

FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Independent Final Evaluation of the Children's Empowerment Through Education Services (CHES) Project in Cambodia

Winrock International

Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-16567-07-75-K



2011

This page intentionally left blank.

**FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

**Independent Final Evaluation of the
Children's Empowerment Through
Education Services (CHES) Project
in Cambodia**

Winrock International
Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-I6567-07-75-K

2011

This page intentionally left blank.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report describes in detail the final evaluation, conducted between June and July 2011, of the Children’s Empowerment Through Education Services (CHES): Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labor in Cambodia project. The report was prepared by ICF Macro, according to agreements specified in its contract with the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking (OCFT). The evaluation of this project in Cambodia was conducted and documented by Dr. Bjorn Nordtveit, an independent evaluator in collaboration with USDOL/OCFT staff, the CHES project team, and stakeholders in Cambodia. ICF Macro would like to express sincere thanks to all parties involved in this evaluation: the independent evaluator, Winrock International, and the U.S. Department of Labor.



Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor under Task Order number DOLJ089K28130. Points of view or opinions in this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

This page intentionally left blank.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iii
List of Acronyms	vii
Executive Summary	ix
I Objectives and Methodology	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Scope and Purpose	1
1.3 Methodology	2
1.4 Stakeholders' Meeting	6
1.5 Limitations	6
II Project Description	9
2.1 Background	9
2.2 Country Context	10
2.3 Children's Empowerment Through Education Services Project	12
III Relevance	15
3.1 Findings	15
3.2 Lessons Learned and Good Practices	24
IV Effectiveness	25
4.1 Findings	25
4.2 Lessons Learned and Good Practices	34
V Efficiency	37
5.1 Findings	37
5.2 Lessons Learned and Good Practices	40
VI Impact	41
6.1 Findings	41
6.2 Lessons Learned and Good Practices	44
VII Sustainability	45
7.1 Findings	45
7.2 Lessons Learned and Good Practices	50
VIII Conclusions and Recommendations	53
8.1 Conclusion	53
8.2 Recommendations	54

Annexes

Annex A: Question Matrix for Fieldwork

Annex B: Fieldwork Schedule

Annex C: Photos

Annex D: Presentation at Stakeholders' Meeting (July 4, 2011)

Annex E: Stakeholders' Comments to the Final Draft of the Evaluation

Annex F: Terms of Reference

Annex G: Documents Reviewed

Annex H: List of Persons Interviewed

Annex I: Stakeholders Meeting Participants

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CEDAC	<i>Centre d'Etude et de Développement Agricole Cambodgien</i> (Cambodian Center for Study and Development in Agriculture)
CFS	Child-Friendly School
CHES	Children's Empowerment Through Education Services
CLMC	Child Labor Monitoring Committee
CSNACLO	Civil Society Network Against Child Labor Organization
CYC	Child Youth Club
DOCL	Department of Child Labor
EI	Education Initiative
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
KAPE	Kampuchean Action for Primary Education
MOEYS	Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports
MOLVT	Ministry of Labor and Vocational Training
NFE	Nonformal Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OCFT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking
PCCL	Provincial Committee on Child Labor
PDOLVT	Provincial Department of Labor and Vocational Training
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor
YAE	Young Agriculture Entrepreneur

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) at the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL), supports U.S. Government policy on international child labor and oversees cooperative agreements with organizations working to eliminate child labor around the world. OCFT-funded projects are subject to midterm and final evaluations.

In 2007, Winrock International received a 4-year cooperative agreement from USDOL to implement the Children's Empowerment Through Education Services (CHES) project in Cambodia. This project aimed to withdraw and prevent children from exploitive child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the goals of USDOL to reduce the worst forms of child labor (WFCL) through research, awareness raising, and policy formation. The project targeted 3,750 children for withdrawal and 4,500 children for prevention from hazardous work in subsistence and commercial agriculture, including freshwater fishing. The project was implemented in 160 villages in the provinces of Kampong Cham, Prey Veng, Pursat, and Siem Reap, 4 of the poorest provinces in Cambodia. Two associate organizations, Wathnakpheap and Kampuchean Action for Primary Education (KAPE), were responsible for implementing work at the provincial level—Wathnakpheap in Pursat and Siem Reap, and KAPE in Kampong Cham and Prey Veng. The associates have field offices and field staff in each province to follow up on project implementation. In October 2010, the project also set up a subcontract with the *Centre d'Etude et de Développement Agricole Cambodgien* (Cambodian Center for Study and Development in Agriculture, or CEDAC) for agriculture training of beneficiaries and the parents of withdrawn beneficiaries.

The CHES project began in September 2007, and its final evaluation was conducted from June 19 to July 4, 2011. The evaluation report builds on findings from the fieldwork but also from project documentation and the midterm evaluation. The scope of the evaluation included a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL cooperative agreement with Winrock International. The approach was primarily qualitative and participative in terms of the data collection methods used. Quantitative data were drawn from project reports to the extent available and incorporated in the analysis. The evaluation was independent—not in any way related to the project and/or to USDOL—in terms of the evaluation team and methodology.

Individual and focus group interviews were held with a total of 100 stakeholders, including teachers, project staff, and officials, 32 of whom were women. In addition, 210 children (138 girls) and 48 parents (34 woman) of beneficiaries were interviewed in focus groups. The results of the findings from the field were further probed and investigated with key informants, both related and unrelated to the project. The evaluator verified the educational status and receipt of a direct service for 225 children during field visits through direct contact with the children. The evaluator kept confidential all sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. Following the field visits, a stakeholders' meeting was conducted during which the findings and conclusion of the evaluation were presented and stakeholders provided feedback on the findings and proposed solutions to address the challenges encountered by the project.

The evaluation fieldwork led to a number of findings, lessons learned, and good practices regarding the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. The project's achieved its immediate objective to reduce the overall number of children engaged in exploitive child labor in subsistence and commercial agriculture in Cambodia. The project reached and tracked 8,988 children (5,275 girls and 3,713 boys), a number well above the target—including dropouts, it should be noted that the number of beneficiaries completing the program is slightly lower than target.

The project offered a wide variety of activities and services to address a complex situation of poverty and a lack of awareness of WFCL and the importance of education. The project design addressed two core barriers to education: (1) poverty, including the need to compensate for income lost when children stop working (addressed with skills training of parents), and (2) low quality of education (addressed by setting up child-friendly schools [CFS]). In addition, the project designed a robust awareness-raising component of the project, which included media, especially radio, as well as one-to-one interaction such as child labor monitoring committee activities in the communities, to change social practices and to bring awareness of the problem of child labor to project stakeholders and the wider community. The project also addressed issues of education access and education quality by training community teachers. Community teachers were posted in areas where schools were overcrowded to improve the teaching-learning environment and allow better interaction between students and teachers.

One main obstacle to project implementation was the non-inclusion of subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing on the list of WFCL in Cambodia. The project had difficulty advocating for the elimination of WFCL in this sector since there was a lack of legal and implementation structures to address the issue. For example, the provincial labor inspectors generally did not follow up on WFCL in subsistence agriculture. The project addressed this problem through research, policy work, and awareness raising at all levels. A major goal of the CHES project was to introduce subsistence agriculture as a sector with child labor, to define worst and hazardous forms of child labor within this sector, and to distinguish them from child work. The project defined WFCL and hazardous child labor in subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing as it implemented the program. Subsequently, project staff realized it would be almost impossible in most cases to eliminate child labor in these sectors in Cambodia. Therefore, the project aimed initiatives first and foremost at identifying and eliminating WFCL in the targeted sectors. The project used an exceptionally multifaceted structure to address the problem. In addition to its four core services—withdrawal and reintegration in primary; withdrawal and provision of nonformal education and skills training; prevention; assistance to girls' transition to secondary—the project used multiple models targeted toward different user groups and categories, including child care mothers, child councils in schools, CFS, child youth clubs (CYC), remedial classes, and young agricultural entrepreneurs (YAE), most of which have been very successful.

The project's multiple implementation strategies led to a reflection on cost effectiveness in the fight against child labor. In general, the evaluator believes that the activities of this project were cost effective, although some false savings were made in under-budgeting skills training services and CFS—not all beneficiaries were able to select the skills training they wanted—but even these activities led to positive outcomes.

The project's impact is visible at the community level, at the institutional levels (both local and central), and at the policy levels through research and development of *prakas* (ministry orders). The project is involved at and has had an effect on different levels. The emerging lessons learned and good practices are related to a good project design—even with a variety of services and interventions at different levels, projects can have an impact at several levels.

Many interviewees underlined the need for long-term continued presence to ensure that social development in terms of child labor practices takes place. The CHES project, similarly to many other child labor projects, invested staff time and funding to establish a presence and ties with the government at both local and central levels, as well as spent staff time to analyze and comprehend the child labor-related, political, and educational scenes in the country. The impact and legacy of the project, to a certain degree, will consist of social development and raised government awareness. However, as noted by many interviewees (including government officials), continued pressure and presence is necessary to make these changes sustainable.

During fieldwork, a number of recommendations emerged that may help the project during its limited remaining time, or may be useful for other institutions:

The evaluator recommends that CHES and USDOL—

- Seek financing from USDOL and/or other donors to continue CEDAC's work in the communities in the form of action-research to understand and capitalize on lessons learned in agricultural training of parents and withdrawn children.
- Assist the International Labour Organization's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour's (ILO-IPEC) training for education staff and provide training in the subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing aspects of WFCL, such as the need for schooling in rural areas for children working in these sectors.
- Seek ways to activate the work of the Civil Society Network Against Child Labor Organization (CSNACLO) network and to clarify its mandate through discussions with ILO-IPEC, and clarify the project's commitment to finance US\$8,000 for CSNACLO activities.
- Prioritize staff time and resources to push the adoption of the *prakas* and other policies by the end of the project. The evaluator recommends that USDOL provide as much support as possible to meet this end since it is a main outcome of the project and a waste of resources if this project target is not achieved.
- Allocate a portion of time and the budget for reflection on lessons learned in terms of the project's cost effectiveness in its various interventions.
- Cooperate with ILO-IPEC to consider the feasibility of creating a working group for the National Sub-Committee on Child Labor.
- Diversify the mandate of child councils and CYCs and introduce other concepts of development, including savings and microfinance, and/or games and fun in the groups.

- Continue the movement toward CFS as much as possible in the few months that remain for project implementation, and/or also contact other donors, such as the United Nations Children's Fund, to promote this initiative. In particular, teacher training should address issues of teacher intimidation, verbal abuse, and corporal punishment of the children.

The evaluator recommends that future projects—

- Establish the easiest possible data collection system that still fulfills USDOL requirements, unless the data collection services are integrated into a research design.
- Review target groups for YAE and other key services and, where adequate, target children that can become leaders to help the more fragile in the community.
- Establish a clear plan for cooperation with government agencies, involving the official partners in field visits and monitoring, as necessary.
- Consider which age groups are most vulnerable to WFCL and target project actions accordingly.
- Along with USDOL and/or other donors, review policies in projects that are intended to produce social development and considers a more long-term presence in the country.

I OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 BACKGROUND

The activities of the Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking (OCFT) at the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL), include research on international child labor; supporting U.S. Government policy on international child labor; administering and overseeing cooperative agreements with organizations working to eliminate child labor around the world; and raising awareness about child labor issues. Since 1995, U.S. Congress has appropriated over US\$770 million for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used by OCFT to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 80 countries around the world. To date, USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects have rescued some 1.38 million children from exploitive child labor.¹

USDOL reports annually to Congress on a number of indicators. As these programs have developed, an increasing emphasis has been placed on ensuring that the data collected by grantees is accurate and reported according to USDOL definitions.

OCFT-funded projects are subject to midterm and final evaluations. On September 30, 2007, Winrock International received a 4-year cooperative agreement from USDOL to implement the Children's Empowerment Through Education Services (CHES) project in Cambodia. This project aimed to withdraw and prevent children from exploitive child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education as well as by supporting the goals of the USDOL to reduce the worst forms of child labor (WFCL) through research, awareness raising, and policy formation. As stipulated in the cooperative agreement, the project targeted 3,750 children for withdrawal and 4,500 children for prevention from hazardous work in subsistence and commercial agriculture, including freshwater fishing. The project was implemented in 160 villages in the provinces of Siem Reap, Pursat, Kampong Cham, and Prey Veng. The CHES project began in September 2007, and its final evaluation was conducted from June 19 to July 4, 2011. The evaluation report builds on findings from the fieldwork but also from project documentation and the midterm evaluation.²

1.2 SCOPE AND PURPOSE

The scope of the evaluation included a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL cooperative agreement with Winrock International. The evaluation considered all activities implemented from project launch through the time of evaluation fieldwork, to the extent possible under the time constraints of the fieldwork. The evaluation assessed the achievements of the project toward reaching its targets and objectives as outlined in the cooperative agreement and project document.

¹ See OCTF's website: <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/programs/ocft/icltc.htm>

² Some of the text describing the project and methodology in this report will be similar to the midterm evaluation, for the reason that the evaluation methodology used was the same and the project background, main services, and design features have not changed since then.

The evaluation addressed issues of project design, implementation, cost effectiveness, impact, and sustainability, as well as lessons learned and replicability of activities. Recommendations for current and future projects are provided.

The purpose of the final evaluation is to—

- Assess whether the project has met its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so.
- Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL.
- Assess the intended and unintended outcomes and impacts of the project.
- Provide lessons learned from the project design and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future child labor projects in the country and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors.
- Assess whether project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national levels and among implementing organizations.

The evaluation considers lessons learned, good practices, and models of intervention that may inform future child labor projects and policies in Cambodia and elsewhere. It serves an accountability function for USDOL and Winrock International. Recommendations focus on lessons learned and good practices from which future projects can glean when developing their strategies toward combating exploitive child labor, in particular in the fields of subsistence agriculture and fishing.

The evaluation aimed to provide USDOL, Winrock International, and other project stakeholders with an assessment of the project's experience in implementation and its impact on project beneficiaries. As far as possible, the evaluation provides credible and reliable information, based on information gained from project stakeholders and documentation, and suggests how the project can boost its impact during the short remaining time of implementation to ensure the sustainability of benefits that have been and will be generated. Although this is a final evaluation, the project has obtained a non-cost extension until the end of 2011. Therefore, a number of recommendations are related to the project's implementation in this prolonged exit phase.

1.3 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation approach was primarily qualitative and participative in terms of the data collection methods used. The evaluator drew quantitative data from project reports to the extent available and incorporated them into the analysis. The evaluation approach was independent both in terms of the membership of the evaluation team (the evaluator and translator were unrelated to the project) and the project staff and implementing partners who were present in meetings with stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries only to provide introductions. A high-quality

translator, fluent in Khmer and English, with extended experience in the field of development, accompanied the evaluator. The following additional principles guided the evaluation process.

Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives were triangulated in response to as many evaluation questions as possible. Parents' and children's voices were included in the evaluation using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the International Labour Organization—International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO-IPEC) guidelines on research ethics with children on WFCL and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) principles for ethical reporting on children.³

The evaluation and interviewing approach were sensitive to gender and cultural diversity, and entailed self-disclosure on the part of the evaluator (briefly, the evaluator explained who he was, why he was there, and what the data would be used for). The interviews were very flexible, using open-ended questions and approaching the interviewee in a conversational manner to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries and allow additional questions to be posed that were not included in the terms of reference, while ensuring that key requirements of data collection were met.

To the extent possible, a consistent approach was followed in each project site. Methodology was based on an anthropological approach. The evaluator systematically reviewed the data gathered after each day of fieldwork to exclude non-relevant questions and include new questions as ideas emerged and an understanding of the project was constructed.

Pre-field visit preparation included an extensive review of relevant documents. During the fieldwork, the documentation was verified and additional documents were consulted, including research reports and school records. The consulted documentation included—

- Project document and revisions
- Cooperative agreement
- Technical progress and status reports
- Project logical frameworks and monitoring plans
- Correspondence related to technical progress reports
- Research and other reports undertaken, mainly the four research reports that were produced on subsistence agriculture, fishing, tobacco, and cassava plantations, and the report on including policies addressing the problem of child labor in education policies
- Project files, including school records.

³ See <http://www.ilo.org/ipeinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026> and http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html

Before beginning fieldwork, the evaluator created a question matrix (see Annex A), which outlined where information was collected for each of the questions from the terms of reference. The evaluator used this question matrix as a guide to help to make decisions on the ways to allocate time in the field. The question matrix also helped to ensure that all possible avenues for data triangulation were explored and to clearly note from where the evaluation findings were coming.

The evaluator held informational interviews with as many project stakeholders as possible, based on both random and stratified sampling. The evaluator conducted fieldwork in all four target provinces, visiting at least three communities were visited in each province. Project staff selected two sites to represent a successful implementation site, and the evaluator selected one site in each province immediately before the visit took place using random selection. The evaluator interviewed at least two community representatives, one teacher and five direct beneficiaries (children), in each target community, using both one-on-one interviews and group interviews, depending on the circumstances. Technically, the evaluator considered all those who had an interest in the project to be stakeholder, including direct and indirect beneficiaries, community leaders, donors, and government officials. A total of 100 individuals, 32 of whom were women, attended individual and focus group interviews, not including the direct beneficiaries and their parents:⁴

- Country director, project managers, and field staff from the grantee and the two partner organizations
- Government ministry officials and local government officials
- Community leaders, members, and volunteers, including focus group meetings with six child labor monitoring child labor monitoring committees (CLMCs)
- School teachers, assistants, school directors, and education personnel
- ILO-IPEC and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) working in the field of child protection and child labor
- Labor reporting officer at the U.S. Embassy.

In addition to the above, 210 children (138 girls) were interviewed in focus group settings, as well as 48 parents (34 women) (see Table 1 for interview structure). A total of 10 schools were visited, at least 2 in each province, of which 1 was based on random sampling (see the fieldwork schedule in Annex B for a list of specific dates and communities met).

⁴ Some numbers are approximate, since in certain group sessions, a few individuals participated for a short time or arrived at the end of the meeting and were, therefore, not registered. Also, a number of teachers were also members of the CLMC, and some children were both members of a CLMC and the child youth club (CYC). Here, they are only registered as being interviewed once.

Table 1: Interviewees

Interviewees	Female	Male	Total
Children—beneficiaries, former beneficiaries	138	72	210
Parents of beneficiaries and former beneficiaries	34	14	48
Specialists—teachers, project staff, officials	32	68	100
Total	204	154	358

The evaluator further probed and investigated the results of the findings from the field with key informants, both related and unrelated to the project. A total of 46 beneficiary children (36 girls) interviewed drew pictures of a certain aspect of the project and their lives—the evaluator asked them to reply to the question “What are you doing in your free time?” or “What are you doing at school?” through a drawing). The evaluator then established a dialogue with the children based on various aspects of their drawings and took pictures of all the drawings to use in the subsequent analysis (the children kept their drawings and the drawing materials). The sample of children participating in the drawing exercise was based on random selection, and the drawings and subsequent debriefing were used as tools to establish a child-friendly dialogue with the beneficiaries and to understand their after-school work and leisure situation, as well as their socioeconomic background (to check that the project reached its intended beneficiary group). The debriefing further controlled for children’s work status during weekends and holidays. Finally, the evaluator verified that all the direct beneficiaries had received a direct educational service from the project.

Additionally, the evaluator verified the educational status and receipt of a direct service for 225 children during field visits through direct encounters with the children. This also allowed the evaluator to verify the project’s reporting system and its monitoring of the children. It was difficult to establish a clear view of the drop-out rates, since the schools operated on double shifts, and the project statistics did not provide a shift-based classification of the children. Also, the evaluation took place during the beginning of the wet season, and a number of children were absent, accompanying their parents in the field for a short period of time without being considered dropouts.

During observation and/or interview sessions, the evaluators took pictures of aspects of the project and of the local condition of the children and the population. These photos were used in the subsequent analysis of the project, and a folder with photos accompanies this report to illustrate aspects of the project and the implementation environment (see Annex C). The evaluator used the ethical guidelines of ILO-IPEC on research with children in WFCL for photography.

The evaluation mission practiced confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure maximum freedom of expression from the implementing partners, stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries, implementing partner staff were not present during interviews.

1.4 STAKEHOLDERS' MEETING

Following the field visits, the evaluator held a stakeholders' meeting, which brought together a wide range of stakeholders, including implementing partners, government officials, local implementation partners, and community representatives, as well as parents and beneficiary children. The inclusion of children and parents was seen as particularly important, since they could provide feedback on the evaluation findings and propose solutions to address the challenges the project encountered.

The stakeholders' meeting was used to present the major preliminary findings from the evaluation, solicit recommendations, and obtain clarification or additional information from the participants. The agenda of the meeting included statements by children and stakeholders, presentations of findings from the evaluator, and group work.

The group work was based on the findings of the evaluation and focused on the following questions:

- Lessons learned from project—Which are the major ones and how to capitalize on them? Strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the project.
- Pros and cons of sustainability plan. Is there any way to improve the likelihood of sustainability of the various levels of project intervention?
- How to reduce child labor in the communities, and how to monitor the children's work? Discuss the future role of CLMCs after the project's end.
- Do community data collection and statistics have a role beyond the project? How? Why?
- Strategies to continue building parents' skills. Action-research with the *Centre d'Etude et de Développement Agricole Cambodgien* (Cambodian Center for Study and Development in Agriculture, or CEDAC)? Other ways?
- Strategies to continue improving schools. How to ensure continuous growth of child-friendly schools (CFS)? How to make the curriculum more relevant to the local population?
- *How can subsistence agriculture be included in the government's list of hazardous work?*

The last question was added after a participant suggested it during the workshop.

1.5 LIMITATIONS

The evaluation report is based on 2 weeks' fieldwork, document analysis, and correspondence with project stakeholders. In view of the short time in the field, the report has to convey what the respondents, especially Winrock staff and associate staff, said about the activities as well as on the observation/interviews with stakeholders in the field. The evaluator was not able to take all sites into consideration when formulating his findings. All efforts were made to ensure that the fieldwork included a representative sample of sites.

The ability of the evaluator to determine efficiency was limited by the amount of financial data available, especially in terms of possible alternative implementation and cost-sharing arrangements, as well as alternative overhead and administration arrangements. A full cost-effectiveness analysis is not included because it would require impact data that are not available.

This page intentionally left blank.

II PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 BACKGROUND

Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate WFCL, as defined by ILO Convention 182. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects, such as the CHES project in Cambodia, generally seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services.
2. Strengthening policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school.
3. Raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures.
4. Supporting research and the collection of reliable data on child labor.
5. Ensuring the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

The approach of USDOL child labor elimination projects—decreasing the prevalence of exploitive child labor through increased access to education—is intended to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at risk of entering exploitive labor. USDOL supports two main programs for international child labor technical cooperation.⁵

1. International Labour Organization’s International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labor

Since 1995, U.S. Congress has earmarked some US\$450 million to support the ILO-IPEC, making the U.S. Government the leading donor of the program. USDOL-funded ILO-IPEC projects to combat child labor generally fall into one of several categories: (1) comprehensive, national timebound programs to eliminate WFCL in a set time frame; (2) less comprehensive country programs; (3) sector-specific projects; (4) data collection and research projects; (5) and international awareness-raising projects. In general, most projects include *direct action* components that are interventions to remove or prevent children from involvement in exploitive and hazardous work. One of the major strategies used by ILO-IPEC projects is to increase children’s access to and participation in formal and nonformal education (NFE). Most ILO-IPEC projects also have a capacity-building component to assist in building a sustainable base for the long-term elimination of

⁵ In 2007, U.S. Congress did not direct USDOL’s appropriations for child labor elimination projects to either of these two programs. That year, USDOL allocated US\$60 million for child labor elimination projects through a competitive process.

exploitive child labor. ILO has been involved in child labor-related work in Cambodia since 1995 and initiated a 4-year timebound program in 2004, which is now in its second phase (2008–2012).

2. Child Labor Education Initiative

Since 2001, U.S. Congress has provided US\$269 million to USDOL to support the Child Labor Education Initiative (EI), which focuses on the elimination of WFCL through the provision of education opportunities. A wide range of international organizations and NGOs as well as for-profit firms are implementing these projects. USDOL typically awards EI cooperative agreements, such as CHES, through a competitive bid process.

EI projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with a high incidence of child labor are withdrawn and integrated into educational settings and that they persist in their education once enrolled. In parallel, the program seeks to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering into child labor. EI projects are based on the notion that the elimination of exploitive child labor depends, to a large extent, on improving the access to, quality of, and relevance of education. Without improving educational quality and relevance, children who are withdrawn or prevented from child labor may not have viable alternatives and could resort to other forms of hazardous work.

The number of working children in Asia and the Pacific is by far the largest in the world and represents 18.8% of the 650 million children age 5 to 14 in the region.⁶ In Cambodia, children work in exploitive conditions on commercial rubber and tobacco plantations, in subsistence agriculture, in salt production, in fish processing, as porters, in brickmaking, in the service sector, and as garbage pickers. They also work in other occupations determined by the government to be hazardous, including processing sea products, such as shrimp; breaking, quarrying, or collecting stones; working in gem and coal mining; working in garment factories; working in restaurants; and making handicrafts. Children also work as domestic servants; most child domestics are girls, age 15 to 17, who work between 6 and 16 hours per day.⁷

2.2 COUNTRY CONTEXT

USDOL has supported numerous initiatives in Cambodia, having devoted over US\$17.5 million since 2001 to combat child labor in the country alone.⁸ In addition to the current project, USDOL funds a US\$4.31 million project implemented by ILO-IPEC to develop national capacity to end WFCL. This project targets 7,200 children for withdrawal and 3,800 for prevention from WFCL in 15 provinces and includes trafficking and work in brickmaking, salt production, fisheries, and as porters.⁹

⁶ ILO-IPEC Asia and the Pacific. Retrieved from <http://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Regionsandcountries/Asia/lang--en/index.htm>

⁷ USDOL. *USDOL's 2008 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor*. p. 35.

⁸ USDOL. *Project Status—Asia*. Retrieved from <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/projects/asia/project-asia.htm>

⁹ USDOL. *2009 Findings*. p. 114.

USDOL also funded a US\$4.75 million project that ended in April 2009 and was implemented by ILO-IPEC, which aimed at eliminating WFCL in the brickmaking, rubbermaking, salt production, fishing, and service sectors and preventing children from working as domestic workers and porters. The project resulted in 5,884 children being withdrawn and 7,789 children being prevented from labor in these sectors through the provision of educational services (see Table 2 for a list of USDOL-funded projects in Cambodia).

Table 2: List of USDOL-funded Projects in Cambodia

Years	Grantee	Project	Amount (USD)
2001–2004	ILO-IPEC	Sector Program: Fish/Shrimp Processing, Rubber Plantations, Salt Production	\$999,310
2003–2007	World Education	Education Initiative: Trafficking and Commercial Sexual Exploitation	\$3,000,000
2004–2007	Hagar International	Expanding Economic Activity	\$500,000
2004–2009	ILO-IPEC	Timebound: Domestic Work, Porters, Fishing, and Production of Brick, Salt, and Rubber	\$4,750,000
2007–2011	Winrock International	Children's Empowerment Through Education Services: Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labor in Cambodia	\$4,025,563
2008–2012	ILO-IPEC	Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labor	\$4,310,000
Total Cambodia			\$17,584,873

The Government of Cambodia has participated in these and other initiatives to combat child labor and child trafficking, and has implemented policy and legal frameworks to address these problems. The Cambodian Labor Law sets the minimum age for wage employment at 15, although children age 12 to 15 can be hired to do light work. A 2004 declaration issued by the Ministry of Labor and Vocational Training (MOLVT) prohibits 38 types of work that are hazardous to the health, safety, and moral development of children younger than age 18. However, MOLVT may authorize children age 16 or older to perform hazardous work under certain conditions. MOLVT is responsible for enforcing the child-related provisions of the Cambodian labor law, but according to the U.S. Department of State, industries with a high risk for child work, such as fishing, saw inspections only after complaints were received.¹⁰

In 2008, the Government of Cambodia, in consultation with stakeholders, approved a National Plan of Action on the Worst Forms of Child Labor (2008–2012), which contains a shorter list of hazardous child labor than the 2004 MOLVT declaration and includes fishing and working on rubber, tobacco, or agricultural plantations. The national plan of action aims to reduce the number of children age 5 to 17 engaged in exploitive work to 8% in 2015 and to eliminate WFCL by 2016.¹¹

¹⁰ USDOL. *USDOL's 2008 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor*. p. 35–36.

¹¹ *Ibid*, p. 36.

2.3 CHILDREN'S EMPOWERMENT THROUGH EDUCATION SERVICES PROJECT

On September 30, 2007, Winrock International received a 4-year cooperative agreement worth approximately US\$4 million from USDOL to implement an EI project in Cambodia aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitive child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the five goals of the USDOL project, as outlined above. In FY2008, an additional US\$25,625 was awarded to fund research on hazardous child labor in subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing in three provinces.

Winrock International was awarded the project through a competitive bid process. As stipulated in the cooperative agreement, the project targeted 3,750 children for withdrawal and 4,500 children for prevention from hazardous work in subsistence and commercial agriculture, including freshwater fishing. The project targeted 160 villages in the provinces of Siem Reap, Pursat, Kampong Cham, and Prey Veng. The project's goal was to reduce the number of children engaged in exploitive child labor in subsistence and commercial agriculture in Cambodia. Intermediate objectives that support the main goals included—

- Improving the access to and quality of education for working and at-risk children in the target areas
- Engaging communities, civil society, and local governments in promoting education and eradicating child labor
- Strengthening national institutions and policies to effectively address the issues of child labor and education
- Ensuring the sustainability of project activities and benefits to the primary stakeholders.

The CHES project used an integrated multitargeted approach to tackle the issue of child labor in Cambodia. It was supported not just through educational interventions but also institutional capacity building to address policy and practical concerns related to child labor and awareness raising at the district level among district officials as well as at the local level among parents and community leaders. The initiatives supported by the CHES project included CFS, support to develop a policy framework addressing WFCL in subsistence agriculture, and other initiatives to train officials and sensitize them toward child labor issues. The project was also tasked with participating in the creation of CLMCs, child youth clubs (CYCs), child councils in schools, and educating families and local leaders through trainings and awareness raising.

Other activities undertaken include (1) improving the capacity of key individuals and institutions, such as the Department of Child Labor (DOCL) at the national level and the Provincial Department of Labor and Vocational Training at the local level, to combat child labor and provide quality education through innovative policy measures; (2) implementing a community-awareness program to provide information on the distinction between child work and exploitive child labor in subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing; (3) conducting participatory research on the causes and extent of child labor in subsistence agriculture, tobacco and cassava farming, and fishing; (4) establishing or strengthening CLMCs in 160 villages to monitor child labor at the local level;

and (5) offering life skills and other programs, classes, and services to targeted children, their parents, and members of the community.

In addition to its implementation in rural agricultural areas, the CHES project addressed child labor issues in floating villages. This posed unique challenges in terms of program implementation and monitoring, and receiving buy-in of parents and community leaders to promote the message of prevention and eradication of child labor. The difficulty was partly linked to transportation. Traveling to school was a concern, with most families having only one boat, which they use for subsistence fishing. Regular school attendance is not always assured because of families' priority for fishing and lack of interest in school. Children who use their small boats as transportation to school are also exposed to grave danger from big tourist and business boats that often spray children with water and threaten to capsizе their smaller boats.

The project administration and organization set up with Winrock at the central level were responsible for the overall implementation arrangements of the project. Staff members included one project director, who was also the lead for education; an M&E specialist, who followed up progress monitoring and research as well as policy development; a child labor specialist, who followed up on program service implementation; a communication specialist; and an administration and finance officer, as well as supporting personnel. These latter included support staff for computerizing the list of beneficiaries and tracking children. Additionally, one provincial coordinator was based in the Provincial Department of Labor and Vocational Training (PDOLVT) in each target province to facilitate implementation at the local level. At the central level, Winrock was responsible for the overall management of the project, including M&E functions, and for awareness raising through radio and mass media. Winrock also had a subcontract with DOCL at the central level to organize training of inspectors at the provincial and commune/community levels.

Two associate organizations Wathnakteap and the Kampuchean Action for Primary Education (KAPE) were responsible for implementation work at the provincial level. Wathnakteap was in charge of implementation in Pursat and Siem Reap, and KAPE in Kampong Cham and Prey Veng. The associates have field offices and field staff in each province to follow up on project implementation and work in close cooperation with the associate and the Provincial Committee on Child Labor (PCCL).

In October 2010, the project set up a subcontract with CEDAC for agriculture training of beneficiaries, mainly those benefiting from NFE services, and the parents of withdrawn beneficiaries. In this way, the project attempted to compensate income parents lost from withdrawing their child from exploitive labor.

The implementation areas are among the poorest in Cambodia. Kampong Cham is located in the east of Cambodia, 124 kilometers away from the capital of Phnom Penh and has been identified as a priority province for child labor prevention interventions because of its high prevalence of child labor in agriculture and other hazardous forms of labor. This province is also a large source area for migrants who are vulnerable to trafficking and other forms of commercial exploitation. Kampong Cham has been ranked as the second highest origin of migrants, and its migratory patterns are believed to generate significant dangers to children in terms of child labor, sexual exploitation, and trafficking. Therefore, school drop-out levels tend to be higher than the national average in Kampong Cham. The province also has a large concentration of plantations and

commercial agriculture farms. The transition rate of students from primary to lower secondary school is 76.4% (the national average is 80.2%).¹²

Prey Veng province is located about 90 kilometers from Phnom Penh and is the fourth largest and second poorest province of the 24 provinces and municipalities in Cambodia. The target area suffers from a high drop-out rate and smaller rice yields relative to surrounding communes because of frequent flooding and isolated location. Almost 70% of the population in the province lives below the poverty line, and 50% have no land for agriculture. In terms of education, while there is a steady increase in enrollment at the primary level, many children still drop-out after completing their primary school education. The transition rate of students from primary to lower secondary school is 81.8%.

Pursat is located 186 kilometers from the capital and is the tenth poorest province in Cambodia and relies heavily on freshwater fishing and subsistence agriculture. It is highly vulnerable to human trafficking for sexual or labor exploitation. In terms of education, the transition rate from primary to lower secondary school is 82.3%.

Siem Reap is located 314 kilometers from the capital and is the poorest of the provinces in Cambodia, despite its tourism and construction industries, both related to Angkor Wat. Siem Reap relies heavily on freshwater fishing and subsistence agriculture and is highly vulnerable to human trafficking for sexual or labor exploitation. In terms of education, while there is a steady increase in enrollment at the primary level, many children still leave school after completing their primary school education. The transition rate to lower secondary school is 78%.

¹² All province-specific statistics are from the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports 2011, data for 2009/2010.

III RELEVANCE

The evaluation considered the relevance of the project to the cultural, economic, and political context of Cambodia, as well as the extent to which it was suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL. This section primarily discusses the theoretical aspects and relevance of the project's strategies. Implementation challenges and successes of each activity will be further developed under the sections for effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.

3.1 FINDINGS

3.1.1 Support of the Five EI Goals

The project supported the five EI goals (see Section 2.1, Background, for the goals stated in full), as follows:

Withdrawing or Preventing Children Through Education. This goal was adequately supported by the project through withdrawal and prevention of children involved in or at risk of becoming involved in exploitive child labor through the provision of four types of direct educational services:

1. Education support for withdrawn child laborers age 6 to 14
2. Provision of NFE and livelihood skills for withdrawn children age 15 to 17
3. Education support for at-risk children age 6 to 14
4. Education support for at-risk girls age 12 to 14 transitioning into secondary school.

In addition, a number of auxiliary services were provided to facilitate children's access to school, including setting up child care mothers (CCM) programs in target communities to ensure that children did not need to stay home to attend to younger siblings but could instead attend school normally. The CCM engaged with a number of younger children, age 3 to 5 and guided them in play and learning activities. Further, the project strengthened the child councils in the schools, which sensitized peers to the dangers of child labor. The project also helped set up CYCs, which followed up on dropouts, participated in awareness-raising activities, and acted as savings clubs. In some cases, members of these clubs offered remedial classes to younger children. In other schools, the project organized regular teachers to offer the remedial classes. Other activities included the skills training of parents to compensate for income lost when children stopped working, as well as the creation and training of community CLMCs to follow-up on the schooling of children.

Strengthening Policies on Child Labor and Education. This goal was adequately supported through the project's work with the National Sub-Committee on Child Labor and, in particular, the assistance in the processes of establishing *prakas* (ministry orders) on WFCL in various sectors related to subsistence agriculture and fishing. The project was also engaged in policy dialogue between MOLVT and the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MOEYS) to facilitate the inclusion of policies contributing to the elimination of child labor, in particular WFCL, into the government's education policy. Conversely, the project also tried to facilitate the

inclusion of policies and programs related to the Education for All initiative in the government's policies on elimination of child labor.

Raising Awareness about Child Labor and Education. This goal was adequately supported through various project initiatives, including the CLMCs' local awareness-raising campaigns, organization of celebrations on World Day Against Child Labor (June 12), the project's quarterly newspaper, collaboration with local media, a video project that has been shown on national TV, and two weekly radio programs on child labor, which had a growing audience. Also, the child councils and CYCs were instrumental in raising awareness about child labor and education.

Research on Child Labor. This goal was adequately supported through various research initiatives, including the baseline study and research regarding WFCL in subsistence and commercial agriculture and freshwater fishing gathered after the establishment of *prakas*. In particular, five core documents were produced at the beginning of 2011 based on research began in October 2010:

1. Crossroads to Development and Winrock. (2009). *Research Report on Hazardous Child Work in Tobacco Production in Kampong Cham Province*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Winrock.
2. Crossroads to Development and Winrock. (2009). *Research Report on Hazardous Child Work in Cassava Production in Kampong Cham Province*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Winrock.
3. Crossroads to Development and Winrock. (2011). *Research Report on Hazardous Child Labor in Subsistence Agriculture Sector*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Winrock.
4. Crossroads to Development and Winrock. (2011). *Research Report on Hazardous Child Labor in Subsistence Freshwater Fishing Sector*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Winrock.
5. Winrock. (2011). *Child Labour, Education and Agriculture Policy Brief*. Phnom Penh, Cambodia: Winrock.

Ensure the Long-Term Sustainability of the Project's Efforts. This goal was supported through various initiatives described in the project's sustainability plan (the version referred to in this document is dated July 6, 2011). Also, a national sustainability conference took place on February 24, 2011 and reviewed the implementation of the sustainability plan at the national and local levels as well as generated commitments from various authorities regarding sustainability.

3.1.2 Project Assumptions

Most of the project assumptions related to poverty and child labor were accurate. However, a number of issues regarding WFCL in the specific fields of subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing were not known at the time of project conception and emerged during implementation. For example, as opposed to WFCL in many other sectors, child labor in the project-specific sectors is seasonal, and it is therefore difficult to accurately define WFCL in these sectors, raise awareness, and eradicate the occurrence of dangerous labor practices for children.

3.1.3 Relevance of the Project's Main Strategies to Withdraw and Prevent Children from WFCL

The project's scope is relevant to prevent WFCL. Presently, the Government of Cambodia has a list of 16 accepted WFCL, but subsistence agriculture is not on this list. A major goal of the CHES project was to introduce subsistence agriculture as a sector with child labor, to define the worst and hazardous forms of child labor within this sector, and to distinguish them from child work. The project simultaneously defined WFCL and hazardous child labor as it implemented the program. In the evaluator's view, this strategy was relevant to address the problem of WFCL in the targeted sectors.

The project's educational strategies included the following four core activities:

1. **Education Support for Withdrawn Child Laborers Age 6 to 14.** This component targeted children who had dropped out of school but previously attained at least grade 3 to 6 of primary schooling to provide them with a 2-month refresher course or 1-month intensive course during the summer holidays, and according to the results of an entry test, to re-enroll these children in grade 3 or 4. Subsequent to the re-entry program, the beneficiaries were provided with educational materials, such as stationery, school bags, uniforms, and in certain cases, shoes. The target age and training of these children followed MOEYS's policies, and the project also used the ministry's curriculum. Most interviewees deemed this component to be the most relevant and effective of all the project activities to combat child labor.
2. **Provision of NFE and Livelihood Skills for Withdrawn Children age 15 to 17.** This component provided literacy and skills training for out-of-school youth who were too old to be reintegrated into primary school. Although this project activity might have reduced WFCL, all the children targeted by this component could be hired legally under Cambodian law for paid work, and many of the beneficiaries reached adulthood (age 18) within the timeframe of the project.
3. **Education Support for At-Risk Children Age 6 to 14.** This component provided educational supplies to at-risk children and provided follow-up through CLMC intervention. It helped the children to stay in school, and most project beneficiaries deemed this support to be adequate and useful for the target beneficiaries.
4. **Education Support for At-Risk Girls Age 12 to 14 Transitioning into Secondary School.** This component provided educational materials to girls transitioning into lower secondary schools. For those living at a distance from school, the component also provided bicycles. In the evaluator's opinion, which contrasts from many stakeholders who thought the service should also be provided to boys, the service was adequate inasmuch as it addressed the gender gap in secondary education and also addressed through the provision of bicycles questions of security that were particularly relevant for girls living at a distance from school.

The auxiliary services were relevant for preventing drop-out and promoting education. Of particular interest was the set up of CFS, even though this component has only been partially implemented. The government policy for CFS, supported by UNICEF, has six dimensions:

1. Access to schooling for all children
2. Effective learning
3. Health, safety, and protection of children
4. Gender responsiveness
5. The participation of children, families, and the communities in running their local school
6. More child-friendly schools, as supported and encouraged by the National Education System.

The CHES project mainly focused on the first two dimensions, and only implemented the CFS component in two classrooms in two selected schools in each commune. In project-sponsored schools, staff members spoke about child-friendly classrooms rather than child-friendly schools. Another relevant project activity was targeting parents of withdrawn children for agriculture training, offered by CEDAC and/or the provincial agriculture authorities. This activity aimed to help compensate for children's earnings, making their withdrawal from WFCL more effective. Several interviewees indicated that these two services, CFS and skills training to parents, were the most important in the project and that the project's weakness was that these activities were implemented so late in the project cycle.

3.1.4 Main Obstacles to Addressing Child Labor in Cambodia

One main obstacle for project implementation was the non-inclusion of subsistence agriculture among the government's list of WFCL, which made it more difficult to advocate for the elimination of WFCL in this sector as there was a lack of legal and implementation structures to address the issue. For example, the provincial labor inspectors generally did not follow up on WFCL in subsistence agriculture. The project addressed this problem through research, policy work, and awareness raising at all levels. Other main obstacles to address child labor, as identified by project stakeholders, included—

- **Lack of Knowledge about WFCL in the Field of Subsistence Agriculture.** There was a lack of understanding about the risks and dangers to children in subsistence agriculture, such as spraying insecticide, using of sharp tools, and working long hours. This problem led to difficulties raising awareness at all levels and setting up a monitoring system. There were also too few labor inspectors, and current labor inspectors did not always see subsistence agriculture as within their mandate, which led to a situation in which the policy gaps were matched with corresponding enforcement gaps.
- **Government Lacked Capability to Tackle the Problem.** Although DOCL was created in 2009 there was and still is a lack of political will to address the issue, according to key interviewees, “nothing much has been done, and resources are not mobilized or allocated

to support the plan for elimination of WFCL.” WFCL are not a priority for ministries other than MOLVT. For example, the Ministry of Health “focuses on the 0–5 age group and there is little engagement for older age groups and issues related to school health or child labor.”

- **Poverty.** Families need the income generated by children’s labor. In some cases, their poverty is worsened by the direct costs of schooling, including teachers’ request for fees. Some parents said about children’s schooling, “They can go to school or they can eat.” At local levels, very few social services exist to help the poor.
- **Distance from School.** Many children live far from school, and the distance to school, particularly at secondary level, prevents many children, especially girls, from attending school.
- **Value of Education.** Education is not perceived as valuable, especially because of poverty and a lack of gainful employment after graduating.
- **Cultural Barriers and Lack of Teacher Sensitivity.** Culturally, many families find it appropriate for their children to help at home. In rural areas, the children will bring the cattle out to the field in the morning and back in the afternoon, and will also help the family with other work, such as fetching water, housework, and guarding younger siblings. The work sometimes prevents children from arriving at school on time or from doing their homework properly. Teachers, having little knowledge or notions of child-friendly schools, are often very discouraging toward children in such labor situations. Corporal punishment is prevalent, especially for children who do not know the answers to teachers’ questions or to the homework; they are perceived as lazy.

