

**U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of International Labor Affairs**

Closing the Child Labor and Forced Labor Evidence Gap: Impact Evaluations

Announcement Type: Solicitation for Cooperative Agreement Applications (SCA).

Funding Opportunity Number: SCA-14-22

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number: 17.401

Total Funding Available for Award: \$10 million

Number of Anticipated Funding Awards: Multiple

Funding Period: Effective date of award through [five (5) years]

Executive Summary: The U.S. Department of Labor’s (USDOL) Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking (OCFT), will award up to \$10 million for multiple cooperative agreements to organizations to implement impact evaluations (IEs) with the goal of expanding the evidence base on child labor and forced labor. Applications must propose randomized control trial (RCT) impact evaluations that address key evidence gaps regarding child labor or forced labor program interventions in the areas outlined in this SCA, and must leverage partnerships with implementing organizations to build upon existing or planned interventions and/or impact evaluations, or secure separate funding for the intervention(s) itself. Funding through this cooperative agreement must only be used to fund RCT impact evaluation design, implementation, analysis and dissemination, and must not be used to fund projects or interventions. Eligible Applicants may include any commercial, international, educational, or non-profit organization(s), including any faith-based, community-based, or public international organization(s) (PIOs), capable of successfully conducting RCTs (and partnering with implementing organizations, if applicable). Subgrants may be made to academics or academic institutions, and study results may be published independently after the cooperative agreement has closed.

Key Dates:

Issuance Date:	8/29/14
Closing Date and Time:	11/7/14
Technical Question Submission Deadline:	9/19/14
Date of Webinar:	Within 30 days after the SCA issuance date
Date of Award:	No later than December 31, 2014

Agency Contacts:

Primary: Bruce Yoon

Email: yoon.bruce@dol.gov

Telephone: 202.693.4876

Applications will be accepted via electronic submission via [Grants.gov \(http://www.grants.gov\)](http://www.grants.gov) or by hardcopy (to include electronic copy/CD) hand delivered or mailed to the GO at the following address:

USDOL/ Employment and Training Administration (ETA)

Attn: Donna Kelly, Grant Officer

200 Constitution Avenue NW, Room N-4716

Washington, DC 20210

Reference: SCA-14-22

A list of frequently asked questions about USDOL's SCA for ILAB grants and responses to technical questions received by e-mail will be posted on [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) and www.dol.gov/ILAB/grants/main.htm. Transcripts of web chats will be posted on <http://www.dol.gov/dol/chat/>.

I. FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

I. FUNDING OPPORTUNITY DESCRIPTION

A. Background

USDOL/ILAB intends to award up to \$10 million for multiple cooperative agreements to organizations to implement impact evaluations to expand the evidence base on child labor and forced labor. Applicants may submit proposals to cover the cost of a full impact evaluation, to request supplemental funding for ongoing evaluations, or for additional analysis on completed evaluations, including survey costs. In general, USDOL would expect proposed full evaluations to range in cost from approximately \$250,000 to \$1 million; requests for supplemental funding for ongoing evaluations, including support of a survey, to range in cost from approximately \$10,000 to \$250,000; and requests for supplemental funding for additional analysis on completed evaluations to range in cost from approximately \$10,000 to \$50,000. It should be noted that these guidelines are not absolute; proposals for impact evaluations must describe and justify the level of funding for each evaluation or additional analysis being requested. Applications must propose impact evaluations that address key evidence gaps regarding child labor or forced labor program interventions in the areas outlined in this solicitation, and must demonstrate how they would leverage partnerships with implementing organizations to build upon existing, planned or completed interventions and/or impact evaluations, or secure separate funding for the intervention(s) itself. Subgrants may be made to academics or academic institutions, and study results may be published independently after the cooperative agreement has closed. Applicants may propose multiple studies. Funding through this cooperative agreement must only be used to fund impact evaluation design, implementation, analysis, and dissemination and must not be used to fund projects or interventions. Proposed impact evaluations must: 1) provide evidence that will be relevant to informing the design and effectiveness of a project or government policy that has direct or indirect effects on child labor or forced labor; 2) utilize partnerships between researchers, contractors, and/or non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and local organizations in the country where the proposed impact evaluation will take place; 3) ensure that impact evaluation results will be available within the time-period of the cooperative agreement; 4) build the evidence base on child labor or forced labor in OCFT's intervention areas and/or outcomes of interest; 5) test interventions or combinations of interventions; 6) examine interventions that are relevant and promising; 7) ensure that study designs, surveys, and analysis conform to international and national definitions and standards on child labor and forced labor; and 8) use RCT designs.

Cooperative agreements awarded under this SCA will be administered by the USDOL's Employment and Training Administration and technically managed by ILAB/OCFT.

The duration of the project(s) funded through this SCA is up to five (5) years. The project start date will be negotiated upon award of individual cooperative agreement(s) but will be no later than December 31, 2014.

ILAB leads USDOL's efforts to ensure that workers around the world are treated fairly and are able to share in the benefits of the global economy. ILAB's mission is to use all available international channels to improve working conditions, raise living standards, protect workers' ability to exercise their rights, and address the workplace exploitation of children and other vulnerable populations.

OCFT conducts and funds research, develops strategic partnerships, and funds an international technical cooperation program to eliminate the worst forms of child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking.

USDOL/ILAB is authorized to award and administer cooperative agreements by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014, Pub. Law 113-76 (2014).

B. Problem Statement

Child labor not only comes at a high cost to the children themselves, but also to society, as children lose the opportunity to gain education and skills to enhance their productivity, thus perpetuating an inter-generational cycle of poverty.¹ Research has provided a deepening pool of evidence of the detrimental short- and long-term effects child labor has on children's health, development, education access and attainment, and economic outcomes.² At the 2010 Hague Global Child Labor Conference, 80 countries made a commitment to "substantially" increase their efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor by 2016. This commitment was reaffirmed at the 2013 Brazil Global Child Labor Conference. However, there is still much to learn about what interventions most effectively, and most efficiently, achieve this objective. This information will help inform policymakers on how to improve targeting and allocation of funds. Thus the aim of this solicitation is to support the generation of rigorous evidence about what approaches are most effective in the fight against child labor.

According to the most recent estimates (2012), approximately 168 million children around the world were engaged in child labor. More than seventy percent (120.5 million) of these children were 5 to 14 years old, and around 4 in 10 child laborers were younger than 12 years old (73 million). More than half (85 million) of these children are involved in hazardous work. Almost 60 percent of child laborers work in the agriculture sector (98 million children) and over 30 percent (54 million) work in services sectors. Hazardous work issues are especially relevant for adolescents (aged 15-17), and 47.5 million children age 15-17 are involved in hazardous work.³

Children work for a variety of reasons. Both children and their families face a number of often conflicting objectives and constraints. Decisions about how to allocate resources, including children's time, may also vary according to contextual factors, such as immediate needs for labor, or perceptions of school quality. It is therefore difficult to point to one problem (and thus, to one solution) that causes child labor. However, five key factors are identified here: poverty, lack of relevant educational opportunities, lack of awareness of the risks and hazards of child labor, attitudes that support child labor, and insufficient institutional frameworks to protect children and enforce workforce protections.

- *Poverty.* Poorer children are more likely to work than their less-poor peers, all other things being equal.⁴ There is some evidence that poor households supplement income, and cope with shocks to income, by relying on the earnings of their children.⁵ Examples of negative economic shocks include parent

¹ ILO-IPEC, *Children in Hazardous Work: What we know, what we need to do.* 2011.

http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/-publ/documents/publication/wcms_155428.pdf

² UCW Project, *Child labour and Education for All: an issues paper.* 2008. Available: http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=11772&Pag=4&Year=-1&Country=-1&Author=-1

³ These are the most recent world estimates. ILO-IPEC. *Marking Progress Against Child Labor.* September 23, 2013. Available: http://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Informationresources/WCMS_221513/lang--en/index.htm

⁴ UCW. *Understanding children's work in Zambia, Understanding Children's Work Programme Country Report Series (Rome) 2009.* Available: www.ucw-project.org. UCW. *Understanding children's work in Vietnam, Understanding Children's Work Programme Country Report Series (Rome) 2009.* Available: www.ucw-project.org

⁵ For a detailed review of current research in this area, see: ILO-IPEC, *World Report on Child Labour: Economic vulnerability, social protection and the fight against child labour.* 29 April, 2013. Available: http://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Informationresources/WCMS_178184/lang--en/index.htm

unemployment or income loss in agricultural settings due to droughts, floods, or other natural disasters.⁶

- *Lack of Access to Relevant Educational Opportunities.* Children may work when they lack access to schools; when the school is too far from the household, is not affordable, or is seen as irrelevant or of low quality. Parents may choose not to prioritize education in allocating household income when available education is not seen as relevant to children's futures or quality is perceived to be too low (demonstrated by insufficient learning) to be worth scarce resources. The family may decide that immediate needs dominate any advantage realized in the future from the investment in a child's education; this is especially true if the household is credit-constrained, and cannot borrow against future earnings to cover school-related expenses or the opportunity costs of education (especially children's earnings from work).⁷ Thus the cost, quality and accessibility of education may play important roles in household decisions about children's work.
- *Lack of awareness of the risks and effects of child labor.* Household decision-makers may not be aware of the state's legal framework protecting children, the hazards of child labor, or the effects child labor may have on their children both now and in the future.⁸ Children may also be unaware of these risks, and the importance of education or workplace protections. Hazardous work issues are especially relevant for adolescents (aged 15-17) who may be of legal working age.
- *Attitudes towards child labor.* Some kinds of work may be seen as formative, or essential to the development of children for their future in the workforce, and thus a positive influence on children's development. However, when this work negatively impacts children's safety or educational outcomes, for example, a conflict arises between cultural attitudes towards child labor and international norms. Attitudes towards child labor are also influenced by ideas and expectations of the ability of children to assume adult responsibilities among parents, employers, and policymakers. These attitudes may be especially pertinent for girl children and their engagement in household chores.⁹
- *Insufficient institutional framework to protect children and enforce workforce protections.* A number of countries have legal frameworks to protect children from exploitation that are considered inadequate by international standards. Moreover, even where these frameworks are in place, enforcement may be weak and inconsistent.¹⁰

Forced Labor is also a global problem, affecting almost 21 million workers.¹¹ In other words, three out of every 1,000 people worldwide are trapped in jobs into which they were coerced or deceived and which they cannot leave. Forced labor disproportionately affects the most vulnerable and least protected people, including those stricken with poverty, those who lack education or access to education, and those who lack access to social

⁶ Beegle, K.; Dehejia, R.H.; Gatti, R. 2003. Child labor, income shocks, and access to credit, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3075 (Washington, DC). Blanco, F.; Valdivia, C. 2006. Child labour in Venezuela: Children's economic vulnerability to macroeconomic shocks, Understanding Children's Work Programme Working Paper Series (Rome). Duryea, S.; Lam, D.; Levison, D. 2007. "Effects of economic shocks on children's employment and schooling in Brazil", in Journal of Development Economics, Vol. 84, No. 1, pp. 188–214. Guarcello, L.; Kovrova, I; Rosati, F. 2008. Child labour as a response to shocks: Evidence from Cambodian villages, Understanding Children's Work Programme Working Paper Series No. 35 (Rome).

⁷ For a more detailed review of research in this area, see: UCW Project, Child labour and Education for All: an issues paper. 2008. Available: http://www.ucw-project.org/Pages/bib_details.aspx?id=11772&Pag=4&Year=-1&Country=-1&Author=-1

⁸ There are many Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (KAP) (and Expectations, KAPE) studies. For one example, see: UNICEF. KAPE Study in Bangladesh. Available: http://www.unicef.org/bangladesh/KAPE_Study_on_Child_Labor.pdf

⁹ There are many studies examining gendered attitudes toward child labor. For example, see: Sakamoto, Shunsuke. Parental attitudes toward children and child labor: evidence from rural India. 2006. Available: <http://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/citations/2847>

¹⁰ For analysis of the legal frameworks and enforcement surrounding child labor in 144 countries, see the U.S. Department of Labor's annual report, Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor. Available: <http://www.dol.gov/ILAB/programs/ocft/tda.htm>

¹¹ ILO, "21 Million People now Victims of Forced Labour, ILO Says." 1 June 2102. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/publications/WCMS_181953/lang--en/index.htm

protection mechanisms. Women, low-skilled migrant workers, children, and indigenous peoples and other groups suffering from discrimination are among those highly vulnerable to forced labor. The International Labor Organization (ILO)'s Strategic Action Program to Combat Forced Labor (SAP-FL) has made progress on defining forced labor¹² and finding and tracking victims of forced labor,¹³ but very little is known about what most effectively helps victims escape forced labor and avoid repeated exploitation.

