



International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)



International
Labour
Office

IPEC Evaluation

Building the Foundations for Eliminating the
Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone
Africa

P340 02 100 051
RAF/02/P51/USA

**An independent final evaluation by a team of external
consultants**

Geographic coverage: Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia

May 2006

NOTE ON THE EVALUATION PROCESS AND REPORT

This independent evaluation was managed by ILO-IPEC's Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED) following a consultative and participatory approach. DED has ensured that all major stakeholders were consulted and informed throughout the evaluation and that the evaluation was carried out to highest degree of credibility and independence and in line with established evaluation standards.

The evaluation was carried out a team of external consultants¹. The field mission took place in May 2006. The opinions and recommendations included in this report are those of the authors and as such serve as an important contribution to learning and planning without necessarily constituting the perspective of the ILO or any other organization involved in the project.

Funding for this project evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor. This report does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

¹ Ms Yasmin Jessie Turton (South Africa), International Consultant/Team leader
with inputs from:
Ms. Rayna Taback (South Africa) Evaluation Team Member
Mr. John Chileshe (Zambia), National Consultant
Mr. Eddy Walakira (Uganda), National Consultant
Ms. Jane Munene (Kenya), National Consultant
Mr. Daniel Doh (Ghana), National Consultant
Dr. Patrick Ngwu (Nigeria), National Consultant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms	4
Executive Summary	4
Section 1: Introducing the evaluation	11
1. Introduction	11
2. Background	11
3. Purpose and scope of the evaluation	13
4. Evaluation methodology	14
5. Limitations	16
Section 2: Findings of the Evaluation	16
2.1 Main findings on Project Design	16
2.2 Main findings on Project Implementation	20
2.3 Sustainability issues	30
2.4 Sub-regional work	32
Section 3: Conclusions and Recommendations	33
3.1 Conclusions	33
3.2 Recommendations	38
Appendices	41

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

AP	Action Programme
APSO	Action Programme Summary Outline
CBP	Capacity Building Programme
CLU	Child Labour Unit
CLC	Child Labour Committees
CLMS	Child Labour Monitoring System
COMAGRI	Commercial Agriculture Programme
COTU	Congress of Trade Unions
CPC	Country Programme Coordinator
CRC	Child Rights Club
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DA	District Assembly
FUE	Federation of Uganda Employers
GNAT	Ghana National Union of Teachers
IA	Implementing Agency
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPEC	International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour
MOL	Ministry of Labour
MOE	Ministry of Education
MTR	Mid-term Review
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPC	National Programme Coordinator
NSC	National Steering Committee
SPIF	Strategic Programme Impact Framework
TBP	Time-bound Programme
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
USDOL	U.S. Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labour

Executive Summary

The **International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)** has been executing a sub-regional capacity-building project since September 2003. A mid-term evaluation was carried out in September to October 2004 and this final evaluation was conducted in February to March 2006. This report, which incorporates elements of the individual country assessments produced by national consultants, is the result of the evaluation process that was conducted during February to March 2006.

The **Capacity Building Programme (CBP)** covers five countries: Zambia, Kenya, Uganda, Ghana and Nigeria. The project has two immediate objectives:

At the **national level**, the immediate objective was that *“governments, workers’ and employers’ organizations, NGOs and other partners will have the technical skills and organizational capacity to formulate and implement policies, programmes and other initiatives to facilitate prevention of the worst forms of child labour, and protection, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of children participating in the WFCL.”*

At the **sub-regional level**, it was expected that at the end of the project *“knowledge and experience on child labour and good practice interventions will be identified and shared.”* At this level, in addition to the core countries, activities were to benefit also non-core countries such as Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania.

The findings of the evaluation reflect numerous successes with regard to the achievement of objectives. In all countries some **institutional mechanisms** exist, albeit with varying degrees of capacity, to take forward programmes to eliminate the WFCL. The institutional structure at national level, however, was not always fully supportive of project implementation. CLU and NSC were mostly found to be weak and had limited capacity to effectively coordinate child labour related activities or to efficiently endorse Action Programmes. It is clear that at a national level the capacity of the CLU need to be enhanced (in all areas) so that they are able to effectively serve as the mechanism to coordinate national activities against the WFCL. NGOs are the main Implementing Agents in the WFCL with different levels of capacity and resources.

Capacity in relation to the child labour content-specific needs of each country has been achieved, and in this regard the objective has been met. With regard to a common understanding of capacity building this was not clear to all stakeholders. An initial flaw in the design process was that capacity building was narrowly considered which impacted on the project throughout its life cycle. Ignoring human resource, institutional and infrastructural support and capacity has huge implications for the effective and successful implementation of the project. Although the preparation of Action Programmes and reporting procedures have been cumbersome, capacity of partners have been built in the process with an improvement in their ability to do Action Programmes and in meeting the reporting requirements. However, much work still needs to be done in this regard, with

the possibility of simplified formats that still allow for accountability but are less technically inclined.

In terms of **institutional capacity**, the traditional partners of the ILO were relatively weak and did not contribute effectively to the implementation of the project. Tripartite partners in some countries did not see the value of working with NGOs not the value of some of the strategies used such as the withdrawal of children. NGOs were however the main implementers of the various Action Programmes that were implemented. The NGOs were well equipped to work with communities, set up child labour committees and child rights clubs and do awareness raising programmes. The limitations however seemed to be at an institutional level with skills in project management, proposal writing and report writing to mention a few. Capacity was also limited at times with regard to infrastructural support to carry out a set of activities so for example, an NGO did not have transport to do proper monitoring of its activities.

The sub-regional work did not feature that prominently and the participation of NGO partners was limited in most cases. Attempts to set up an internet-based discussion forum did not work well because of technical and other logistical problems that were not foreseen. A sub-regional newsletter was also planned but its effectiveness and impact was not easy to ascertain because partners were not aware of the newsletter. On the other hand, the good practices documentation has been welcomed by all and partners are looking forward to seeing the final product which will be able to share experiences across the five countries.

In terms of overall **impact of the project**, the project strategies were generally appropriate, well integrated into national development policies and relevant to national development strategies and priorities. At the *policy level* there are draft policies in place as an attempt to create the necessary legislative environment to address the challenges of the WFCL. Workers and Employers Organizations have also incorporated elements of child labour into their policies and programmes. In some countries child labour has been included in the Poverty Reduction Strategy, which is major victory in efforts to mainstream child labour. The implications are that all government agencies should have child labour programmes and budgets in their plans.

At the level of *Implementing Agency* the impact of the project has been quite substantial. Organizations have been able to respond to a number of interventions from the level of policy development, awareness raising, mobilising communities, empowering child labour committees and child rights clubs. The most tangible impact has been in direct action where children have been withdrawn or prevented and placed in schools or vocational training. Innovative approaches have been used which included using national artists, different forms of media and introducing the participation of children through the SCREAM pack as well as child rights clubs.

Networking amongst implementing agencies has also had some positive impacts both from the point of view of sharing information and of creating linkages to collaborate

around events and areas of work. Partners with more capacity have helped those that were not as strong and required support. This is however an area that could be enhanced.

At the level of *beneficiaries* the most notable impact has been the withdrawal and prevention of children. Those children that were placed in school have benefited from this programme. Youth who were involved in vocational training had also benefited from this programme and in all instances having the opportunity to learn a skill takes them one step further away from having to return to, or get involved in child labour. The formation of child labour committees at community level has really demonstrated the potential strength and impact of this programme. The ownership for tackling the issues around child labour is then taken to source and addressed at this level. Parents were enlightened and made aware and this encouraged some of them to withdraw their children, the community identified and reported cases of child labour and took it upon themselves to intervene.

Project implementation was seriously hampered by the unnecessary length of time for AP to be finally approved and funds released. Progress reports also are time consuming and exceptionally cumbersome. What emerges from the evaluation is that the systems and structures in ILO are not conducive to some developmental programmes like the CBP, which requires the kind of environment that is more responsive, enabling and geared towards building the capacity of partner organizations. Lengthy bureaucratic procedures coupled with time delays and what seems to be confusion about the role of the Area Offices as well as how capacity building is understood; can in fact hinder the process of capacity building. Decentralisation in the regions has not facilitated the process in terms of time; it seems to have simply added another loop into the already cumbersome system because decision making is not decentralised.

The **role of the CPC** was supportive and partners were assisted as much as possible to speed up the process, although delays in approvals and disbursements were beyond their control. Although CPC tended to have many obligations, on an informal basis the national IPEC staff (which included CPC's and FAA's) worked with many of the partners to guide them in the finalisation of their proposals, as well as with their narrative and financial reporting and on a one-to-one basis helped to build their capacity. The CPC have a key role to play in building the capacity of IA, and in coordinating and pooling together the various strands of such a programme. To give them the respect and credibility to guide this process they too need to have the capacity to do so.