The project aimed to address the poverty situation through skills training for parents and caregivers to enhance their income and compensate for opportunity costs for their children’s schooling. Provision of school kits and stationery alleviated some of the direct costs of education. The distance from school was partially addressed through the provision of bicycles to girls who had a long distance to travel to school. Cultural barriers and the negative perception of schools were addressed through mass-media, awareness-raising campaigns as well as through one-to-one and community-awareness campaigns involving CLMCs. Child councils and CYCs helped to raise awareness of the importance of education and followed up on other children’s schooling. Also, teachers’ lack of understanding of the plight of working children was addressed through the promotion of child-friendly schools. Setting up CCMs prevented children from staying stay at home to guard younger siblings. Remedial classes reduced repetition and failure. The project design seemed to adequately and comprehensively address the barriers to education in the communities.

3.1.5 Appropriateness for the Cultural, Economic, and Political Context in Cambodia—Issues of Corruption

Most stakeholders found the project design to be appropriate for the cultural context in Cambodia. In terms of political appropriateness, some government and project staff felt that the project's strategies and assumptions assumed that the government had resources available for project follow-up. However, DOCL within MOLVT was new and had little resources allocated to field monitoring. According to an interviewee, "Every year the Department of Child Labor proposes a budget, which is not approved [by the Ministry]." In such circumstances, it was difficult to avoid government request for financing. Some officials also "need incentives to do their work," as noted by interviewees. However, according to strong interview evidence, there were very few cases of direct corruptive practices, as noted by a project interviewee:

Government staff isn't always happy. There is no direct bribery, but perhaps some officials are getting kickbacks. We inform them of our policies—I think we have been clear about them. The most important corruption could occur at national levels, but there are also some "rotten eggs" in the commune. Our internal audit revealed a few cases of officials taking advantage of the situation, saying "I give you a bicycle; you give me 30,000 Riel."¹³

However, interview and document evidence indicate that the cases described above were rare and relatively minor and that the project had control over its resources. Major cases of corruption have been avoided through clear and transparent project policies and implementation practices.

3.1.6 Project Design Fit with Government and Organizations Existing Initiatives to Combat Child Labor

Many organizations and government initiatives in Cambodia do not address the issue of child labor. All stakeholders said that the project was timely and appropriate. Another key project on child labor was an ILO-IPEC project, with which CHES established a broad cooperation. ILO-IPEC and the CHES project were very complementary, since CHES addressed a sector in which ILO-IPEC was not much involved—subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing. Interviewees from ILO-IPEC commented on this positive fit between the projects. Key government officials emphasized that the project's strategies fit within the government's priorities. The main problem with the project design, as mentioned by almost all interviewees, was that its 4-year implementation duration did not correspond to the government's needs and targets for 2015 and 2016. A general complaint about the project was that "it is closing down when it should be scaling up."

¹³ 30,000 Riels is approximately US\$7.50.

3.1.7 Recommendations from the Midterm Evaluation

After the midterm evaluation, key Winrock project personnel, together with the associates, reviewed and planned follow-up of the recommendations. Interview and observation evidence, as well as documentary evidence such as the technical progress reports, demonstrate the decisions taken on the various recommendations:

- **Recommendation to follow up on effects of economic crisis and new government policies.** The CHES project continued to monitor the situation.
- **Address the age gap in service provision through policy work with the government and possibly extending the literacy and NFE services to offer them for this age group.** The project design was based on the MOEYS policy for re-entry programs, which targeted dropouts from grades 3 to 6. The CHES project did not make the changes suggested because of concerns that if younger children were allowed to attend the NFE programs then they may drop-out of formal school to attend NFE. Also, the project lacked funds to offer services to an additional group of beneficiaries.
- **Improved cooperation with ILO-IPEC.** Collaboration with ILO-IPEC improved through regular meetings on areas of common concern. Among other activities, Winrock and ILO-IPEC identified action points to develop a common child labor monitoring system, implement a resource mobilization strategy to achieve sustainability of current interventions, and collaborate in updating the National Plan of Action to Eliminate Worst Forms of Child Labor.
- **Child labor was not eliminated—recommendation to investigate the situation.** Children continued to help families during transplanting and harvesting, and some also continued to bring animals to rice fields, collect rice, and look after siblings in addition to attending school. Winrock reassessed the targeted children and provided mentoring to CLMCs, particularly in workplace monitoring, to ensure that all data reported about withdrawal and prevention of child labor were validated. Winrock, through its associates, also looked for opportunities to improve skills training for parents and improve children's schooling status to prevent early dropouts.
- **Statistics were not up-to-date, and the data collection and entry system was very complex.** The CHES project improved and simplified the process of project data collection and entry. Some of the statistics were still not up-to-date during final evaluation fieldwork.
- **Seek ways to activate the Civil Society Network Against Child Labor (CSNACLO) through improved coordination with donor and international agencies, such as ILO-IPEC and UNICEF.** A national coordinator for CSNACLO was appointed, financially supported by ILO-IPEC. However, CSNACLO did not appear active at the time of the final evaluation, despite project follow-up on its planning and activities.

- **Look into various means to provide children from floating communities with additional classes, possibly using the re-entry classes model.** The CHES project conducted CFS training for teachers, organized remedial classes for slow learners, and provided appropriate transportation support through the purchase of boats.
- **Investigate whether NFE for children age 15 to 17 is the most cost-effective way to address questions of child labor in Cambodia.** Winrock did not agree that it was more cost effective to address WFCL for younger children than older children and therefore did not take any action on this issue.¹⁴
- **Re-evaluate the support to girls' transition into lower secondary school to make this service better fit the project's goals of removal and prevention.** Winrock checked and confirmed that the targeted participants for this component met project criteria, which included economic status, distance from school, and number of siblings, among others.
- **Better inform beneficiaries and schools, especially at secondary school level, about the project's aim, so that they can be involved in monitoring beneficiaries' schooling and work status.** The project provided training on child labor and related aspects to school teachers and CLMC member, as well as CYCs.
- **For floating communities, consider purchasing a motorboat to be managed by a CYC on a for-profit basis—the boat would be used for economic purposes to cover gasoline, maintenance, and repairs, against the commitment to ensure free transportation to school for community children.** The CHES project provided three boats to the villages and trained a sustainable community-based structure, a boat management committee, to maintain the boats in accordance with the project's objectives during its term and beyond.
- **Design concrete plans to transfer ownership of activities to project stakeholders at all levels: communities, schools, civil society, and district-, province-, and central-level government.** The CHES project developed a sustainability plan and consulted all stakeholders about the operationalization of this plan. The project also held a sustainability conference in February 2011 to assess progress made and advocate for more intensive implementation of key activities at various levels.
- **Develop a coordination plan to enhance the project's outreach to other organizations and look into the possibility of coordinated work in the target communities to enhance impact.** The CHES project invited UN agencies, local partners, and other civil society sectors to visit project sites and participate in project activities. The project also organized/attended coordination meetings with NGOs working in the same areas to inform them about project activities and seek more active collaboration and cooperation in child labor prevention work.

¹⁴ The evaluator respects the difference in opinion, but still believes that it is more cost effective to address WFCL for younger children than for older youth. See Section 5.1.1 for a more in-depth discussion of this question.

- **Generalize skills training through experimental gardens and fish ponds, and set up teacher training and experimental classes in CFS.** The CHES project provided refresher training in collaboration with the Provincial Department of Education, Youth, and Sports on CFS concepts and child-centered teaching methodologies to school teachers in targeted schools and set up child-friendly classes in selected schools.
- **Reconsider project sustainability and exit plans and make them more concrete and practical.** The project's sustainability plan was reviewed and endorsed by the government, and has concrete activities and strategies at the national and sub-national levels.
- **Investigate the possibility of connecting project-related (or -created) institutions, such as CLMCs, CCMs, and CYCs, to economic interest groups and/or assisting in their transformation into for-profit groups, such as women's or youth savings and for-profit associations.** The CHES project strengthened the existing CLMCs and CYCs and the parents of the targeted children and introduced saving concepts.
- **Seek to work at the policy level with employers, such as garment factories, to request that they require a lower secondary degree for all individuals seeking employment.** Winrock agreed with this recommendation but did not prioritize any activities to develop a policy agreement with employers, particularly those involved in the formal sector. The project did not have funding for this effort.

The evaluator believes that evaluations and recommendations are tools to be used or rejected by the project in view of funding and implementation possibilities. Also, there may be differences in the interpretation of various issues, such as cost effectiveness and age of beneficiaries, as well as the effectiveness of various types of activities. The project's responses to the midterm evaluations were fully appropriate and adequate in the evaluator's view.

3.1.8 Response to the Changing Economic Environment Because of the Recent Economic Crisis

In Cambodia, the textile sector was hit particularly hard by the crisis, which led to massive layoffs. The sector started to pick up again at the end of 2010, which led to new recruitment and a new rural exodus of young women. The project's strategy, being related to WFCL in subsistence agriculture, did not need major readjustments because of the crisis. As noted by a key project interviewee, "The project did not make any big adjustments to the economic crisis because it had little effect on subsistence agriculture. Prices have gone up, for example, for food, but there is no other particular impact on the project. The poor are left with themselves."

The project's recent work with CEDAC and Department of Agriculture trainers and, in particular, training of young agriculture entrepreneurs (YAE) and parents in livelihood skills were an appropriate response to the changing economic environment, according to the evaluator. These activities encouraged better and more varied agriculture production in the children's and parents' home area instead of providing skills that would be adequate in an urban setting, such as factories.

3.2 LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

The project offered a wide variety of activities and services to address a complex situation of poverty and a lack of awareness of WFCL and the importance of education. In particular, the project design addressed two core barriers to education: (1) poverty and a need to compensate for income lost when children stop working, which the project addressed through skills training of parents; and (2) the lack of education quality, which the project address by setting up child-friendly schools. In addition, the robust awareness-raising component of the project, which included media, especially radio, as well as one-to-one interaction such as CLMC activities in the communities, was designed to change social practice and to bring awareness of the issues to project stakeholders and the wider community.

The project's good practices include—

- A range of services to attack the problem of WFCL from various angles
- Interventions in the field that were accompanied with research and policy work at the central level
- Partnerships with local NGOs to build capacity and ensure sustainability
- Robust project strategies with good foundations for an effective implementation.

IV EFFECTIVENESS

The evaluation assessed the extent to which the project had reached its objectives and the effectiveness of project activities contributing toward those objectives.

4.1 FINDINGS

4.1.1 Project Has Achieved Targets

The immediate objective of the project was to reduce the overall number of children engaged in exploitive child labor in subsistence and commercial agriculture in Cambodia. The project achieved this target, and at the time of the final evaluation, the project had reached and surpassed the target number of beneficiaries enrolled.¹⁵ The target number of direct beneficiaries, prevented and withdrawn, was 8,250 children—5,325 girls and 2,925 boys. The number of direct beneficiaries reached and tracked was 8,988 children (5,275 girls and 3,713 boys), well above targets. However, these numbers must be compared with the number of beneficiaries who actually completed the program. The project-established definition of *completion* is 2 years for formal education programs and 6 months for NFE programs. The aggregate percentage of children enrolled in the first of the project's cohorts who completed the program was 81%. For the other project cohorts (children enrolled in 2009 and new NFE children enrolled in 2010 and 2011), the project verified that by end of July 2011, 4,567 children (2,722 girls) completed their education and training programs, for a 73% completion rate against those enrolled (6,177) for the period. At the time of the April 2011 Technical Progress Report, the number of beneficiaries withdrawn and/or prevented was 7,964 children (4,802 girls and 3,162 boys), slightly below target. These numbers are likely to be somewhat reduced for the final completion report of the program (see also Section 4.1.8 on the project's monitoring system for data accuracy). The number of beneficiaries enrollment compared with the target, by service, is displayed in Table 3.

Table 3: Number of Beneficiaries

Services	Target	Actual
Service 1. Withdrawn	2,250	2,289
Service 2. NFE	1,500	1,706
Service 3. Prevented	3,000	3,785
Service 4. Girls' Transition	1,500	1,208
Total	8,250	8,988

The project indicated that an additional 578 children (310 girls) age 15 to 17 have recently been withdrawn and enrolled in NFE (agricultural skills training). The withdrawn and prevented figure as of August 2011 is 8,542 (5,112 girls), which exceeds the target. The highest drop-out percentage is found among NFE beneficiaries, especially in the first generation of enrollees before the service had been sufficiently adjusted to the needs of the beneficiaries in terms of literacy and skills training (see Section 4.1.3). Also, certain population groups, such as those

¹⁵ These numbers are the same as those listed in the April 2011 Technical Progress Report, since no new beneficiary has been added since then. The project's M&E specialist checked this paragraph for accuracy.

residing in floating villages, encountered difficulties in retaining children because of the cultural and practical problems discussed in Section 2.3. The projects' provision of transportation services through the purchase of a boat has alleviated some of these problems.

To strengthened national policy on child labor and education, the project targets aimed to complete three draft policy papers "to reflect the needs of child laborers in agriculture and children at risk." The project addressed this target through the use of a consultancy firm, Mekong Think Tank, to produce a policy paper that addressed the link between child labor and education, which was the subject of a project-arranged, bipartite meeting between MOEYS and MOLVT on July 5, 2011. The research papers referred to in Section 3.1.1 helped in forming policies and *prakas* for the sector. However, since the process of forming and adopting *prakas* is extremely time-consuming, none of the draft policies were formally promulgated and implemented at the time of the evaluation. The project achieved targets for "Improved capacity of key individuals and institutions to combat child labor and provide quality education," and through the aforementioned research reports, "Government and NGOs have information to understand and respond to the causes and extent of child labor in subsistence agriculture, tobacco and cassava farming, and fishing" (Output 4.1).

4.1.2 Effectiveness of the Direct Action Interventions

All 210 children the evaluator met during fieldwork had received a direct service from the project. The fieldwork found that a number of children had dropped out of school. The drop-out percentage was very irregular, ranging from 0% to over 40% in certain geographic locations and for certain services. The project's statistics indicated an average retention rate of above 90% for the period ending on February 2011, which is very good.

Activity 1: Education Support for Withdrawn Child Laborers Age 6 to 14. This component led to the effective withdrawal of 2,289 children from child labor, of which 83.6% were retained in school. The project offered a 2-month re-entry course for those who dropped out at or above grade 3 for less than a year. This course followed the Ministry of Education's policies and curriculum and was an effective tool to reintegrate children back into class. This component was adequate for those at or above grade 3 but not for those below. The children's socioeconomic situation and age group seemed to correspond to the project goals, and the service has generally been successful.

Activity 2: Provision of NFE and Livelihood Skills for Withdrawn Children Age 15 to 17. This service generally reached the target group of drop-out children age 15 to 17. Enrollees were provided with a 3- to 8-month literacy course, followed by skills training. Often, the children were less interested in literacy and preferred skills training. Some children who had previously been to school found the literacy training too easy; conversely, some children who had not been to school were skill not capable of reading and writing after attending the course. Skills training was provided in various fields, including agriculture (chicken and fish raising, growing vegetables and mushrooms, pisciculture and earthworm production), hairdressing, weaving, and sewing, as well as motorcycle and bicycle repair. The activities were generally effective, but they also had some shortcomings as not all the skills were marketable or taught in sufficient depth:

In Service [Activity] 2 they cannot always use their skills. They can't open a business because the kits [provided by the project] are very basic and they don't have any other working capital. Some students work for their peers. There is a problem of market saturation—which is also related to the skills of the child. People will come to the best one—and the beneficiaries need to study more [to improve their skills and be competitive], but they can't afford it. The skills are not yet very good with the training received.

A future problem was that there were only trainers in local skills, such as sewing, weaving, or basic agriculture skills, and rarely in skills where there was no market saturation. Despite using a participatory approach and market studies when offering training, the project did not have a sufficient budget to provide long-term training that would make the trainees very competitive, such as in sewing, or to address demand in nonconventional skills training. A partial exception was the agriculture training provided by CEDAC, which focused on new skills, such as using compost, raising earthworms, and cultivating mushrooms, for which there were better marketability and the learners could use for subsistence production.

Activity 3: Education Support for At-Risk Children Age 6 to 14. This component aimed to prevent drop-out of at-risk children by providing stationery and school materials, including uniforms and shoes. In general, project intervention was effective, inasmuch as these children knew about the project objectives and appreciated the project assistance. Interviews, child drawings, and debriefings indicated that the beneficiaries corresponded to the project targets—they were poor and at-risk children.

Activity 4: Education Support for At-Risk Girls Age 12 to 14 Transitioning into Secondary School. This service provided education materials and bicycles to a number of girls transitioning into secondary schools. Many of the girls interviewed had a long way to go to school and appreciated the bicycle. Some of the interviewees had a shorter distance to school or already had a bicycle when they received a second one from the project. This was especially the case in one site visited where all the interviewed children except one said they owned a bicycle before project intervention, but they were happy for the second one, since their older bicycle could be given to siblings. During the midterm evaluation, direct beneficiaries, teachers, and school administrators often did not know the reasons for the support, but the project seems to have corrected this since then. In general, this project activity stimulated educational participation among girls transitioning to secondary school, but a question remains to which extent this component represented an effective way of combating WFCL.

See also Section 4.1.5 on the effectiveness of the specific models (auxiliary services).

4.1.3 Work Status of CHES Beneficiaries

Service 1—Withdrawal. Beneficiaries of Service 1 often indicated that they worked more before than after being re-enrolled in primary school. Most beneficiaries worked before or after school hours, since schools operated with double shifts and children studied either in the morning or in the afternoon. In a typical case children attended school from 7 or 8 a.m. to 11 a.m. and worked in the afternoon. Children also worked during weekends and holidays. During the harvest season and other seasons of agricultural activity, some children left school periodically to assist their parents. During the evaluation fieldwork, which took place after

exams and during the beginning of the wet season, many children were absent because of work. In many cases, the work performed by children fell under the definition of child labor, and in some cases, it could be classified as WFCL, spraying fertilizer for example. Some children indicated that they were involved in this work “occasionally.” In some other cases, children complained about long working hours and heavy work, such as fetching water, and were probably involved in WFCL. As one CHES staff member indicated:

Child labor and WFCL continue [among project beneficiaries] in the communities because of poverty. In average 15 to 20% of the working children are still working in WFCL. The most common WFCL are spraying insecticide, using the walk-behind tractors [also called walking, 2-wheel or hand tractors], and long hours with heavy work, such as carrying of harvest products, loading, or looking after ducks from dawn to dusk.

Project support contributed to a reduced workload for most of these children. Also, most children knew the definitions of child work, child labor, and WFCL, although some indicated that they “had to engage in spraying when needed” but also sought to minimize any work that could be dangerous, including spraying.

Service 2—NFE. Beneficiaries of Service 2 hoped to find gainful and adequate employment as hairdressers and in motorbike repair, among others. Some were successful, but many of them returned to their initial jobs, often in agriculture- or fishing-related activities. Some beneficiaries said there was little market demand for the skill they had learned.

Service 3—Prevention. Beneficiaries of Service 3 generally worked before and after school, as well as during weekends and holidays. Most beneficiaries said that their work burden was the same as before project intervention, although some said they worked less, and a few children said they worked more than before. This latter response was probably related to the allocation of a higher work burden on children as they grew older as well as the effects of the economic crisis. Most beneficiaries knew the difference between child work, child labor, and WFCL. Some of their work could be classified as child labor and occasionally as WFCL.

Service 4—Girls' Transition to Secondary School. None of the girls interviewed seemed to be involved in child labor or WFCL, and very few seemed to have been involved in child labor or WFCL before receiving project support. One main risk for this group of beneficiaries was to travel to Phnom Penh to seek employment in the garment industry using papers with falsified birth dates showing their age as 18 or older. Interviews confirmed that a number of beneficiaries fell into this category—they had already dropped out to seek employment:

Beneficiaries, especially withdrawn ones, need money, so we're worried that they drop-out. They cannot afford the opportunity costs, especially when they pass to secondary school. Many of them obtain certificates from the commune councils that they're above 18 and migrate to work in garment factories.

In general, no child interviewed during the fieldwork was working permanently in WFCL, but for a limited number of children, their work was occasionally WFCL.

4.1.4 Effectiveness of the Services in Meeting the Needs of the Target Population

Section 3.1.4 identified several barriers to education, for which the project offered a number of services.

Policy and Legal Barriers. The project addressed these issues through policy work at the central level and did not have immediate consequences for the target population. However, correcting these issues is believed to lead to a long-term reduction in WFCL in the concerned sectors.

Poverty. The project addressed this barrier by providing skills training to the parents of children benefiting from Service 1 and 2 (Withdrawal and NFE, respectively). The project offered skills training to this category of parents to compensate for income lost when children are removed from child labor. However, not all of the parents were interested in the skills training. The parents receiving and accepting to receive this support were generally of a relatively mature age (average age of the sample of 48 interviewees was 45.4), who were rice growing farmers. Some of the beneficiaries had their own land; a few were working for others. Project support helped diversify and improve production by growing vegetables or raising chickens in a more effective way. Also, some of the parents organized themselves into production groups to improve yield. In general, the agricultural skills training offered to parents seemed effective and adequate. Other skills were not as marketable. One project staff member noted:

Vocational skills training needs more funding. The beneficiaries need marketable skills. Our beneficiaries cannot meet the qualifications for the government's training centers: maybe another project can make a bridge system [towards vocational training centers for dropouts from primary].

The project's interventions were not always sufficient to provide the required training in marketable skills or to compensate for lost income.

Distance from School. The project addressed this barrier by providing bicycles as incentive to transition into secondary school. However, this component was limited to girls transitioning from primary to lower secondary and therefore did not address the needs of boys, children in primary school, or those already enrolled in secondary school.

Value of Education. The project addressed this barrier through awareness raising by CLMCs and associate staff, celebration of World Day Against Child Labor, and mass media programs. Generally, these services were effective because the large majority of children and adults knew about the objectives of the project and understood, at least theoretically and conceptually, the difference between child work, child labor, and WFCL.

Cultural Barriers and Lack of Teacher Sensitivity. The project addressed this component by setting up child-friendly schools based on UNICEF's model. These classrooms contained filtered water and a small library—with an additional library provided to the whole school. Teachers in CFS benefited from training in child-friendly approaches. Several project stakeholders found that the skills training and CFS components were the most effective to combat WFCL and thereby address local needs, since one addressed poverty issues and the other made the schools better.