While the existence of numerous environmental influences of child labor and forced labor may be known, little is understood about how these dynamics interact, and thus how to best combat child labor or forced labor. There are few rigorous evaluations of interventions aimed at addressing these problems, and fewer that focus specifically on child labor or forced labor outcomes. Most rigorous evidence on child labor and children's time use comes from the evaluation of cash transfer programs. The joint ILO-World Bank- United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) Understanding Children's Work Project (UCW) recently conducted reviews of available child labor-relevant impact evaluations of cash transfer programs, and found that while cash transfers did tend to reduce child labor, especially amongst poorer children or where prevalence of child labor was initially high, some programs had no impact.¹⁴ Most of these studies tracked children's economic activities, but did not include household chores in the study, and thus might inaccurately estimate the impact of interventions on the activities of girls.

There is also some evidence from evaluations of child labor issues in other areas, such as social protection, education, skills development, infrastructure upgrading, access to finance, and health and family planning. However, the impacts of these instruments on child labor are mixed and inconclusive.¹⁵ Almost no rigorous evidence is available in the area of forced labor.

Insufficient evidence exists to help policymakers fully understand the most effective ways to combat child labor or forced labor, and much less on what interventions might be cost-effective. More evidence is needed from both traditional child labor- or forced labor- focused work, as well as interventions and sector approaches in areas outside of traditional child labor-focused work that may have an effect on child labor outcomes. Such areas might include, but are not limited to, social safety nets, workers' rights, health, agriculture, and infrastructure.

C. Objectives

The overall purpose of this SCA is to support RCT impact evaluations that can provide information on effective approaches to fighting child labor or forced labor. **Funding must not be used to support the implementation of projects or interventions to combat child labor or forced labor.** Applicants must propose to design and implement an RCT impact evaluation(s) that will provide evidence about effective approaches to combat child labor or forced labor. Funded projects that include full impact evaluations should include a design period (which will involve close coordination with USDOL), baseline and follow-up data collection activities, a substantial accompanying qualitative assessment to help clarify data collection results and provide context about outcomes

¹² ILO, Indicators of Forced Labour. October 2012. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/publications/WCMS_203832/lang--en/index.htm

¹³ ILO, Hard to See, Harder to Count: Survey Guidelines to Estimate Forced Labour of Adults and Children. June 2012. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/sapfl/Informationresources/ILOPublications/WCMS_182096/lang--en/index.htm

¹⁴ De Hoop and Rosati, Cash Transfers and Child Labor. Understanding Children's Work Project, January 2013. Available: http://www.ucw-project.org/attachment/Cash_Transfers_and_Child_Labour20130506_165200.pdf; ILO-IPEC, World Report on Child Labour: Economic vulnerability, social protection and the fight against child labour, 29 April 2013. http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Informationresources/WCMS_178184/lang--en/index.htm.

¹⁵ De Hoop and Rosati, The complex effects of public policy on child labour. Understanding Children's Work Project, March 2013. Available: http://www.ucw-project.org/attachment/Effects_public_policy_child_labour20130503_171917.pdf

achieved or not, analysis, reports, and dissemination of results. Other types of evaluations may have varied implementation processes. See the deliverables list in (Section E) for detail about specific expected deliverables. All activities, analysis, and dissemination must be completed during the funding period. Evaluations that cannot provide final results within the five year funding period will not be considered.

Applicants may propose RCT impact evaluations that study interventions targeted at combating child labor. Applicants may also propose RCTs examining interventions and sector approaches in areas outside of traditional child labor-focused work. In either case, the Applicant must credibly demonstrate that the intervention proposed may have an effect on child labor outcomes, including examinations of child labor outcomes in RCTs initially designed to evaluate something different. Such areas may include, but are not limited to, social safety nets, health, agriculture, workers' rights, and infrastructure. Any plausible intervention will be considered, provided it is grounded either in theory or in empirical observation (i.e., that it can demonstrate proof of concept). Applicants must include in their proposal an explanation and justification for the proposed area to be addressed through the RCT impact evaluation.

While many areas of study may be proposed, in order to build the evidence base on what is effective in combatting child labor and forced labor, the Applicant must provide a clear explanation of the mechanisms by which changes in outcomes occur. For this reason, RCTs that evaluate only a set of interventions as a whole or a complex package of interventions, without being able to determine the impacts of specific interventions, are discouraged. Applicants are encouraged to propose evaluations that either examine a single intervention, or, in cases of a package of interventions, assess the comparative effects of those interventions. All applications should include a logic model to provide a visual (flowchart format) theory of change that details the hypothesis of how changes in child labor or forced labor outcomes will be achieved for each intervention studied. This simple logic model should include activities/interventions, outputs, outcomes, and impacts, and must be accompanied by a narrative.

All proposals should include initial power calculation estimates. Applicants should also clearly identify any sub-groups that are of specific interest and estimates of power and minimum detectable effects (MDEs) for primary outcomes of interest for each subgroup to be studied. If sub-group analysis is proposed, estimates of power should clearly demonstrate that the sub-group analysis can be supported by the sample size.

Given the vulnerable groups that may be involved in proposed studies, all Applicants must provide a thoughtful approach for how any potential ethical issues will be addressed, according to internationally-accepted standards for the protection of human subjects in each study proposed, including how they will incorporate an appropriate Institutional Review Board (IRB) review.

Applicants may propose to implement multiple impact evaluations, including multiple types of impact evaluations (full impact evaluation, request for supplemental funding, etc.) in a proposal. However, USDOL reserves the right to choose to fund any or all of the RCT impact evaluation studies proposed by the Applicant. For this reason, Applicants' budgets must provide a clear indication of costs per proposed study. USDOL also reserves the right to require an Applicant to submit an updated budget before finalizing an award should USDOL elect to fund less than the total number of RCT impact evaluations outlined in an Applicant's proposal.

In addition to the above, proposals must demonstrate that the project will:

- 1) Provide evidence that will be relevant to informing the design and effectiveness of a project or government policy.** Data collected from the surveys should be used to design and assess policies and programs that directly or indirectly address child labor or forced labor. Results from this research can assist governmental and non-governmental actors in identifying specific sectors, geographical areas, and demographic populations that may be particularly vulnerable. For each evaluation, Applicants should

briefly describe the approach they would take to target and disseminate results to appropriate parties. These efforts may include engagement through meetings, presentations, or workshops for dissemination purposes, although the main focus of funds should be conducting and producing the study itself. Proposals should demonstrate a thoughtful approach to dissemination to key stakeholders in order to maximize impact of results. Applicants should also briefly describe how they will engage key stakeholders in each target country during the study design and data validation phases of the project. Key stakeholders include but are not limited to government, industry, and labor representatives as well as NGOs with substantial expertise on child labor or forced labor issues. Applicants should expect to work closely with OCFT in engaging these key stakeholders.

- 2) **Utilize partnerships between researchers, contractors, and/or NGOs and local organizations in the country where the proposed impact evaluation will take place, or demonstrate that separate funding has been secured for the intervention(s) itself.** Although funding must not be used to implement projects or programs, proposals should clearly describe the key details of the intervention, demonstrate how the intervention will be implemented in a manner conducive to an RCT, and describe the applicant's planned collaboration with implementing partners (if applicable), including submission of memorandums of agreement or other letters of support, to be submitted with the proposal; these documents must demonstrate implementing partners' commitment to the impact evaluation methodology, data collection exercises, and implementing timeline. Applicants must also demonstrate support from relevant national and local government stakeholders integral to the smooth implementation of the impact evaluation. All proposals must include some form of in-country oversight of the impact evaluation that will be present during key evaluation start-up, implementation, and data collection activities.
- 3) **Ensure that impact evaluation results will be available within the time period of the cooperative agreement.** As impact evaluations may take several years to implement, and are dependent upon the implementation timeline of the project to be studied, it is critical that proposals demonstrate realistic planning for the timing of the study, taking into account potential delays due to unforeseen circumstances, to ensure that results are available and disseminated prior to the end of the funding period. Projects may be fewer than five years, but all applicants must include a clear, effective project management plan for carrying out the study to realistically publish (publication is defined at a minimum of a complete, polished report submitted to ILAB and available on the organization's Web site) and disseminate results before the end of the project (duration up to five years).
- 4) **Build the evidence base on child labor or forced labor in intervention areas and/or outcomes of interest.**

Outlined below are examples of the kinds of intervention areas of interest to USDOL for coverage by impact evaluations proposed in response to this SCA. In addition, within these areas (or new ones proposed by applicants), there are specific outcomes of interest (section ii) that should be considered in developing research questions and designing data collection instruments and analysis plans. At a minimum, studies must examine impacts on child labor or forced labor, but other outcomes of interest detailed in section ii below may also be included. All proposals must include an MDE table for the primary outcomes of interest, including by sub-group, if any sub-group analyses are proposed.

- i. **Intervention Areas of Interest:** While the primary aim of this funding is to focus on outcomes, not interventions, some intervention areas are of strong interest. All proposals must focus on interventions that may lead to a reduction in child labor, including in its worst forms, or forced labor. The limited range of literature available leaves many questions about the efficacy of specific interventions. As noted above, the majority of empirical evidence on child labor comes from cash

transfer programs. It is likely that many other interventions can have impacts on children's time use and on the constraints facing households that cause them to allocate their children's time to work. Very little is known about the impacts of awareness-raising on child labor or forced labor, and the same is true of interventions focused on behavior change, such as behavior change campaigns and regulation and enforcement. The paths from livelihoods interventions to economic outcomes to household decisions about child labor are also not well understood and, as the majority of child labor is in agricultural work, evaluations of programs aimed at reducing child labor in these areas are of interest. Programs that improve quality, accessibility, or affordability of education, or that attempt to move adolescents and youth from hazardous to non-hazardous work through training or other interventions are also of interest. OCFT is also interested in the impacts of innovative work around broader social protection and workers' rights initiatives, corporate social responsibility initiatives, health, agriculture, or infrastructure work on child labor or forced labor.

Priority consideration will be given to the design of evaluations directly targeted at combating child labor or forced labor, but proposals must include planned, ongoing and completed RCTs in areas that may have direct or indirect impacts on child labor or forced labor, regardless of whether the initial program targets child labor or forced labor directly. Any plausible intervention will be considered, provided it is grounded either in theory or in empirical observation (i.e., that it can demonstrate proof of concept), and proposals should provide a sound logical chain or theory of change linked to reducing child labor or forced labor in a narrative or flowchart format. That is, applicants may propose RCTs of new programs that are not directly designed to combat child labor or forced labor, but may have a coincidental impact on this issue.

In addition, Applicants may propose a package of quick, iterative evaluations that assess small changes in intervention implementation to generate evidence for changes in program design, rather than a single evaluation with a longer time frame. These series of evaluations should assess interventions relevant to OCFT's identified key outcomes for projects:

- Improved participation by vulnerable children in education and training.
- Improved access by vulnerable populations, including those in child labor and forced labor, to social protection services.
- Improved livelihood opportunities for vulnerable households and those in forced labor.
- Improved knowledge of vulnerable households and communities of the dangers of child labor and forced labor.
- Improved protection of workers and children from labor exploitation

Applicants proposing iterative series of RCTs should demonstrate clear linkages to the above outcomes in their proposals.

Applications for support of ongoing evaluations must still have scope for the inclusion of child labor- or forced labor- related questions that adhere to definitions provided in Appendix B in at least one follow-up survey; and must have a geographic area or industry focus where there is a known child labor or forced labor issue; proposals must demonstrate why it would be beneficial to add a child labor or forced labor component to the evaluation, that it is feasible to do so within the evaluation design and structure, and that there is a demonstrable and reasonable expectation that the intervention may have an impact on child labor or forced labor. Applications for support of completed evaluations must have included questions pertaining to child labor or forced labor that reasonably adhere to definitions of child labor, including hazardous work, and forced labor provided in Appendix B (in addition, a detailed explanation of the suitability of child labor or forced labor data collected as part of the evaluation must be provided in proposals), and must have had a geographic area or industry focus where there is a known issue; proposals must demonstrate how relevant evidence about child labor or forced labor can be gleaned from additional analysis on the data and results from the completed study and that there is a demonstrable and reasonable expectation that the intervention may have had an impact on child labor or forced labor.

For all types of evaluation support requested, proposals must include a sound logical chain or theory of change in a narrative or flowchart format to support each request.

- ii. **Outcomes of interest. A) Child Labor** - This SCA also seeks to help answer questions on a range of outcomes, including the allocation of children's time, the incidence of child labor, and the incidence of exploitative or dangerous work among children and young people. Additionally, the spillover effects of interventions on siblings and other relatives, as well as across households within communities, are not well understood in any context. How do targeted interventions affect the incidence (and prevalence in specific areas or industries, where possible) and intensity of child labor among families and communities? How do interventions differentially affect girls and boys? How sustainable are outcomes - what is the trajectory of change after an intervention ends? Of special interest is the comparative sustainability of outcomes generated by different types of interventions commonly funded by OCFT technical assistance funding. For this reason, evaluations that follow-up on completed impact evaluations of projects (including non-OCFT impact evaluations), which examine areas commonly funded by OCFT, are welcomed. For example, do education interventions provide longer-lasting impacts than livelihood initiatives? Program impacts are likely to be heterogeneous, varying by gender, location (especially urban versus rural locations), wealth, social capital, migrant status and so on. While studies must examine child labor outcomes, the above are additional outcomes for which there is an evidence gap, and applicants may consider integrating some of the above areas in designing studies. As previously mentioned, proposals must include power analyses and MDEs for all sub-group estimates. **B) Forced Labor** - This SCA also seeks to help answer questions on a range of outcomes, including differential impacts of social protection measures, socio-economic support, and monitoring and awareness-raising. How do targeted interventions affect the incidence (and prevalence in specific areas or industries, where possible) and intensity of forced labor among communities? How do interventions differentially affect children and adults and different genders? How sustainable are outcomes - what is the trajectory of change after an intervention ends?