Efforts to **mainstream child labour** have been effective with a number of good practices documented. In all countries work has been done to incorporate child labour into the social work curriculum, and to a large extent this has been successful or certainly a large amount of work has gone into finalising the process. In Zambia the Department of Education through ZAMISI has made much progress in developing a Manual on Child Labour that targets secondary schools and colleges. In three countries child labour has been included in the country's Poverty Reduction Strategy (Ghana and Uganda) or National Development Plans (Zambia).

Various **methods were used in awareness-raising**: workshops, production and dissemination of awareness-raising materials, such as booklets, posters, radio and TV programmes, video presentations, drama, and music performances. At schools, the formation of child's rights clubs empowered children to participate in raising awareness. This was done through drama, drawing, poetry and music. The few schools visited where there were child rights clubs was very impressive.

The formation of **Child Labour Committees** has been a tangible indicator of mobilising communities to become aware, able to identify children in these situations, and have them withdrawn and returned to school was itself seen as an indicator of its success. A number of success stories have emerged as good practices to indicate the extent to which awareness raising has led to the withdrawal of children.

The implementation of a **Child Labour Monitoring System** has not been that effective and seems to be beyond the capacity of this project. To implement an effective CLMS, at a country, organization and community level requires a good coordination and integration system which is not yet in place. It seems more appropriate that an entire programme be dedicated to developing and implementing a CLMS which is going to be essential to assess the impact of programmes to eliminate the WFCL.

The lack of **coordination and synergy of IPEC programmes** at the country level was problematic with a perception of rivalry amongst the different IPEC programme managers. Although the pooling of resources among different IPEC programmes was meant to facilitate greater co-ordination, this was not the case.

Based on the above, the following **recommendations** are proposed:

IPEC Management/ILO Head Office

- i. Firstly ILO/IPEC would be doing a great disservice by simply ending the Capacity Building Programme which has gone a long way in building the foundations for eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone Africa. The next stage is to build on and consolidate the gains made during the first phase of the Capacity Building Programme, and pave the way for a more sustainable intervention. The recommendation, therefore, is that the Capacity Building Programme is extended for a further 3 to 5 years.
- ii. The scope for such a programme should be more holistic and provide an integrated approach to capacity building that takes into account content-specific capacity, as well as human resource, institutional and infrastructural support that might also be needed to effectively implement the programme.

- iii. In general there should be a reduction in bureaucracy in proposal writing and disbursement of funds to speed up the process. Consider devolving power from Geneva, to ILO field offices and to country programmes so that increasingly some significant financial approval is done in the country where the action takes place. An approval committee can be instituted to approve certain amounts of funds in country. A review of this process is recommended as well an increased focus on training in proposal writing and reporting for ILO-IPEC partners.
- iv. To extend the duration of similar regional capacity building projects to 4 - 5 years, or if a project is of shorter duration then the outputs should match the time frames.
- v. There has to be greater coordination and synergy between the different ILO/IPEC programmes so as to avoid unnecessary confusion amongst stakeholders but also to maximise the resources that are available. Where new country programmes are going to be implemented the ILO-IPEC should ensure that previous ILO-IPEC country programmes do not overlap.
- vi. As part of a learning and reflection process ILO/IPEC should take recommendations on previous evaluations and mid-term reviews seriously, otherwise it defeats the purpose of learning from one programme to the next and learnings are lost.
- vii. Clear guidelines on the role and responsibilities of the NSC should be incorporated into a standard Terms of Reference and be part of the MoU. The composition of NSC to be reviewed and additional partners included.
- viii. Standard monitoring tools should be developed that could be adapted for each project if necessary, that will help to track outcomes and assess the impact (this goes beyond activity and progress monitoring which are captured in progress reports and checklists). There is also a need for developing project monitoring tools for increased qualitative monitoring. Monitoring tools should also be implemented at a community level, with CLC members being empowered on how to implement them.
- ix. The tracking and tracing methodologies should be finalised and a standard system put in place for all projects – this should be an integral part of all projects.
- x. Future projects should build upon and further expand the networking and linkages undertaken by the CBP. More creative networking instruments could be devised, for example, promoting visits among partners to each others projects, more frequent review meetings, could be quarterly other than wait for six months, and so on.

- xi. With CLMS a national task force of key government agencies involved in CL issues should be established. This should be a separate investment as a regional project, possibly where a TBP is in place or foreseen.
- xii. There is a need for increased direct collaboration with local governments i.e. to give them an opportunity to directly implement activities as a way of fostering involvement and ownership of child labor interventions by local government structures.
- xiii. In order to strengthen the Ministry of Labour and CLU it might be necessary to negotiate with the Ministry to place a Technical Assistant in the Ministry for a period of 3-5 years with the purpose of strengthening the Unit and providing support to the functioning of the NSC

Donor

- i. It is highly recommended that for future IPEC interventions aimed at building capacities of implementing agencies, provisions of financial resources be made to assist IA with adequate equipment, transport and resources if this is what is needed to build capacity to effectively implement activities towards eliminating the WFCL. Investment in such material resources should also be conceived as a concrete aspect of building capacity of IAs.
- ii. Budgetary limitations that are beyond control of the project should be open to negotiation rather than excluding key areas of work. Field offices should have access to a contingency fund that can be easily accessed (and must be accounted for). In this way complimentary activities that are not necessarily planned for in advance, can be accommodated as well as currency fluctuations that negatively affects project budgets.

Section 1: Introducing the evaluation

1. Introduction

This report is the result of an independent final evaluation of a sub-regional child labour project implemented by the International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) of the International Labour Organization (ILO). The project covers five Anglophone countries in East and West Africa: Zambia, Uganda, Kenya, Nigeria and Ghana. The evaluation was carried out during February and March 2006 and included presentations of preliminary findings at five national workshops in Lusaka, Kampala, Nairobi, Abuja and Accra. An integral part of the evaluation was the national assessments conducted in the five countries prior to the start of the evaluation. This report summarises the main findings, conclusions and recommendations and incorporates elements of the five national assessments, discussions during the five national workshops as well as comments from the workshop held with IPEC staff in Accra where the preliminary findings were presented.

2. Background

The aim of IPEC is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially its worst forms. The political will and commitment of individual governments to address child labour - in cooperation with employers' and workers' organizations, non-governmental organizations and other relevant parties in society- is the basis for IPEC action. IPEC support at the country level is based on a phased, multi-sector strategy. This strategy includes strengthening national capacities to deal with this issue, legislation harmonization, improvement of the knowledge base, raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour, promoting social mobilization against it, and implementing demonstrative direct action programmes (AP) to prevent children from child labour and remove child workers from hazardous work and provide them and their families with appropriate alternatives².

In 2002, IPEC developed a technical cooperation programme entitled "Building the Foundations for Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone Africa" [the "Capacity Building Programme (CBP)"]. The project focused on five core countries and was developed against the backdrop of experiences with national programmes in Kenya, Zambia, Uganda, Ghana and Nigeria, which included a combination of awareness-raising, training and capacity-building and direct-action elements. Whereas Kenya has benefited from IPEC activities since 1992, the other four countries have had programmes implemented only during the period of 1999-2002³.

The capacity needs pertinent to the sub-region were outlined in several national needs assessment workshops carried out in the five countries in May and June 2002 and further explored in a sub-regional Strategic Programme Impact Framework (SPIF) workshop

² Terms of Reference for Independent Final Evaluation, January 2006

³ Mid-term evaluation Report, November 2004

undertaken in late June 2002. The Area of Impact Framework (AOI) was developed during the sub-regional workshop and it identified the major capacity building needs common to all countries in the sub-region. The Area of Impact framework is available in the project document.

Based on these two frameworks and on the past ILO-IPEC experience in the five core countries, the project was designed to have a two pronged strategy to build capacity of national institutions and organizations to apply ILO Convention 182 to implement interventions against WFCL as well as to identify the sub-regional capacity building needs.

A series of national needs assessments provided baseline data for the project. Based on the project's participatory planning process, the CBP anticipated that partner countries would first identify necessary project outcomes through sub-regional and national SPIF exercises and then select activities from a menu of interventions, including a limited set of pre-determined model interventions for adaptation to the national context. A sub-regional SPIF was done during the project design phase while national outcomes were set during the national SPIFs. Interventions to be supported at national level would thus fall within the broad range of the following elements:

- Building the knowledge base on child labour;
- Dissemination of information;
- Raising awareness;
- Networking, integration and mainstreaming;
- Policy and legislative support;
- Direct action activities.