4.1.5 Effectiveness of Models Used by the Project (Auxiliary Services)

The project used an exceptionally multifaceted structure to address the problem of child labor and had multiple models that targeted different user groups.

Child Care Mothers. The project addressed the need for certain children to stay at home to look after younger siblings by setting up CCM service to care for younger children in lieu of their siblings, who could now attend school. This component was an innovative way of helping children to attend school and at the same time provide preschool services. However, many centers closed down as fewer and fewer parents of beneficiaries were interested. “The reasons we closed down are that less children come—the parents live far from the center. As the children grow, they start school and there’s no need for the center. Also, the government has set up preschools, and we have difficulties to attract clients.”

Despite the reduction in CCMs since midterm, the evaluator believes this was an original project model that should be considered in other projects.

Child Councils in Schools. The Ministry of Education promotes the establishment of child councils in primary schools and youth councils in secondary schools. Parents, teachers, and local authorities support these groups, which discuss child labor and other relevant issues. The project-supported child councils and CYCs seemed overly focused on child labor issues. The evaluator believes that engaging the children and their institutions in a larger spectrum of activities—play and fun, debates about democratic participation in the country, health issues including HIV/AIDS awareness—would make these programs more useful and more sustainable.

Child-Friendly Schools. As noted above, this component provided training in child-centered teaching and learning to teachers as well as water and books to the classrooms. It was built on UNICEF’s proven model, although the project did not have enough funds to implement the model in full. The project’s version of the model is useful; however, implementation of the full UNICEF model would have been more effective.

Child Youth Clubs. The project often organized CYCs as savings groups, and the members also at times offered remedial classes. These groups followed up on other children’s schooling and raised awareness about child labor:

We’re in total 27 members with 6 boys and 21 girls, but some are lazy and others are busy with cattle or [they are] in the field. The club explains to the dropouts to go back to school and try to persuade them to do that. We explain others about child labor: in this area children are working for long hours in cassava plantations and also spraying chemicals. Our other activities are that we give support to poor children. We have collected money and given 5,000 Riel¹⁶ to two poor children. We meet sometimes twice or once a month, and sometimes once every 2 months to talk about child labor, how to persuade dropouts to go back to school, and how to eliminate WFCL.

¹⁶ Approximately US\$1.25.

Similarly to the child councils, diversifying the mandate of the CYC would perhaps be a good change; the children the evaluator met were age 13 to 16 and faced many challenges other than WFCL.

Remedial Classes. The project helped organize remedial classes for CHES beneficiaries and other interested students, most taking place from March to June 2011. Teachers were recruited for this popular service, or in some cases, CYC members ran them. The project offered incentives for the service, so children did not have to pay for the classes. This model was effective although there is uncertainty regarding its sustainability.

Young Agricultural Entrepreneurs. The YAE model is implemented by CEDAC. Participants visited, observed, and interviewed farmers and wrote reports together with their own history. Teaching, often provided by a Community-based Facilitator, concentrated on one or several of the following topics: system of rice intensification; composting to grow vegetables; or fish and chicken raising. During the evaluation, the evaluator met a few beneficiaries of this training, specializing in chicken raising. Although the beneficiaries said they had benefited from the program, they did not seem clear about their future employment plans. One project staff member noted:

[CEDAC] is a strong organization in livelihoods, and [the YAE] is a strong process, but when they [CEDAC] become members of Winrock [CHES], they just follow project rules. When they select YAE they select illiterate or semi literate children; it's a difficult group. Now we ask CBFs [Community-based Facilitators] to help this group and their parents. Originally, the YAE were children with high commitment, who could read and write; they should be children that can lead others. We cannot divide the groups into poor, medium poor and rich; we need to engage the community as a whole, not separately...CEDAC's work needs to be integrated with all the groups of the community and activate them.

In other words, CEDAC's YAE model could perhaps had been more effective if it engaged children leaders rather than drop-out and unschooled children at risk of exploitive child labor. Generally, this and the other models described above seem to be adequate and effective to address child labor.

4.1.6 Adequate Selection of Beneficiaries

All beneficiaries were selected by CLMCs and based, at least theoretically, on rigorous selection criteria. Selection was then controlled by project staff from Winrock and associates. Drawings that the children made for the evaluator during fieldwork and debriefings indicated that the beneficiaries generally corresponded to the targets—children living in poverty and involved in child labor. This was especially the case for beneficiaries of Services 1 to 3. The girls benefiting from Service 4 did not always come from the poorest strata of society—the poorest had already dropped out—and did not seem to be in WFCL. However, they were *at risk* of WFCL since many of them considered seeking work in the garment industry in Phnom Penh.

The extent to which work could be characterized as WFCL depended on each individual case. The project's targets of subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing are where the absolute majority of working children in Cambodia can be found. The target groups create particular challenges (identification, withdrawal, and retention of children in school) by the sheer quantity

of children involved. However, unlike other sectors, the children are unlikely to be involved in WFCL on a permanent basis in these sectors. Rather, children are involved in child labor during large parts of the year and in WFCL during specific agricultural seasons. The project's targets and selection of beneficiaries seem adequate. During fieldwork, the evaluator verified the educational status of 225 children—10% of whom were absent from school because of work and an additional 8% were absent because of teacher absence and had therefore gone to the fields to work with their parents.

4.1.7 Sector-specific Lessons Learned

Based on interviews and fieldwork observations, the evaluator presumes that it would be very difficult to fully eliminate child labor in the sectors of freshwater fishing and subsistence agriculture in Cambodia, partly because of its seasonal nature. Therefore, initiatives should first identify and eliminate WFCL. The project identified many good practices and lessons learned, specifically in working with seasonal WFCL, in particular the need to back up policies with research to demonstrate the dangers of child labor in the sectors of freshwater fishing and subsistence agriculture. Little research existed in this area even though it is the largest employment sector for children in Cambodia, and the project needed research data to convince authorities and other agencies of the dangers children face working in seasonal WFCL.

4.1.8 Monitoring and Tracking Systems of the Project

The project used five forms to identify and track each individual child—the system was simplified from an initial nine forms. Two initial information forms (Forms a and b) were filled out by CLMCs and verified by CHES and/or subcontractor staff. CLMC members and beneficiary children filled out monthly reassessment of work status forms (form c). A monthly form, filled out by the teacher or trainer, tracked school or NFE class attendance (Form d). When the beneficiary completed the CHES program, a final form (Form e) was filled out and the formal tracking completed. Completion of the program was set at 2 years for beneficiaries of Services 1, 3, and 4, and 7 months for beneficiaries of Service 2 (NFE). Winrock staff computerized the forms for Pursat and Siem Reap, and KAPE staff was responsible for computerizing forms in Kampong Cham and Prey Veng. Winrock staff was responsible for the final analysis and organization of the data as well as for controlling data collection procedures. In general this was done in a systematic and satisfactory way. However, KAPE encountered considerable delays with computerization and did not update the children's files. Only children dropping out were indicated, but the work status form (Form c) was not computerized for the beneficiary children.

Aside from this problem in two project provinces, not all the files were up-to-date. As noted above, during fieldwork the evaluator verified the educational status of 225 children. Of the 225, 13 students (6%) had dropped out for a period ranging from 2 months to 2 years and 1% indicated an erroneous school. A number of other errors were found, including grade at entry, gender, and incorrect names indicated in the English version of the database (see also Section 5.1.3 on cost effectiveness and tracking).

4.1.9 Management Strengths and Challenges

The project had a good management structure and benefited from well-trained staff members. The contract with former associate Healthcare Center for Children was terminated and replaced with KAPE, mainly because of the management weaknesses of the former. The project benefitted from a generally strong team and healthy management procedures, despite KAPE's problems with statistics, described above. The project performed well despite having had three directors, which according to some interviewees, was not always easy. "We had three project directors with three different management styles. Sometimes it is hard for us—what we did before, is no longer correct."

The floating schools in Pursat and Siem Reap posed unique challenges in child monitoring and helping children access school. The project budget did not distinguish between floating villages and other target areas, although project implementation was more expensive in the floating villages because of transportation difficulties.

The subcontract with DOCL was generally successful and led to a number of training sessions, including training Winrock and associate staff members, chairpersons of PCCL, district governors, various district staff, and CLMC members. The subcontract with CEDAC was very successful and led to training of children in the YAE program, as well as parents.

4.1.10 Communications Officer

The communication officer was in charge of the project's awareness raising activities, which were effective in educating and informing stakeholders and the public about child labor. This included activities on World Day Against Child Labor.

The communication officer was also in charge of project-purchased airtime for radio programs, each of which focused on a specific child labor-related topic. The project produced promotional stickers to inform the public about the time and frequency of the program (Tuesdays 4 to 5 p.m. and Fridays 11 a.m. to noon) and experienced an increasing interest and number of outside calls. Project statistics show that over 800 people called in. Some listeners pledged to give money or materials to help eradicate child labor. The communication officer followed up on these pledges, which had still not materialized at the time of the evaluation. The radio programs were coupled with promotional spots of less than a minute, which promoted the programs and key ideas, such as the importance of education. Several interviewees emphasized the usefulness of the radio programs. "The commercials about schooling can't be underestimated. Most people get their information from the radio." ILO-IPEC, CSNACL, and another USDOL-funded project managed by Winrock in Rwanda are currently in touch with the communication officer for advice on how to proceed with radio programs; they are interested in purchasing radio time for the same reasons the CHES project did.

A video was produced with "best practices" from the CHES project and was very well received. The video was shown during trainings, at the sustainability conference, and at launch seminars for school start, and was also given to DVD rental facilities in project target communities.

In addition, the communication officer was responsible for the production of a quarterly newsletter that featured information about the main activities from the provinces, as well as “Voices of Children,” in which beneficiary children shared information about their lives. Because of the project’s limited budget, electronic copies of the newsletter were distributed as well as a few photocopies. The project produced a number of posters promoting education, which were distributed in the target communities, as well as T-shirts with promotional messages. The evaluator often observed child council members or CLMC members wearing these T-shirts. The evaluator believe the distribution of such promotional material had a significant impact on raising awareness of child labor in the communities. The communication officer was responsible for the organization of a large part of the project’s awareness-raising activities and was vital to the project’s impact.

4.2 LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

The project’s strategies were focused on four core services: (1) withdrawal—primary, (2) withdrawal—NFE, (3) prevention, and (4) support to girls’ transition to secondary, as well as a number of auxiliary services. Whereas all the strategies and models were effective and adequate to some extent, some proved to be more successful than others. Interviewees generally found the most effective project practices to be Service 1, as well as the skills training of parents and the child-friendly schools.

Of the lessons learned and good practices, the project found that—

- In most cases, all forms of child labor cannot be effectively eliminated from the sectors of subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing. In these sectors, project actions should first focus on eliminating WFCL.
- To be successful, withdrawal needs to be accompanied by compensation for the income lost when children are removed from child labor, especially for poorer families.
- Not all poor families accepted being part of income-generating programs. They found the programs too time-consuming, which created additional problems for the effective withdrawal of child laborers.
- Skills training needs to be adapted to market demand. Agriculture skills that are encouraging beneficiaries to stay in their communities while at the same time improving their livelihoods should be tested out and, if adequate, encouraged.
- Not all training and programs work best with at-risk and vulnerable children. Some skills training and activities should be focusing on children who could be leaders in the field, as is the case in child councils, CYCs, and YAE programs.
- Awareness raising through radio and other mass media is important to complement local, face-to-face awareness raising. However, they do not address the same public. Mass media addresses the public at large and contributes to creating a favorable setting for social and policy change.
- A simplified monitoring and tracking system works best.

In general, the project's implementation was successful and contributed to understanding the plight of children working in subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing in Cambodia. The lessons learned and examples of good practices can be used in other projects working with the same sectors.

This page intentionally left blank.

V EFFICIENCY

This section provides analysis of whether the strategies employed by the project were efficient in terms of the resources used (inputs) compared with its qualitative and quantitative impact (outputs).

5.1 FINDINGS

5.1.1 Cost-Effectiveness

Cost-effectiveness difficult to assess because the only other project on child labor is the USDOL-funded ILO-IPEC timebound project, which is different from the CHES project in its approaches and focus. The ILO-IPEC project is implemented by a UN agency, and therefore, its cost structure and intervention methods are different from the CHES project. Also, its intervention is more focused on government operation and policy strengthening. The two projects can be seen as complementary instead of competing. In this section, project cost-effectiveness will be analyzed in its relation to three main issues: (1) implementation alternatives, (2) alternative activities, (3) age of beneficiaries related to the services offered.

In terms of implementation, according to interviewees, the project could have opted for a more cost-effective approach if Winrock directly implemented all project activities instead of using local NGOs. In this way, Winrock would have had more control over project implementation and would have used less resources and staff time in follow-up and training counterpart staff. However, such an approach would not have supported local civil society and would not have entailed the same possibilities for sustainability, since Wathnakpheap and KAPE will continue to implement development projects in many of the same regions as they did with the CHES project (see Section 7.1.5 on sustainability). The implementation model chosen by the project, which may not have been optimal in cost-effectiveness for the short term, has its advantages for the long term.

A number of interviewees said the project should have emphasized school quality and livelihoods skills, which are, according to some of the central project staff, the two most important project activities to prevent WFCL. These two services, which were not key services but implemented late in the project cycle, were much in need. However, focusing on these two services would not have contributed to important lessons learned in the other fields of intervention. It is clear, in hindsight, that the project should have implemented these services from the beginning, since they emerged as very important components of the project. This lesson is part of the emerging knowledge obtained from the project implementation—it is a lesson learned for the future—and this knowledge was perhaps not available during project conception. The project could also have focused exclusively on policy or on community-based services. Such project focus would have strengthened policy or community-based services, but would not, according to the evaluator, have represented a holistic and balanced approach.

Finally, the project could have focused on different age groups. In calculations of cost-effectiveness and returns of investment in education, the stream of future earnings is usually considered. In other words, it is more cost-effective to invest in children age 6 to 14 than in

adults, since the former have more opportunity to use the education received. Similarly, in WFCL, the evaluator believes that it is important to consider the effect and impact of WFCL on different age groups. For example, it would be less cost-effective to withdraw a child about to reach age 18 since what was considered child labor will be gainful and adequate employment in a few months' time. Conversely, ensuring that a child age 6 or 7 is withdrawn from labor and sent to school will have multiple positive consequences for that child. Also, the psychological and physical impact of WFCL on the younger child would be more tangible than for adolescents who are in or close to the legal working age.

In this project, the services addressed various age groups (see Table 4).

Table 4: Mean Age of Beneficiaries

Services	Mean age (μ)
Service 1. Withdrawal	11.42
Service 2. NFE	15.21
Service 3. Prevention	11.32
Service 4. Girls' Transition	14.01

For withdrawal and prevention, the children were still young—younger than the authorized age for light employment. Looking only at age, it can be argued that the withdrawal and prevention services (*caeteris paribus*) were more cost-effective than the other services. As for girls' transition, the service did not necessarily touch the poorest individuals in the community, who would already have left school. This service nevertheless helped prevent girls from dropping out and seeking employment in garment factories, which was a temptation for this age group and which could lead to temporarily unemployment and engaging in sex work. It may be debated whether the provision of a bicycle, especially to those who already possessed one, was a cost-effective way of preventing these young women from seeking work in the garment industry.

The mean age for enrollment in NFE was 15.21, an age for which legal employment is authorized in most sectors in Cambodia. This led to particular problems. "The 15–17 age group is especially difficult because of migration [for work]." Moreover, withdrawal from labor for these beneficiaries was not complete; many children returned to the same employment after the skills training because of the low marketability of the skills learned. For some children, reorientation of employment, such as from farming to hairdressing, led to a better future. They were happier in their daily lives and said that their new employment corresponded better with their desires. However, this again may not be the most effective way to combat WFCL in Cambodia. A final point to be considered is that few of the children withdrawn were permanently engaged in WFCL. Some were engaged in WFCL *occasionally*, and some were engaged only in child labor. The harshness of the employment and the level of danger the children were exposed to must also be considered for cost-effectiveness.

The direct services targeted various age groups and beneficiaries, each representing different levels of cost-effectiveness in terms of reducing WFCL. This is part of the experimentation of the project as well as lessons learned and is not necessarily a negative feature. The evaluator

believes that the project represented a balanced approach and a good design that could be further improved for future projects.

5.1.2 Financial and Human Resources Allocated

In general, the project adequately allocated human resources. The core Winrock staff as well as the Winrock provincial coordinators were very effective and well suited to their tasks. A number of the associate NGOs' staff, however, needed a large amount of support. Some of the work could still not be done correctly, such as KAPE computerizing the tracking forms.

Most of the project's resources and activities were well matched. However, some important, yet auxiliary services, such as setting up child-friendly schools, were not sufficiently funded. Only two classrooms per targeted school could be reached, and the full, 6-step UNICEF program for CFS was not implemented. Other important activities lacked funding, including skills training, which did not always allow children to choose the training they desired most. In some cases, the training duration was sufficient to ensure the beneficiaries became skilled enough to be competitive in the market. For the last generation of NFE enrollees, only agricultural training was available.

Institutions working with child labor in Cambodia are *not* adequately funded. "Every year the Department of Child Labor proposes a budget which is not approved." This contrasts with the officials' statements that, "Cambodia is a leading country in the world to combat child labor. The Prime Minister is committed to the goals set for 2016." However, as noted by another interviewee, "There is no budget for implementation of the 2016 goals. They [the government] need US\$100 million, but there is no indication where the resources should come from. At least if they had budgeted 5% or 10%, there could have been something to start from; now there's nothing."

5.1.3 Monitoring Systems

The systematic tracking and reporting of beneficiary children are part of USDOL requirements for project implementation and are necessary to inform U.S. Congress. Therefore, these systems have a meta-function that is not in line with required and necessary practices in the field. The monitoring and tracking systems are neither efficient nor cost-effective in terms of field requirements. Likewise, they were not fitting for the culture and society in which they were implemented. For example, systematic collection of data by CLMC members who, in many cases, are semi-literate does not make sense the goal is to create a sustainable local system of monitoring WFCL and children's schooling. As noted in Section 4.1.8, the monitoring forms were not up-to-date at the time of the fieldwork and neither was the computerization of forms, partially because of local failure to understand the necessity of keeping a written track of each child. In many cases, the CLMC members informed the evaluator that they "spoke" to parents of the children's working situation. The "speaking" was not necessarily accompanied by a written paper trail. Systematic written tracking was not part of the local cultural practices and had to be taught to CLMCs by project staff. At the project level, one M&E officer accompanied by one database assistant and three volunteers were responsible for tracking and computerizing the data in two provinces. For the two KAPE provinces, Kampong Cham and Prey Veng, an M&E officer and a volunteer should have been responsible for computerizing and tracking the data; however, the work was not done.

In conclusion, the tracking and monitoring systems were necessary and cost effective as far USDOL requirements; in terms of field requirements, they were not.

5.2 LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

The project's multiple implementation strategies lead to a reflection on cost-effectiveness in the fight against child labor. Because of its very broad approach, this project could function as a laboratory on cost-effectiveness, and it is important for the project to draw conclusions on lessons learned on this topic. A consideration of the cost-effectiveness of each project service is beyond the scope of the current evaluation.

A number of lessons learned should can be emphasized:

- In many cases, approaches that were apparently cost-effective, such as low-cost skills training, were in fact underfunded and led to less effective services.
- Likewise, short-term cost-effectiveness in project implementation, such as direct implementation by an international NGO, should be sacrificed in many cases for long-term benefits, such as capacity building for local NGOs and community-based organizations, and/or sustainability.
- Age and cost-effectiveness should be considered in projects. Projects should consider which age groups are most vulnerable to WFCL and target project actions accordingly.
- Data collection systems should be as simple as possible to ensure that tracking is easy to perform. In general, the project should only collect the data required by USDOL, unless it is part of a research design. No data should be collected without very specific purposes; it's a waste of time and resources.

In general, the evaluator believes that this project was cost-effective. Some false "savings" were made in under-budgeting certain skills training services and CFS, but even these activities led to positive outcomes.

VI IMPACT

The evaluation assessed the positive and negative changes produced by the project—intended and unintended, direct and indirect, as well as any changes in the social and economic environment in the country, as reported by respondents.

6.1 FINDINGS

6.1.1 Project Impact to Date on Individual Beneficiaries

Children. The project, through CLMCs and staff intervention, withdrew children from child labor and provided them with educational services. In addition to direct beneficiaries, certain children were also organized in CYCs and child councils, and some children even participated in the CLMCs. All were trained to take up community responsibilities. Some of the children, such as those in a CYC met during fieldwork, had even collected money to help vulnerable children with schooling. Most beneficiary children were aware of the difference between child labor, child work, and WFCL and stated that they now work less. Generally, the services touched the poorest and most vulnerable in society, with the partial exception of the component supporting girls transitioning from primary to lower secondary school, which may not always have benefited the target. Services offered were not always sufficient to retain all the children in school; there were a number of dropouts. Some children received sufficient skills to help them gain adequate and gainful employment.¹⁷

Parents. The project sensitized parents to the differences between child work and child labor. Many of them tried to reduce their children’s workload to facilitate their schooling. “Parents have a changed concept of schooling and are now committed to let the children attend school, even if they still need them during harvesting time. Before they did not know the difference between abusive labor and child work; now they know.”

However, the knowledge is limited to beneficiary families. “Not all rural people know the difference between child work and child labor...the achievement of the 2016 goals are not possible if people don’t understand the difference.” A number of parents of withdrawn children, (children receiving Service 1 or 3, Withdrawal or NFE, respectively), received skills training, and some were able to compensate for lost children’s income through improved agriculture techniques, including production of earthworm, pisciculture, improved chicken raising, and vegetable growing. Some of these skills are being propagated to non-beneficiaries in the communities. For example, a parent of a beneficiary said he had sold earthworms to other members of the community and taught them how to raise the earthworms.