Applicants should expect to work closely with OCFT to refine these outcomes in designing data collection instruments and analysis plans, where applicable.

- 5) **Test individual interventions and combinations of interventions to combat child labor or forced labor.** OCFT will look to support evaluations that can explain the impacts of any intervention with plausible impacts on child labor or forced labor. Proposals may include evaluations of single or multiple interventions; OCFT may prioritize evaluations that examine the relative effectiveness of different approaches, or the differential impact of combinations of interventions (including the contribution of each individual intervention). As mentioned previously in the SCA, 'black box' RCTs that evaluate a project or set of interventions as a whole, without being able to determine the impacts of specific interventions, are discouraged. In other words, proposed evaluations should be able to assess the impact of individual interventions; or in cases where multiple interventions are under study, the RCT should be able to assess the differential contribution of each intervention to change. Studies that test OCFT's theory of change for combating child labor are welcomed. Collaboration to design new programs, or new combinations of interventions, and evaluations that test innovative hypotheses and outcomes is also encouraged. For example, a program to enhance school quality might be more effective if combined with a behavioral change program or with a program to ensure consumption in the event of a negative shock to the household. The relative effectiveness of these interventions and the most effective combination(s) of interventions in reducing child labor assist in understanding how to best allocate scarce resources and, therefore, are topics critical to improving understanding in this field. The integration of cost-effectiveness analysis with studies is encouraged, but not required. OCFT also

welcomes proposals for impact evaluations examining interventions and sector approaches in areas outside of traditional child labor-focused work that may have an effect on child labor outcomes. Such areas might include, but are not limited to, broader social protection/social safety nets and workers' rights initiatives, corporate social responsibility initiatives, health, agriculture, and infrastructure. Any plausible intervention will be considered, provided it is grounded either in theory or in empirical observation (i.e., that it can demonstrate proof of concept), and proposals should provide a sound logical chain or theory of change in a narrative or flowchart format.

- 6) Examine replicable and/or promising interventions.** Applicants should show how all interventions to be studied are or will be well-implemented, such as a description of an assessment of the implementer's capacity and experience, a past evaluation of the intervention that demonstrates it was implemented well, or a description of a review of the implementers work plan, project design, and other materials. In addition, Applicants should describe how interventions are either replicable, even if they have not yet been closely examined for evidence about their impacts on child labor, or promising, but have not been evaluated. Replication is an important tool for deepening our understanding of what works, where, and why. The number and range of evaluations to date do not support any general lessons or synthesis. Replicating successful models in different contexts is necessary to quantify the extent to which programs work under varying circumstances. ILAB will look for programs that are likely to be replicable or are already being replicated in different settings, and which may therefore yield lessons of more general relevance. For example, evaluations that scale-up interventions that have already been successful in small-scale settings to a regional or national level can help achieve greater confidence about what works. On the other hand, new and innovative work that may have promising outcomes on child labor but has not yet been rigorously evaluated is also of interest.
- 7) Evaluation components conform to international and national definitions and standards on child labor or forced labor.** Evaluation data must be analyzed according to definitions of child labor or forced labor per the international framework referenced in this solicitation. Proposals should take into account the need to clearly adapt child labor or forced labor definitions to specific contexts, starting with the international standards outlined in Appendix B. Data on age, intensity of work (hours), activities (to define the Worst Forms of Child Labor), exposure to hazards as defined by national legal frameworks or international standards (where national hazardous work lists are not available) should be collected and analyzed. Data collection strategies must be in accordance with the guidelines on child labor statistics as outlined by the 18th International Conference of Labor Statisticians.¹⁶ Applicants may utilize and improve upon data collection tools and strategies developed by the ILO. If adult labor rights are relevant to the Applicant's proposed study, measurements must align with the 1998 ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, and forced labor studies should build upon guidance on designing surveys and identifying indicators of risk of forced labor from the ILO's "Hard to See, Harder to Count."¹⁷
- 8) Use RCT designs.** Applicants may propose any of a number of approaches for clustering, stratification, or roll-out within the RCT framework. In other words, proposals must randomly establish valid experiment and control groups, and demonstrate sufficient power for analysis and MDEs for all proposed sub-groups, but the manner in which analysis is completed is flexible. Studies should include at least two surveys (usually at baseline and a follow-up survey), and proposals must also include an accompanying qualitative study that can help shed light on the mechanisms that lead to change.

¹⁶ 18th International Conference of Labor Statisticians, http://www.ilo.org/global/statistics-and-databases/meetings-and-events/international-conference-of-labour-statisticians/WCMS_092024/lang--en/index.htm.

¹⁷ For more information on the 1998 Declaration, see: <http://www.ilo.org/declaration/lang--en/index.htm>

For more on identifying forced labor, see: http://www.ilo.org/sapfl/Informationresources/ILOPublications/WCMS_182096/lang--en/index.htm

D. Requirements

1. Pre-Application

a. Desk Review

Applicants should review relevant materials to sufficiently respond to the requirements outlined in this SCA and ensure they have a thorough understanding of the international child labor or forced labor context, international standards related to child labor or forced labor, internationally recognized definitions of child labor or forced labor, including the 18th International Conference of Labor Statisticians, and key international conventions related to child labor or forced labor, including ILO Conventions 182 and 138, and ILO Conventions 105 and 29. Applicants also should review “Hard to See, Harder To Count: Survey Guidelines to Estimate Forced Labor of Adults and Children.”¹⁸

b. Evaluation Approach

Applicants should respond to the requirements outlined in the SCA and must describe the overall approach of the evaluation, including:

- the intervention(s) to be studied and broad theory of change related to child labor or forced labor;
- the planned implementation of the intervention(s), including content and approach, timing, geographic coverage, and plausible consistency across geographic areas and time;
- plans to refine the theory of change of the intervention(s) related to child labor or forced labor;
- the methodology of the randomized control trial including sub-groups identified for analysis and initial power analyses and MDEs for all outcomes of interest by sub-group (if sub-group analysis is proposed);
- troubleshooting plans for possible threats to the implementation of the RCT and problems with intervention implementation to protect both the timeliness and the analytical credibility of the evaluation;
- summaries of Applicants’ planned data analysis and dissemination approaches;
- how the Applicant will work closely with ILAB to develop and complete all deliverables outlined in the SCA; and
- how Applicants will take appropriate measures to protect human subjects and safeguard personally identifiable information of respondents.

In addition, if proposed evaluations will build upon ongoing or completed evaluations, Applicants should assess the quality and rigor of the RCT’s methodology and data, and include sufficient information in proposals to demonstrate that the evaluation produced with OCFT funding will meet the standards outlined in this SCA.

c. Sharing Lessons Learned and Good Practices

¹⁸ http://www.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/2011/111B09_351_engl.pdf

Applicants should ensure that the dissemination plan includes strategies to promote the sharing of experiences and lessons learned within the geographic area of study and among child labor and forced labor experts and evaluation practitioners, as possible. These dissemination efforts may be comprised of workshops, presentations and webinars, publication of reports, and other dissemination activities.

d. Partnership

Applicants must also establish partnerships with implementing organizations as funds through this grant cannot be used to support implementation of those interventions studied, and conduct consultations with local and national governments as necessary for the implementation of the impact evaluation. Applicants should carefully review requirements related to establishment of partnerships and documentation of commitment to collaborate outlined in the SCA.

2. Post Award

Winning Applicants (or ‘Grantees’) must comply with the following post-award requirements. Grantees must adhere to all of the post-award requirements outlined in the Management Procedures and Guidelines (MPG) and summarized below.

E. Project Deliverables

Grantees must submit the following project deliverables by the specified deadlines provided. All deadlines specified below refer to calendar days. If a particular deadline falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline will refer to the following business day.

Required deliverables

For each impact evaluation study funded, the below deliverables shall be submitted to USDOL per the timeline in the table below or as agreed with USDOL.

All deliverables should be electronic copies submitted in English (except where otherwise noted), and final drafts should be revised taking into consideration USDOL comments. Final, approved versions of deliverables should be provided in electronic and hard copy.

Deliverables list:

- Work Plan outlining timeline for all fieldwork and deliverables listed below;
- Draft and Final evaluation design plans, including a logic model, sampling design, power calculations, MDEs, replacement protocols, ongoing monitoring approach, data quality and analysis plan and work plan;
- Draft and final survey tools and enumerator training materials for each survey conducted;
- Approval from a relevant IRB;
- Terms of reference and proposals for any subcontracts or grants;

- Draft and Final survey reports, including table of response rates, for each survey conducted;
- Qualitative data collection exercise data collection tools, and report of results;
- Electronic and hard micro-data files with all raw survey data – two copies – in SPSS or other format, and public-use datasets, data dictionaries, syntax files, and any other materials required for data analysis will be prepared by the Grantee and made publicly available for each survey conducted under this project. Public-use data sets must include identifiers to link adult and child responses, the weights used in order to replicate estimates published in the final reports, and data crosswalks that connect survey items to code variables. Data dictionaries or codebooks will be developed for public use in conducting further analysis of the data. Applicants must discuss in their proposal their past experience in carrying out this type of work and their approach to ensuring public-use data files are user-friendly;
- Draft and Final follow-up analysis report of evaluation results;
- Draft and Final Results Summary Report and presentation for dissemination, in **English and local language**, to be disseminated to all local partners, including local and national government bodies.
- Coordination and facilitation of dissemination event(s) in country of study, inviting relevant partners, including USDOL.
- Participation in an initial kick-off meeting with USDOL, a mid-term grantee learning workshop, and a final grantee learning workshop, all to take place in Washington, D.C.

Report Structures:

Reports submitted by the Grantee to the USDOL Grant Officer’s Representative (GOR) must include a thorough discussion of the research objectives, key research questions, methodology, results, key findings and limitations. Reports must, at a minimum, fulfill the minimum basic requirements according to the most recent guidance from Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT). Grantees should expect to work closely with USDOL to finalize reports and dissemination materials.

DELIVERABLE	DEADLINE	SUBMIT TO
Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA) Proposal	Submit within 90 days of award;	Cognizant Agency
Draft Work Plan	Within 30 days of award	GOR
Contact information for Grantee provided to USDOL, including name, address, phone, and email of point of contact at Grantee headquarters and in the project country	Within 30 days of award	GOR
Written notification that key personnel have begun to work on the project	Within 45 days of award	GOR
Federal Financial Report (FFR) Standard Form (SF) 425	Quarterly: January 31, April 30, July 30, October 31	E-grants
Technical Progress Report (TPR), with all required elements, updated work plan	Semi-annually: April 30 and October 30	GOR
Final Work Plan and Draft Evaluation Design Plan	Within 120 days of award	GOR
Subaward Matrix, if applicable. (see MPG for sample matrix); Grantees must adhere to requirements on government subawards provided in the Cooperative Agreement and MPG.	Within 120 days of award and subsequently if additional subawards are being proposed.	GOR
Final Evaluation Design Plan	Within 150 days of award	GOR
Draft baseline survey tools and training materials, IRB approval	TBD based on approved work plan	GOR
Final baseline survey tools, including: instruments, data analysis plan; consent, parental permission and assent forms and protocols used during the survey, training materials, IRB approval	TBD based on approved work plan	GOR

Draft Baseline survey report package	Within 9 months of award, or coordinated with approved work plan	GOR
Final Baseline survey report package	Within 12 months of award or coordinated with approved work plan	GOR
Baseline survey dataset	TBD based on approved work plan	GOR
Final survey tools submitted	TBD based on approved work plan	GOR
Draft follow-up survey report package	At least 2 months prior to the end of the Cooperative Agreement	GOR
Final follow-up survey report package	By the end of the Cooperative Agreement	GOR
Draft Qualitative Study Report	TBD based on approved work plan	GOR
Final Qualitative Study Report	TBD based on approved work plan	GOR
Follow-up Survey dataset	TBD based on approved work plan	GOR
Public-use datasets, log of analyses, data crosswalks, data tables	At least 1 month prior to the end of the Cooperative Agreement	GOR
Draft Final Analysis report	At least 2 months prior to the end of the Cooperative Agreement	GOR
Final Analysis report	By the end of the Cooperative Agreement	GOR
Draft Results Summary Report	At least 1 month prior to the end of the Cooperative Agreement	GOR
Final Results Summary Report	By the end of the Cooperative Agreement	GOR
Government Property Inventory Disposition Request; inventory list of all real property, equipment with an acquisition value of \$5,000 or more per unit, and supplies if aggregate value exceeds \$5,000	At least 120 days prior to the end of the Cooperative Agreement period	GOR
Closeout Documents Checklist; Final TPR; Final Quarterly FFR/SF-425; Closeout Financial Form; Recipient's Release Form; Government Property Closeout Inventory Certification	Within 90 days after the end of the Cooperative Agreement period	GOR

The final deliverables table may be subject to change and finalized in the Cooperative Agreement, based on the specific cases of proposed evaluations.