The official start of the programme was in September 2002. However, the project teams became operational much later, with the CTA starting only in February 2003 and national teams starting at different times, for example, in Uganda only in May 2003. As a result, the planned end date has been extended to May 2006, with operations ending in March 2006. The total budget of the CBP was set at USD 5.3 million.

The project has two immediate objectives:

At the **national level**, the immediate objective was that *“governments, workers’ and employers’ organizations, NGOs and other partners will have the technical skills and organizational capacity to formulate and implement policies, programmes and other initiatives to facilitate prevention of the worst forms of child labour, and protection, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of children participating in the WFCL.”*

At the **sub-regional level**, it was expected that at the end of the project *“knowledge and experience on child labour and good practice interventions will be identified and shared.”* At this level, in addition to the core countries, activities were to benefit also non-core countries such as Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania.

Reflecting the project's flexible and demand-driven approach to planning and monitoring, national activities were to be implemented in four stages with national self-evaluation-cum planning workshops to be held at each stage. It was hoped that these workshops would allow for a systematic involvement of all partners, an effective information exchange, the documentation of experiences and through a close monitoring of implementation, allow for possible corrections.

3. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

The evaluation looked at the project as a whole and addressed issues of project design, implementation, lessons learned, replicability and recommendations for future programmes and any specific recommendations for use in any future intervention.

More specifically, the purpose of the evaluation was:

- i. To assess whether the objectives of the project were achieved by comparing the intended outputs with the actual outputs;
- ii. To assess the overall impact of the project at different levels such as at policy level, organizational (partner) level, beneficiaries level, community level and household level.
- iii. To assess the effectiveness of the project operation/implementation and management both at the implementing agency level and at IPEC level.
- iv. To analyse strategies and models of intervention used, document lessons learned and potential good practices, and provide recommendations on how to integrate these into planning processes and implementation of future IPEC activities in the project countries.
- v. A particular focus should be to identify elements of effective models of intervention and assess the modalities of the menu of interventions approach including its potential use and its strengths and weaknesses.

The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

4. Evaluation methodology

The evaluation tool was designed by the consultants and shared with IPEC in Geneva and the CTA for their input and comments. The evaluation tool consisted of a set of questions based on the Terms of Reference and adjusted according to the specific respondents being interviewed. The desk-top review included an analysis of IPEC documentation: Inception Report, SPIF guidelines, Good Practices guidelines, partner technical progress reports, mid-term evaluation report, document. A combination of semi-structured interviews and group discussions were used.

In each of the five countries the consultants visited representatives of government institutions, social partners and selected implementing agencies. At community level individual interviews and focus group discussions were held with representatives of child labour committees, child rights clubs and child beneficiaries in their working or learning environment. A few parents of these children were also interviewed.

The presentation of preliminary findings and participation in the national feedback workshops provided additional opportunities for testing, clarifying and refining the findings. In addition, participants suggested recommendations to strengthen such a programme in the future.

A two day workshop with IPEC staff took place in Accra and was used as a further opportunity to gather further data and to present the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations and obtain feedback.

The team leader appointed by ILO was responsible for the overall coordination and consistency of the evaluation. The team leader visited Zambia, Kenya and Ghana while a different consultant visited Uganda and Nigeria. At the country level the team leader was assisted by local consultants who had prepared national assessments prior to the arrival of the team leader (with the exception of Nigeria). These assessments assisted the team leader to obtain an overview of the situation in each country and lay the basis for the evaluation. The national assessments helped to inform the overall evaluation report. By the end of the mission, all but one national consultant had submitted reports and this report incorporates key findings from them. The collaboration with national consultants throughout the process was not only beneficial but one that facilitated the work of the team leader in each country. These types of evaluations should not be conducted without a national consultant, although it is essential to clarify the role of the team leader in relation to that of the national consultant. For example, in Zambia the national consultant did a desktop study to prepare the report for the team leader, while in Kenya the national consultant spent the week prior to the team leader arriving visiting partner organizations. Some of these visits were to key partners, whom the team leader had included in her schedule of visits for the evaluation, leading to duplication and some partners not being pleased about this.

5. Limitations

Conducting an evaluation of this scope with five countries in five weeks was a very short time for such an extensive exercise. In reality only three of these days were set aside for meeting with all stakeholders (IPEC staff, government officials, social partners and community beneficiaries). The fourth day was supposed to be spent preparing for the partner workshops. Inevitably, some partners were accommodated on the fourth day which placed a lot of pressure on the evaluation team to compile and do a preliminary analysis of the data within a very short period of time. In the process some visits had to be cancelled, especially in cases where implementing agencies had planned visits to outlying areas. This limited the amount of time spent on seeing child beneficiaries, as in most cases the visits to government institutions and implementing agencies had first place

on the planned schedules. Even in these cases the tight schedules allowed little time for detailed analysis or extensive partner consultations.

The team leader relied on the national consultants to provide the orientation to projects and the extent to which this was done differed from country to country. In some countries the national consultant was not even sure what had to be done prior to the team leader consultant arriving in the country, delaying their draft assessment report. In such cases where the report was not available on the first day of the evaluation in a particular country, the team leader was less able to have a quick grasp the situation as compared to when such a report was available.

The end of the CBP resulted in staff in some countries feeling insecure and unsure about their future in IPEC; as such the consultants did not have the same levels of cooperation in all countries.

Section 2: Findings of the Evaluation

Responding to some of the specific regional causes of child labour has been an overall objective of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO-IPEC) in Anglophone Africa. IPEC support to national efforts against child labour in sub-Saharan Africa began in 1992 with assistance to Kenya. National programmes followed in Ghana, Nigeria, Uganda, and Zambia via direct actions to withdraw children from child labour or to prevent them from entering it during 1999-2002. In addition, those programmes raised consciousness of the practice and strengthened capacities of governments and other organizations in combating it. However, these national programmes also were generally perceived as exhibiting a “top/down” approach – with IPEC mostly as the top and national partners as the bottom - that insufficiently fostered participation by national stakeholders. In part to address these concerns, and also to implement effectively Convention 182, ILO-IPEC instituted the Capacity-Building Programme (CBP) in Anglophone Africa in 2002 with funding from the U.S. Department of Labour.

2.1 Main findings on Project Design

Relevance of objectives and strategy

The CBP has the overall development objective of contributing to the elimination of the WFCL in Anglophone Africa. As discussed above, it seeks this objective through pursuing two interrelated immediate objectives: at the national level, the CBP aims to withdraw or protect 10,000 children from child labour and to develop the technical and organizational capacities of stakeholders opposing such labour in five countries of Anglophone Africa; at the sub-regional level, the CBP promotes the sharing of experiences and information opposing child labour among those five core countries and four peripheral ones.

In all five countries IA were involved in AP that to varying degrees addressed one or more of the following models of intervention: building the knowledge base on child labour, dissemination of information, raising awareness, networking, integration and mainstreaming, policy and legislative support and direct action activities.

Capacity building debate

A capacity building needs assessment was conducted in each country, although this report was not readily available in all the countries, with the exception of Zambia. Perusing the contents of the needs assessment report, it is clear that this was focused on the needs in relation to the content of child labour and what was needed in each country for child labour to be tackled⁴.

⁴ Zambia Capacity building needs assessment report

While other country needs assessments were not seen, it is fair to assume that all would follow a similar approach. The extent to which the project defined capacity building needs with regard to what is happening in each country and the child labour content-specific needs of each country, has been partially achieved. With regard to a common understanding of capacity building this was not the case. The Project Inception document defines “*Capacity in this context as those skills and structures, contained in institutions and organizations, which enable them to work towards the elimination of the WFCL. This implies that “capacity” is made up of a variety of skills and structures and that capacity building therefore may aim at improving and/or building technical skills and resources, specifically related to fighting the WFCL, and organizational/management skills of a crosscutting nature, for example the capacity to mobilize resources, co-ordinate interventions etc. It further states that the second type of capacities is extremely broad and some of the skills and capacities contained herein are beyond the reach of this programme, such as those relating to institutional development and management. The programme will focus on general skills with a direct bearing on the ability to fight the WFCL, though it is acknowledged that other skills or lack of these may have an indirect impact.*

This is one of the prime reasons for the importance placed on the sharing of experience, building networks, and facilitating mainstreaming and integration with other programmes. These elements make up the back-bone of the programme strategy within both components. They are seen as vital to strengthening the capacity of partners in each country and within the sub-region to fight the WFCL as they allow for pooling of resources, generation of ideas and creation of synergy effects that are central to tackling a vast problem with limited resources”⁵.