Teachers. Certain teachers and community members received training from the project as part of the re-entry program, NFE component, remedial classes, CFS initiatives, or part of their participation in the CLMCs. Their understanding of child labor and WFCL improved, and they were able to address this issue during classes. During evaluation fieldwork, children often told

¹⁷ This was the case of a hairdresser who had previously been engaged in WFCL. After 4 months of hairdresser training and on-the-job practice, he skillfully cut the evaluator’s hair. When using a razor blade, he told the evaluator that he changed the blade “every time because of the risks of HIV/AIDS.”

the evaluator, “The teacher spoke about child labor and WFCL.” Also, some of the teachers may now better understand the plight of children who are late to school because of their work duties and make use of more appropriate disciplinary methods. However, many teachers’ understanding about CFS and child-centered pedagogy is still limited. For example, corporal punishment¹⁸ is still widely practiced, especially in schools that have not received training in child-friendly education approaches.

6.1.2 Impact of Project Activities on Education Quality

The project’s impact on education quality was especially visible in the child-friendly schools, or rather, for the project, in the two child-friendly classrooms that the project organized in two schools in each commune. At the time of the evaluation fieldwork, the project had organized and trained teachers for 92 child-friendly classes, involving 1,212 beneficiaries, 671 of whom were girls. Not all beneficiaries enrolled in primary school were in CFS, and conversely, not all the students in the child-friendly schools were project beneficiaries. It should be noted that not only CFS classrooms but also other schools have a visibly friendlier aspect than before the project with pictures and other decorations in the classrooms and libraries set up for the students. The students themselves said they feel better working in a nice environment. The project’s intervention in this field was of prime importance to move the Cambodian school system toward a more child-friendly approach, which is also in line with government policy. However, the project’s interventions had limitations, as noted by a Winrock staff. “We’re not conducting any assessment of safety in school, of water quality, or of bullying and protection.”

In addition to CFS, the project set up about 20 fish ponds and school gardens, one in each target commune, and facilitated some skills training, ensuring a more practical and community-oriented education experience for the children.

6.1.3 Project Impact to Date on Organizations and Institutions

The project ensured that a number of the associates’ project staff were trained on the issue of child labor. Project and associate staff can, in the future, continue working on child labor-related matters and will become a resource pool for future initiatives on this issue. The project was a resource in the work and (re-)structuring of CSNACLO. However, this organization is still dormant, and its mandate perhaps needs to be re-conceptualized. At this point, there is a discrepancy between Winrock and ILO-IPEC’s ideas of the future role of CSNACLO, which needs to be clarified before the end of the CHES project. ILO-IPEC funded a full-time coordinator for the network as well as US\$40,000 in activities, and the CHES project committed to a contribution of US\$8,000, which at the time of the evaluation had not been paid because of the project’s worries concerning the future role of the network. Whereas ILO considered the network rather as an implementation unit, Winrock emphasized that it is composed of representatives of various NGOs with their own mandate, work, and field of interests.

By its contribution to the creation and/or strengthening of PCCLs in four provinces as well as of CLMCs at the local level, the project helped institutionalize structures related to child labor,

¹⁸ Although corporal punishment in Cambodia is not excessively severe, as in many other countries, it is still a practice that is contrary to the principles of CFS and a child-centered learning approach.

which are now an element on the agenda of national and provincial structures. The CLMCs are recognized community structures, and certain communes have included CLMC financing in the commune development budget. However, some of these institutions did not function well. For example, several CLMCs were reorganized because of dormant membership. Others institutions have been operational only for a short time. The PCCL in Prey Veng, for example, had its first meeting on August 23, 2009 and has been operational only for two years. A number of project staff members were concerned about the institutions' future work and sustainability.

6.1.4 System-Wide Changes

Contributions to system-wide changes include the project's work with the subsistence agriculture and fishing sectors. Few organizations have been involved in these sectors, which employ the largest number of children in Cambodia. These sectors are now under government scrutiny through the evaluation and possible future adoption of *prakas*.

6.1.5 Impact of Four Research Studies

The research studies on child labor in subsistence agriculture, fishing, tobacco, and cassava farming were subject to distribution seminars and were being used as references to the development of *prakas* in the sector. Government officials emphasized the importance of these research studies:

Winrock is courageous to try to eliminate child labor in agriculture, which represents 70% of child labor [in Cambodia]. It is difficult to control it...The studies are made in cooperation with the Ministry [MOLVT]—we think the studies are important. They can help build certain policies, such as the integration of child labor into education policies, with a focus on what children really need. The prakas are important; they will allow [labor] inspectors to work with communities—they are necessary legal instruments. But it's necessary to have evidence-based policies; we need the data [from the studies].

A staff member noted that—

The findings [of the studies] are good for the development of prakas. Prakas are good—they're legal instruments that make it easier for us to work with withdrawal. If the child is working with subsistence farming in WFCL, but parents don't see it as hazardous, our intervention will be easier since we can refer to the prakas. We have 8 prakas developed with the assistance of IPEC but they aren't specific for [our target] sectors."

6.2 LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

Project impact was visible at the same levels as the design and implementation—at community level, the institutional levels (both local and central), and the policy levels through research and development of *prakas*.¹⁹ The project has been involved and had an effect on these different levels. The emerging lesson learned *and* good practice is related to project design—even with a variety of services and interventions at different levels, projects can have an impact at multiple levels. In other words, it is not necessary for a project to focus on one intervention or one service at one level. It can successfully engage in a wider range of activities and still have impact on various levels of implementation.

¹⁹ Ongoing activities demonstrate the project's serious policy advocacy work, which project staff believe will result in the approval of the *prakas* concerning child labor in agriculture. Project staff have consulted the government about the processes leading to the approval of such *prakas*, have completed research work, and are now conducting interministerial consultations to seek endorsement of the *prakas* and their eventual approval by the minister of MOLVT.

VII SUSTAINABILITY

The evaluation assessed the extent to which the project has taken steps to ensure that the approaches and benefits continue after its completion.

7.1 FINDINGS

7.1.1 Exit Strategy and Sustainability Plan

The project has an exit strategy and a sustainability plan, which have been subject to various meetings and fine-tuning, including a sustainability conference. The plan to sustain project activities that was presented during the conference included key activities that, according to the evaluator, would be crucial for the future sustaining of project activities:

- CLMC's capacity to identify children in and at risk of child labor as well as to refer them to appropriate services and monitor their work and school performance
- Official integration of CLMCs in the commune councils and in their development plans and budgets
- CFS where children learn better, where school becomes accessible to children, and where schools retain children more effectively
- PCCLs' implementation of policy and organization of various services for at-risk children; PCCLs working with CLMCs to monitor children's work and educational conditions
- National Sub-Committee on Child Labor providing leadership in policy development and implementation and advocating for resources to reach the country's twin goals
- Policy on hazardous labor in agriculture developed and enforced; the capacity to effectively disseminate and enforce such policy
- Links between child labor and education recognized and established to address education promotion and child labor elimination simultaneously.

Work on each of these points is progressing.

Additionally, several sections of the project document contain acknowledgement of elements of the sustainability strategy, including work on *prakas* for child labor in subsistence agriculture; capacity building of government officials and community leaders to understand and monitor WFCL and to value education; awareness raising on child labor and education; creation PCCLs and CLMCs, both officially recognized by the government; and close collaboration with the Ministries of Labor and Education and the Departments of NFE, Agriculture, and Social Affairs. Also, the issue of sustainability should be placed within the context of introducing child labor within the subsistence agriculture sector in Cambodia, a new and controversial area.

7.1.2 Sustainability Conference

The national sustainability conference took place on February 24, 2011 with 185 participants (57 women) from concerned ministries, donors, NGOs, international INGOs, and authorities from provinces, concerned provincial departments, district, and communes, as well as school principals, teachers, students, and parents. The conference reviewed the ongoing activities in view of sustainability of project actions in key government institutions and in the four project provinces. This initiative emerged as an example of a best practice that could be duplicated elsewhere. For future arrangements of similar nature, the participatory aspects of the conference or workshop could be enhanced, with small-group work and brainstorming sessions to generate new ideas.

7.1.3 Leveraging of Non-Project Resources

The project leveraged some resources, such as books and study materials. Also, some of the activities set up by the project generated additional resources. For example, three motorboats provided to help children living in floating communities in Pursat and Siem Reap get to and from school will be used during the tourist season for sightseeing. Local CLMCs/boat management committees control the income generated from this activity.

However, at this point, although the project is aligned with national education policies, NFE and CFS for example, there are no immediate possibilities of sustainable funding and/or expansion of project activities. Certain activities, such as the development of CFS, will continue through UNICEF and other donors' involvement. Other core project activities, such as the development of new CLMCs and identification of new beneficiaries, will slow down or stop altogether.

Four Core Project Services

1. **Education Support for Withdrawn Child Laborers Age 6 to 14.** This activity is theoretically a government activity that MOEYS should implement.
2. **Provision of NFE and Livelihood Skills for Withdrawn Children Age 15 to 17.** This component is also a part of the MOEYS agenda, in particular, its literacy component, and could be continued by the Department of NFE. Also, MOLVT has vocational training centers in every province that are capable of continuing the program; however, the centers are not involved in child labor preventing activities at this point. For both Activities 1 and 2, education support to reach child laborers would depend on schools' focused targeting to reach a particular group of vulnerable children.
3. **Education Support for At-Risk Children Age 6 to 14.** In principle, MOEYS should have funding for this activity through its Priority Action Program.
4. **Education Support for At-Risk Girls Age 12 to 14 Transitioning into Secondary School.** In principle, MOEYS should have funding for this activity through its Priority Action Program.

7.1.4 Sustainability of Auxiliary Services

Child Care Mothers. In some areas, the government is setting up preschools to take over this service. Since the CCMs received incentives from the project—5 months' salary of US\$20/month per person—for their services, the service itself is not likely to be sustainable.

Child Councils in Schools. In Cambodia, the Ministry of Education has promoted the establishment of child councils in primary schools and youth councils in secondary schools, so in theory, this is a government initiative that will be continued and expanded with MOEYS funding. Therefore, this service is likely to be not only sustainable but also expanded.

Child-Friendly Schools. Similar to the child councils, CFS is a MOEYS policy, which will be supported and expanded through government (and UNICEF) funding.

Child Youth Clubs. The members of CYCs seem enthusiastic to continue, and the evaluator believes that these clubs will be sustainable as long as they do not focus only on child labor-related issues but also on savings and other activities, perhaps including fun and play.

Remedial Classes. Sustainability of the remedial classes is questionable, because the project offered incentives for this service so that children did not have to pay for it. Cambodia has a long history of “shadow education”—teachers asking for payment to teach quasi-mandatory classes outside official school hours to compensate for the low government salaries, which are not sufficient to keep a family alive. Although this practice is prohibited, it still takes place. During the evaluation fieldwork, the evaluator found this practice to be more frequent at the secondary level and in urban areas. In rural areas, the population cannot pay for the service, and teachers discontinue it, instead gaining supplemental income from agriculture. The evaluator believes remedial classes will revert to for-fee classes or be discontinued in areas where the population cannot pay for them.

Young Agricultural Entrepreneurs and Skills Training. CEDAC is likely to continue implementing their model. However, in the project areas the intervention started in October 2010, very late in the project cycle, and the service merits continuation, perhaps organized as action research to test out the model.

7.1.5 Major Challenges and Successes in Initiating and Maintaining Partnerships

As noted above, the projects partnership with two associated NGOs, KAPE and Wathnakteap, has been generally successful and is important for the future sustainability of project actions. Both organizations indicated that they will continue implementing development projects in or close to project areas and will be available to provide occasional assistance to communities and/or project institutions (CLMCs, PCCLs, or others), as required.

7.1.6 Involvement of Local and National Government in the Project

National Sub-Committee on Child Labor. The sub-committee is in charge of coordinating child labor-related issues among administrative units and raising awareness. It has been working very closely with the CHES project. However, the sub-committee convenes only three to four times each year when financing is available for the meeting and/or when the project or ILO-IPEC is convening. According to key Winrock staff, the sub-committee needs a working group to follow up in between meetings. Such working group could facilitate more effective multisectoral work that the sub-committee is not able to coordinate as much as it should.

Ministry of Labor and Vocational Training. MOLVT and DOCL are involved in various aspects of the project, including training. MOLVT is also involved in awareness-raising and monitoring activities. These activities include participation in and screening of a TV spot developed by the project and input in the radio programs to provide technical assistance and ensure that the programs fulfill government technical requirements. However, there is no multisector approach within DOCL to address the issue of child labor. There is also a lack of integration of vocational training and child labor. For example, the provincial centers for vocational training are not used strategically as a means to combat WFCL. “The vocational training centers are controlled by a secretary of state. Winrock [CHES] cooperate with them in Prey Veng, but we need to pay for [their services].”

Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports. The project has had a good relationship with MOEYS, both at central and local levels. In particular, the project has cooperated with the Department of NFE to set up NFE literacy classes and re-entry programs. However, MOEYS and the Department of NFE are not much involved in child labor-related issues or in project activities.²⁰ An interviewee emphasized, “In terms of the cooperation, there is usually no invitation for us to participate in teacher training or in field activities. I never went to the field to see CHES activities. Usually we’re not receiving reports about field activities, but we were invited to a workshop.”

Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fishery. At the central level, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fishery was involved with the project in research on WFCL in agriculture. At local level, the Department of Agriculture was involved in training for parents and NFE beneficiaries in agriculture-related matters, such as pisciculture and chicken, earthworm, and vegetable farming.

7.1.7 Major Challenges and Opportunities Coordinating with the Host Country Government

In general, local and central government authorities were positive toward the project and found the cooperation satisfactory. The main challenge was the lack of funding at all government levels. Government staff often did not understand why projects funded NGOs and not government institutions. “Government staff indicates that why not give the money to the government. They criticize all [NGO] work, but this criticism also leads to better project

²⁰ The project coordinated with the Department of Primary Education late in the project to strengthen CFS in selected schools.

implementation.” U.S. interviewees emphasized that in the government, attitudes were changing toward WFCL but it still needed funding. “The attitude is changing: Cambodia listens to us, especially with regards to WFCL and trafficking. There is a willingness to address the issues. We need to support the government, and to provide funding. It’s a poor government—with low tax bases for income.”

7.1.8 Coordination with ILO-IPEC; Leveraging Links with ILO-IPEC to Enhance Sustainability

Coordination with ILO-IPEC was considerably strengthened after the project midterm. ILO has been involved in projects and research related to WFCL in Cambodia since 1995 and has gained good knowledge and a widespread contact net on this issue. According to ILO and project interviewees, the CHES project and the ILO-IPEC project developed a very good partnership and coordination. ILO-IPEC is working in 15 provinces in Cambodia, 2 of which overlapped with the CHES project. Coordination took place for key project activities, including the following:

- **Provincial Committees on Child Labor.** The two projects interacted, provided training, and ensured that the PCCLs functioned, which is positive for the sustainability of the PCCLs. So far, cooperation is especially present in Siem Reap.
- **National Steering Committee on Child Labor.** The CHES project funded the committee, and ILO-IPEC supported it through capacity building and technical support. This support will continue after the end of the CHES project.
- **World Day Against Child Labor.** The day was organized jointly by the CHES project and ILO-IPEC and was connected to International Children’s Day, becoming a 2-week event.
- **Common Child Labor Monitoring System.** As the project-specific monitoring systems were deemed too complex for use in normal circumstances, the CHES project and ILO-IPEC established a simplified child labor monitoring system that could be used more easily by the communities in Cambodia.
- **Resource Mobilization.** The project and ILO-IPEC cooperated on training in resource mobilization at the central, regional and local levels. ILO-IPEC hoped to organize a donor forum—staff worried that USDOL was the sole donor for child labor and that the funding would not be sufficient to meet pledged targets for 2016, the elimination of WFCL in Cambodia.
- **Education Policy.** The project and ILO-IPEC cooperated on the integration of child labor-related issues into the education policy. The CHES project financed research on this issue, and ILO-IPEC started a training program for the Ministry of Education on the topic at both central and decentralized levels. ILO-IPEC hoped the CHES project could join the program to cover agriculture-related issues.
- **Work with Commune Councils.** ILO-IPEC attempted to enhance interest in child labor-related issues and began to work with the commune councils through the Ministry of

Interior. At present, 34 of 1,200 communes have been selected as pilots, and all the CHES and ILO-IPEC target communes will be included in this selection.

- **Civil Society Network Against Child Labor Organization.** The CHES project was very active CSNACLO, and ILO-IPEC provided US\$40,000 in support.

Interviews with ILO-IPEC staff emphasized the positive collaboration between the two projects and the need to continue CHES activities:

The goal is to eliminate WFCL by 2016. There is a need for continuity; it is important to keep reminding the Government about WFCL. If Winrock withdraws, the process will slow down...Winrock and IPEC do not need to be there to work directly with the children; there is enough capacity in the country to do that. We should be working with those helping the children—and with the government...There is a need to shift gear—to go to scale and the presence [of Winrock/CHES] is vital.

Regarding the phasing out of the CHES project and leveraging links with ILO-IPEC to ensure sustainability, ILO-IPEC staff emphasized that they would continue to put pressure on the government to support the sustainability of CHES actions, but they also underlined that the CHES project's withdrawal was premature, a point which coincided with key CHES staff's evaluation of the project.

7.1.9 Working with International/Multilateral Organizations, NGOs and Community-Based Organizations

The CHES project had limited cooperation with organizations other than ILO-IPEC. The project shared a few common project areas with Plan International in Siem Reap, but did not have any organized cooperation with this NGO. The U.S. Embassy and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) had good, though limited, cooperation with the project. The Office for Education and Health at USAID provided initial guidance and helped in the start-up phase of the project. In the beginning, project activities were delayed because of misunderstandings and disagreement about the project's status within the government—in particular, cooperation with the Department of Labor and Vocational Training took time to establish—and USAID facilitated this process.

The project had limited cooperation with national NGOs and *community-based organizations*. The communication officer at Winrock is the president of CSNACLO, a civil society group created in 2006 with six participating organizations, including Health Care Center for Children, Winrock, World Education, and World Vision. The group was initiated by ILO-IPEC, which established a budget for the group and hired a full-time coordinator.

7.2 LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

Key project staff at Winrock emphasized the need for a long-term continued presence to ensure that social development in terms of child labor practices takes place. This point was re-emphasized in other interviews with experts in child labor who were unrelated to the project:

The concept of “project” is perhaps good for engineering, but not for social development. Projects for building a bridge may be possible; but it is not a word to be used for social development—there is a need for USDOL to understand that long-term commitment is needed. It takes a year to start a project—and 6 months to close it down; that’s nearly 2 years. You should not tamper with the lives of children for 12 months and say goodbye; it’s counterproductive. People don’t have faith in NGOs; [because] they come and go. They shouldn’t get engaged with child labor related issues in a country if they’re not prepared for sustained presence for 10 to 12 years: It would be a waste of resources and a disservice to the children.

The evaluator does not believe that the CHES project could be represented in any way as a “waste of resources and a disservice to children,” neither did the interviewee intend to suggest that the CHES project was ineffective. As another interviewee said, “4 years is better than 0 years.” However, the CHES project, similar to many other child labor project, invested heavily in establishing a presence, training personnel, and setting up project structures, such as monitoring and evaluation. The project used an inordinate amount of staff time to establish ties with the government at both local and central levels and used staff time to analyze and apprehend the child labor-related, political, and educational scene of the country. Much of this investment will be lost with the project’s withdrawal. The impact and legacy of the project, *to a certain degree*, will consist of social development and raised government awareness. However, as noted by many interviewees including government officials, continued pressure and presence is necessary to make the changes sustainable.

This page intentionally left blank.

VIII CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 CONCLUSION

The project strategies were robust and a good foundation for effective implementation. In particular, the project offered a wide variety of activities and services to address a complex situation of poverty and a lack of awareness of WFCL and the importance of education. Specifically, the project addressed two core barriers to education: poverty and the lack of education quality. The robust awareness-raising component of the project, which included mass media as well as one-to-one interaction, contributed to a change in social practice and brought awareness of the issue of child labor to project stakeholders and the wider community. The project's partnerships with local NGOs built capacity and helped ensure sustainability.

The project's strategies were focused on four core services—(1) Withdrawal (Primary), (2) Withdrawal (NFE), (3) Prevention, and (4) Support to Girls' Transition to Secondary School—as well as a number of auxiliary services, all of which have been effective and adequate. Some have been more successful than the others, and interviewees emphasized the effectiveness of Service 1 (Withdrawal), as well as CFS and the skills training for parents. However, the evaluator found that not all poor families accepted being part of income-generating programs, since they found them too time-consuming. A project staff member noted:

People need motivation to be part of the service[s]; they need to commit. It is a process; and they need to go through a “social assistance” phase. They're used to plan only for tomorrow—and they need to understand concepts of asset growth. This is a social development process and it takes time. Community-based Facilitators [CEDAC-trained] could be part of this process.

Processes of social development take time, and the project's 4-year timeframe was too short to maximize its impact on the stakeholders at various levels, including central policy levels.

Agriculture skills that encouraged beneficiaries to stay in their communities and at the same time improved their livelihoods were given for such a short duration that they were not adequately tested out. Not all training and programs worked best with at-risk and vulnerable children. Some skills training and activities should have focused on children who could be leaders in the field, for example, children in child councils, CYCs, and YAE programs. In addition to these local initiatives and activities, awareness raising through radio and other mass media was important, and contributed to a favorable setting for social and policy change. The impact of the project was visible at the community level, the institutional levels (both local and central), and the policy levels through research and development of *prakas*.

The project was cost-effective, and in general, the project's implementation was successful. For future projects, age and cost-effectiveness should be considered. Projects should consider which age groups are most vulnerable to WFCL and target project actions accordingly. Also, data collection systems should be as simple as possible to ensure that tracking is easy to perform. The lessons learned from this project and examples of good practices can be used in other projects working with the same sectors.

As a concluding remark, the evaluator would like to cite the project's assessment of its own impact:

Social development has indeed commenced, particularly around the issue of preventing child labor and promoting education. During its short presence in Cambodia, CHES has initiated important changes in current accepted norms about child labor particularly in agriculture. We have clearly identified what good changes and benefits should be sustained and during the project life, we have endeavored to create the capacities and positive climate for these to endure. We are ending with concrete steps to leave behind community-based child labor monitoring system, policies that will continue to call attention to the plight of hazardous child labor in agriculture; capacities and systems within the labor and education systems that will strengthen the promotion of education and elimination of child labor, and economic ventures that will reduce the family's need to depend on their children's labor.

8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The project offered a number of well-designed features and activities. However, during fieldwork, a number of recommendations emerged that may help the projects during its limited remaining time, may be useful for future projects, or may be useful for USDOL and/or other donors.