F. Required Staffing

1. Key Personnel

Key personnel positions are deemed essential to the successful operation of the project and completion of all proposed activities and deliverables. USDOL retains the authority to approve all key personnel changes throughout the life of the cooperative agreement. Key personnel must commit to the allocation of sufficient time to the evaluation to complete it within the timeline outlined in the proposal. Applicants must ensure that all proposed key personnel will be available to staff the project within 45 days of award should the Applicant be selected for award (See Section IV.B.1.d(4) for additional details). Proposed key personnel candidates must sign letters indicating their commitment to serve on the project for a stated term of the service and their availability to commence work within 45 days of cooperative agreement award. USDOL encourages Applicants to hire national/local staff for key personnel positions.

Applicants must propose candidates with qualifications to successfully implement the proposed strategy. Applicants must address candidates' level of competence, past experience relevant to this solicitation and qualifications to perform the requirements outlined in the Funding Opportunity Description and the Project Intervention proposed by the Applicant.

Grantees assume full responsibility for ensuring that all key personnel have a clear and thorough understanding of USDOL policies, procedures, and requirements and that all documents submitted to USDOL are in fluent English.

USDOL has designated the following position(s) as key personnel. Applicants are strongly encouraged to subgrant funds for evaluations to academics or academic institutions. Requirements for each individual position follow:

Principle Investigator (PI)

- The PI is responsible for overall project management, supervision, technical quality, administration and implementation of the requirements of the cooperative agreement, including the timely and effective implementation of all activities identified in the SCA and proposal. The PI will establish and maintain a system for project operations; ensure that all cooperative agreement deadlines are met and targets are achieved; maintain working relationships with project stakeholders (including subgrantees and/or subcontractors) and target country governments; and oversee the preparation and submission of technical and financial reports to USDOL. The PI must have a minimum of five years of professional experience in a leadership role in implementation of RCT evaluations and research projects relevant to this solicitation. The PI must possess experience working with impact evaluation designs, including those named in this solicitation, implementation of RCTs in an international development context, survey design and management, and quantitative analysis. The individual(s) selected for this position must hold a Master of Science or PhD in economics, applied economics, sociology, statistics, survey methodology or a related field.

2. Other Professional Personnel

Applicants may also propose other professional personnel as appropriate for their proposal. Other professional personnel may include in-country research assistants, statisticians, economists, senior analysts, supporting investigators, survey managers, data managers, and others. Applicants must identify other professional staff in their proposal and submit résumés to USDOL for those individuals.

II. AWARD INFORMATION

Award information is provided on the cover page (page 1) of the SCA.

III. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

A. Eligible Applicants

Any commercial, international, educational, or non-profit organization(s), including any faith-based, community-based, or PIOs, capable of successfully fulfilling the objectives identified in the Funding Opportunity Description is eligible to apply. Organizations applying for this award must demonstrate a proven ability to manage complex evaluations in developing countries. This SCA is for the award of a new cooperative agreement with the specific objectives and outcomes outlined in this SCA. As such, Applicants may not submit applications to renew or supplement an existing project.

PIOs are eligible to apply. However, USDOL requires that PIOs and all other entities that elect to apply for this grant opportunity adhere to the specific requirements outlined in this SCA concerning monitoring and evaluation, audits and counter-terrorism. In negotiating an award with a PIO, USDOL will discuss the inclusion of appropriate language acknowledging the rights and privileges as currently established and afforded to PIOs by the U.S. Government in accordance with U.S. law.

Applicants and any proposed subgrantees or subcontractors must comply with all audit requirements, including those established in the relevant Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular. Applicants must also demonstrate partnership with an in-country implementing presence and the ability to begin implementation of the impact evaluation in the proposed country or countries immediately upon award. Applicants may demonstrate this either independently or through a relationship with another organization with country presence that will be directly involved in project implementation (i.e., a subgrantee or subcontractor) — so that program activities can be initiated upon award of the cooperative agreement (see Section IV. Application and Submission Information).

The following Applicants (including subgrantees/subcontractors) **will not** be considered:

- Foreign governments and entities that are agencies of, or operated by or for, a foreign state or government.
- Organizations designated by the U.S. Government to be associated with terrorism or that have been debarred or suspended.
- Applicants charging a fee (profit) associated with a project funded by USDOL under this award.

B. Cost Sharing or Matching

Cost sharing or matching funds (including in-kind contributions) are not required as a condition for application. However, USDOL welcomes applications that include cost share or matching funds. Applicants that propose cost sharing or matching funds must indicate the nature; source(s) of funds and/or in-kind contributions; the amount in U.S. dollars; and the proposed project activities to be performed with these resources. Applicants must also explain how these activities will complement or enhance project objectives. Grantees that have proposed cost sharing or matching funds will be required to report on those funds in the FFR or SF-425 and are liable for the full amount of the funds.

Cost sharing, including from subgrantees and/or subcontractors, must be used to support the work of the project or defray its costs. Applicants may not award a subgrant or subcontract contingent upon the provision of matching funds from those entities.

C. Other

All applications will be screened for responsiveness. If deemed non-responsive, the Applicant will be notified of the reason(s) for the determination of non-responsiveness.

Applicants will be considered non-responsive and will not be eligible for this solicitation for any of the following reasons:

1. Failure to submit timely application by [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) or hard copy via the U.S. Postal Service or other delivery service, such as Federal Express, DHL, or UPS;
2. Failure to register with and maintain an active account in the System for Award Management (SAM) (<http://www.sam.gov>);
3. Failure to submit both a complete Technical Proposal and a complete Cost Proposal as specified in Section IV;
4. Failure to include all of the required documents and Appendixes in the Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal;
5. Submission of an application with an accompanying budget that exceeds the ceiling amount as specified on the cover page (page 1) of the SCA;
6. Failure to designate key personnel candidates, if required under this SCA, and failure to include résumés and signed letters of commitment for key personnel candidates;
7. Failure to include an English language copy of the opinion letter(s) and a summary of audit findings for the Applicants and subgrantee/subcontractors providing services related to project intervention strategies (see Section I.D.) For U.S.-based non-profit organizations that are subject to the Single Audit Act, failure to submit their most recent single audit or to demonstrate compliance with single audit submission timeframes established in OMB Circular A-133. For non-U.S.-based and for-profit entities, failure to submit opinion letters of the most current independent financial audit and a summary of audit findings in English.

IV. APPLICATION AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION

A. Address to Request Application Package

All information needed to apply for cooperative agreement funding is included in this solicitation. The SCA package and any amendments can be downloaded and viewed from [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) by referencing the Funding Opportunity Number.

B. Content and Form of Application Submission

Applications must consist of two separate parts: a Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal. Unless specified as “optional” or “as applicable,” all documents identified in this section must be included in the application package for it to be considered complete and responsive.

Applicants’ Technical and Cost Proposals must address the project objectives and requirements outlined in the SCA. Applications must be organized as outlined below. All pages of the application must be numbered. All required documents (including Appendixes) must be submitted in English. Any additional documentation submitted that is not required or specifically requested under this solicitation will not be considered. Technical Proposals must be no more than 50 single-sided, double-spaced pages (8-1/2” x 11” with 1” margins). Font size must be no less than 12-point Times New Roman. The Abstract, Table of Contents and required Appendixes to the Technical Proposal do not count toward the page limit.

1. Technical Proposal (50 page limit)

a. Abstract (Executive Summary)

The Abstract must not exceed two pages and must include: evaluation title; name of the Applicant; any proposed subgrantee(s) or subcontractor(s); summary of the proposed project design and key project activities; funding amount requested from USDOL; and total dollar value of cost share (if applicable). If using Grants.gov for submission, this document must be attached under the Mandatory Other Attachment section and labeled "Abstract."

b. Table of Contents

The Table of Contents must list all required documents and include their corresponding page numbers.

c. Evaluation Design Narrative

The Evaluation Design Narrative must describe in detail the Applicant's response to the Funding Opportunity Description. At minimum, the Project Design Narrative must contain the following sections:

1. Background, Research Question(s), and Hypothesis

Applicants are expected to describe how the proposed evaluation(s) will contribute to fill a gap in evidence about how to effectively combat child labor or forced labor both in the specific context (including policy or program relevance for governments or implementing partners) and more broadly (i.e. filling literature gaps in rigorous evidence about a specific intervention, combination of interventions, or outcome(s), regardless of context). Applicants must include the central research question(s) and hypothesis or hypotheses the applicant proposes to examine with randomized control trial evaluation(s), and reference relevant literature from which the proposed evaluation will build.

2. Partners

Applicants must include a brief description of all evaluation partners (as applicable), including a description of the project partners' role and capacity to implement specific aspects of the evaluation, and how proposed partners strengthen the overall proposal. This should include intervention implementing partners (if applicable), potential survey implementers (if known), and any additional partners or subgrantees involved in analysis and dissemination of the evaluation. Applicants should specifically reference partners' background and expertise in their area of contribution, and partners' commitment complete to the grant or subgrant, if awarded. Subgrants may be made to academics or academic institutions.

3. Evaluation Approach

Applicants must outline a proposed evaluation, or evaluations, that fully responds to the objectives and requirements discussed in Section I. Applicants must explain how their proposed strategies will lead to successfully completed evaluation(s) that address the hypothesis or hypotheses identified in the background section.

Applicants should respond to the requirements outlined in the SCA and must describe the overall approach of the evaluation, including:

- the intervention(s) of study and broad theory of change related to child labor or forced labor;
- the planned implementation of the intervention(s);
- plans to refine the theory of change of the intervention(s) related to child labor or forced labor;
- the methodology of the randomized control trial including sub-groups identified for analysis and initial power analyses and MDEs for all outcomes of interest by sub-group (if sub-group analysis is proposed);
- troubleshooting plans for possible problems with intervention implementation to protect both the timeliness and the analytical credibility of the evaluation;
- summaries of Applicants' planned data analysis and dissemination approaches;
- how the Applicant will work closely with ILAB to develop and complete all deliverables outlined in the SCA; and
- how Applicants will take appropriate measures to protect human subjects and safeguard personally identifiable information of respondents.

In addition, if proposed evaluations will build upon ongoing or completed evaluations, Applicants should assess the quality and rigor of the RCT's methodology and data, and include sufficient information in proposals to demonstrate that the evaluation produced with OCFT funding will meet the standards outlined in this SCA.

4. Progress Reporting

Applicants should outline their capacity and commitment to produce and submit quarterly FFRs, bi-annual (twice per year) TPRs, and their plans for close engagement with USDOL in designing and developing deliverables outlined in this SCA. Grantees will be provided format and content parameters for Technical Progress Reports.

5. Results Framework and Project Definitions of Child Labor or Forced Labor

The results framework must encompass all interventions of study, and include outputs, supporting results, intermediate objectives, a project objective related to child labor or forced labor, and critical assumptions that may influence the project intervention(s). The results framework should also include an estimated timeline for predicted changes (i.e. timing for outputs to influence relevant supporting results, intermediate objectives, and the project objective related to child labor or forced labor). The results framework must be no longer than two pages and be included as an Appendix. The results framework will be refined and finalized during the full evaluation design process. For a template, definitions, and example, please see the MPG.

Applicants must also include the project-specific definitions for “child labor”, including “worst forms of child labor” and “hazardous child labor”, and “forced labor” that they propose to use in implementing their evaluation. The Applicant’s definitions for these terms must be consistent with those definitions provided in this SCA in Appendix B. However, the Applicant must provide more specificity in their definitions for use in survey design, taking into account the context of the country where the project will be implemented and their proposed implementation strategy.

6. Work Plan

The Work Plan must identify major evaluation activities, deadlines for completing these activities, and person(s) or institution(s) responsible for completing these activities for the entire life of the evaluation, from design to analysis to dissemination. The work plan must be included as an Appendix and correspond to timing identified in the results framework and the evaluation approach narrative, and fulfill the requirements outlined in the deliverables table of this SCA. Applicants may choose an appropriate format for their work plan.

d. Organizational Capacity

This section must describe the qualifications of the proposed Applicant and/or any proposed subgrantees and/or subcontractors to implement the evaluation. Applicants may demonstrate this either independently or through a relationship with proposed subgrantees and/or subcontractors that will be directly involved in evaluation implementation.

1. International and U.S. Government Grant and/or Contract Experience

Applicants must describe any experience they have with implementing evaluations or projects relevant to the stated objective(s) of this SCA (see Section I) and provide references for past performance (no more than a total of six (6) references/projects, see Appendices for a sample format). Applicants should prioritize submission of references related to the objectives of the project. References should be included for all the Applicants and subgrantees and/or subcontractors providing services related to the project (see Section I.D.). Projects included in the table must have been active within seven years of the issuance date of the SCA.