However, the design of the project in terms of capacity building was not clear to all stakeholders. The project focused on and supported only those activities where they were directly relevant to child labour, thereby ignoring the institutional and infrastructural support that might also be needed to effectively implement these activities. The other question was “who’s capacity was been built - was it IPEC staff, NGOs, government or communities, or all of these”? The Project Inception document states that “*The overall strategy for this programme is to build capacity of national institutions and organizations to apply C182 and implement interventions against the WFCL. The programme will build capacity to prevent the WFCL and to protect, withdraw, rehabilitate and reintegrate children found in the WFCL. Particular emphasis will be given to moving the fight against WFCL “up-stream” to the policy level and to build national capacity to integrate child labour concerns with national development efforts at national and local levels. Moreover, particular emphasis will be placed on social mobilization in a broad sense, sharing of experience and information for co-ordination and creation of synergy effects to facilitate replication and scaling up of interventions”.*

Hence, the flaw is the initial conception and design of the project where the concept of capacity building was not clear to everyone, and therefore, different expectations

⁵ Project Inception Report, September 2002

emerged. In some countries the Ministry of Labour expected that the funds should have been spent on supporting them in either building the CLU or in providing infrastructural support. There was therefore some disquiet because “it seemed like NGOs were being supported”. At the same time, if an IA could not develop a proper budget or report adequately this implies that institutional capacity is necessary to adequately address all aspects related to the project.

All the project strategies proved to be relevant in the sense that it was able to respond to the needs of the target group addressing the issue from different angles. It was also able to identify direct beneficiaries, who did ultimately benefit from the outcomes of projects implemented. This was verified through meeting beneficiaries who reflected how the projects impacted positively on their lives.

Adequacy of project design process

The overall assessment is that the CBP project was designed in such a way that maximised participation from all key stakeholders. While all social partners (Ministries of Labour, Employer’s Organizations and Worker’s Organizations) were involved in the design phase, the level of involvement from other stakeholders differed from country to country, as well as within a country. Where Implementing Agencies (IA) were involved in previous ILO country programmes there was a tendency to include many of the same IA’s in the design of the CBP; thus promoting the commitment and buy-in the IA’s, but also excluding potential partners.

There was a difference noted when IA’s were either not part of the SPIF process or where there had been staff turnover and the resultant lack of institutional knowledge being passed on to the successor. An example of this is In Zambia where CHIN participated in the national SPIF but then experienced substantial staff turnover with key people who were involved in the SPIF and the design of the AP leaving. The new Director did not seem to be adequately briefed on past developments so not surprisingly, viewed it as a ‘donor driven’ process motivated by the organizations’ need for funding rather than being part of organizational priorities. This pointed out to the lack of proper mechanisms and information systems in organizations to ensure continuity.

The project design was appropriate and feasible to address the problems of WFCL, but in the majority of cases it was not realistic within the time frames identified. This was largely a problem of the delays in approval of AP and then the release of funds. The delays in approval of AP was partly related to systemic issues within the ILO system but also largely related to the lack of capacity of a number of organizations to complete the APs.

In the design of some of the AP, certain key partners were excluded which created a problem. In Ghana for example, the District Assemblies were not included in the initial design. District Assemblies or Local Authorities are key partners to implementation at local level, so in this case the CPC had to do some ‘damage control’ to correct this

situation and bring them into the process. Fortunately in this case, it was a good move that worked out well.

While the design has emphasis on WFCL as it affects girls and boys, the assumption is that IA has grasped the concept of gender and will effectively address the needs of both girls and boys. The projects did not consciously adopt a gender sensitive approach and where this was taken into account it seemed to be more as a matter of circumstances rather than of design.

Evidence of monitoring plans was found in all country reports where specific milestones, indicators and means of verification were identified. The formats tend to be cumbersome with components of the LFA spread across many pages making it difficult to follow.

The inclusion of monitoring and evaluation in the project design is beneficial and can serve as a useful tool to monitor and evaluate projects. Self evaluations proved to be a beneficial exercise for both stakeholders and the ILO-IPEC. The inclusion of the self-evaluation processes in the design provided opportunities not only for capturing progress within the work of each IA, but also offered space for exchanging experiences and learning.

The issue of sustainability remains inadequately addressed in the design phase. There is no conscious link in the design phase with other IPEC programmes, which would allow for better integration and effective linkages across programmes. In addition, building on lessons learned was a critical oversight (also identified in the mid-term evaluation) in that lessons learned from the one programme was not addressed in the next programme but rather transported into the next programme. This renders such evaluations meaningless because recommendations are not being addressed and there is no follow through or monitoring of impact of previous programmes. One of the key issues is that new Programmes start before the previous ones have been finalised and evaluated so that lessons learnt could not systematically inform the design of the new programme. In Kenya and Ghana the TBP has started and already there are elements in it that are being repeated from the CBP and that should not have been. For example, a key concern in the CBP has been that the impact of an intervention cannot be sufficiently assessed within the short time frame that is given for projects and that a longer period is required. In Kenya some AP are still 18 – 24 months.

Use of ILO tools SPIF and Menu of interventions

The design of the project facilitated the identification of country priorities to be included in the project strategy. Of particular note was the SPIF development where stakeholders all met to identify the capacity building needs and identify the focus of action plans. This process was useful and contributed to the relevance of the project, while the *menu of interventions* approach allowed for the efficient identification of country priorities to be developed.

While the SPIF is a very useful planning tool, views were mixed on its use. Some remembered that while it was a useful process it was at the same time “an energy sapping process”. Some IA found it difficult to understand, abstract and too theoretical, while others saw it as a useful tool to use to identify issues and address concerns.

IA had lots of difficulties in developing their AP’s, this resulted in delays in implementing their projects. In Nigeria the AP’s presented some IA with many challenges. The logical framework approach and the terminology used in this approach proved difficult in the development of the AP. If the project was to be repeated a more intensive training around proposal writing and reporting should be conducted. IA acknowledged the support and guidance that they received from the CPC with regard to the technical aspect of the project.

Overall validity of design

The Inception document is very explicit on what it wants to achieve. Immediate objectives and outputs are clearly outlined. The indicators are quite broad and ambitious, although less so for Immediate objective one. Immediate objective one refers to “the technical skills and organizational capacity to formulate and implement policies, programmes and other initiatives...” yet the indicators broadly refer to: WFCL mentioned in policy, number of national institutions in WFCL work increased and changes in level of understanding of child labour issues and skills to address them. Indicators are used to measure the extent to which objectives have been met. In this case the complications arising from these broad level indicators is that it is not easy to measure nor is it easy to assess impact. While the easier indicator is quantitative (referring to number of children) a number of the other indicators are qualitative, which is more difficult to identify and assess; all the more reason to try and be more specific in this regard. The monitoring plan clearly identifies what needs to be monitored, how this will be done as well as the frequency.

The design of the sub-regional work is less explicit and perhaps overly ambitious given the spread of countries across the continent. Some of its limitations are apparent in the implementation of this aspect and will be discussed further in the report.

2.2 Main findings on Project Implementation

Management Issues

The project experienced significant delays associated with both the recruitment of project staff during the start-up phase and the retention of staff during the project cycle. Instead of September 2002, the Chief Technical Adviser and the actual project start occurred only in the month of February 2003. The project end date was May 2006.

National level activities started at different times with Action Programmes generally taking many months to be finally approved. In terms of immediate objective one a

number of AP's were approved over the three year period. However, the ILO procedures from granting technical approval, financial approval from their procurement division, signing of contracts and then disbursing funds could all take over six, and in some case up to nine months to finalise. Additional bottlenecks occur when financial approval has to be communicated from Geneva to the Area Office directors in Abuja, Lusaka or Dar es Salaam for actual release of the funds. From a capacity building point of view this procedure in itself can be seen as disempowering rather than empowering. IA have to spend all this time waiting for approval, then for the disbursement of funds to actually implement their activities.

The preparation and approval of progress reports is another reason for delays. The CPC reviews all reports, sends back to IA for changes, then it is sent to the CBP sub-regional office in Lusaka for approval. Thereafter, ILO offices in Lusaka, Abuja and Dar es Salaam approve and issue the actual release of funds to the partner⁶. Some IA have been fortunate to have additional funds which they could advance while waiting for these funds, but this has not been the norm and most times IA just wait for the funds to come through. In addition, the limited size of ILO budgets meant to cover many activities, means that IA are put under increased pressure to leverage additional sources of funding to support ILO-supported activities. While this could be seen as a positive contribution towards sustainability it does however, imply that there is a mismatch between the planned activities and the budget.

The delay in financial disbursements and the amount of time spent on developing AP impacts negatively on the design of the project. Not only has this resulted in delays of the project, inflation affected the amount of monies that were transferred, particularly in countries where local currencies have appreciated in 2005/06.