8.2.1 Relevance

Monitoring and Data Collection. The project's data collection procedures were not up to date.²¹ Although the procedures were simplified after the midterm evaluation, they were still very complex. For future projects, the evaluator recommends establishing the minimum data collection system that fulfills USDOL requirements, unless the data collection services are integrated into a research design.

Young Agriculture Entrepreneurs. Engaging the full community in the struggle against child labor may be difficult if the targets are the most illiterate and/or fragile in the community. For future projects, review target groups for YAE and make them leaders that can help the more fragile in the community.

8.2.2 Effectiveness

Action Research with CEDAC. CEDAC's intervention started in October 2010, and the evaluator saw some interesting results in the communities at the time of the evaluation. The evaluator recommends that the project seek financing from USDOL and/or other donors to continue CEDAC's work as action-research to understand and capitalize on lessons learned in agricultural training of parents and at-risk and/or withdrawn children. It is important for Winrock and USDOL to learn whether this type of intervention is effective in the fight against child labor.

²¹ The project noted that it would have helped if checking and verification procedures of data were consistently done in a timely manner especially at community and provincial levels before submission to the national level system.

Integration Child Labor into Education Policy. ILO-IPEC is currently planning a training session for education staff at local and central levels and seeks participation from the CHES project in this endeavor. If the remaining project budget allows such participation, the project should seek to support ILO-IPEC's training, covering subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing aspects and schooling for children in rural areas who are working in these sectors.²²

Civil Society Network Against Child Labor Organization. Despite ILO-IPEC's recent investment in this group and the appointment of a full-time coordinator, the group appears to be dormant. The evaluator recommends that the project seek ways to activate the network and discuss ways to clarify its mandate through discussions with ILO-IPEC. Also, the project's commitment to finance US\$8000 for CSNACLO activities should be clarified.

Policy Work and *Prakas*. The project has not yet succeeded in establishing *prakas* for WFCL in the sectors of subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing. The evaluator recommends that the project prioritize staff time and resources to push the adoption of *prakas* and other policies, as possible, by the end of the project. For USDOL, the evaluator recommends providing as much support as possible to meet this end, since it is a main outcome of the project and a waste of resources if this project target is not achieved.

Involving MOEYS and the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fishery Staff in Project Activities. MOEYS staff interviewed felt they were not sufficiently involved in project activities, and CHES staff also emphasized that the project should have established stronger partnerships with other government institutions. For future projects, the evaluator recommends establishing a clear cooperation plan, involving partners in field visits and monitoring, as necessary.

8.2.3 Efficiency (Cost-Effectiveness)

Cost-Effectiveness and Age Groups. The project addressed certain services to youth, who are allowed to access certain salaried employment in Cambodia. Also, some beneficiaries reached age 18 during training and were thereby allowed to access most legal employment. For future projects, the evaluator recommends more consideration to which age groups are most vulnerable to WFCL and targeting project actions accordingly.

Laboratory on Cost-Effectiveness. In view of its multiple interventions for various age groups and types of beneficiaries, the project can function as a "laboratory" on cost-effectiveness. The evaluator recommends that time and a portion of the budget be allocated for reflection on lessons learned from project in terms of the cost-effectiveness of its various interventions.

²² Winrock further proposed that the gaps and challenges in addressing interrelated policies between child labor and education be presented to the education staff and that the ILO-IPEC training package could use Winrock's policy research study on the subject as reference material.

8.2.4 Impact

National Sub-Committee on Child Labor. The sub-committee currently meets infrequently, and interviewees emphasized that it has not had the intended impact on the policy scene in Cambodia. Interviewees mentioned the need to create an executive working group within the sub-committee.²³ The evaluator recommends that the CHES project cooperate with ILO-IPEC to consider the feasibility of creating such working group.

Child Councils and CYCs. The children participating in these groups are very committed. However, the groups have been overly focused on child labor-related issues. To maximize their impact and to make them more sustainable, the evaluator recommends diversifying their mandate and introducing other concepts of development, including savings and microfinance, and/or games and fun in the functioning of the groups.

Child-Friendly Schools. The CFS component was not fully implemented. The evaluator recommends that the project continue the movement toward CFS as much as possible in the few months that remains of project implementation and/or that it contact other donors, such as UNICEF, to promote this component. Teacher training should address issues of teacher intimidation, verbal abuse, and corporal punishment.

8.2.5 Sustainability

Duration of Projects. The CHES project, like many other child labor projects, invested heavily in establishing a presence and ties with the government at both the local and central levels. A change in social practices among rural populations is slow and takes time. Much of the project investment will be lost with the project's withdrawal. The evaluator recommends that USDOL and/or other donors review policies in projects that are intended to produce social development, and consider a more long-term presence in the country.

²³ This idea was first proposed by Winrock at the ILO-IPEC midterm stakeholder workshop in February 2011. However, during a review of the final evaluation report in October 2011, it emerged that "NsC [National Sub-Committee] members feel that they are doing their best to perform their mandate, particularly in the area of policy work and coordination with development partners. They do not think a working group within the sub-committee is needed since DOCL already acts as a secretariat that coordinates the activities of the sub-Committee."

ANNEXES

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX A: QUESTION MATRIX FOR FIELDWORK

Question Matrix for the Independent Final Evaluation of Children's Empowerment Through Education Services (CHES): Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labor in Cambodia

Questions	Project & Supporting Documents	Children Family & Community	Teachers, Education Staff	Project Staff	Officials & Partners
Relevance					
Does the project design seem to be adequately supporting the five EI goals? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?		X	X	X	X
Have the project assumptions been accurate?	X			X	
What are the main project strategies/activities designed toward meeting objectives? What is the rationale behind using these strategies?	X			X	
What are the main obstacles or barriers to addressing child labor in the target area? Has the project been successful in addressing these obstacles?	X	X	X	X	X
Is the project design appropriate for the cultural, economic, and political context in which it works?		X	X	X	X
Has the project been affected by the prevalence of corruption in the country, and how has it dealt with this?				X	
How has the project fit within existing programs to combat child labor and trafficking, especially government initiatives?				X	X
Did the project adjust implementation and/or strategy-based on the findings and recommendations of the midterm evaluation?	X			X	
What other major design and/or implementation issues should be brought to the attention of DOL and Winrock?	X	X	X	X	X
How has the project been able to respond to the changing economic environment due to the recent economic crisis?	X	X	X	X	X
Effectiveness					
Has the project achieved its targets and objectives as stated in the project document? What factors contributed to the success and/or underachievement of each of the objectives?				X	
Assess the effectiveness of the "direct action" interventions (i.e., nonformal education, formal education and re-entry programs, Child-Friendly Schools, Child Youth Clubs, and the provision of formal school supplies and scholarship program).	X	X		X	
Have children who completed CHES programs returned to work? If so, in what occupations and activities? Specifically, have beneficiaries returned to the worst forms of child labor?	X			X	
Assess the effectiveness of the services in meeting the needs of the target population identified in the project document including children prevented and withdrawn from labor/trafficking.		X	X	X	X
Assess the effectiveness of the specific intervention models employed by the project (re-entry, Child-Friendly Schools, nonformal education, Child Care Mothers, Child Labor Monitoring Committees) on increasing educational opportunities, creating community ownership, increasing the capacity of communities, and increasing awareness/understanding of the dangers of child labor.		X	X	X	X

Questions	Project & Supporting Documents	Children Family & Community	Teachers, Education Staff	Project Staff	Officials & Partners
Has the project accurately identified and targeted children engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors identified in the project strategy (subsistence and commercial agriculture, including freshwater fishing)? In a larger sense, did they accurately identify the worst forms of child labor in the country?	X		X	X	X
Are there any sector specific lessons learned regarding the types and effectiveness of the services provided? Specifically comment on the ability to affect children working in subsistence agriculture, and whether this sector could be targeted in future USDOL programming.			X	X	X
What monitoring systems does the project use for tracking the work status of children? Is it feasible and effective? Why or why not?		X		X	
What are the management strengths, including technical and financial, of this project?				X	
What management areas, including technical and financial, need to be improved in order to promote success in meeting project objectives?				X	
Efficiency					
Is the project cost-efficient?	X			X	X
Were the project strategies efficient in terms of the financial and human resources used, as compared to its outputs? What alternatives are there?		X		X	X
Was the monitoring system designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project?			X	X	X
Impact					
What appears to be the project's impact to date on individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, etc.)?		X	X	X	X
Assess the impact, to the extent possible, of project activities on education quality. How has the education quality component been received by the provincial governments and the communities?		X	X		
What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on partners or other organizations working on child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, etc.)?				X	X
What appears to be the project's impact to date on government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labor issues?				X	X
What has been the impact of the four research studies on child labor in subsistence agriculture, fishing, tobacco, and cassava? Have efforts to recognize these sectors as hazardous been successful?		X	X	X	X
Sustainability					
Have an exit strategy and sustainability plan been integrated into the project design? Will it likely be effective?	X	X	X	X	X
Was the sustainability conference effective in encouraging sustainability of the project activities? Should this tactic be encouraged as a good practice?	X			X	X
How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustainable funding?				X	X
What have been the major challenges and successes in initiating and maintaining partnerships in support of the project, including with other USDOL-funded projects?				X	

Questions	Project & Supporting Documents	Children Family & Community	Teachers, Education Staff	Project Staff	Officials & Partners
What have been the major challenges and opportunities of initiating and maintaining coordination with the host country government, particularly the MOLVT, Ministry of Agriculture, and Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports, as well as other government agencies active in addressing issues related to children's labor and protection?				X	X
What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with international and/or multilateral organizations (including ILO-IPEC) and other NGOs involved in child labor issues?				X	
Will the Child Care Mothers, Child-Friendly Schools, Child Labor Monitoring Committees, Child Youth Clubs, other monitoring systems, and other committees/groups and systems created by the project be sustainable?				X	X
What lessons can be learned of the project's accomplishments and weaknesses in terms of sustainability of interventions? What additional steps need to be taken in order to promote the sustainability of project components?			X	X	X

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX B: FIELDWORK SCHEDULE

Draft Tentative Program for CHES Final Evaluation Schedule of Final Evaluation at National Level

Date/Time - Activities - Venue - Contact Point - Remarks

Monday, June 20, 2011

- 8:00–10:45 Meeting with Winrock team to review the CHES implementation, Winrock Office in Phnom Penh #48, St. 242, Sangkat Chak Tomuk, Khan Daun Penh, P.O. Box: 1201 Phnom Penh, Cambodia
- 11:00–12:00 Meeting with WP team to review the implementation of CHES, Wathnakpheap Office in Phnom Penh #187, St. 163, Toul Tum Pong II, Chamkarmorn, Phnom Penh, Cambodia PO Box: 90, Kingdom of Cambodia Tel: 855- 23 217 449, E-mail: director@wathnakpheap.org, Mrs. Heng Chanthon Executive Director
- 14:00–15:30 Meeting with ILO-IPEC, ILO Office in Phnom Penh P.P Center building B, 2nd floor, Tel: 855-23 220 817 Mr. MP Joseph Chief Technical Advisor ,Tel: 012 778 687
- 15:00–16:30 Meeting with Civil Society Network Against Child Labor (CSNACL) Office Address: #20, St 71, Sangkat Tonle Basac, Khan Chamkar Morn, Phnom Penh, Cambodia E-mail: Chantra_pen@wvi.org; Mr. Pen Chantra Executive Committee Member, Tel: 017 816 921
- 16:30–18:00 Meet with CHES staff individually Winrock Office in Phnom Penh

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

- 9:00–10:45 Meeting with DOCL and H.E Prak Chantha of MOLVT, MOLVT Office #3, Russian Federation Blvd, Toul Kok, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, Tel: 855-23 882 684 Mr. Veng Heang, Director of DOCL, Tel: 012 34 32 22
- 11:00–12:00 Meeting with UNICEF, UNICEF Office No. 11, Street 75, Sangkat Sraschak, P.O. Box 176, Phnom Penh, Kingdom of Cambodia Ms. Heang Neang, Assistant Project Offer Teacher Training
- 14:00–15:30 Meeting with U.S. Embassy and USAID, U.S. Embassy Office, No.1, St. 96, What Phnom, Phnom Penh, Cambodia, Tel: 855-23 728 000 Ms. Lisa Kalajian Political/Labor Officer
- 15:45–17:00 Meeting with NFE of MOEYS -NFE Department, MOEYS No.169, St. Norodom Blvd, Boeung keng Kang I, Chamkar Mon, Phnom Penh, Cambodia Tel: 855-23 219 258/ 362 334; Mr. Kuoch Kou Lom, Director, Tel: 011 213 592

Draft Tentative Program for CHES Final Evaluation Schedule of Final Evaluation at Sub-National Level From June 22 to July 03, 2011

Schedule of final Evaluation in Prey Veng Province From June 22 to 24, 2011

Wednesday, June 22, 2011

- 7:30–10:00 Travel to Prey Veng, WI
- 10:00–11:00 Meeting with KAPE/WI-PPC, KAPE Office Kg. Trabek, KAPE, Ms. Oun Rith

*Independent Final Evaluation of the
Children's Empowerment Through Education Services (CHES) Project*

- 11:00–12:00 Travel to Prey Veng, Prey Veng Town, KAPE/Evaluation Team
- 12:00–14:00 Lunch and Check in, Hotel-KAPE/Evaluation Team, Hotel La Lin
- 14:00–17:00 Meeting PCCL chairperson, PDOLVT and PDOEYS, Provincial Office of Labor and Vocational Training, WI/KAPE/Evaluation Team, Mr. Chea Tha, Tel: 012 930289

Thursday, June 23, 2011

- 7:00–09:00 Travel from Prey Veng to Banteay Chakrei commune, Ngaek Ngak village, Banteay Chakrei commune, Preah Sdach District, KAPE, Mr. Nou Sinath, Tel: 097 456 18 72
- 9:00–10:00 Meeting NFE graduated girls who are running tailor business, Ngaek Ngak village, Banteay Chakrei commune, Preah Sdach District. KAPE
- 10:00–11:30 Meeting livelihood parents raising fish, Earth worm and chicken, Bos Roluoy village, Banteay Chakrei commune, Preah Sdach District, CEDAC Uy Thea 017 200 801
- 11:30–13:30 Lunch
- 13:30–14:00 Meeting with CLMC from Banteay Chakrei commune, Banteay Chakrei commune's Hall KAPE, Mr. Nou Sinath 097 456 18 72
- 14:00–15:30 Meeting with school director, CFS teachers, students, and school administrators Bos Roluoy/Ampil primary school, Banteay Chakrei commune KAPE
- 15:30–17:00 Meeting district chief and technical staff of DOE, Preah Sdech district, KAPE
- 17:00–17:30 Travel back to Prey Veng town, Hotel, WI, Chea Tha 012 930 289

Friday, June 24, 2011

- 7:00–8:00 Travel from Prey Veng to Kampong Trabaek district, Kapong Trabaek district, CEDAC Uy Thea 017 200 801
- 8:00–9:00 Meeting Young Agriculture Entrepreneur (YAE), Prey Mnas village, Preah Chhor commune, Kapong Trabaek district, CEDAC
- 9:00–10:30 Meeting target family, community base facilitator (CBF) and saving group, Phnov village, Preah Chhor commune, Kapong Trabaek district, CEDAC Uy
- 10:30–11:30 Visit school or village based on evaluator choice (School or village?), WI/KAPE/Evaluation Team
- 11:30–13:00 Lunch at Prey Veng town, Prey Veng Town, WI/KAPE/Evaluation team
- 13:00–15:00 Travel from Prey Veng to Kampong Cham, WI/Evaluation team

**Schedule of Final Evaluation in Kampong Cham Province
From June 25 to 27, 2011**

Saturday, June 25, 2011

- 8:00–11:00 Meeting with KAPE staff, KAPE Office, Kampong Cham, KAPE staff
Mr. Nov Malis, Tel: (012) 599 093
- 11:00–12:00 Meeting with WI Provincial Coordinator Provincial Department of Labor, Mr. Kosal Chhoun
Mr. Kosal Chhoun, Tel: (012) 606 687
- 12:00–13:00 Lunch Break (Optional)

- 13:00–13:30 Travel from Kampong Cham to Chiro Commune, Driver
- 14:00–15:30 Meeting with CLMC Chirou Muoy Commune Office, WI/Evaluator team
Mr. Kosal Chhoun Tel: (012) 606 687
- 15:30–17:00 Visiting N.F.E on Chicken raising of NFE in Chiro Loeur village, Chiro Loeur village, WI/Evaluator team
- 17:00–17:40 Meeting with parents on chicken raising of in Roka Thom village, Roka Thom village, WI/Evaluator team

Sunday, June 26, 2011

- 7:30–8:30 Travel from Kampong Cham to Ponhea Krek, WI/Evaluator team, Driver
- 8:30–9:00 Meeting with CLMC in Bos Check village, Kraek Commune Office, WI/Evaluator team
Mr. Kosal Chhoun, Tel: (012) 606 687
- 9:00–9:30 Meeting with CYC in Bos Chek village, Bos Chek village, WI/Evaluator team
- 9:30–10:00 Visiting with N.F.E on chicken raising in Sa Am village, Sa Am village, WI/Evaluator team
- 10:30–12:00 Meeting with parents on chicken raising in Chi Tok village, Chi Tok village, WI/Evaluator team
- 12:30–13:30 Lunch Break (Optional)
- 13:30–14:30 Travel to Bos Lovea
- 14:30–15:30 To meet Child Council in Bos Lovea school, Bos Lovea school WI/Evaluator team
Mr. Kosal Chhoun Tel: (012) 606 687
- 15:30–16:00 Visit school or village based on evaluator choice (School or village?), WI/Evaluator team

Monday, June 27, 2011

- 8:30–10:30 Meeting with PCCL chairperson, PDOLVT and PDOEYS, PDOLVT Office
PCCL chairperson, director of PDOLVT and PDOEYS, Mr. Kosal Choun, Tel: (012) 606 687
- 10:30–11:40 Visit school or village based on evaluator choice (School or village?), WI/Evaluator team
- 12:00–13:30 Lunch Break (Optional)
- 14:30–16:00 Travel from Kampong Cham to Phnom Penh, WI/Evaluator team, Driver

**Schedule of Final Evaluation in Pursat Province
From June 28 to 30, 2011**

Tuesday, June 28, 2011

- 7:30–10:30 Departure from PNP to WP office in Krakor district, Pursat, Evaluator team, Driver
- 10:30–12:00 Meeting with WP staff, WP Office in Krakor district, Pursat, Evaluator team and WP PRM, WI PPC
Mrs. Yim Rina, Tel: 012 583 861
- 12:00–13:30 Lunch Break, Khla Khmom Restaurant, WI/Evaluator team
- 14:00–15:30 Visiting N.F.E children running business scarf weaving and barber, NFE residence in O' Sandan commune
O'Taprok village, WI/Evaluator team, Mrs. Yim Rina, Tel: 012 583 861
- 15:30–17:00 Meeting with CLMC, Don Chuo village, WI/Evaluator team

17:00–17:40 Departure from Don Chuo to Pursat town, WI/Evaluator team

Wednesday, June 29, 2011

7:30–8:30 Departure from Pursat town to Kanh Chor commune

8:30–9:00 Meeting with children who attend in Child-Friendly School and remediation classes, 7 Makara Primary School, Samrong village, WI/Evaluator team, Mrs. Yim Rina, Tel: 012 583 861

9:00–10:00 Meeting with parents who applied livelihood skills, 7 Makara primary school, WI/Evaluator team

10:00–11:30 Meeting with CYC who being running Community Extra Class, Kanh Chor village, WI/Evaluator team

11:30–12:30 Travel back to Pursat town

12:30–13:30 Lunch Break, Mlup Svay Restaurant, WI/Evaluator team

14:00–17:00 Visit school or village based on evaluator choice (School or village?)
Mrs. Yim Rina, Tel: 012 583 861

Thursday, June 30, 2011

8:30–10:30 Meeting with PCCL, PDOLVT Office, PCCL chairperson, PDOLVT and 2 PDOEYS
Mr. Yos Nara, Tel: 089 578 148

10:30–11:40 Interview with WI PPC, PDOLVT Office, Mr. Yos Nara, PPC

12:00–13:30 Lunch Break, Mlup Svay Restaurant, Evaluator team & WI

13:30–16:00 Visit school or village based on evaluator choice (School or village?), Evaluator team
Mrs. Yim Rina, Tel: 012 583 861

16:00–19:00 Travel from Pursat to Phnom Penh, Evaluator team

Schedule of Final Evaluation in Siem Reap Province From July 01 to 03, 2011

Friday, July 01, 2001

7:15–8:15 Fly from Phnom Penh to Siem Reap Siem Reap Airport WI/Evaluator team
Mr. Yos Nara, Tel: 089 578148

8:00–9:00 Travel from AirPort Administrative Office

9:30–10:30 Meeting with PCCL member, Provincial office, PCCL chairperson, PDOLVT and 2 PDOEYS,
Yos Nara, Tel: 089 578 148

10:45–11:00 Interview WP staff, WP Office, Field staff and PM

11:00–12:00 Interview WI PPC, WP office, WI PPC

12:00–13:30 Lunch Time, at River Side Restaurant, Siem Reap town

13:30–14:15 Travel from Siem Reap to Floating community, WI/Evaluator team

14:15–15:30 Meeting with children who attend Child-Friendly School, Chong Khnies Primary School, Chong Knies
WI/Evaluator team, Mr. Heng Sokkhy, Tel: 017 676979

- 15:30–16:15 Travel to floating village, On the boat, Evaluator team
- 16:15–17:00 Meeting with Boat Management Committee (BMC) On the boat, WI/Evaluator team
- 17:00–17:30 Travel back Siem Reap, WI/Evaluator team

Saturday, July 02, 2011

- 7:30–9:00 Travel from Siem Reap to Prey Chhkar village, Pongro Leu commune
Mr. Heng Sokkhy, Tel: 017 676979
- 9:00–9:30 Meeting with Child and Youth Club members, Prey Chhar Primary School, WI/Evaluator team
- 9:30–10:15 Meeting with Child Labor Monitoring Committee, Prey Chhar Primary School, WI/Evaluator team
- 10:15–11:45 Visiting one NFE student who trained on Chicken Raising, Prey Chhar village, WI/Evaluator team
- 11:45–12:30 Travel from Prey Chhar village to Khav commune, Prey Chhar village
- 12:30–13:45 Lunch at Khav Restaurant
- 13:30–15:00 Meeting with Re-entry children, at Risk Children who attend CFS, Kvav Primary School, Kvav village
Evaluator team, school teachers and children, Mr. Heng Sokkhy, Tel: 017 676979
- 15:00–15:15 Travel from Khav village to Ou village
- 15:15–16:00 Visit NFE and parents who started mushroom growing, Ou village, O village
- 16:00–17:30 Travel back to Siem Reap

Sunday, July 03, 2011

- 7:30–8:30 Travel from Siem Reap to Baval village, Tayaek commune
- 8:30–9:30 Visit Child-Friendly School; Re-entry, at risk Children and meeting with CFS teachers, Baval Primary School
Evaluator team, school teachers and children, Mr. Heng Sokkhy, Tel: 017 676979
- 9:30–10:30 Meeting with CLMC, Baval village, Evaluator team, CLMC members and adviser
- 10:30–11:30 Visit NFE who started activity of chicken raising and mushroom growing, Baval village, Evaluation team
NFE children and parents
- 11:30–12:30 Travel back to Siem Reap
- 12:30–13:30 Lunch at River Side Restaurant
- 17:20–18:20 Fly back to Phnom Penh, Siem Reap Airport, Evaluator Team

Monday, July 04, 2011 (National Stakeholder Workshop)

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX C: PHOTOS



**1. Sewing Workshop
(Setup Subsequent to Skills Training)**



2. Skills Training in Mushroom Production



3. Chicken Raising and Egg Production



4. Earthworm Production



5. Weaving



6. Agriculture Training by CEDAC



**7. CHES Beneficiaries
in the Library of a Child-Friendly School**



**8. Child-Friendly School
Note the filtered water and the boy with armband
and CHES tee shirt; he is a Child Council member**



**9. Child Youth Club Member
Offering Remedial Classes**



10. Classroom in a Floating School



**11. CLMC Members/Members of
Boat Management Committee Following Up on
Children in Floating Communities**



**12. CHES Provided Three Boats for
Transport of Children to and from School
in the Floating Communities**



13. During the Evaluation, Drawings Were Used to Establish Communication with Children



14. Happy at School and at Work...



15. Balanced Afterschool Activities—
Looking after Cattle, Cutting Wood and Reading



16. Drawings by Children in a Floating School



17. Most Drawings Indicated Work-related Situations at Home as well as Happiness at School



18. Some Also Showed Labor-Related Situations and/or Unhappiness at School

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX D: PRESENTATION AT STAKEHOLDERS' MEETING

CHES Project Cambodia
Final Evaluation 18.06–02.07.2011
Bjorn H. Nordtveit

Overview of Presentation

- Objectives of evaluation
- Findings
- Design (relevance)
- Implementation (effectiveness)
- Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)
- Impact
- Sustainability
- Q&A

Objectives of the Evaluation

- Assess whether the project has met its objectives and identify the challenges encountered
- Assess the relevance of the project in its cultural, economic, and political context
- Assess the intended and unintended outcomes and impacts
- Provide lessons learned from the project design and experiences in implementation
- Assess whether project activities can be deemed sustainable.