2. Country Presence and Host Government Support

Applicants must describe their organization’s (or partner organization’s) existing presence and ability to start up project activities in the target area(s) upon signing a cooperative agreement. Applicants should also discuss their ability to work directly with relevant government agencies and NGOs, including local organizations and community based organizations, and their past experience working with these stakeholders. Applicants must submit supporting documentation demonstrating evidence of any relationships necessary to implement the evaluation.

Any documents that demonstrate country presence and corroborate host government or partner support must be included as an Appendix to the Technical

Proposal. Documentation may include official registration of the Applicant's organization in the host country, a current Memorandum of Understanding between the Applicant and the host government, and letters of support for the proposed project from the national and/or local governments or partners.

3. Project Management Plan

Applicants must outline a project management plan encompassing all proposed evaluations, including a narrative description of the structure of the project's management team, key personnel roles and responsibilities. If any of the project's personnel would be employed by a subgrantee/subcontractor, the Applicant must provide a rationale for this arrangement and an explanation of the staffing structure.

Applicants must also include (as an Appendix) a project management organization chart that provides a visual depiction of the project's management structure and lines of authority among all key personnel, other professional personnel, and other project staff being proposed. Applicants may choose an appropriate format for their project management organization chart.

4. Personnel

Applicants must include (as an Appendix) signed letters of commitment from all proposed key personnel (as identified in this SCA) indicating their commitment to serve on the project. Applicants must include as an Appendix a one-page personnel description outlining roles and responsibilities for each key personnel and professional personnel position specified in their proposal. Applicants must also submit as an Appendix a one-page résumé for all positions designated as key personnel in this SCA and any other professional personnel being proposed by the Applicant in the SCA. Each résumé must include:

- Educational background, including highest education level attained;
- Work experience covering at least the last five years of employment to the present, including such information as the employer name, position title, clearly defined duties, and dates of employment;
- Special experience, capabilities, or qualifications related to the candidate's ability to implement the proposed strategy and perform effectively in the proposed position; and
- English and other relevant language skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing).

5. Audit Reports

Applicants must include (as an Appendix) a copy of the opinion letter(s) and a summary of audit findings for the Applicant and all subgrantees/subcontractors providing services related to the project. The Applicant must include a cover sheet

for its audit attachments. The following audit attachments are required, depending on the organization's status:

- Applicants from U.S.-based non-profit organizations and all proposed U.S.-based, non-profit, subgrantees and/or subcontractors that are subject to the Single Audit Act must include the summary of audit findings and opinion letter of the most recent single audit and demonstrate compliance with single audit submission timeframes established in OMB Circular A-133. Organizations with audit findings that include qualified or adverse opinions must also include a summary of corrective actions undertaken to address the findings.
- Non-U.S. based and for-profit Applicants must submit an English version of opinion letters and a summary of audit findings from their most current independent financial audit report.
- For all proposed subgrantees and/or subcontractors that are for-profit or non-U.S.-based organizations, Applicants must submit English versions of the summary of their audit findings and opinion letters for their most current independent financial audit.
- Upon request, Applicants/Grantees will be required to submit full audit reports and/or official translations of audit reports.

2. Cost Proposal

Applicants must prepare a cost proposal as Part II of the application. Applicants must provide a narrative description and supporting documentation that demonstrate their organization has a sound financial system in place to effectively manage the funds requested under this solicitation.

The cost proposal must reflect consistency between the proposed costs and the work to be performed as outlined in the project design narrative of the Applicant's technical proposal. For proposals where multiple evaluations are proposed, cost proposals (in the outputs-based budget) should detail costs (including personnel) per evaluation, as well as a cost proposal encompassing all proposed evaluations (which may include cost savings for personnel working across multiple evaluations) so that USDOL may evaluate costs per proposed impact evaluation, should not all proposed evaluations be selected. The cost proposal must contain the following: (1) an SF-424 Supplemental Key Contacts Information; (2) an SF-424 Application for Federal Assistance; (3) an SF-424A Budget Information; (4) a detailed outputs-based budget and an accompanying budget narrative; (5) an indirect cost form and supporting documentation; and (6) cost sharing information, if applicable.

Applicants should take careful note of USDOL's intention to award multiple cooperative agreements within the \$10 million funding ceiling for multiple evaluations. When putting together cost proposals, Applicants should consider that in general, USDOL would expect proposed full evaluations to range in cost from approximately \$250,000 to \$1 million; requests for supplemental funding for ongoing evaluations to range in cost from approximately \$10,000 to \$250,000; and requests for funding for additional analysis on completed evaluations to range in cost from approximately \$10,000 to \$50,000. It should be noted that these guidelines are not absolute, but are provided to assist Applicants in

developing appropriate cost proposals; proposals for all impact evaluations must describe and justify the level of funding being requested.

a. Dun & Bradstreet (DUNS) Number and SAM Registration

Applicants must include their unexpired DUNS number in the organizational unit section of Block 8 of the SF-424. Applicants proposing subgrantees or subcontractors must submit each organization's DUNS number as an attachment to the Cost Proposal.

Organizations that do not have a DUNS number can receive a DUNS number at no cost by using the web-based form available at <http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform>.

In addition to having a current DUNS number, Applicants must be registered with the SAM Web site prior to submitting an application to this solicitation. Instructions for registering with SAM can be found at <https://www.sam.gov>. An awardee must maintain an active SAM registration with current information at all times during which it has an active Federal award or an application under consideration. To remain registered in the SAM database after the initial registration, the Applicant is required to review and update the registration at least every 12 months from the date of initial registration or subsequently update its information in the SAM database to ensure it is current, accurate and complete.

b. Required Standard Forms

1. SF-424 Supplemental Key Contacts Information

This form must include name, position title, address, telephone and fax numbers, e-mail address, and other relevant information for the Applicant's designated key contact person.

2. SF-424 Application for Federal Assistance

This form must reflect the entire amount of funds being requested under this solicitation and, if applicable, the amount of any cost sharing proposed by the Applicant must be shown in Section 18.b.

3. SF-424A Budget Information (Non Construction Programs)

This form must include all costs for proposed activities. If applicable, line 6 must include construction activities that are: 1) over \$5,000; and/or 2) for the construction of a permanent structure (latrines, wells, etc.)

c. Outputs-Based Budget

The Cost Proposal must include a summary outputs-based budget, along with specific outputs-based budgets for the Applicant and each proposed subgrantee/subcontractor. The outputs-based budget must correspond to the SF-424 and SF-424A. The outputs-based budget (including USDOL funds and any cost sharing funds reported on the SF-424 and SF-424A) must comply with Federal cost principles. Allowable costs are defined in OMB Circular A-122. The budget will become part of the cooperative agreement in the

event of award and any costs omitted by the Applicant may not be allowed after award. Applicants must not rely on other contracts, grants, or awards that are pending at the time of application to implement the Applicant's proposed strategy. Applicants should only rely upon funds that have been secured prior to application. The budget submitted with the application must include all necessary funds to implement the proposed project strategy. USDOL will not provide any additional funding to cover unanticipated costs.

The detailed outputs-based budget must present costs in a manner that is linked to activities, objectives, and outputs reflected in the evaluation design narrative, work plan, and results framework and demonstrate cost-effective allocation of project funds. In addition, it must provide a breakdown of total administrative costs into direct and indirect administrative costs and allocate the largest proportion of project resources to direct intervention rather than to direct and indirect administrative costs.¹⁹

Applicants must use the following guidance in preparing their outputs-based budget:

1. Travel

Applicants must allocate sufficient funds to finance appropriate in-country and international travel. At a minimum, applicants must allocate funds for:

- Travel by the Principal Investigator and/or other relevant personnel staff member to Washington, D.C. to attend a post-award meeting (New Grantee Orientation);
- Travel by the Principal Investigator and/or other relevant personnel staff to participate in a mid-term evaluation grantee lessons learned workshop and a final evaluation grantee lessons learned and dissemination workshop in Washington, D.C.; and
- Travel by the Principal Investigator and other relevant personnel staff to conduct sufficient site visits to ensure quality and timely completion of the evaluation, including oversight of key evaluation activities such as baseline and follow-up surveys, launch of evaluation implementation, discussions with key stakeholders, appropriate ongoing monitoring, and dissemination activities.

2. Evaluation Oversight

All USDOL funded projects must allocate funds to cover the costs associated with evaluation oversight activities. This includes administrative costs for required in-country oversight of key data collection activities (for both survey and qualitative data collection activities) and travel, if necessary, for principal investigators and other relevant personnel staff to visit evaluations periodically. Applicants should also allocate funds to meet all progress reporting and deliverable requirements as discussed in the SCA.

3. Data Collection and Analysis Costs

¹⁹ The GO reserves the right to negotiate project and administrative cost levels before award.

Applicants are expected to provide detailed budget information for all data collection and analysis activities, including for the baseline and follow-up surveys, and the qualitative data collection exercise.

4. Single Audits / Attestation Engagements

Include costs for single audits as direct or indirect costs, whichever is appropriate, in accordance with the cost allocation procedures approved by the U.S. Federal Cognizant Agency (FCA). Attestation engagements are conducted at USDOL's expense to supplement the coverage provided by the single audits. There should be no costs included in the budget for attestation engagements.

5. Allowance for Unforeseen Costs

Applicants must include five percent of the project's total direct costs to address unforeseen circumstances beyond the Grantee's control that affect specific budget lines related to:

- Inflation affecting specific project costs;
- United Nations System or foreign government-mandated salary scale or benefits revisions; and
- Exchange rate fluctuations.

USDOL also recognizes that certain unforeseen circumstances may arise and result in a need for exceptions to these uses of Allowance for Unforeseen Costs funds and a need for budget modifications or time extensions. These include (1) changes in a country's security environment; (2) natural disasters; (3) civil or political unrest/upheavals or government transitions; or (4) delays related to loss of or damage to project property. Use of these funds must be approved by the GO. The MPG gives guidelines for requesting approval of a budget modification to re-allocate funds under the Allowance for Unforeseen Costs budget line, as well as guidance on the timeline by which such re-allocations should be completed.

6. Value Added Tax (VAT)

Applicants must include costs related to VAT. If VAT costs are applied by the host government but are omitted in an Applicant's budget, the Grantee will be responsible for paying them. USDOL-funding cannot be used for VAT costs that were not included in the initial budget proposal.

7. Housing

If included in the budget, provide in the budget narrative a justification for any proposed housing costs, housing allowances, and/or personal living expenses. In accordance with federal cost principles, personnel housing and personal living expenses may not be counted as fringe benefits or indirect costs in the project

budget. USDOL funds may only be used to pay for housing costs, housing allowances, and personal living expenses (e.g., dependents' allowance) of project staff if they (1) are separately accounted for as direct costs of the project necessary for the performance of the project and (2) receive prior approval from USDOL. Applicants must provide a brief explanation as to why such costs are considered necessary for the performance of the project, consistent with the organization's established policies, and reasonable for the country where the staff person will reside.

d. Budget Narrative

The cost proposal must include a budget narrative that corresponds to the outputs-based budget. The budget narrative must include a detailed justification, broken down by line item, of all of the Applicant's costs included in the outputs-based budget.

e. Indirect Cost Information

According to Federal regulations, indirect costs are those that have been incurred for common or joint objectives and cannot be readily identified with a particular final cost objective. Indirect cost charges must be based on allowable, allocable, and reasonable costs based on the applicable cost principles.²⁰ Indirect cost support for allocated charges to the grant and the closeout process is validated using a federally approved Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (NICRA). The NICRA is issued by the FCA based on annual indirect cost proposal submissions from grantees. Typically, the agency providing the preponderance of direct Federal funds to the organization is the FCA.

1. Indirect Cost Form for the Applicant

The cost proposal must contain information on the Applicant's indirect costs, using the Indirect Cost Form provided on Grants.gov and on the USDOL/ILAB's Web site at <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/grants/SGAguidelines.htm>.

2. Indirect Cost Supporting Documentation

For organizations with a current rate approved by the FCA: provide a copy of the NICRA in the proposal.

For organizations with no budgeted/claimed indirect costs: provide a Certificate of Direct Costs. See the Indirect Cost Form for details and a sample certificate.

3. Indirect Cost Proposal Submission Requirements

For organizations with an expired rate or a rate not previously approved by the FCA: For evaluation purposes, applicants without an approved NICRA must submit an indirect cost rate or ceiling amount that they propose be incorporated into the resultant cooperative agreement award. An indirect cost proposal must be

²⁰ OMB Circular A-122 for non-profit organizations or OMB Circular A-87 for State and local organizations; and OMB Circular A-21 for Educational Institutions. These cost principles are available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/index.html>. Federal Acquisition Regulations, 48 Code of Federal Regulations Part 31, for for-profit organizations are available at: <http://www.arnet.gov/far/>.

submitted to the FCA within 90 days of grant award to establish a provisional NICRA. This provisional rate may be effective for a period up to two years until a final NICRA is established.

For organizations with a current rate: Indirect cost proposals must be submitted on an annual basis to the FCA to obtain federally approved NICRAs for the life of the grant, unless the FCA instructs otherwise. These proposals are based on incurred costs and are due six months after the end of each fiscal year.