Stakeholders in Kenya and Ghana were generally confused because of the different IPEC programmes and were uncertain which programme was offering a particular training intervention. The lack of coordination and synergy of IPEC programmes at the country level was problematic with a perception that this created rivalry amongst the different IPEC programme managers. Although the pooling of resources among different IPEC programmes was meant to facilitate greater co-ordination, this was not the case. An additional glitch has been that the Area Office now also deals directly with IA, which creates more confusion amongst partners.

Some social partners particularly in Ghana and Kenya felt that no support or technical assistance was provided by the ILO office. In Ghana the CLU was particularly hostile towards the ILO-IPEC largely because there was an expectation that they would be given a grant to operate. The view from social partners in both Ghana and Kenya was that the ILO was more involved with working with NGOs rather than social partners and they were only invited to workshops and seminars. Social partners saw this as a "move away from the original intention which was to build the capacity of the MoL and CLU".

7. As of 2006, this process only applies to projects located in a country with a area office (in this case Nigeria and Zambia) In other countries, the actual release of funds can now be approved by the local imprest account manager.

IA in Nigeria were concerned that theirs was a much bigger country compared to other African countries, and especially those that were included in the CBP project; hence it was unfair that they received the similar amount of funding from the ILO-IPEC when the scope of the WFCL was so much bigger in Nigeria due to the size of the population.

There was no provision for a number of complimentary activities that might not have a direct relation but would be important nevertheless. For example with the UN celebrations in Uganda there were no funds available for partners in the CBP to participate, which would have helped to profile issues of child labour. There needs to also be provision for an emergency fund that can cover staff costs between the end of one project and the start of another.

Role of IPEC HQ⁷ as it relates to the CBP

Questions have been raised about the extent to which IPEC in Geneva is staffed with the appropriate people who have the necessary knowledge and skills about development programmes and technical cooperation. Unless there is a clear understanding about capacity building as a concept important issues such as human resource development will be overlooked in the process as would institutional and infrastructure issues .

Different country programmes have different CTA's, so for example, there are 5 HO staff and 4 CTA s in Ghana. Is this cost effective? The intention has been to cost share but as indicated earlier this has not proved very successful in all countries, probably because there are no guidelines or models to facilitate the implementation thereof.

Reference was made in the IPEC meeting in Ghana about constraints within the project emanating from the ILO Head Office and impacting on the project⁸.

Stakeholder involvement and implementation capacity

The involvement of stakeholders was generally good, although NGOs sometimes expressed frustration at the lack of progress from government. Clearly NGOs were more proactive and in touch with issues directly involved in WFCL, and became frustrated with the lack of progress from government's side. In this regard it would be useful to assess the extent to which the Child Labour Units and National Steering Committee served as an effective mechanism to coordinate national activities effectively.

⁷ NOTE: It should be noted that a stakeholder referred specifically to DED in this case, however as DED is the independent evaluation section of IPEC, and to maintain its independence does not get involved in the day to day running of project implementation, would not make sense to refer to DED in this context.

⁸ Recommendations relating directly to the functioning of ILO Head Office and its impact on project implementation is attached as an Appendix

Child Labour Unit

The Child Labour Unit (CLU) was established by the different Ministries in each country and was initiated as a key driver in the fight against the WFCL, and to serve as mechanism to coordinate national activities.

The Child Labour Unit had not functioned effectively and has not proved to be an effective structure to coordinate or strengthen child labour activities in all but one country. Apart from Kenya the CLU was not part of formally approved and gazetted structures and was largely an in-house arrangement which was often not given much priority. This was largely due to the fact that the Labour Ministry had to contend with Ministry requirements and responsibilities which limited the amount of time the CLU could spend on meeting its objectives of the ILO/IPEC supported project. In Nigeria the CLU was quite involved in driving processes and functioned more effectively. A policy on WFCL was drafted and was about to be legislated. In Uganda the CLU cited the delay in funding from ILO/IPEC as the reason for their lack of performance.

Despite the fact that in Kenya the Child Labour Division is a formally approved and gazetted structure, they too were not very effective although they had 7 staff they were involved in other areas of work in the Division, and spent about 60% of time on Child Labour work. Partners expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of leadership and lack of coordination from the CLD. NSC meetings had not taken place for a considerable period of time because the CLD was not fulfilling its function as the Secretariat to convene such meetings. In fact, ANPPCAN has formed an Alliance against Child Labour in Kenya and was making an effort to bring all key stakeholders on board.

With the exception of Ghana CLU's had an AP which supported their work. This understandably is the reason for a huge amount of negativity from the CLU in Ghana who did not feel that they were supported, nor their capacity built to stand on their own. In this way they believe that child labour was relegated to the background. A specific issue with the CLU in Ghana is that there is a separate ILO Focal person in the MoL which probably creates confusion and dilutes the role of the CLU.

IA across the five countries indicated varying degrees to which the CLU was able to support them and recognised the challenges faced by them in meeting its coordinating function.

In at least three countries, the ineffectiveness of the CLU's was attributed to the delays in receiving the budget transfers from ILO-IPEC. In Zambia and Ghana the lack of a vehicle was seen as a major constraint in providing an effective service. In Uganda the delays in receiving ILO-IPEC funds were attributed to the delays in implementing their AP. Thus monitoring tools had not been disseminated, nor was a national strategy in place.

The NSC was set up when the Memorandum of Understanding was signed with the Ministry of Labour, Employers Organization and Workers Organizations and forms the key social partners within the NSC. The CLU also served as the secretariat of the NSC

so the effectiveness of the CLU has a direct impact on the extent to which the NSC would function optimally, and across the countries the NSC did not meet regularly and did not have the ability to offer guidance and leadership. The role of NSC was also misinterpreted by some NSC members who saw their role as approving rather than endorsing AP, as being decision-makers rather than advisors; hence feeling that they are not being allowed to fulfill their role. Despite some of the constraints mentioned with regard to the functioning of the NSC, in Uganda non ILO USDOL funded projects have been impressed with the NSC and are using it as a mechanism to bring together child labour issues, and have been willing to put resources into this. In Zambia, the ECLT project has indicated a similar intention.

An overriding issue seems to be whether the MoL in each country has indeed got the necessary stature and authority to influence what happens across government departments with regard to child labour issues. As it stands there was no evidence to indicate that the CLU worked effectively to coordinate and advocate for the inclusion of CL issues across the different Ministries. In Ghana a very explicit plea from the CLU was that “government at a higher level should take responsibility for coordinating the NSC”.

Capacity of social partners and implementing agencies

In terms of institutional capacity, the traditional partners of the ILO were relatively weak and did not contribute effectively to the implementation of the project. Each of the partners had very different priorities and CL issues are not one of the main ones although there is an overall interest to address the WFCL; hence not a lot of time or resources are put into addressing this issue. If one takes the example of developing CL policies in each country, in none of the five countries has CL policies been formally adopted, a responsibility that rested with members of the tripartite, for example, the MoL in Zambia, the Department of Labour and Productivity in Nigeria, and in Ghana the Federation of Employers. In some countries individual members of the tripartite took more initiative than others for example in Kenya the Trade Union Congress developed their own policy on Child Labour. These partners expected more from the project with regard to building their capacity, for example that more institutional strengthening towards the elimination of the WFCL (as the name of the project implies) would take place, rather than some of the interventions pursued by the project (even though they were all relevant).

The question remains whether a focus on this would have helped to strengthen national structures, or whether government bureaucracy and its other priorities, would still result in the same challenges. Interestingly in Zambia, the Ministry of Labour had set aside funds for child labour work with an understanding that they would cover the shortfall required by NGOs, for example, in some cases they were supposed to assist organizations with transport. Despite this, no NGO was assisted with transport and the CLU complained that they themselves could not do their work because they did not have transport.

In all cases the selection of IA extended beyond the traditional tripartite partners and included primarily NGOs, some who had already participated in previous IPEC

programmes, as well as newer NGOs invited to submit proposals for particular AP. In general, NGOs were more successful in implementing projects, despite some capacity constraints. In all cases, the knowledge base of child labour was enhanced, although an IA in Kenya and Nigeria indicated a lack of knowledge of the laws around child labour and international instruments prohibiting child labour, and that they had to learn this along the way. The institutional capacity of partners to implement their AP was not always as effective. This caused numerous delays both when formulating AP's as well as when they had to submit technical and financial reports. What the Inception Report acknowledged that *"the programme will focus on general skills with a direct bearing on the ability to fight the WFCL, though it is acknowledged that other skills or lack of these may have an indirect impact"*, was indeed a reality.

On an informal basis the national IPEC staff worked with many of the partners to guide them in the finalisation of their proposals as well as with their narrative and financial reporting and on a one-to-one basis helped to build their capacity. During the period of this project though training workshops on IPEC reporting requirements was conducted in Ghana, Nigeria and Uganda (in Ghana and Nigeria in collaboration with WACAP). This however, was not part of the design of the project but rather as a consequence of the lack of capacity of some partner organizations to effectively report on their projects.