I: Project Design

Relevance

Design Strengths

- Consultation with stakeholders during the design phase
- Multi-faceted approach attacking the problem of child labor from many angles
 - Service 1: Withdrawal and re-entry program
 - Service 2: NFE and skills training
 - Service 3: Prevention through scholarship program
 - Service 4: Help to vulnerable girls to continue schooling at lower secondary level
- Innovative auxiliary services
- Institutional setup
- CLMC, PCCL, coordination with local NGOs
- Child Care Mothers (CCM)
 - Take care of the youngest while their siblings attend school

- Child Youth Clubs (CYC)
 - Awareness raising and savings
 - Remedial classes
 - Help ensure success in school
- Radio and mass media dissemination
- Generate public awareness and interest about child labor
- Research and policy work

Project Design: Challenges

- Age gap in service provision
- Project doesn't cover those dropped out for more than a year (unless they can be re-enrolled in primary 1st or 2nd year) until they are 15 and can enroll in NFE
- Focus on education quality and livelihoods could have been strengthened
- These are two main barriers to education
- Limitations in implementation of Child-Friendly Schools (CFS)
- Not all parents receive livelihoods training (the service is targeted at households with children receiving Services 1 and 2)
- But generally, a good design

II: Effectiveness

Project Implementation

Implementation Strengths

- Project supports all the EI goals (awareness, education, policy, research, sustainability)
- Educational services are provided to all direct beneficiaries
- Cooperation with CEDAC to provide livelihood skills training to parents and beneficiaries
- Good targeting of beneficiaries
- Good performance of the local Child Labor Monitoring Committees (CLMC)
- Substantial achievements
- Training, awareness raising, mass media dissemination, policy work

Implementation: Limitations

- CLMCs follow-up of the individual child's work status is sometimes still limited
- Successful restructuring of certain CLMCs in 2010
- Some issues with monitoring tools
- A number of drop-outs are not indicated
- Limited activities in the creation of CFS

- Piloted in two target schools per commune and limited to Child-Friendly Classrooms (2 per school)
- Limited service provision (only 2 dimensions of 7 are provided)

Service 1: Re-entry

- Some beneficiaries drop-out due to poverty
- Large regional disparities
- In some areas, CLMCs continue follow-up beyond the 2 years of service provision (and required follow-up)
- Good skills training to parents by CEDAC
- May substitute for lost earnings from children's work
- However, not all parents benefit from this service
- The most vulnerable identified
- Most beneficiaries say "they work less than before"
- Knowledge and awareness to child labor and WFCL of most parents and children

Service 2: NFE

- Success in helping children gain access to skills, especially in agriculture
- Program of Young Agricultural Entrepreneurs (YAE)
- Generally, good performance of CEDAC and the Community-Based Facilitators (CBF)
- Generally varied and adequate skills
- In some cases there is little market opportunities for the skills learned (e.g., sewing)
- This component does not withdraw children from labor, but in many cases gives more varied and age-appropriate work opportunities

Service 3: Scholarships

- Service seems to reach target group of vulnerable children
- No visible problems with jealousy from classmates
- Service often not sufficient to significantly lower the workload of the beneficiaries
- The school materials and follow-up are "encouraging" children to stay in school
- Absenteeism seems to be lower than among non-supported children

Service 4: Girls' Transition to Secondary

- The services offered are not always sufficient to keep children in school
- Frequent drop-out of the poorest children to seek work
- The oldest can gain access to work in the formal and/ or nonformal sector
- Some are dropping out because they receive employment—or they leave for Phnom Penh to work in garment factories

- The beneficiaries often have to pay for schooling
- Frequently they are requested to take extra classes for a fee and/or to pay for exam papers

III. Efficiency

Cost Effectiveness

Aims of the Project

- Importance of education quality and livelihood skills
- These components were implemented late in the project cycle
- Certain services may lack cost effectiveness
- Some girls in Service 4 already have a bicycle or they are living very close to school
- Some children, after attending literacy and skills training, return to their former employment
- 16- or 17-year-old beneficiaries are eligible for employment in some sectors and will be eligible for all work soon after the project's end

Mean Enrollment Age

- The services address various age groups
 - Service 1 (Withdrawal): 11.42
 - Service 2 (NFE): 15.21
 - Service 3 (Prevention): 11.32
 - Service 4 (Girls' Transition): 14.01
- Earlier intervention further decreases adverse effects from child labor
- The younger children arguably represent higher cost effectiveness since they will be out of CL and/or WFCL for a longer time
- At 15, children are allowed to do acceptable work by law

Alternatives

- Direct implementation by Winrock
 - Would not have supported local civil society
- Emphasis on school quality and livelihoods skills
 - Would not have gained important lessons in the other fields of intervention
- Focus on different age groups
- Intervention in policy domain or service delivery only
 - Would have strengthen one domain and not the other
- Conclusion: The project represents a balanced approach that could be improved after lessons learned

IV: Impact

WFCL in Agriculture and Fishing Sectors

- Not a permanent issue, i.e., most children are not employed in WFCL constantly
- After receiving project services, some children are permanently withdrawn from WFCL
- Others return to WFCL occasionally, e.g., they are working very long hours during certain seasons
- Generally, the project has raised awareness about the sector
- “We’re getting old, and our children are growing strong—who else can we ask to work to support us?”

Community Level

- Creation of CLMCs
- Better performances after the reorganization that took place after midterm
- Most children are still working before and after school, during weekends and holidays
- It is difficult to assess whether the work should be classified as child work, child labor, or WFCL
- The communities have been sensitized about WFCL
- CYCs are sensitizing and follow-up on children’s schooling—and also involved in savings schemes

School Level

- Creation of Child-Friendly Schools (CFS)
- However, limitation to two classrooms per school
- Training of some teachers (literacy teachers, re-entry teachers, CFS teachers, and CLMC members who are teachers)
- However some schools still informally request fee payments
- Especially for examination fees and extra classes
- Frequent use of corporal punishment, sometimes even in CFS
- Contract teachers are paid infrequently (often yearly) and often have very low instruction level

Provincial and Central Level

- Support to research and development of *Prakas*
- Including research policy on linkages between child labor and education
- Training by MOLVT to members of PCCL
- Include members from civil society
- District-level training of CLMC advisers by DOCL, MOLVT and PDOLVT

- Commune police, teachers, or village chiefs
- Government's role and involvement in project have been much improved since the midterm

V: Sustainability

New Strengths

- Forum on sustainability generated new directions and ideas
- A real effort on planning the project exit since midterm
- CLMCs included in commune development plans
- Some CLMCs have received budget from commune investment fund to continue functioning
- Radio program component seeks private sponsorships
- Continued intervention from local NGOs associated with the project

Conclusions

- Important lessons learned, which should be capitalized on
- In view of the targets for 2015 and 2016, untimely end of project activities
- No other interventions in the field of subsistence agriculture
- Good and necessary partnership with ILO-IPEC
- Possibility to continue CEDAC interventions as action research for a period extending beyond the project's life time?
- In general—a good project—with many good interventions, some of which started late in the project cycle

Q&A

Thank you

Bjorn H. Nordtveit

bjorn@hku.hk; bjorn@educ.umass.edu

Group Work

1. Lessons learned from project—which are the major ones and how to capitalize on them? Strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the project.
2. Pros and cons of sustainability plan. Is there any way to improve the likelihood of sustainability of the various levels of project intervention?
3. How to reduce child labor in the communities, and how to monitor the children's work? Discuss the future role of CLMCs after the project's end.
4. Do community data collection and statistics have a role beyond the project? How? Why?
5. Strategies to continue building parents' skills (action-research with CEDAC? Other ways?)
6. Strategies to continue improving schools: how to ensure continuous growth of CFS? How to make the curriculum more relevant to the local population?

ANNEX E: STAKEHOLDERS' COMMENTS TO THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE EVALUATION

Page 51, Paragraph 151 Monitoring and Data Collection

Agree. Future child labor projects will be guided by a national child labor monitoring system being introduced by WI and ILO-IPEC to government, principally the Department of Child Labor. This system will cover three levels of monitoring: work place, school and community monitoring, using simple data collection tools and process. DOCL is the lead agency that will implement the new child labor monitoring system.

Page 51, Paragraph 152, Young Agriculture Entrepreneurs

Agree. This is basically the intention of the project too. The stakeholders added that in the future, the CLMCs and local Associates should be responsible in selecting qualified YAEs. They can also help in training these young leaders as role models for other youth in agricultural communities.

Page 51, Paragraph 153, Action Research with CEDAC

Agree. The stakeholders added that Winrock International and CEDAC together with the commune councils can seek funding from USDOL. They also said that it is essential to integrate this model into the commune investment plan for another 2 to 3 years.

Winrock did inquire from USDOL about the possibility of extending this intervention but was told that resources are not available to pursue this proposal.

Page 51, Paragraph 154, Integration Child Labor into Education Policy

Agree. In principle, WI has agreed to support the training technically by sharing its training module for child-friendly schools. The module has in fact been expanded to include mainstreaming of child labor into teachers' lesson plans.

WI has yet to hear from ILO-IPEC about the progress of its training activities for education staff at local and central levels.

Page 51, Paragraph 155, The Civil Society Network Against Child Labor Organization

Agree. A major activity was done in August to reactivate the Network. Winrock is also in discussion with ILO-IPEC for supporting a major capacity building activity in October to improve the Network's organizational functioning. WI has clarified the purpose of its commitment amounting to US\$8,000. Part of this amount has already been expended and a plan agreed for fully utilizing this amount this year.

Page 52, Paragraph 156, Policy Work (*Prakas*)

Agree. WI has incorporated activities leading to the finalization, endorsement, approval and dissemination of the 4 *prakas* before the completion of CHES. To date, the National Sub-Committee on Child Labor has endorsed the 4 *prakas* and work is underway to get it approved by the Minister of Labor and Vocational Training.

Page 52, Paragraph 158, Cost-Effectiveness and Age Groups

Agree. Stakeholders suggested targeting the 12 to 17 age group as most vulnerable to WFCL and should be provided vocational skills training. A multisectoral group composed of labor, education, commune councils, social affairs, planning ministries and NGOs should be involved in identifying project actions for this age group.

Page 52, Paragraph 160, National Sub-Committee on Child Labor

Disagree. NsC members feel that they are doing their best to perform their mandate, particularly in the area of policy work and coordination with development partners.

They do not think a working group within the Sub-Committee is needed since DOCL already acts as a secretariat that coordinates the activities of the Sub-Committee.

Page 52, Paragraph 161, Child Councils and CYC

Agree. Actions have already been taken prior to this recommendation. CYC and CC have a functioning savings scheme and are incorporating fun activities in their group.

Page 52, Paragraph 162, Child-Friendly Schools

Agree. CHES has prioritized full implementation of its support to CFS schools, focusing on mainstreaming of child labor into teachers' lesson plans. The Education Offices added that they need to strengthen their collaborative work with partners and continue their resource mobilization to sustain the CFS system.

ANNEX F: TERMS OF REFERENCES

Terms of Reference for the Independent Final Evaluation of Children’s Empowerment Through Education Services (CHES): Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labor in Cambodia

Cooperative Agreement Number:	IL-16567-07-75-K
Financing Agency:	U.S. Department of Labor
Grantee Organization:	Winrock International
Dates of Project Implementation:	September 30, 2007–September 30, 2011
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Final Evaluation
Evaluation Field Work Dates:	June 20–July 4, 2011
Preparation Date of TOR:	June 13, 2011
Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:	FY 2007: US\$3,999,938 FY 2008: US\$25,625 Matching Funds: US\$442,250
Vendor for Evaluation Contract:	ICF Macro, Headquarters 11785 Beltsville Drive Calverton, MD 20705 Tel: (301) 572-0200 Fax: (301) 572-0999

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). OCFT activities include research on international child labor; supporting U.S. Government policy on international child labor; administering and overseeing cooperative agreements with organizations working to eliminate child labor around the world; and raising awareness about child labor issues.

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over US\$780 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 80 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor as defined by ILO Convention 182. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Reducing exploitative child labor, especially the worst forms through the provision of direct educational services and by addressing root causes of child labor, including innovative strategies to promote sustainable livelihoods of target households.

2. Strengthening policies on child labor, education, and sustainable livelihoods, and the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, address its root causes, and promote formal, nonformal and vocational education opportunities to provide children with alternatives to child labor.
3. Raising awareness of exploitative child labor and its root causes, and the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures.
4. Supporting research, evaluation, and the collection of reliable data on child labor, its root causes, and effective strategies, including educational and vocational alternatives, microfinance and other income generating activities to improve household income.
5. Ensuring the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

The approach of USDOL child labor elimination projects—decreasing the prevalence of exploitive child labor through increased access to education and improving the livelihoods of vulnerable families—is intended to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at-risk of entering exploitive labor.

In FY2010, Congress provided new authority to ILAB to expand activities related to income generating activities, including microfinance, to help projects expand income generation and address poverty more effectively. The funds available to ILAB may be used to administer or operate international labor activities, bilateral and multilateral technical assistance, and microfinance programs, by or through contracts, grants, sub grants and other arrangements.

In the appropriations to USDOL for international child labor technical cooperation, the U.S. Congress directed the majority of the funds to support the two following programs.²⁴

1. International Labour Organization's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC)

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated some US\$450 million to support the International Labor Organization's International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC), making the U.S. Government the leading donor to the program. USDOL-funded ILO-IPEC projects to combat child labor generally fall into one of several categories: comprehensive, national Timebound Programs (TBP) to eliminate the worst forms of child labor in a set time frame; less comprehensive Country Programs; sector-specific projects; data collection and research projects; and international awareness raising projects. In general, most projects include "direct action" components that are interventions to remove or prevent children from involvement in exploitative and hazardous work. One of the major strategies used by IPEC projects is to increase children's access to and participation in formal and nonformal education. Most IPEC projects also have a capacity-building component to assist in building a strong enabling environment for the long-term elimination of exploitive child labor.

²⁴ In 2007, the U.S. Congress did not direct USDOL's appropriations for child labor elimination projects to either of these two programs. That year, USDOL allocated US\$60 million for child labor elimination projects through a competitive process.

2. Child Labor Education Initiative

Since 2001, the U.S. Congress has provided some US\$269 million to USDOL to support the Child Labor Education Initiative (EI), which focuses on the elimination of the worst forms of child labor through the provision of education opportunities. These projects are being implemented by a wide range of international and non-governmental organizations as well as for-profit firms. USDOL typically awards EI cooperative agreements through a competitive bid process.

EI projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with a high incidence of child labor are withdrawn and integrated into educational settings, and that they persist in their education once enrolled. In parallel, the program seeks to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor. The EI is based on the notion that the elimination of exploitative child labor depends, to a large extent, on improving access to, quality of, and relevance of education. Without improving educational quality and relevance, children withdrawn/prevented from child labor may not have viable alternatives and could resort to other forms of hazardous work. EI projects may focus on providing educational services to children removed from specific sectors of work and/or a specific region(s) or support a national Timebound Program that aims to eliminate the worst forms of child labor in multiple sectors of work specific to a given country.

Other Initiatives

Finally, USDOL has supported US\$2.5 million for awareness-raising and research activities not associated with the ILO-IPEC program or the EI.

Project Context

Children in Cambodia are exploited in the worst forms of child labor. Many children work in agriculture, including on rubber plantations; this work commonly involves harmful activities, such as use of potentially dangerous machinery and tools, carrying of heavy loads, and the application of harmful pesticides. Children also work in freshwater fishing, shrimp processing and salt production. In the salt fields, children carry heavy loads, work long hours in the sun, and suffer from cuts on their feet from the salt crystals. Children in Cambodia also work in other harmful sectors, such as portering, street vending, domestic work, brick making, rubbish picking, handicraft making, and scavenging.²⁵

USDOL has supported numerous initiatives in Cambodia, having devoted over US\$17.5 million since 2001 to combat child labor in the country alone.²⁶ In addition to the current project, USDOL funds a US\$4.3 million project implemented by ILO-IPEC to develop national capacity to end the worst forms of child labor. This project targets 7,200 children for withdrawal and 3,800 for prevention from the worst forms of child labor in 15 provinces and includes trafficking, work in brick making, salt production, fisheries, and working as porters.²⁷

²⁵ USDOL. 2009 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor. *Cambodia Country Profile*. p. 111.

²⁶ USDOL. *Project Status—Asia*. Retrieved from <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/projects/asia/project-asia.htm>.

²⁷ USDOL. 2009 Findings. p. 114.

USDOL-Funded Projects in Cambodia

Years	Grantee	Project	Amount
2001–2004	ILO-IPEC	Sector Program: Fish/Shrimp Processing, Rubber Plantations, Salt Production	\$999,310
2003–2007	World Education	Education Initiative: Trafficking and Commercial Sexual Exploitation	\$3,000,000
2004–2007	Hagar International	Expanding Economic Activity	\$500,000
2004–2009	ILO-IPEC	Timebound: Domestic Work, Porters, Fishing, and Production of Brick, Salt, and Rubber	\$4,750,000
2007–2011	Winrock International	Children's Empowerment Through Education Services: Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labor in Cambodia	\$4,025,563
2008–2012	ILO-IPEC	Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labor	\$4,310,000
Total Cambodia			\$17,584,873

The Government of Cambodia has ratified ILO Conventions 138 and 182. The minimum age of employment is 15, and youth under 18 are prohibited from work that is hazardous to their health, safety, and moral development, according to a 2004 declaration issued by the Ministry of Labor and Vocational Training (MOLVT). The declaration lists 38 types of hazardous work, which includes working with certain types of machinery or tools, and some fishing activities. However, there are exceptions to the hazardous labor prohibition, and it does not protect children working in family businesses, including agricultural activities. The law also does not provide for a minimum age for compulsory education. The MOLVT and Provincial Labor departments are responsible for enforcing the child-related provisions of the Cambodian Labor Law, and while the number of inspectors is insufficient for the scope of the child labor problem, Winrock International and ILO-IPEC have provided training to inspectors and other partners through their USDOL-funded programs.²⁸

In 2008, the Government of Cambodia approved the National Plan of Action on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor 2008-2012 (NPA-WFCL). It aims to reduce the percentage of children ages 5 to 17 in Cambodia who are working from 13 percent in 2005 to 8 percent by 2015, and to eradicate the worst forms of child labor by 2016. The issue of child labor has also been incorporated into other key development policy strategies, including the Millennium Development Goals for Cambodia, by the Government. The Cambodian National Council for Children (CNCC) and its subcommittee for child labor are the main monitoring institutions at the national level on child labor issues. The CNCC subcommittee on child labor includes all concerned ministries, businesses, trade unions, and NGOs and coordinates projects and programs with national policy on child labor. Coordination also occurs at the provincial level through the Provincial Committees on Protection of Child Rights and Provincial Committees on Child Labor.²⁹

²⁸ Ibid. p. 111–112.

²⁹ Ibid. p. 112–113.

Children's Empowerment through Education Services (CHES): Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labor in Cambodia

On September 30, 2007, Winrock International received a 4-year Cooperative Agreement worth US\$3,999,938 from USDOL to implement an EI project in Cambodia, aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitive child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the five goals of the USDOL project as outlined above. In FY 2008, an additional US\$25,625 was awarded to fund research on hazardous child labor in freshwater fishing in three provinces. The project has also contributed its own matching funds of US\$442,250. Winrock International was awarded the project through a competitive bid process. As stipulated in the Cooperative Agreement, the project targets 3,750 children for withdrawal and 4,500 children for prevention from hazardous work in subsistence and commercial agriculture, including fresh water fishing. The project targets 150 villages in the provinces of Siem Reap, Pursat, Kampong Cham, and Prey Veng.