4. Indirect Cost Ceilings

The proposed/approved NICRA rate, or indirect rate proposed in response to the SCA for those organizations with no rates approved, will be used to set a ceiling for indirect costs in the cooperative agreement. The Government will not be obligated to pay any additional amount should the final indirect cost rates exceed the negotiated ceiling rate(s).

3. Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunity for Applicants (Optional)

All Applicants are requested, but not required, to complete and include the Survey on Ensuring Equal Opportunity for Applicants (OMB No. 1890-0014) in their applications; this form is provided on USDOL/ILAB's Web site at:
<http://www.dol.gov/ilab/grants/SGAguidelines.htm>.

C. Submission Dates and Times

All applications must be received by the closing date and time on the cover page of this announcement. Late applications will be considered non-responsive and will not be reviewed.

D. Intergovernmental Review

This funding opportunity is not subject to Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs."

E. Funding Restrictions

All Applicants must adhere to requirements concerning restrictions, unallowable activities, and specific prohibitions, as identified in OMB Circular A-122, OMB Circular A-21, 29 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 95, 29 CFR Part 98, and USDOL/ILAB policies outlined in the MPG, for all USDOL-funded technical cooperation projects. Applicants should take particular note of and should adhere to the funding restrictions/administrative requirements in the USDOL/ILAB MPG (available on Grants.gov as a document accompanying this SCA).

F. Other Submission Requirements

Applications must be submitted electronically via [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) or in hard copy. Applications submitted by other means, including e-mail, telegram, or facsimile (FAX) will be not be accepted.

1. Electronic Submission

Applicants electing to submit electronically must submit one electronic copy of the complete application via [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov). Applicants submitting via [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) are responsible for ensuring that their application is received by [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) by the deadline.

Applicants submitting their application electronically through [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) should note the following submission instructions: (1) an individual with authority to legally bind the Applicant must be responsible for submitting the application on [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov), (2) applications submitted through [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) do not need to be signed manually; the form will automatically affix an electronic signature for the authorized person identified, and (3) when submitting on [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov), Applicants must save all attachments as a .doc, .pdf, .txt, or .xls file. If submitted in any other format, the application bears the risk that compatibility or other issues will prevent USDOL from considering the application. USDOL will attempt to open the document, but will not take any “corrective” measures in the event of issues with opening the document. In such cases, the non-conforming application will not be considered for funding.

To avoid unexpected delays that could result in the rejection of an application, Applicants should immediately initiate and complete the registration steps at http://www.grants.gov/Applicants/get_registered.jsp as registration can take multiple days to complete. Applicants should consult the [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) Web site’s Frequently Asked Questions and Applicant User Guide, available at http://www.grants.gov/help/general_faqs.jsp, and <http://www.grants.gov/assets/ApplicantUserGuide.pdf>. Within two business days of application submission, [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) will send the Applicant two email messages to provide the status of application progress through the system. The first, almost immediate, email will confirm receipt of the application by [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov). The second email will indicate the application has been successfully submitted and successfully validated or has been rejected due to errors. Only applications that have been successfully submitted and successfully validated will be considered. It is the sole responsibility of the Applicant to ensure a timely submission, therefore sufficient time should be allotted for submission (two business days) and, as necessary, additional time should be allotted to address errors and receive validation upon resubmission (an additional two business days for each ensuing submission). It is important to note that if sufficient time is not allotted and a rejection notice is received after the due date and time, the application will not be considered.

Applicants can contact the [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov) Contact Center at 1-800-518-4726 or support@grants.gov to obtain assistance with any problems related to using [Grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov), including difficulties downloading the application package; software compatibility questions; and questions on how to assemble electronic application packages. USDOL bears no responsibility for data errors resulting from transmission or conversion processes.

2. Hardcopy Submissions

Applicants electing to submit hard copies must submit one (1) signed original, complete application, *plus* one (1) copy of the application, along with a CD that includes the Technical and Cost Proposals saved as .doc, .pdf, .txt, or .xls files. Hard copy applications must be delivered to the address on the cover page of this announcement. Applicants are advised to submit their applications in advance of the deadline. Applications may be hand delivered or submitted via the U.S. Postal Service or non-U.S. Postal Service delivery services, such as Federal Express or UPS. Regardless of the type of delivery service selected, Applicants bear

the responsibility for timely submission. The application package must be received at the designated place by the date and time specified or it will be considered non-responsive and will be rejected. Note: Please be advised that U.S. mail delivery in the Washington D.C. area can be slow and erratic due to security concerns. Applicants must consider this when preparing to meet the application deadline.

Any application received after the deadline will not be considered unless it is received before the award is made and:

1. It is determined by the Government that the late receipt was due solely to mishandling by the Government after receipt at USDOL at the address indicated; and/or
2. It was sent by registered or certified mail not later than the fifth calendar day before the deadline; or
3. It was sent by U.S. Postal Service Express Mail Next Day Service-Post Office to Addressee, no later than 5:00 p.m. at the place of mailing two (2) working days, excluding weekends and Federal holidays, before the deadline.
4. It was sent by non-U.S. Postal Service Next Day Service-carrier facility to Addressee, no later than 5:00 p.m. at the place of mailing two (2) working days, excluding weekends and Federal holidays, before the deadline.

The only acceptable evidence to establish the date of mailing sent by registered or certified mail is the U.S. Postal Service postmark on the envelope or wrapper and on the original receipt from the U.S. Postal Service. The only acceptable evidence to establish the date of mailing sent by U.S. Postal Service Express Mail Next Day Service-Post Office to Addressee is the date entered by the Post Office clerk on the "Express Mail Next Day Service-Post Office to Addressee" label and the postmark on the envelope or wrapper on the original receipt from the U.S. Postal Service. For Applications submitted through other delivery services such as Federal Express or UPS, the only acceptable evidence to establish the date of the mailing is the tracking number, which contains detailed information about the mailing.

If the postmark is not legible, an application received after the above closing time and date will be treated as if mailed late. "Postmark" means a printed, stamped, or otherwise placed impression (not a postage meter machine impression) that is readily identifiable without further action as having been applied and affixed by an employee of the U.S. Postal Service on the date of mailing. Therefore, Applicants should request that the postal clerk place a legible hand cancellation "bull's-eye" postmark on both the receipt and the envelope or wrapper.

V. APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION

A. Criteria

Procedures for assessing the technical merit of applications have been instituted to provide for an objective review of applications and to assist the applicant in understanding the standards against which each application will be judged. The evaluation criteria are based on the information required in the application as described in Section IV.

CRITERIA	REFERENCE	POINTS
Background Research Question(s), and Hypothesis	IV.B.1.c.1	20

Partners, Country Presence and Host Government Support	IV.B.1.c.2 IV.B.1.d.2	10
Evaluation Approach, Results Framework	IV.B.1.c.3 IV.B.1.c.5	25
International and US Government Grant and/or Contract Experience	IV.B.1.d.1 IV.B.1.d.3	5
Personnel	IV.B.1.d.4	25
Project Management Plan, Work Plan	IV.B.1.d.2 IV.B.1.c.6	5
Budget (Outputs-Based Budget and Budget Narrative)	IV.B.2	10
Total =		100

B. Review and Selection Process

A technical review panel will evaluate each responsive application against the criteria described in this SCA. Reviewers will award points based on the extent to which the Applicant's proposal provides a clear and strong response to requirements in the SCA related to each of the criteria above.

Applicants are advised that panel recommendations to the GO are advisory in nature. The GO may elect to select a Grantee on the basis of the initial application submission or the GO may establish a competitive or technically acceptable range from which a Grantee will be selected.

If deemed appropriate, the GO may call for the preparation and receipt of final revisions of applications, following which the evaluation process described above may be repeated, in whole or in part, to consider such revisions. The GO will make final selection determinations based on panel findings and may consider other factors that represent the greatest advantage to the Federal Government, including cost, the availability of funds, and the Applicant's past performance on Federal awards. USDOL reserves the right to: (1) solicit information from Federal sources and/or non-Federal sources about the Applicant's past performance on any awards—including evaluations, audits, attestation engagements, and questionnaires; (2) assess the Applicant's past performance on awards with respect to its potential effect on grant implementation; and (3) consider this information as part of its selection process. If USDOL does not receive technically acceptable applications in response to this solicitation, it reserves the right to terminate the competition and not make any award. The GO's determinations for awards under this solicitation are final.

Before the actual cooperative agreement is awarded, USDOL may enter into discussions with one or more selected Applicants for any reason deemed necessary, including negotiating components of the project design/strategy; budget; project duration; staffing; funding levels; and financial and administrative systems in place to support implementation of the cooperative agreement [including relevant issues raised in submitted audit report(s)]. If negotiations do not result in a mutually acceptable submission, the GO reserves the right to terminate the negotiation and decline to fund the application.

Award of a cooperative agreement under this solicitation may also be contingent upon an exchange of project support letters between USDOL and the relevant host government ministries.

C. Anticipated Announcement and Award Dates

Information on the anticipated award date is provided on the cover page of the SCA. USDOL is not obligated to make any awards as result of this solicitation.

VI. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Award Notices

The GO will notify Applicants of designation results as follows:

1. Notice of Award

The notice of award signed by the GO serves as official notice of an Applicant's designation as Grantee. The notice of award will be accompanied by a cooperative agreement and the most current MPG, which is available on Grants.gov (as a document accompanying this SCA). The MPG provides general management procedures and guidance for recipients of ILAB's Grants and/or Cooperative Agreements in areas that may not be explicitly detailed in the solicitation.

2. Notice to Unsuccessful Applicants

Applicants not selected for award will be provided notification. Unsuccessful Applicants that wish to be debriefed by the GO must submit a written request within 10 business days after receipt of notification of non-selection. The GO is not required to provide debriefings if written requests are not received within the specified timeframe.

Notification of designation by a person or entity other than the GO is not valid.

B. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

1. General Requirements

Grantees under this SCA shall be subject to the terms outlined in this solicitation, the cooperative agreement, and the MPG. They are also subject to applicable U.S. Federal laws (including appropriations laws) and regulations, Executive Orders, applicable OMB Circulars and USDOL policies. If, during project implementation, a Grantee is found in violation of any of the foregoing, remedies may include modification of the terms of the cooperative agreement awarded under this solicitation; disallowance and recovery of costs; termination of the cooperative agreement; and any other action permitted by law.

For the purposes of this solicitation and cooperative agreement awards, Grantees will be the sole-entity:

- to act as the primary point of contact with USDOL to receive and respond to all inquiries, communications and orders under the project;

- with authority to withdraw or draw down funds through the Department of Health and Human Services-Payment Management System ;
- responsible for submitting to USDOL all deliverables, including all technical and financial reports related to the project;
- that may request or agree to a revision or amendment of the cooperative agreement or the Project Document; and
- responsible for working with USDOL to close out the project. Each Grantee must comply with all applicable Federal regulations and is individually subject to audit.

2. Project Audits and External Auditing Arrangements

U.S.-based non-profit Grantees whose total annual expenditure of Federal awards is more than \$500,000 must have an organization-wide audit conducted in accordance with 29 CFR Parts 96 and 99, which codify the requirements of the Single Audit Act and OMB Circular A-133, and must comply with the timeframes established in those regulations for the submission of their audits to the Federal Audit Clearinghouse. Grantees must send a copy of each single audit conducted within the timeframe of the USDOL-funded project to their assigned GOR at the time it is submitted to the Federal Audit Clearinghouse.

In accordance with 29 CFR Parts 96 and 99, USDOL has contracted with an independent external auditor to conduct project-specific attestation engagements at USDOL's expense to supplement the coverage provided by the annual audits that Grantees are required to arrange, which are referenced in the preceding paragraph. All Grantees, including non-U.S.-based and private for-profit Grantees, are subject to attestation engagements during the life of the cooperative agreement. Attestation engagements will be conducted in accordance with U.S. Government Auditing Standards, which includes auditors' opinions on (1) compliance with USDOL regulations and the provisions of the cooperative agreement and (2) the accuracy and reliability of the Grantee's financial and performance reports.

3. Administrative Standards and Provisions

Cooperative agreements awarded under this solicitation are subject to all applicable Federal laws, regulations, and applicable OMB Circulars. Awards under this SCA will be subject to the following administrative standards and provisions:

- 29 CFR Part 2 Subpart D – Equal Treatment in Department of Labor Programs for Religious Organizations; Protection of Religious Liberty of Department of Labor Social Service Providers and Beneficiaries.
- 29 CFR Part 31 – Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs of the Department of Labor— Effectuation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
- 29 CFR Part 32 – Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Programs and Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance.
- 29 CFR Part 33 – Enforcement of Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Programs or Activities Conducted by the Department of Labor.
- 29 CFR Part 35 – Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Age in Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance from the Department of Labor.

- 29 CFR Part 36 – Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance.
- 29 CFR Part 93 – New Restrictions on Lobbying.
- 29 CFR Part 94 – Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Financial Assistance).
- 29 CFR Part 95 – Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals and other Non-Profit Organizations, and with Commercial Organizations, Foreign Governments, Organizations Under the Jurisdiction of Foreign Governments, and International Organizations.
- 29 CFR Part 96 – Audit Requirements for Grants, Contracts and Other Agreements.
- 29 CFR Part 98 – Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Non-procurement).
- 29 CFR Part 99 – Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.
- OMB Circular A-21 – Cost Principles for Educational Institutions.
- OMB Circular A-110 – Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations.
- OMB Circular A-122 – Cost Principles for Non-Profit Organizations.
- OMB Circular A-133 – Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.