The SPIF exercise was a capacity building intervention as well as partner self-evaluation-cum-planning exercises was an opportunity for IA to provide a forum for peer review, learn about other organizations, build confidence, identify strengths and weaknesses, and know where they can call on each other to help them.

These workshops also provided partners with the opportunity to network and in a number of cases, these extended outside of formally created opportunities. For example: ING and CENCOSAD in Ghana, ANPPCAN and USK in Kenya, ANPPCAN and UYDEL in Uganda also provided training to other partners, while M-Films in Zambia worked closely with partners because they needed their input in producing the materials for radio and TV. In Zambia UNICEF partnered with IPEC to provide school uniforms and with the Red Cross to provide mobile clinics. In Nigeria UNICEF and UNODC collaborated and co-funded the national baseline survey on child protection issues.

Of further note is that in Nigeria ILO-IPEC and UNICEF spearheaded the establishment of a UN Donor Consultative Forum on child labour/trafficking which was established to foster collaboration and ensure synergy in intervention programmes. Other agencies such as UNODC, USAID, Save the Children (UK), French, Swedish, Italian and American embassies were part of this forum.

Some partners also provided support to those who were not that strong and required some capacity building, so for example, in Ghana RAINS came to assist YDF who were having problems; in Zambia Hossana, Advocacy on Human Development, Kalulushi Municipal Council seemed to work together around their projects with Hossana providing a form of technical assistance to AHD around their specific project.

The IA was also involved in building the capacity of their partners at community level, for example the case of Child Labour Committees. Across the five countries the capacity of CLC was built so that people at community level were sensitised to child labour issues, especially the WFCL. The communities elected persons among themselves to be members of the CLC, comprising of local council leaders, opinion leaders, teachers, faith-based leaders and women's representatives. Members of the CLC were in a position to identify children in worst forms of child labour, sensitise communities, at times leading to the withdrawal and rehabilitation of children.

IA and CLC had limited or no capacity with regard to facilities and equipment (cars, bicycles, computers etc). Some organizations struggled to monitor their activities because they had no means of transport. This was especially difficult for those working in rural areas where vast distances made it difficult to function without transport in order to follow up on children who had been withdrawn from labour. In some instances, logistical support was provided to partners in the form of computers, for example, the School of Social Work in Ghana, FKE in Kenya and CLU in Zambia. At the same time the CLU in Ghana indicated that they were not supported in any way by the ILO-IPEC – for example they did not have a car nor other equipment needed to do their jobs such as a computer, fax, etc. this was eventually provided by UNICEF. The criteria for who qualifies for such support are not clear.

National IPEC staff were part of national partner meetings as well as sub-regional meetings and to this extent one can assume that the knowledge base of child labour was enhanced. In most cases the CPC was responsible for managing more than one IPEC programme, with minimal staff support, resulting in additional pressures associated with this. In certain countries the CBP had support staff, such as a programme assistant or financial officer and a driver, while in others they did not. The idea of cost-sharing while good in principal, did not always work out well in reality, with perceived turf-battles between different programmes. Communication between IPEC staff and stakeholders appeared to be good. IA were satisfied with the work of the CPC who were considered as supportive, providing direction, on-the-job support and going the extra mile to assist IA. Indeed the CPC spent a great deal of time responding to requests for guidance on their AP and on general capacity issues.

In general, capacity building was an inadequate term to describe what has taken place in the project - as it implies that the capacity of institutions would be built, this was not the case as there was no human resource development plan in place, although on-the-job learning with IPEC staff as well as IA had taken place.

The CTA has played a key role in providing assistance to CPC in all the countries. Although Zambia was seen to have benefited more because the CTA is based in Zambia, it was also seen quite positively because it forced CPC to be more independent while at the same time knowing that it was possible to refer to the CTA when necessary.

Additional capacities required include: project management skills, proposal writing skills, counseling skills, report writing and so on also remain lacking in a number of IAs. Other capacity issues include weak monitoring mechanisms such that some APs lose

information when staff leave as such information is never systematically collected and documented. Other organizational gaps that remain un-addressed include setting up systems to support the project work, for example, monitoring systems including database to support monitoring. If partners require infrastructural support in order to implement a project then the lack thereof implies that the capacity of partners to deliver was hindered.

Mainstreaming Child Labour

Mainstreaming ties very closely with social mobilization and advocacy and concerns all segments of society from central government policy makers to grass roots organizations. A number of initiatives have been undertaken and have been realised as a direct contribution of the CBP to address the mainstreaming of child labour issues.

National policies: Support has been offered to develop national policies on child labour in each country, unfortunately, the adoption of new legislation and national policies have proved to be a difficult task that seems to be caught up in various levels of government bureaucracies. Hence, in all countries child labour policies exist but they have not been finally approved. In Zambia the MoL has been responsible for developing a National Policy on Child Labour. At the time of the midterm evaluation in 2004 the policy was in draft form; 18months later the revised draft is still not approved. A similar situation was found in Kenya where so much time has lapsed since the initial draft that “it needed to be reviewed because the situation in the country has changed since it was first drafted”.

Other attempts at mainstreaming that have yielded more success are:

Social Work curriculum: In all countries work has been done to incorporate child labour into the social work curriculum. Some countries have been more successful at this than others. In Ghana the School of Social Work has been through an extensive process and now have mainstreamed child labour into the social work curriculum. The first students have completed their exams on child labour. At the University of Zambia discussions are taking place to integrate the Manual on Child Labour into the Social Work Department, while at the University of Nairobi an initial process was started with a stakeholder sensitisation workshop and then research done into institutions to assess the status of existing institutions and a report produced. This would have gone to a stakeholders’ workshop but due to the delay in the disbursement of funds from ILO/IPEC this process was stalled at a very crucial stage.

The Niger State College of Education in Nigeria has produced a Curriculum and Teacher’s Manual on Child Labour Education for Social Workers to facilitate the mainstreaming of child labour issues into the curriculum for the training of social workers. In Uganda, the Makerere University (Department of Social work and Social Administration) is reviewing and revising the Social work curriculum to include modules on child labour.

Poverty Reduction Strategy: In Ghana child labour is now included in the Poverty Reduction Strategy as well as a major item in the social protection component of the

strategy document. This is seen as a major victory in efforts to mainstream child labour. The implications are that all government agencies should have child labour programmes and budgets in their plans. Similarly, in Uganda, child labour issues are being given attention in the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP), while in Zambia child labour concerns feature in the draft Fifth National Development Plan.

Other government departments: In Zambia some government departments have made good strides in this regard. The Department of Education through ZAMISI has made much progress in developing a Manual on Child Labour that targets secondary schools and colleges. The Manual is to be used as a basis for curriculum review in all high schools and colleges. The idea is to mainstream child labour and integrate it into the school curriculum so by training teachers to use the Manual.

Worker's Organizations: The GNAT has mainstreamed child labour in all the work of the Union. They are said to have an institutionalised programme, one which is on Child labour. Handbook for local elected officials has a chapter dedicated to "The concept and variants of child labour in Ghana" which includes a section on the role of organised labour in the elimination of child labour. A workshop in Tamale aimed at mainstreaming child labour issues into the training programmes of the National Board for Small Scale Industries (NBSSI) to address challenges facing the urban informal sector. In Kenya, COTU developed a Child Labour Policy that applies to the context of the trade union. COTU's affiliate unions have incorporated the issues of elimination of WFCL into their policies and programmes with some staff identified to deal with child labour issues. FUE produced a publication called Child Labour Policy and Guidelines for Trade Unions in Uganda.

Child labour monitoring systems

Child labour monitoring systems would be able to monitor the extent to which a country fulfils the requirements of C182, that is, where there is actual progress in the elimination of the WFCL. WACAP has developed a CLMS which could possibly be used in the CBP. At this stage the CBP in Ghana has used this CLMS and questionnaires have been completed in 4 AP, although the information is not yet collated. In addition, the CLU is coordinating the CLMS in 5 Districts in Ghana where these are being piloted. In Kenya, there is a booklet on Child labour monitoring systems in Commercial Agriculture available but there is no system in place to monitor child labour. The consequence of this is that government more broadly and the project more specifically would not be able to track the movement of children who are withdrawn, rehabilitated, prevented or who return to work in order to assess the reasons for this and work out possible interventions. In Uganda, the IPEC tracking and tracing methodology was piloted to follow up on children who had benefited from the programme. The IA has continued to use this system. Unfortunately this system has not been finalised so that it could be incorporated as part of a monitoring system.

A CLMS is quite a complex undertaking and it seems overly-ambitious that the CBP would be able to achieve this. It seems more appropriate that an entire programme be

dedicated to developing and implementing a CLMS which is going to be essential to assess the impact of programmes to eliminate the WFCL.