The project's goal is to reduce the number of children engaged in exploitive child labor in subsistence and commercial agriculture in Cambodia. Intermediate objectives that support the main goals include improving access and quality of education for working and at risk children in target areas; engaging communities, civil society and local governments in promoting education and eradicating child labor; strengthening national institutions and policies to effectively address the issues of child labor and education; and ensuring the sustainability of project activities and benefits to the primary stakeholders.

CHES has been an integrated multi-targeted approach to tackle the issue of child labor at various levels in Cambodia. It is supported not just through educational interventions but also institutional capacity building to address policy and practical concerns *vis-à-vis* child labor and awareness raising at the level of district officials as well as at the local level for parents and community leaders. Some of the initiatives supporting CHES have been the following: (Child-Friendly School) CFS policy framework and other initiatives to train officials and sensitize them toward child labor issues. CHES was tasked with strengthening the capacities of Child Labor Monitoring Committees (CLMCs), Child Youth Clubs (CYC), families and local leaders through trainings, awareness raising.

Other activities undertaken have been toward improving the capacity of key individuals and institutions, such as the Department of Child Labor and Provincial Department of Labor and Vocational Training, to combat child labor and provide quality education through innovative policy measures; implementing a community awareness program to provide information on the distinction between child work and exploitive child labor in subsistence agriculture and freshwater fishing; conducting participatory research on the causes and extent of child labor in subsistence agriculture, tobacco and cassava farming, and fishing; establishing or strengthening CLMCs in 150 villages to monitor child labor at the local level; and offering life skills and other programs, classes and services to targeted children, their parents and members of the community.

CHES is very unique in that it specifically addresses child labor issues in the floating villages where the schools are located. This poses unique challenges in terms of program implementation and monitoring and getting the buy in of parents and community leaders to promote the message of prevention and eradication of child labor.

Midterm Evaluation

A midterm evaluation was conducted in December 2009 by Bjorn Nordtveit, an independent international consultant. The evaluation consisted of document review; individual and group interviews with project staff, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders; site visits (observation) in Phnom Penh, Prey Veng, Pursat, and Siem Reap; a stakeholder workshop; and the use of photographic evidence.

The evaluation found that the project's design was generally good, and the combined actions of the project, including CCM, skills training for parents, establishment of Child-Friendly Schools (CFSs), and withdrawal and prevention of the beneficiary children from the WFCL, constitute a wide-ranging set of interventions that are responding to community needs. In terms of policy formulation, the project responds to a knowledge gap in Cambodia, with regard to the forms of labor which are considered hazardous by the MOLVT 2004 decree. Good practices identified include the project's work with the subsistence agriculture and fishing sectors and the follow-up and awareness-raising activities conducted by Child Labor Monitoring Committees (CLMCs) and associate staff in the communities. The project experienced some delays in start-up and the need to change an associate organization after its first year of operation. Despite the delays, the project was on track to meet its targets at midterm.

The main recommendations from the midterm evaluation were as follows:

- That the project monitor the economic situation closely, and if necessary readjust its focus to better cope with new government policies, such as the possible discontinuation of contract teachers.
- That the project address the needs of children who have dropped out below third grade and those who have been out of school for more than one year.
- To further investigate the adequacy of the skills training for parents.
- To engage in a round of exchange and field visits with International Labour Organization—International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour, if possible with government staff.
- To further investigate whether target beneficiaries' work falls within WFCL (based on the project's emerging definitions of WFCL in subsistence agriculture).
- To improve and simplify the processes of collection and processing of project data.
- To seek ways to reactivate the work of the Civil Society Network Against Child Labor.
- That the project consider various means to provide the children from floating villages with additional catch-up classes, maybe using the model of the re-entry classes.

- That the project design concrete plans to transfer the ownership of activities to project stakeholders at all levels: community, schools, district, province, and central-level government and civil society instances.
- That the project consider expanding skills training to all students (not only direct beneficiaries), through experimental gardens and fishponds, and that it set up teacher training and more experimental classes in CFSs.
- That the project consider its sustainability and exit plan(s) and make them as concrete as possible.
- That the project investigate the possibility of connecting services and institutions (such as CCM, CLMC, CYC) to economic interest groups or that it assist the transformation of these institutions into for-profit groups (e.g., women's or youth savings and for-profit associations).

II PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

OCFT-funded projects are subject to midterm and final evaluations. The field work for final evaluations is generally scheduled three months before the end of the project. The CHES project in Cambodia went into implementation in September 2007 and is due for final evaluation in 2011.

Scope of Evaluation

The scope of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with Winrock International. All activities that have been implemented from project launch through time of evaluation fieldwork should be considered. The evaluation should assess the achievements of the project in reaching its targets and objectives as outlined in the cooperative agreement and project document.

The evaluation should address issues of project design, implementation, management, lessons learned, replicability and provide recommendations for current and future projects. The questions to be addressed in the evaluation (provided below) are organized to provide an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and (to the extent possible) impact on the target population.

Final Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the final evaluation is to—

1. Assess whether the project has met its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so.
2. Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL.

3. Assess the intended and unintended outcomes and impacts of the project.
4. Provide lessons learned from the project design and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future child labor projects in the country and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors.
5. Assess whether project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national level and among implementing organizations.

The evaluation should also provide documented lessons learned, good practices, and models of intervention that will serve to inform future child labor projects and policies in Cambodia and elsewhere, as appropriate. It will also serve as an important accountability function for USDOL and Winrock International. Recommendations should focus around lessons learned and good practices from which future projects can glean when developing their strategies toward combating exploitive child labor.

Intended Users

This final evaluation should provide USDOL, Winrock International, other project specific stakeholders, and stakeholders working to combat child labor more broadly, an assessment of the project's experience in implementation and its impact on project beneficiaries. Lessons learned and good practices should be used by stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future child labor projects in the country and elsewhere as appropriate. The final 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

Specific questions that the evaluation should seek to answer are found below, according to five categories of issue. Evaluators may add, remove, or shift evaluation questions, but the final list will be subject to approval by USDOL and ICF Macro.

Relevance

The evaluation should consider the relevance of the project to the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL. Specifically, it should address the following questions:

1. Does the project design seem to be adequately supporting the five USDOL goals, as specified above? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?
2. Have the project assumptions been accurate?
3. What are the main project strategies/activities designed toward meeting objectives in withdrawing/preventing children from WFCL? What is the rationale behind using these strategies?

4. What are the main obstacles or barriers that the project has identified as important to addressing child labor in this country (i.e., poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education)? Has the project been successful in addressing these obstacles?
5. Is the project design appropriate for the cultural, economic, and political context in which it works? Specifically, has the project been affected by the prevalence of corruption in the country, and how has it dealt with this?
6. How has the project fit within existing programs to combat child labor and trafficking, especially government initiatives?
7. Did the project adjust implementation and/or strategy based on the findings and recommendations of the midterm evaluation?
8. What other major design and/or implementation issues should be brought to the attention of the grantee and USDOL?
9. How has the project been able to respond to the changing economic environment due to the recent economic crisis?

Effectiveness

The evaluation should assess whether the project has reached its objectives, and the effectiveness of project activities in contributing toward those objectives. Specifically, the evaluation should address the following questions:

1. Has the project achieved its targets and objectives as stated in the project document? What factors contributed to the success and/or underachievement of each of the objectives?
2. Assess the effectiveness of the "direct action" interventions, including the education interventions provided to children (i.e., nonformal education, formal education and re-entry programs, Child-Friendly Schools, Child Youth Clubs, and the provision of formal school supplies and scholarship program). Did the provision of these services result in children being withdrawn/prevented from exploitive child labor/trafficking and ensure that they were involved in relevant educational programs?
3. Have children who completed CHES programs returned to work? If so, in what occupations and activities? Specifically, have beneficiaries returned to the worst forms of child labor?
4. Assess the effectiveness of the services in meeting the needs of the target population identified in the project document including children *prevented* and *withdrawn* from labor/trafficking.

5. Assess the effectiveness of the specific models (re-entry, Child-Friendly Schools, nonformal education, Child Care Mothers, Child Labor Monitoring Committees) on increasing educational opportunities, creating community ownership, increasing the capacity of communities, and increasing awareness/understanding of the dangers of child labor.
6. Has the project accurately identified and targeted children engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors identified in the project strategy (subsistence and commercial agriculture, including freshwater fishing)? In a larger sense, did they accurately identify the *worst* forms of child labor in the country?
7. Are there any sector specific lessons learned regarding the types and effectiveness of the services provided? Specifically comment on the ability to affect children working in subsistence agriculture, and whether this sector could be targeted in future USDOL programming.
8. What monitoring systems does the project use for tracking the work status of children? Were they feasible and effective? Why or why not?
9. What are the management strengths, including technical and financial, of this project?
10. What has been the effectiveness of including a communications officer in the key staff of the project?

Additional Questions

- To what extent did the project respond to the MTE and what improvements happened since?
- What has been the general response of government, local partners and civil society in achieving the aims of the project?
- How did the project address serious constraints in government (MOLVT) leadership and 'culture of governance' within which it operated?
- What has been the contribution of this project to Cambodia's plan to combat child labor, considering the long ILO-IPEC work on this area?
- In addition, the issues to be addressed could revolve around the following topics: program interventions, policy response, capacity of government and non-government partners; CHES monitoring system.

Efficiency

The evaluation should provide analysis as to whether the strategies employed by the project were efficient in terms of the resources used (inputs) as compared to its qualitative and quantitative impact (outputs). Specifically, the evaluation should address the following questions:

1. Is the project cost-efficient?

2. Were the project strategies efficient in terms of the financial and human resources used, as compared to its outputs? What alternatives are there?
3. Was the monitoring system designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project?

Impact

The evaluation should assess the positive and negative changes produced by the project—intended and unintended, direct and indirect, as well as any changes in the social and economic environment in the country—as reported by respondents. Specifically, it should address the following questions:

1. What appears to be the project's impact, if any, on individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, etc.)?
2. Assess the impact, to the extent possible, of project activities/strategies on education quality (both formal and nonformal interventions). How has the education quality improvement component been received by the government and the communities?
3. What appears to be the project's impact, if any, on partners or other organizations working on child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, national child labor committee, etc.)?
4. What appears to be the project's impact, if any, on government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labor issues?
5. What has been the impact of the four research studies on child labor in subsistence agriculture, fishing, tobacco, and cassava? Have efforts to recognize these sectors as hazardous been successful?

Sustainability

The evaluation should assess whether the project has taken steps to ensure the continuation of project activities after the completion of the program, including sources of funding and partnerships with other organizations and/or the government, and identify areas where this may be strengthened. Specifically, it should address the following questions:

1. Were the exit strategy and sustainability plan integrated into the project design? Will it likely be effective?
2. Was the sustainability conference effective in encouraging sustainability of the project activities? Should this tactic be encouraged as a good practice?
3. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustainable funding?

4. What have been the major challenges and successes in maintaining partnerships in support of the project, including with other USDOL-funded projects?
5. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of maintaining coordination with the host country government—particularly MOLVT; the Ministry of Agriculture; and the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports; as well as other government agencies active in addressing related children's issues?
6. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing coordination with the ILO-IPEC?
7. Has the project successfully leveraged all available linkages with ILO-IPEC to enhance sustainability, specifically in addressing child labor monitoring and supporting government structures?
8. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with international and/or multilateral organizations?
9. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and/or community-based organizations present in the country?
10. Will the Child Care Mothers, Child-Friendly Schools, Child Labor Monitoring Committees, Child Youth Clubs, other monitoring systems, and other committees/groups and systems created by the project be sustainable?
11. What lessons can be learned of the project's accomplishments and weaknesses in terms of sustainability of interventions?

III EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

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

A Approach

The evaluation approach will be primarily qualitative in terms of the data collection methods used as the timeframe does not allow for quantitative surveys to be conducted. Quantitative data will be drawn from project reports to the extent that it is available 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 to be made for the different actors involved and activities conducted and the progress of implementation in each locality.
6. Suggested methodologies: use of key informant interview; use of illustrative diagrams, pictures when dealing with children; FGDs; observation of field activities, Associates meeting, provincial and national stakeholders meetings
7. The national stakeholders' meeting should have provision for guided group discussion to elicit feedback on the preliminary findings as well as get additional information relevant to the final evaluation concerns
8. Site visits should be done in areas representing the following agricultural sub-sectors: fishing, rice farming, tobacco, and cassava

B Final Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will consist of—

1. The international evaluator
2. An interpreter fluent in Khmer and English who will travel with the evaluator.

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

The international evaluator is Bjorn Nordtveit. He will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with ICF Macro 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 findings of the evaluation to the national stakeholder meeting and preparing the evaluation report.

The responsibility of the interpreter/s 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, including research reports and school records.
- Documents may include—
 - Project document and revisions
 - Cooperative Agreement
 - Technical Progress and Status Reports
 - Project Logical Frameworks and Monitoring Plans
 - Work plans
 - Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports
 - Management Procedures and Guidelines
 - Research or other reports undertaken (baseline studies, etc.)
 - Project files (including school records) as appropriate.

2 Question Matrix

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

3 Interviews with stakeholders

Informational interviews will be held with as many project stakeholders as possible, based on both random and stratified sampling. The fieldwork will be conducted in all of the four target provinces. In each province, at least two communities will be selected; one by project staff (to represent a successful implementation site or one that has encountered some challenges), and one by the evaluator, using random selection. At least one community representative, as well as one teacher and five direct beneficiaries (children) will be interviewed in each target community. Depending on the circumstances, both one-on-one interviews and group interviews will take place. The evaluator considers as stakeholders all those who have an interest in the project, for example, as implementers, direct and indirect beneficiaries, community leaders, donors, and government officials. Thus, it is anticipated that meetings will be held with—

- ILAB/OCFT Staff
- Headquarters, Country Director, Project Managers, and Field Staff of Grantee and Partner Organizations

- Government Ministry Officials and Local Government Officials
- Community leaders, members, and volunteers
- School teachers, assistants, school directors, education personnel
- Project beneficiaries (children—withdrawn and prevented—and their parents)
- International Organizations, NGOs and multilateral agencies working in the area
- Other child protection and/or education organizations, committees and experts in the area
- Labor Reporting Officer at U.S. Embassy and USAID representative.

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 will 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 children and parents will be held, and interviews will be conducted with representatives from local governments, NGOs, community leaders and teachers.

The interviews will be based on unstructured and semi-structured questions, and conducted in an interactive, dialogical manner. The results of the findings from the field will be further probed and investigated with key informants, both related and unrelated to the project. A number of the interviewed beneficiary children may be asked to draw pictures of a certain aspect of the project and their lives (representing answers to questions such as “what are you doing in your free time?” through a drawing). This drawing will be used as a way to initiate a dialogue with the children based on various aspects of their drawings. This drawing technique has been used with success previously in Cambodia for evaluation purposes. The sample of children will be based on random selection, and the drawings and subsequent debriefing will be used as a tool to establish a child-friendly dialogue with the beneficiaries, and to understand their after-school work and leisure situation, as well as their socioeconomic background (to check that the project reached its intended beneficiary group). The debriefing further will control for children’s work status during weekends and holidays. Also, the evaluator will verify that all the direct beneficiaries interviewed or observed have received a direct educational service from the project.

During observation and/or interview sessions, the evaluators will take pictures of aspects of the project and of the local condition of the children and the population. These photos will be used in the subsequent analysis of the project, and a folder with photos will be annexed to the report to illustrate aspects of the project and the implementation environment. The ethical guidelines of ILO-IPEC on research with children on the worst forms of child labor (see A2 above) will be used for photography or videotaping, as well as for the interviews.

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 beneficiaries, 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 Stakeholders' 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. The list of participants may include project direct beneficiaries, including children and parents.

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

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

1. Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main findings
2. Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the findings
3. Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality
4. Possible 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.

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 findings. 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. Findings for the evaluation will be based on information collected from background documents and in interviews 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.

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

G Timetable and Workplan

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

Activity	Responsible Party	Proposed Date(s)
Phone Interview with DOL and Grantee Staff/ Headquarters	ICF Macro, DOL, Grantee, Evaluator	June
Desk Review	Evaluator	May–June
Question Matrix and Instruments due to ICF Macro/DOL	Evaluator	June 12
Finalize TOR and Submit to Grantee and DOL	DOL/ICF Macro/Evaluator	June 13
International Travel		June 19
Introductory Meetings with Project Staff and National Stakeholders	Evaluator	June 20
Field Site Visits	Evaluator	June 20–July 4
National Stakeholder Meeting		July 4
International Travel		July 5
Post-Evaluation Debrief Call with DOL		July 11
Draft Report to ICF Macro for QC Review	Evaluator	August 3
Draft Report to DOL and Grantee for 48-hour Review	ICF Macro	August 14
Draft Report Released to Stakeholders	ICF Macro	August 28
Comments due to ICF Macro	DOL/Grantee and Stakeholders	September 1
Report Revised and Sent to ICF Macro	Evaluator	October 3
Revised Report Sent to DOL	ICF Macro	October 17
Final Approval of Report	DOL	September 22
Finalization and Distribution of Report	ICF Macro	October 7

IV EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

Ten working days following the evaluator's return from fieldwork, a first draft evaluation report will be submitted to ICF Macro. The report should have the following structure and content:

- I. Table of Contents
- II. List of Acronyms
- III. Executive Summary (providing an overview of the evaluation, summary of main findings/lessons learned/good practices, and three key recommendations)
- IV. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology
- V. Project Description

- VI. Relevance
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- VII. Effectiveness
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- VIII. Efficiency
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- IX. Impact
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- X. Sustainability
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- XI. Recommendations and Conclusions
 - A. Key Recommendations—critical for successfully meeting project objectives
 - B. Other Recommendations—as needed
 - 1. Relevance
 - 2. Effectiveness
 - 3. Efficiency
 - 4. Impact
 - 5. Sustainability
- XII. Annexes—including list of documents reviewed, interviews/meetings/site visits, stakeholder workshop agenda and participants, TOR, etc.

The total length of the report should be a minimum of 30 pages and a maximum of 45 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 findings, 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.

After returning from fieldwork, the first draft evaluation report is due to ICF Macro on August 4, 2011, as indicated in the above timetable. A final draft is due one week after receipt of comments from ILAB/OCFT and stakeholders and is anticipated to be due on September 1, 2011, as indicated in the above timetable. All reports including drafts will be written in English.

V EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

ICF Macro has contracted with Bjorn Nordtveit to conduct this evaluation. Dr. Nordtveit has over a decade of experience in evaluation, research, planning and project management with the United Nations, the US Government and the World Bank. He conducted the midterm evaluation of the CHES project. He is fluent in English, French, Lao, and Norwegian, with solid work experience from various African, Asian and Middle-Eastern countries. Dr. Nordtveit holds a PhD from the University of Maryland in International Education Policy and is currently a Professor at the University of Hong Kong specializing in issues of education support to vulnerable populations and children working in the worst forms of child labor. The contractor/evaluator will work with OCFT, ICF Macro, and relevant Winrock International staff to evaluate this project. The contractor/evaluator will work with OCFT, ICF Macro, and relevant Winrock International staff to evaluate this project.

ICF Macro will provide all logistical and administrative support for their staff and sub-contractors, including travel arrangements (e.g., plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing *per diem*) and all materials needed to provide all deliverables. ICF Macro will also be responsible for providing the management and technical oversight necessary to ensure consistency of methods and technical standards.

ICF Macro or its subcontractors should contact Rocio Cordova (rcordova@winrock.org) to initiate contact with field staff. The primary point of contact for the project in Cambodia is Ana Maria Dionela, Project Director (anadionela10@yahoo.com.ph or ADionela@field.winrock.org).

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX G: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- CHES M&E Field Manual
- CHES Presentation on Sustainability
- Cooperative Agreement
- Correspondence with USDOL Related to Technical Progress Reports, ILO-IPEC Midterm Evaluation
- Policy Documents
- Project Files (including school records)
- Project Logical Frameworks and Monitoring Plans
- Project Posters, Brochures, CHES E-Newsletter, Radio Programs and Video
- Research Reports Undertaken (Baseline Study, National Plan of Action on Eliminating WFCL, OVC Situation and Response Assessment, UNICEF Report on Children's Work in Cambodia)
- Revised Project Document
- Technical Progress and Status Reports (in particular TPR September 2010 to April 2011)
- Work Plans

Research, including:

- Research Report on Hazardous Child Work in Tobacco Production in Kampong Cham Province
- Research Report on Hazardous Child Work in Cassava Production in Kampong Cham Province
- Research Report on Hazardous Child Labor in Subsistence Agriculture Sector
- Research Report on Hazardous Child Labor in Subsistence Freshwater Fishing Sector
- Child Labour, Education, and Agriculture Policy Brief

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX H: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

- Administration & Financial Associate, Winrock
- Assistant Executive Director, CAMFEBA
- Child Labor Program Officer, Winrock
- Children (beneficiaries, former beneficiaries)
- CLMC members
- Communication Officer, Winrock
- Coordinator and key staff, CSNACLO
- CTA, ILO-IPEC
- Deputy Director, Department of Child Labour
- Deputy Director, Department of Labor Inspector
- Deputy Director, Department of OSH
- Deputy Director, MORD
- Deputy Office CNCC
- Director and/or Deputy Directors of DOLVT, Provinces
- Director, Department of Child Labour
- Director, KAPE
- Director, Wathanakpheap
- Directors and Deputy Director DOEYS, Provinces
- Governors and/or Deputy Governor, Provinces
- Key staff, KAPE
- Monitoring & Evaluation Officer, Winrock
- Office Director, MOT
- Parents of beneficiaries and former beneficiaries
- PCCWs, Provinces
- Project Coordinators and key staff, CEDAC
- Project Director, Winrock
- Project Managers and key staff, Wathanakpheap
- Provincial Program Coordinators Winrock
- Secretary of State, MOLVT
- Senior Program Officer, ILO- IPEC
- Specialists (teachers, project staff, officials, etc.)
- Technical Officer, Department of NFE
- Under Secretary of State, MOLVT

See itinerary for a more detailed list of interviewees.

This page intentionally left blank.