvernement, communauté, syndicats, secteur privé et partenaires non gouvernementaux, communautés) pour construire des partenariats visant à lutter contre le travail des enfants est-il censé être durable à long terme ?
- 2) Quelle est la probabilité que la stratégie du projet conduise à une durabilité *effective de la mise en œuvre des activités de lutte* contre le travail des enfants dans la chaîne de valeur vanille ?

Groupes communautaires, Parents, Enfants

(I) Pertinence

Selon vous :

- 1) Le projet a-t-il correctement identifié les principales raisons du travail des enfants dans votre région ?
- 2) Si non, quelles sont les principales raisons ?
- 3) Les activités du projet visant à réduire le travail des enfants à la vanille sont-elles les meilleures dans votre communauté ou y en aurait-il d'autres utiles ? Que seraient-ils ?

(II) Efficacité, Impact et Pérennisation

Selon vous :

- 1) Quels sont les principaux succès et défis des activités du projet dans votre communauté jusqu'à présent ?
- 2) Avez-vous déjà remarqué des exemples de réduction du travail des enfants dans votre communauté à la suite du projet ? Si oui, pouvez-vous les décrire ?

- 3) Les garçons ainsi que les filles sont-ils/elles impliqués dans les activités du projet ? Si oui, comment sont-ils/elles impliqués ? Qu'en pensez-vous ?
- 4) Le projet a-t-il mené des activités pour réduire les problèmes environnementaux posés par la production de vanille ? Que sont-elles ? Qu'en pensez-vous ?
- 5) D'après ce que vous avez remarqué jusqu'à présent, pensez-vous que les activités du projet contribueront ou pas à améliorer les conditions de vie de sorte que moins d'enfants travailleront dans la vanille à long terme ?
- 6) Outre le personnel du projet SAVABE, qui d'autre vous aide à réduire le travail des enfants dans votre communauté ? Que font-ils ? Que pensez-vous de cela (points forts et défis) ?
- 7) À demander seulement si des activités de projet importantes ont déjà été mises en œuvre dans la communauté :
- 8) Dans quelle mesure pensez-vous que la communauté sera en mesure de continuer à mettre en œuvre les activités initiées par le projet même après la fin du projet dans moins de deux ans ?
- 9)

(III) Efficience

Selon vous :

- 1) Le projet connaît-il des retards de mise en œuvre jusqu'à présent ? Avez-vous des commentaires sur pourquoi ? Qu'en pensez-vous ?
- 2) Est-ce que le personnel du projet ou d'autres personnes liées au projet vous rendent visite ? À quelle fréquence vous ont-ils rendu visite au cours des 6 derniers mois ? Qu'en pensez-vous ?

Résultats Attendues (Traduction informelle)

Résultat 1 : Les exportateurs, les collecteurs et les préparateurs de vanille réduisent considérablement le travail des enfants dans la production de vanille à la ferme, ainsi que dans la collecte et la préparation à Sava

Sous-résultat 1.1: Les exportateurs de vanille mettent en place un système assurant la surveillance du travail des enfants tout au long de la chaîne d'approvisionnement.

Sous-résultat 1.2: Les exportateurs, les collecteurs, les préparateurs et les producteurs de vanille ont recours à un système structuré d'orientation et de prise en charge des victimes du travail des enfants.

Sous-résultat 1.3: Les exportateurs de vanille veillent à ce que les collecteurs et les préparateurs mettent en œuvre des systèmes et des programmes efficaces de prévention du travail des enfants

Output 1.3.1: Les collecteurs et les préparateurs de vanille sont formés aux moyens de prévenir le travail des enfants.

Output 1.3.2: Les producteurs de vanille qui participent à des programmes de partenariat dans la chaîne d'approvisionnement sont formés aux moyens de prévenir le travail des enfants.

Output 1.3.3: Mise en place un système de traçabilité tout au long de la chaîne d'approvisionnement en vanille (Veuillez décrire le processus d'enregistrement des fournisseurs de vanille du projet.

Résultat 2 : Les responsables de l'application des lois et de la protection des enfants appliquent les lois et les politiques relatives au travail des enfants et assurent la prise en charge des victimes dans les régions de Sava productrices de vanille

Sous-résultat 2.1: Renforcement des capacités des services répressifs et des prestataires de services chargés de la prise en charge des victimes, y compris l'inspection du travail, le PMPM, la gendarmerie et les réseaux de protection de l'enfance

Sous-résultat 2.1.1: L'inspection du travail, le PMPM, la gendarmerie et le RPE ont une meilleure connaissance des procédures d'application des lois sur le travail des enfants et la prise en charge des victimes

Sous-résultat 2.2: Le Comité régional sur le travail des enfants (CRTLE) coordonne efficacement les entités chargées de l'application de la loi sur le travail des enfants au niveau régional

Sous-résultat 2.2.1: La capacité du CRTLE à suivre et à signaler le travail des enfants est accrue

Sous-résultat 2.3: La capacité des syndicats de promouvoir les droits de l'enfant et d'engager le dialogue social au sein de SAVA est accrue

Résultat 3 : Les membres de la communauté surveillent le travail des enfants et orientent les victimes vers les autorités et les services concernés.