Awareness raising and community mobilization

While awareness-raising is a difficult indicator to measure partners were very clear that the sensitisation work with communities has had an impact. An average of 2 000 children per country was set as the target for withdrawal or prevention, and in all cases partners have met their targets and beyond. The formation of Child Labor Committees has been a tangible indicator of mobilising communities to become aware, able to identify children in these situations, and have them withdrawn and returned to school was itself seen as an indicator of its success. A number of success stories have emerged as good practices to indicate the extent to which awareness raising has led to the withdrawal of children. Some of these are:

Zambia

- Use of Artists in Combating Child Labour

Artists Involving Traditional Leaders In Hosting Sensitization Concerts

The use of stakeholder-driven multimedia approach to design, produce and disseminate media products on the WFCL in Zambia

Kenya

- Community Response and Action
- Child Rights Clubs and public performances

Ghana

- Creating Child Labour Sensitive Media Personnel
- Social Mobilization to Combat Child Labour (The Use of Study Circles in Agricultural Communities)
- Awareness Creation through Interactive Theatre (using the Rites of Passage: Funerals & Naming Celebrations)
- Community Drama as a Medium for Combating Child Labour
- Using Community Structures to Raising awareness to combat WFCL

Nigeria

- Establishment of Child Labour / Neighbourhood Committees in Child Labour Endemic Communities of South-South and South – East Nigeria{ TC "Establishment of Child Labour / Neighbourhood Committees in Child Labour Endemic Communities of South-South and South – East Nigeria" \f C \l "2" }
- Use of Church Bulletin as a Medium of Publicity
- Involvement of District Heads in Raising Community awareness on ills of Child Labour
- Community Mobilization for the Elimination and Prevention of Child Labour{ TC "Community Mobilisation for the Elimination and Prevention of Child Labour" \f C \l "2" }

Uganda

- Rural out Reach Programmes
- Awareness raising through Music, Dance and Drama
- Use of Information Education and Communication (IEC) Materials”

Various methods were used in awareness-raising: workshops, production and dissemination of awareness-raising materials, such as booklets, posters, radio and TV programmes, video presentations, drama, and music performances. At schools, the formation of child’s rights clubs empowered children to participate in raising awareness. This was done through drama, drawing, poetry and music. The few schools visited where there were child rights clubs was very impressive.

In Nigeria the IPEC partner was HDFN which is not a faith based organization, but they chose as a strategy to use the church as a vehicle to raise awareness regarding WFCL. For example: issues regarding WFCL were referred to in church newsletters and/or messages from the pulpit included issues regarding child labour. It also should be pointed out that in Nigeria the church has an enormous following. Thus it was decided that promoting the fight against child labour would have a big impact if done through the church.

In Uganda the Federation of Uganda Employers (FUE) who is the sole national representative body of Employers in the public and private sector in Uganda raised awareness among its member associates on child labour issues. FUE produced a publication called Child Labour Policy and Guidelines for Trade Unions in Uganda. Similar activities have been undertaken by the Federation of Kenyan Employers.

IPEC has launched an education and social mobilization initiative, "SCREAM Stop Child Labour", to help educators worldwide promote understanding and awareness of child labour among young people. SCREAM stands for Supporting Children's Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media, but also reflects the silent suffering of working children and the need to give them a voice. Through creative and innovative teaching methods, the SCREAM programme aims to inform children and adolescents about the world in which they live and the injustices that exist, with the focus on child labour, so that they in turn can speak out on behalf of child labour everywhere.

It was clear that the messages to communities with regard to sensitising them to child labour can’t be a once off event; when people don’t hear the messages they revert to old habits especially if there was not a sustained campaign. While awareness raising and community mobilization was successful there is nevertheless a tremendous amount of work that still needs to be done in this regard.

2.3 Sustainability issues

The issue of sustainability from a financial point of view has been a key area of concern of the CBP. Although IPEC staff saw, as a success feature of the CBP, that IA were all informed of the close out phase and had to develop sustainability plans, IA did not share the same views. In some countries those IA who were lucky to be selected to be part of

the TBP did not have to worry about sustainability issues. The concern is what criteria were used to decide which IA's progressed with IPEC from one programme to the next. Indications are that IA that were 'problematic or not performing' in the CBP would not be included in the TBP, which is hugely flawed particularly if the intention was to build the capacity of partners, then it is particularly the weaker organizations that require attention.

The issue of sustainability especially with regard to direct action work where children are withdrawn and then sent to school is sometimes affected when IPEC support ends these children might have to leave school. This is not a very constructive approach and one which IPEC needs to review.

Partners with more experience have been able to look at other funding opportunities and been able to sustain activities. In Kenya sustainability has also been realised through local fundraising efforts. These efforts involved mobilising local resources by fund raising through individuals, groups and institutions. These include politicians, women group's businessmen and churches. Despite this, however, in some communities across the five countries, there seemed to be an over-reliance on what ILO IPEC could do for them.

The CBP has been sustainable in other aspects apart from the financial aspect. Where projects are involved in skills training even after project has ended, people remain with the skills which one could argue could be utilised to generate some kind of income, for example, youth who have gone through vocational training.

The awareness-raising and training done with CLC implies that at local level the fight against the WFCL would continue even if it is at a less practical level. So for example, even if there were no funds available to withdraw those children in labour and place them in schools, the CLC could continue to raise awareness in communities and this could serve as a preventative measure. The same applies to child rights clubs at schools, the work that has been done has been remarkable and these young boys and girls become ambassadors against the WFCL.

Working with District Councils/Assemblies has also proved to be a good practice. In some case (cases) Councils are now allocating budgets to support projects on reducing WFCL. In countries where child labour has been incorporated into the Poverty Reduction strategy, the implication is that this aspect could be included in planning and budgeting processes and therefore support to families of withdrawn children could be sustained.

Partners have potential to form discussion forums and make use of the radio and TV programme shows to continue raising awareness on child labour and their intervention strategies. All these strategies do not need to be paid for and can be used to sustain the awareness raising activities.

Mainstreaming is a good practice with regard to sustainability. As government and other institutions of civil society integrate child labour into their programmes and processes, the issues of WFCL remain on the public agenda and in this way can be addressed. Good

practice documentation will also help to generate new ideas and strategies and provide some form of sustainability, therefore it is important that this document be finalised and distributed to partners.

WACAP has developed a CLMS, which could be adapted and used in monitoring child labour in the general. The purpose of a CLMS as stated in the handbook on Administering Child Labour Monitoring Tools is so as to “establish a permanent institutional framework on child labour monitoring that enables tracking, reviewing and reporting on progress achieved and setbacks encountered in the struggle to eliminate the WFCL”. It provides evidence on progress and impediments in the efforts to eradicate WFCL which can then be used in drawing useful conclusions and collating lessons from the programme. The system itself is sustainable although implementation thereof is a serious issue that needs to be addressed. If the system is not implemented effectively, there is no way for countries as well as IPEC to know the impact of this programme from a quantitative point of view.

Monitoring mechanisms for many of the projects remain weak. Partners do not have ways of tracking performance, outcome and impact. This was largely attributed to lack of skills and proper systems. The general lack of monitoring systems has resulted in a lack of continuity as people leave with the institutional knowledge of the project. This is an area that should be addressed in future programmes. At the time of the evaluation, some projects were not yet completed and the concern was whether this would be left hanging or accommodated in other IPEC projects, for example, the Advocacy Strategy in Zambia and Ghana. In both countries the evaluators requested copies of these strategies but these were not provided by the IA. It is not possible therefore to know the status of these strategies and whether it has an implementation framework or not. This could not only affect the implementation of the strategy but could even mean that valuable resources are lost if it is not taken further.

2.4 Sub-regional work

Most of the IA did not know about sub-regional work and would have valued contact with other countries where similar projects have been implemented. Some IA did participate in a few sub-regional events, for example, CENCOSAD and ING went to Tanzania to learn about CLMS, MoL and FKE went to South Africa to attend a sub-regional workshop on social security. APCR had visited Kenya and ACP spoke about the importance of sub-regional sharing where good lessons were learnt, such as participatory methodologies and the SPIF. In Nigeria and Uganda IA were not aware that the CBP included other countries, and indicated that they would have benefited from having contact with other IA in other countries that had participated in similar CBP activities. The reason for this seems to be a limited budget that has to first cater for the tripartite partners in all the countries, and only if space is available, will other partners to be invited. This obviously limits the number of NGO partners that could be invited.