On December 26, 2013, OMB published the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards; Final Rule, 78 Fed. Reg. 78590, which can be found at: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2013-12-26/pdf/2013-30465.pdf>. These new rules will supersede the requirements of OMB Circulars A-21, A-87, A-110, A-122, A-89, A-102, and A-133, and the guidance on Circular A-50 on Single Audit Act follow-up. Federal agencies are required to promulgate a regulation applying the rules by December 26, 2014, at which point the rules will be applied to awards to non-Federal entities. Awards made prior to promulgation of the new regulations will be governed by the terms and conditions contained in that award.

For more information about the Final Rule and uniform guidance, please visit www.cfo.gov/COFAR. Crosswalks and side-by-sides with old guidance next to the new language are available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/grants_docs.

4. Transparency

USDOL is committed to conducting a transparent grant award process and publicizing information about program outcomes. Posting grant applications on public Web sites is a means of promoting and sharing innovative ideas. For this grant competition, USDOL will publish all proposal Abstracts on the Department's public Web site or similar publicly accessible location. Additionally, USDOL will publish a redacted version of the Technical Proposal required by this solicitation for all Awardees, on the Department's Web site or a similar location. Except for the sections listed above, none of the Attachments to the Technical Proposal described in Section IV will be published. The Technical Proposals and Abstracts will not be published until after the cooperative agreements are awarded. In addition, information about Cooperative Agreement progress and results may also be made publicly available.

USDOL recognizes that grant applications sometimes contain information that an Applicant may consider proprietary or business confidential information, or may contain personally identifiable information. Proprietary or business confidential information is information that

is not usually disclosed outside an organization and the disclosure of which is likely to cause the Applicant substantial competitive harm. Personally identifiable information is any information that can be used to distinguish or trace an individual's identity, such as name, social security number, date and place of birth, mother's maiden name, or biometric records; and any other information that is linked or linkable to an individual, such as medical, educational, financial, and employment information.²¹

Abstracts will be published in the form originally submitted, without any redactions. Applicants should not include any proprietary or confidential business information or personally identifiable information in this summary. In the event that an Applicant submits proprietary or confidential business information or personally identifiable information, USDOL is not liable for the posting of this information contained in the Abstract. The submission of the grant application constitutes a waiver of the Applicant's objection to the posting of any proprietary or confidential business information contained in the Abstract. Additionally, the Applicant is responsible for obtaining all authorizations from relevant parties for publishing all personally identifiable information contained within the Abstract. In the event the Abstract contains proprietary or confidential business or personally identifiable information, the Applicant is presumed to have obtained all necessary authorizations to provide this information and may be liable for any improper release of this information.

By submission of this grant application, the Applicant agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the United States, USDOL, its officers, employees, and agents against any liability or for any loss or damages arising from this application. By such submission of this grant application, the Applicant further acknowledges having the authority to execute this release of liability.

In order to ensure that proprietary or confidential business information or personally identifiable information is properly protected from disclosure when USDOL posts the winning Technical Proposals, Applicants whose Technical Proposals will be posted will be requested by the Grant Office to submit a redacted version of their Technical Proposal, with any proprietary or confidential business information and personally identifiable information redacted. All non-public information about the Applicant's and subgrantee or subcontractor members' staff (if applicable) should be removed as well.

Submission of a redacted version of the Technical Proposal will constitute permission by the Applicant for USDOL to make the redacted version publicly available. USDOL will also assume that by submitting the redacted version of the Technical Proposal, the Applicant has obtained the agreement of all persons and entities whose proprietary, confidential business information, or personally identifiable information is contained in the Technical Proposal to publish any unredacted information which fits under either category. If an Applicant fails to provide a redacted version of the Technical Proposal by the deadline established by USDOL, USDOL will publish the original Technical Proposal in full, after redacting only personally identifiable information. (Note that the original, unredacted version of the Technical Proposal will remain part of the complete application package, including the Applicant's proprietary and confidential business information and any personally identifiable information).

²¹ Office of Management and Budget, *OMB Memorandum 07-16 and 06-19. GAO Report 08-536, Privacy: Alternatives Exist for Enhancing Protection of Personally Identifiable Information*, May 2008; available from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d08536.pdf>.

Applicants are encouraged to maximize the grant application information that will be publicly disclosed, and to exercise restraint and redact only information that clearly is proprietary, confidential commercial/business information, or capable of identifying a person. The redaction of entire pages or sections of the Technical Proposal is not appropriate, and will not be allowed, unless the entire portion merits such protection. Should a dispute arise about whether redactions are appropriate, USDOL will follow the procedures outlined in the Department's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) regulations (29 CFR Part 70).

Redacted information in grant applications will be protected by USDOL from public disclosure in accordance with federal law, including the Trade Secrets Act (18 U.S.C. § 1905), FOIA, and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a). If USDOL receives a FOIA request for an application, the procedures in USDOL's FOIA regulations for responding to requests for commercial/business information submitted to the government will be followed, as well as all FOIA exemptions and procedures. 29 CFR § 70.26. Consequently, it is possible that application of FOIA rules may result in release of information in response to a FOIA request that an Applicant redacted in its "redacted copy."

5. Transparency Act Requirements

Applicants must ensure that necessary processes and systems are in place to comply with the reporting requirements of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (Pub. Law 109-282, as amended by section 6202 of Pub. Law 110-252). Complete information on the reporting requirements of the Transparency Act, as described in 2 CFR Part 170, Appendix A, can be found at the following Web site: <http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2010/pdf/2010-22705.pdf>.

C. Reporting

Grantees must submit copies of all required reports to USDOL by the specified due dates, unless otherwise indicated. More information on the reports and exact timeframes for their completion will be included in the cooperative agreement.

VII. AGENCY CONTACTS

Agency contact information is available on the cover page of the SCA.

VIII. OTHER INFORMATION

A. OMB Information Collection

This SCA requests information from Applicants. This collection of information is approved under OMB control number 1225-0086 (expires January 31, 2016). According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 40 hours per response. These estimates include time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, completing and reviewing the collection of information, and drafting the proposal. Any comments about the burden estimated or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, should be directed to the ETA.

This information is being collected for the purpose of awarding a cooperative agreement. The information collected through this SCA will be used by the USDOL to ensure that cooperative agreements are awarded to the Applicant(s) best suited to perform the functions of these cooperative agreements. Submission of this information is required in order for the Applicant to be considered for award of a cooperative agreement.

B. Privacy Act and FOIA

Any information submitted in response to this solicitation will be subject to the provisions of the Privacy Act and the FOIA, as appropriate.

APPENDIX B. Definitions

1. **“Acceptable work,”** while not specifically defined in the ILO Conventions, is work that is performed by children who are of legal working age, in accordance with national legislation and international standards, namely ILO Conventions 182 and 138; non-hazardous; non-exploitative; and does not prevent a child from receiving the full benefit of an education. For example, “acceptable work” would generally include light work that is compatible with national minimum age legislation and education laws.
2. **“Area-based approach”** targets all forms of child labor within a defined geographic location.
3. A **“Child”** or **“children”** are individuals under the age of 18 years. For the purposes of this solicitation, the term “youth” will be used for older children who are age 15 to 18 years. **“Child labor”** is defined by a combination of three international conventions and individual countries’ legal frameworks. U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) and its option protocols provide an overall framework of human rights for children, including their right to protection from economic exploitation and hazardous work. ILO Convention number 138 on the Minimum Age (1973) sets age 15 as the minimum age for ordinary work, age 18 as the minimum age for hazardous work, and age 13 as the minimum age for light work. ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labor (1999) prohibits the use of children in slavery, commercial sexual exploitation, and other illicit activities (such as drug trafficking), and hazardous work, or “work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children.” While ILO’s Worst Forms of Child Labor Recommendation, 1999 (No. 190) attempts to further define the Worst Forms, according to Article 4 of Convention 182, countries are able to define hazardous work in their own context, meaning that there is no single legal definition of child labor that can be used around the world. Taken together, ILO Conventions 182 and 138 and ILO Recommendation 190 provide the definitional basis for the following terms: exploitative child labor, worst forms of child labor, and hazardous work for children. Child labor is therefore a narrower concept than “children in employment”, excluding children who are working only a few hours a week in permitted light work and those above the minimum age whose work is not classified as a worst form of child labor, including those in “hazardous work”, in particular. Child Labor includes those children (minors under age 18) working in the worst forms of child labor as outlined in ILO Convention 182 and children engaged in work that is exploitative and/or interferes with their ability to participate and complete required years of schooling, in line with ILO Convention 138. ILO Convention 182 defines the worst forms of child labor as:
 - (a) all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of children, debt bondage and serfdom and forced or compulsory labor, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict;
 - (b) the use, procuring or offering of a child for prostitution, the production of pornography or for pornographic performances;
 - (c) the use, procuring or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the production and trafficking of drugs as defined in the relevant international treaties; and
 - (d) work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children.

Grantees are encouraged to consult Recommendation 190 accompanying C. 182 for additional guidance on identifying hazardous forms of work. According to ILO Convention 182, hazardous work “shall be determined by national laws or regulations or by the competent authority, after

consultation with the organizations of employers and workers concerned, taking into consideration relevant international standards...” As this suggests, forms of work identified as “hazardous” for children [Article 3(d)] may vary from country to country. ILO Recommendation No. 190, which accompanies ILO Convention 182, gives additional guidance on identifying “hazardous work.” ILO Recommendation No. 190 states in Section II, Paragraph 3 that, “[i]n determining the types of work referred to under Article 3(d) of the Convention [ILO Convention 182], and in identifying where they exist, consideration should be given, inter alia to:

- (a) work which exposes children to physical, psychological, or sexual abuse;
- (b) work underground, under water, at dangerous heights or in confined spaces;
- (c) work with dangerous machinery, equipment and tools, or which involves the manual handling or transport of heavy loads;
- (d) work in an unhealthy environment which may, for example, expose children to hazardous substances, agents or processes, or to temperatures, noise levels, or vibrations damaging to their health;
- (e) work under particularly difficult conditions such as work for long hours or during the night or work where the child is unreasonably confined to the premises of the employer.

ILO Recommendation No. 190 goes on to state in Paragraph 4 that, “[f]or the types of work referred to under Article 3(d) of the Convention and Paragraph 3 above, national laws or regulations or the competent authority could, after consultation with the workers’ and employers’ organizations concerned, authorize employment or work as from the age of 16 on condition that the health, safety and morals of the children concerned are fully protected, and that the children have received adequate specific instruction or vocational training in the relevant branch of activity.”

4. **“Child labor monitoring system”** CLMS involves the identification, referral, protection, and prevention of child labor through the development of a coordinated multi-sector monitoring and referral process that aims to cover all children living in a given geographical area.

Progress in this field can be demonstrated if one or several of the following systems has been established:

- A comprehensive plan and/or pilot program to develop and establish national, local or sector specific CLMS.
- A CLMS covering various forms of child labor at the national level;
- A CLMS covering various forms of child labor at the local level;
- A CLMS in any formal or informal sector, urban or rural.

A comprehensive and credible CLMS includes the following characteristics:

- The system is focused on the child at work and/or in school;
- It involves all relevant partners in the field, including labor inspectors if appropriate;
- It uses regular, repeated observations to identify children in the workplace and determine risks to which they are exposed;
- It refers identified children to the most appropriate alternative to ensure that they are withdrawn from dangerous work;
- It verifies whether the children have actually been removed and/or shifted from dangerous work to an appropriate situation (school or other);
- It tracks these children after their removal, to ensure that they have satisfactory

- alternatives; and
 - It keeps records on the extent and nature of child labor and the schooling of identified child workers.
5. **“Children at high-risk of entering child labor”** refers to children who experience a set of conditions or circumstances (family environment or situation, proximity to economic activities prone to employ children, etc.) under which the child lives or to which the child is exposed that make it more likely that the child will be employed in child labor (e.g. siblings of working children). The definition of high-risk should be defined by the project and used in the baseline survey.
 6. **“Cooperative agreement”** refers to an award instrument where substantial involvement is anticipated between the donor (USDOL) and the Grantee during the performance of project activities. The level of monitoring and accountability required by USDOL under a cooperative agreement is less than what is required under a contract, but more than what is required under a regular grant.
 7. **“Cost sharing”** means any method by which the Grantee accomplishes the work of the grant, or work that supports or enhances the goals of the grant, with funds or other things of value obtained from the Grantee and/or non-Federal third parties. These methods may include “matching funds” and “in-kind contributions.”
 8. **“Decent work”** is an initiative led by the ILO that promotes higher productivity and fair income for all workers. It is based on four components: (1) job creation, (2) exercise of labor rights, (3) expansion of social protection programs, and (4) social dialogue.
 9. **“Direct beneficiaries”** are children and households that have been provided with educational and livelihood services.
 10. **“Direct beneficiary monitoring system”** monitors provision of educational and livelihood services provided to direct beneficiaries as well as monitoring of children’s education and work status.
 11. **“Direct educational services”** may involve either of the following:
The provision of goods and/or services (if lack thereof is a barrier to education) that meets direct beneficiaries’ specific needs and results in their enrollment in at least one of the four categories of educational activities listed below. Examples of goods and/or services that may meet the specific gaps/educational needs of targeted children include tutoring, school meals, uniforms, school supplies and materials, books, tuition and transportation vouchers, or other types of non-monetary incentives.