Sous-résultat 3.1: Capacité de la communauté à sensibiliser, à prévenir et à signaler le travail des enfants est accrue

La stratégie de sensibilisation contre le travail des enfants est-elle mise en œuvre efficacement ? (Également au niveau de l'environnement favorable)

Résultat 3.1.1: L'ordonnance régionale sur la vanille (Dinam-paritra), adaptée pour inclure le travail des enfants, est distribuée aux communautés

Output 3.1.2: Les comités de protection de l'enfance surveillent le niveau d'éducation et le statut professionnel des enfants exposés à un risque élevé de travail des enfants

Résultat 4 : Les ménages bénéficiaires n'utilisent pas le travail des enfants pour compléter leur revenu

Questions spécifiques dans ce domaine :

Quels efforts ont été déployés pour atteindre les objectifs des activités génératrices de revenus ? Veuillez évaluer la quantité et la nature des services fournis et déterminer si ces services peuvent contribuer à réduire le travail des enfants dans le secteur de la vanille.

Quelles sont les stratégies du projet pour atteindre l'objectif de 15 000 ménages d'ici la fin du projet ?

Sous-résultat 4.1 Les ménages bénéficiaires ont augmenté leurs revenus

Sous-résultat 4.1.1: Les ménages bénéficiaires adoptent les bonnes pratiques agricoles (BPA)

Sous-résultat 4.1.2: Les programmes de développement des compétences des producteurs sont améliorés et étendus

Sous-résultat 4.1.3: Les services aux membres des groupes de producteurs (coopératives, associations de producteurs) sont renforcés pour améliorer la production et les revenus.

Résultat 4.1.1.1: Création du centre de connaissances sur la qualité de la vanille pour soutenir la production et le traitement améliorés et durables de la vanille

Sous-résultat 4.2: Les ménages bénéficiaires gèrent leur revenu plus efficacement

Sous-résultat 4.2.1: Les ménages bénéficiaires ont une meilleure connaissance de la gestion financière

Sous-résultat 4.3: Les enfants bénéficiaires ont davantage accès à l'enseignement secondaire, notamment à la formation professionnelle.

Annex J: Tag Cloud Indicating Frequency of Comments on Evaluation Subjects

Note that the Tag Cloud only provides an overview representation of the frequency of comments on evaluation issues. Nevertheless, the larger the words in the graphic, the more frequently interviewees and focus group members commented on these issues. This is particularly important given the semi-structured methodology for asking questions with all except the project staff members. The methodology allowed respondents to stress the most important issues without prompting. During interviews and focus groups, specific questions were mostly only asked to deepen understanding of the points that the respondents raised.

XSL Stylesheet: HU Tag Cloud - A simple tag cloud viewer browser for HU entities
Description: A tag cloud is a visual depiction of content tags used in your HU. More frequently used tags are depicted in a larger font; display order is alphabetical. This lets you find a tag both by alphabet and by frequency.
HU: Madagascar SAVABE Mid Term Evaluation by Mel Zegers

HU Tag Cloud

1. Relevance project 1.1 Challenges to the design 1.2 Ability of SAVABE to adapt to realities 1.3 Baseline 1.4

Need for policy- platform interprofessional 2. Effectiveness 2.0 Project visibility - (& need for steering committee), increase understanding of project 2.1 Outcome 1 Vanilla Exporters reduce CL 2.1.1 Supply chain monitoring Vanilla exporters 2.1.2 Structured referral and care CL along value chain 2.1.3 Prevention of CL along value chain actors - Including Code of Conduct 2.1.3.1 Vanilla collectors and preparers trained 2.1.3.2 Vanilla producers in partnerships programs trained 2.1.3.3 Traceability system 2.2 Outcome 2 Law enforcement & policy implementation 2.2.1 Capacities enforcement and care of victims strengthened: knowledge laws and enforcement increased 2.2.2 CRLTE coordinates at regional level - capacities increased 2.2.3 Trade Union capacities child rights and social dialogue 2.3 Outcome 3 Communities identify, refer and monitor 2.3.1 Community capacities awareness, prevention, reporting 2.3.1.1 Dina Regional ordinance distributed (Dinam-parita) 2.3.3 CPC monitor education and work status 2.4 Outcome 4 HHs livelihoods component What efforts? Quantity and nature of services? Able to reduce CL? Strategies for reaching 15,000 HHs? 2.4.1 HHs have increased income 2.4.1.1 Adopt Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) 2.4.1.2 Skills bldg programs 2.4.1.3 Producer groups capacities - Vanilla Quality Knowledge Center created 2.4.2 HHs manage incomes - financial mgt knowledge 2.4.3 Children access vocational /skills trng 2.6 Benefits channelling through project instead of existing programs? 2.7 Gender issues 2.8 Environmental issues 3. Efficiency 3.1 Timeliness - why, what impact of delays, adaptation to address delays? 3.2 Internal M&E system & steps to improve, shairng info 3.3 Availability and balance of funding? 3.4 Efficient mgt of time, human, logistics resources 3.5 SVI ILO Government and other mgt partnerships 3.6 Local SAVABE partnerships 4. Impact - Evidence of expectation of CL reduction? 5. Sustainability partnerships quality and their sustainability. 5.1 Likelihood of ownership strategy to sustainability 6. Recommendations