The four categories of educational activities that qualify are:

- Non-formal or basic literacy education- This type of educational activity may include transitional, leveling, or literacy classes so that a child may either be mainstreamed into formal education and/or can participate in vocational training activities;
- Vocational, pre-vocational, or skills training- This type of training is designed to develop a particular, marketable skill (i.e., mechanics, sewing);
- Formal education - This is defined as the formal school system within the select country; or
- Mainstreaming - This type of educational activity involves transitioning children from non-formal education into the formal education system. Generally, mainstreaming involves the

provision of goods and/or services that may assist in placement testing and enable a child to attend and stay in school.

OR

The direct provision of at least one of the following two educational activities by the project to its direct beneficiaries:

- Non-formal or basic literacy education; or
- Vocational, pre-vocational, or skills training.

Grantees must be able to match a particular service or educational or training opportunity to an individual child. Therefore, project interventions such as infrastructure improvements to schools and other learning environments, teacher training, construction of latrines, inclusion of child labor modules in teacher curriculum, or the provision of classroom chalkboards are not considered “direct educational services” as defined above (see definition of “other project interventions”).

12. **“Direct services”** are interventions that include educational and livelihood services provided by the project.
13. **“Educational services”** refers to formal or non-formal education:
 - **Formal education services** refer to education provided and/or recognized by the government. Formal education may include government schools, private schools, religious schools, etc. The support of formal education may involve the provision of goods and/or services including direct costs such as school fees and teaching and learning materials and indirect costs such as school uniforms, transportation costs, etc. These goods and/or services are intended to ensure that the child will attend and stay in school.
 - **Non-formal education services** refer to education provided by any organization or body outside of the formal school system. This education may include literacy, mainstreaming education, accelerated learning, community-based education, bridge courses, remedial education, life skills, etc. Non-formal education services may lead to mainstreaming into formal education or equivalent school certificates.
 - **Vocational education services** refer to education and/or training related to a specific vocation, trade or occupation. For the purposes of a project(s) funded under this solicitation, a child under the age of 18 who receives vocational education services will be counted as having received an educational service. Vocational education services may also be provided to individuals 18 years of age and older in a household, including older siblings of working or at-risk children under the age of 18, if the provision of such services is intended to reduce the likelihood of child labor for a child in that household as a result of improvements to the household’s livelihood. In such cases, the Grantee will report this vocational service to DOL as a livelihood service provided by the project.
14. **“Forced labor”** refers to all work or service that is exacted from any individual under menace of any penalty for nonperformance of the work or service, and for which the work or service is not offered voluntarily; or the work or service is performed as a result of coercion, debt bondage, or involuntary servitude. This definition is derived from ILO Convention 29 (Forced Labor). For a

more detailed description of indicators of forced labor, Applicants also should review “Hard to See, Harder to Count: Survey Guidelines to Estimate Forced Labor of Adults and Children.”²²

15. **“Hazardous work”** The worst forms of child labor referred to in Article 3(d) of Convention 182 are known as **“hazardous work.”** According to ILO Convention 182, hazardous work “shall be determined by national laws or regulations or by the competent authority, after consultation with the organizations of employers and workers concerned, taking into consideration relevant international standards...” As this suggests, forms of work identified as “hazardous” for children [Article 3(d)] may vary from country to country. ILO Recommendation No. 190, which accompanies ILO Convention 182, gives additional guidance on identifying “hazardous work.” ILO Recommendation No. 190 states in Section II, Paragraph 3 that, “[i]n determining the types of work referred to under Article 3(d) of the Convention [ILO Convention 182], and in identifying where they exist, consideration should be given, inter alia to:
- a. work which exposes children to physical, psychological, or sexual abuse;
 - b. work underground, under water, at dangerous heights or in confined spaces;
 - c. work with dangerous machinery, equipment and tools, or which involves the manual handling or transport of heavy loads;
 - d. work in an unhealthy environment which may, for example, expose children to hazardous substances, agents or processes, or to temperatures, noise levels, or vibrations damaging to their health;
 - e. work under particularly difficult conditions such as work for long hours or during the night or work where the child is unreasonably confined to the premises of the employer.”

ILO Recommendation No. 190 goes on to state in Paragraph 4 that, “[f]or the types of work referred to under Article 3(d) of the Convention and Paragraph 3 above, national laws or regulations or the competent authority could, after consultation with the workers’ and employers’ organizations concerned, authorize employment or work as from the age of 16 on condition that the health, safety and morals of the children concerned are fully protected, and that the children have received adequate specific instruction or vocational training in the relevant branch of activity.”

16. **“Indirect beneficiaries”** are individuals who may benefit from “other direct services” and/or “other project interventions” provided by the project but who do not receive a “direct educational service.” Such individuals would not qualify as direct beneficiaries.
17. **“In-Kind contributions”** means goods or services committed to the project by the Grantee and/or a non-Federal third party. A Grantee will be responsible for obtaining such goods or services from the third party and applying them to the work of the grant. Failure to do so may result in USDOL’s disallowance of costs in the amount of the committed in-kind contributions.
18. **“Key stakeholders”** can include, but are not limited to: parents, educators, community leaders, national policy makers, and key opinion leaders.
19. **“Livelihood”** is defined as a means of living, and the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources, such as, food, potable water, health facilities, educational opportunities, housing, and time for participation in the community), and activities required for it. A livelihood

²² http://www.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/2011/111B09_351_engl.pdf

encompasses income, as well as social institutions, gender relations, and property rights required to support and sustain a certain standard of living. It includes access to and benefits derived from social and public services provided by the state, such as education, health services, and other infrastructure. Sustainable livelihood programs seek to create long-lasting solutions to poverty by empowering their target population and addressing their overall well-being. USDOL child labor elimination projects focus on ensuring that households can cope with and recover from the stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance present and future capabilities and assets in a way that helps them overcome the need to rely on the labor of their children to meet basic needs.

20. **“Livelihood services”** may include, but are not limited to, the provision or linkage to education and training, employment services, economic strengthening services, improved access to savings and credit, and social capital services. Definitions of livelihood services include, but are not limited to, the following categories:
- **Livelihood education and training services** aim to provide adult participants with the basic skills and knowledge necessary to benefit from social services, financial services, and higher education. Education and training services may include the provision or linkage to life skills, leadership training, financial education, and literacy and numeracy programs. Only adults²³ may be counted in this category as receiving education and training services.
 - **Improved access to savings and credit** aims to mitigate economic shocks by leveling out the income of participants over time. These services may include village savings and loan programs, micro-insurance, micro-savings, (un)conditional cash transfer programs, health services, food programs, housing, and initiatives that aim to diversify the income sources of participants. Adults and children may receive these services.
 - **Social capital services** aim to expand a participant’s connection within and between social networks. Social capital services may include the provision or linkage to support groups and labor sharing arrangements. Adults and children may receive social capital services.
 - **Employment services** aim to increase employment, job retention, earnings, and occupational skills of participants. Employment services may include the provision or linkage to employment assistance programs, vocational and business training, business start-up packages, occupational safety and health training, micro-franchise programs, job placement, apprenticeships and public works programs. Adults and children of the legal working age may receive employment services.
 - **Economic strengthening services** aim to increase the economic well-being of participants. Economic strengthening services may include the provision or linkage to micro-credit, productivity transfers, and cooperatives. Adults and children of the legal working age may receive economic strengthening services.
 - **Productivity transfers** are inputs aimed at improving the productivity and/or efficiency of processes and may include, for example, training, seeds, fertilizers, fuel, and labor-saving technologies.
 - **Cooperatives** are groups owned and operated by individuals, organizations, or businesses

²³ A legal adult is a person who has attained the age of 18.

for their mutual benefit. For example, agricultural cooperatives or farmers' cooperatives may provide services, such as training, to individual farming members; pool production resources (land, machinery) so that members can farm together; provide members with inputs for agricultural production, such as seeds, fertilizers, and machinery; and engage in the transformation, distribution, and marketing of farm products.

21. **“Matching Funds”** means cash or cash equivalents committed to the project by the Grantee and/or a non-Federal third party. A Grantee will be responsible for obtaining such funds from the third party and applying them to the work of the grant. Failure to do so may result in USDOL’s disallowance of costs in the amount of the committed matching funds.
22. **“Monitoring and evaluation”** M&E consists of two basic components —performance monitoring and evaluation— each of which serve distinct purposes. Performance monitoring of changes in performance indicators reveals whether desired results are occurring and whether implementation is on track. In general, the results measured are the direct and near-term consequences of project activities. Evaluation is the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of programs and projects as a basis for judgments, to improve effectiveness, and/or to inform decisions about current and future programming.
23. **“Occupational safety and health”** encompasses issues related to safe and healthy working environments and efforts to prevent workers from occupational injuries, diseases, and deaths.
24. **“Other direct services”** are services (1) considered essential for ensuring reduction of children in child labor and (2) provided directly to the project’s direct beneficiaries. Some examples of “other direct services” would include extracurricular activities during school breaks and psychosocial counseling or medical care (e.g., for children withdrawn from commercial sexual exploitation, child soldiering). Another example would be providing direct beneficiaries who meet minimum age requirements for employment (particularly children 15-17 years) with occupational safety and/or health interventions that promote safe, acceptable work (e.g., protective masks, goggles, gloves) or job placement services to facilitate children’s transition from a vocational or skills training program into acceptable work. If the project provides children with one or more “other direct services” but does not provide them with a “direct educational service,” then the project cannot count these children as “direct beneficiaries.” However, such children may be considered “indirect beneficiaries.”
25. **“Public International Organization (PIO)”** is an international organization composed mainly of countries. As defined by the International Organizations Immunities Act, 22 U.S.C. § 288, et. seq, PIOs are eligible to apply for award.
26. **“Social protection programs”** include government interventions that seek to mitigate the impact of economic shocks, promote equity, and reduce poverty by providing social assistance to vulnerable populations. These can include cash transfers, microloans, health insurance, scholarships, savings, vocational training, and temporary jobs. Some of USDOL-funded projects have worked with governments to include project beneficiaries in social protection programs, provide project services to social protection beneficiaries, or conduct joint initiatives to combat child labor within the social-protection programs’ framework.
27. **“Youth”** means persons between the ages of 15 and 24 years. However, for the purposes of this solicitation, USDOL defines youth as ages 15 to 18 unless otherwise specified in the text.

28. **“Youth development”** is defined as a process which prepares young people to meet the challenges of adolescence and adulthood through a coordinated, progressive series of activities and experiences which help them to become socially, morally, emotionally, physically, and cognitively competent. Positive youth development addresses the broader developmental needs of youth, in contrast to deficit-based models which focus solely on youth problems.
29. **“Youth employment”** seeks to provide employment opportunities for youth ages 15 to 24 who currently lack decent work and face underemployment, temporary and involuntary work with few benefits, and limited opportunities for advancement. USDOL projects recognize the value of safe work for youth and their families and may support efforts to (1) promote youth employment opportunities that ensure youth can access educational, developmental, vocational, economic, and social opportunities, and (2) protect working children from hazards in the workplace.
30. **“Youth empowerment”** is an attitudinal, structural, and cultural process whereby youth gain the ability, authority, and agency to make decisions and implement change in their own lives and the lives of other people, including youth and adults.

APPENDIX C. Sample Past Performance Table

Name of Applicant/ Subgrantee/ Subcontractor	Agency/ Donor/ Organization	Agency/ Donor/ Contact Information (Name, telephone, fax, e-mail)	Name of the Project and Instrument Number	Funding Amount (in \$)	Country of Implementation and Period of Performance	Brief Summary of Work Performed and Accomplishments

APPENDIX D. Documents Required for Application Submission

Required Documents	SCA Reference	Applicant	Subgrantee (providing services related to project intervention strategies)	Subcontractor (providing services related to project intervention strategies)
Technical Proposal	Section IV.B.1	√		
Cost Proposal	Section IV.B.2	√		
Past Performance Table	Section IV.B.1.d.1 Appendix C	√	√	√
Copy of the opinion letter(s) and a summary of audit findings	Section IV.B.1.d.5	√	√	√
Documentation of Partner commitment and Host Government Support (if applicable)	Section IV.B.1.d.2	√		
Key Personnel Signed Letters of Commitment	Section IV.B.1.d.4	√	√	√
Outputs-Based Budget	Section IV.B.2.c	√	√	√
SAM Registration	Section IV.B.2.a	√		
SF-424	Section IV.B.2.b	√		
SF-424A	Section IV.B.2.b	√		
Indirect Cost Form	Grants.gov and ILAB Web site	√	√	√