The limitation is that there was no systematic follow up after these workshops so one does not get a sense of the value thereof apart from sharing information which could have

been passed on through other means. Discussions with IPEC staff revealed that attempts were made to launch an internet-based discussion forum but this did not work well because of technical and other logistical problems that were not foreseen. These include problems with power supplies in the countries which makes access difficult as well as the fact that this would have been a new approach to communication which might have been quite alien to people's reality. At the same time, however, most IA did not have any knowledge of this.

On the other hand, follow up is being done with the child participation workshops. Through CBP at national level SCREAM trainings have been held in Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia. In Ghana the national follow-up workshop was held in collaboration with WACAP and in Kenya national SCREAM activities will be supported by the TBP.

A sub-regional newsletter was also planned but its effectiveness and impact was not easy to ascertain because partners were not aware of the newsletter. On the other hand, the good practices documentation has been welcomed by all and partners are looking forward to seeing the final product which will be able to share experiences across the five countries.

Section 3: Conclusions and Recommendations

3.1 Conclusions

3.1.1 Achievement of objectives

The evaluation has found numerous successes with regard to the achievement of objectives. In all countries some institutional mechanisms exist, albeit with varying degrees of capacity, to take forward programmes to eliminate the WFCL. The CLU's are in place although not all are effective which in turn impacts on the NSC and its functioning. It is clear that at a national level the capacity of the CLU need to be enhanced (in all areas) so that they are able to effectively serve as the mechanism to coordinate national activities against the WFCL. This includes having clear terms of reference for the NSC and providing this structure with the necessary support to function effectively. The involvement and active participation of Employers' and Workers' Organizations differ from country to country with some less involved than others. However, where they are active some impressive initiatives have been recorded. NGOs are the main IA in the WFCL and the evaluation has found the capacity of NGOs differed with some having more capacity and resources than others.

Capacity in relation to the child labour content-specific needs of each country has been achieved, and in this regard the objective has been met. With regard to a common understanding of capacity building this was not clear to all stakeholders. An initial flaw in the design process was that capacity building was narrowly considered which impacted on the project when it came to implementation. The project focused on and supported only those activities where they were directly relevant to child labour, thereby ignoring the human resource, institutional and infrastructural support that might also be needed to effectively implement these activities. Unless there is a clear understanding about capacity building as a concept important issues will be overlooked in the process. Simply put having the content knowledge of child labour on its own is not helpful at an institutional level unless people have the necessary tools to translate this into practice. This flaw in the design stages lead to different expectations emerging. In some countries the Ministry of Labour expected that the funds should have been spent on supporting them in either building the CLU or in providing infrastructural support. There was therefore some disquiet because "it seemed like NGOs were being supported".

In summary, while capacity of partners' has been built, it is fair to say that this was not in a holistic way but honed in on particular areas of capacity that was deemed necessary to implement activities around the WFCL. Institutional and implementation capacity needs have been recognised during the evaluation so clearly a more holistic approach to capacity building needs to be addressed.

With regard to Immediate Objective 2, sub-regional workshops were held although the participation of NGO partners was not that prominent. The attempts to set up an internet-

based discussion forum did not work well because of technical and other logistical problems that were not foreseen. A sub-regional newsletter was also planned but its effectiveness and impact was not easy to ascertain because partners were not aware of the newsletter. On the other hand, the good practices documentation has been welcomed by all and partners are looking forward to seeing the final product which will be able to share experiences across the five countries.

3.1.2 Overall impact of the project

The project strategies were generally appropriate, well integrated into national development policies and relevant to national development strategies and priorities.

At the *policy level* in the MoL there are draft policies in place as an attempt to create the necessary legislative environment to address the challenges of the WFCL. There is still a long way to go as none of these policies are approved and all remain in draft form.

Workers and Employers Organizations have also incorporated elements of child labour into their policies and programmes. Child labour advocacy strategies exist in some countries although these need to be accompanied by an implementation strategy so the work done is taken forward.

A further impact is the inclusion in some countries of child labour in the Poverty Reduction Strategy, which is major victory in efforts to mainstream child labour. The implications are that all government agencies should have child labour programmes and budgets in their plans.

At the level of *Implementing Agency* the impact of the project has been quite substantial. Organizations have been able to respond to a number of interventions from the level of policy development, awareness raising, mobilising communities, empowering child labour committees and child rights clubs. The most tangible impact has been in direct action where children have been withdrawn or prevented and placed in schools or vocational training. Innovative approaches have been used which included using national artists, different forms of media and introducing the participation of children through the SCREAM pack as well as child rights clubs.

Some partners have been able to mobilise community resources to sustain their activities especially with keeping children at school. Others have not been able to do so, which presents a challenge to ILO-IPEC with regard to the withdrawal of children and whether it is realistic to withdraw children and expect the families to self support when funding stops.

Although the preparation of Action Programmes and reporting procedures have been cumbersome, capacity of partners have been built in the process with an improvement in their ability to do Action Programmes and in meeting the reporting requirements. However, much work still needs to be done in this regard, with the possibility of simplified formats that still allow for accountability but are less technically inclined.

Networking amongst implementing agencies has also had some positive impacts both from the point of view of sharing information and of creating linkages to collaborate around events and areas of work. Partners with more capacity have helped those that were not as strong and required support. This is however an area that could be enhanced.

At the level of *beneficiaries* the most notable impact has been the withdrawal and prevention of children. Those children that were placed in school have benefited from this programme. Although some children were still involved in certain areas of work especially where they have to sell products after school to contribute to sustaining the family, this was not seen to be impacting negatively on their school work.

Youth who were involved in vocational training had also benefited from this programme and in all instances having the opportunity to learn a skill takes them one step further away from having to return to, or get involved in child labour. A few instances were recorded where these youth had no means of support so they came to the workplace with nothing to eat and often stayed this way for the day. Despite this, there was a commitment to continuing with the programme and endure these difficulties although some kind of support should be considered.

Time constraints did not allow many visits to *communities*. However, a few were visited and the impact of this work was remarkable, and indicates the potential strength of this programme. This is especially so where child labour committees were established. The ownership for tackling the issues around child labour is then taken to source and addressed at this level. Parents were enlightened and made aware and this encouraged some of them to withdraw their children, the community identified and reported cases of child labour and took it upon themselves to intervene.

Through Implementing Agents parents were supported to start small activities that would generate an income which could be used to sustain the family. The impact of Income Generation Activities (IGA) was not clear to establish and in most instances seemed miniscule.

3.1.3 Project Implementation

From an administrative point of view there seems to be an unnecessary length of time for AP to be finally approved and funds released. Progress reports also are time consuming and exceptionally cumbersome. Surely there must be a way to hold organizations and partners accountable without all the pressures associated with it. The ILO needs to be cautious that in the name of capacity building and empowerment it does not in fact unconsciously disempower partners. What emerges from the evaluation is that the systems and structures in ILO are not conducive to some developmental programmes like the CBP, which requires the kind of environment that is more responsive, enabling and geared towards building the capacity of partner organizations. Lengthy bureaucratic procedures coupled with time delays and what seems to be confusion about the role of the Area Offices as well as how capacity building is understood; can in fact hinder the process of capacity building. Decentralisation in the regions has not facilitated the

process in terms of time; it seems to have simply added another loop into the already cumbersome system because decision making is not decentralised. Although the pooling of resources among different IPEC programmes was meant to facilitate greater co-ordination, this was not the case.

In terms of institutional capacity, the traditional partners of the ILO were relatively weak and did not contribute effectively to the implementation of the project. The expectations of these partners was that more institutional strengthening towards the elimination of the WFCL would take place, rather than some of the interventions pursued by the project. Tripartite partners in some countries did not see the value of working with NGOs not the value of some of the strategies used such as the withdrawal of children. NGOs were however the main implementers of the various Action Programmes that were implemented. The NGOs were well equipped to work with communities, set up child labour committees and child rights clubs and do awareness raising programmes. The limitations however seemed to be at an institutional level with skills in project management, proposal writing and report writing to mention a few. Capacity was also limited at times with regard to infrastructural support to carry out a set of activities so for example, an NGO did not have transport to do proper monitoring of its activities.

The delay in financial disbursements and the amount of time spent on developing AP impacts negatively on the design of the project. Not only has this resulted in delays of the project, inflation affected the amount of monies that were transferred, particularly in countries where local currencies have appreciated in 2005/06.

In general the CPC at all the offices was seen as supportive and assisting as much as possible to speed up the process, although delays in approvals and disbursements were beyond their control. On an informal basis the national IPEC staff (which included CPC's and FAA's) worked with many of the partners to guide them in the finalisation of their proposals, as well as with their narrative and financial reporting and on a one-to-one basis helped to build their capacity. This however, was not part of the design of the project but rather as a consequence of the lack of capacity of some partner organizations to effectively report on their projects. The CPC have a key role to play in building the capacity of IA, and in coordinating and pooling together the various strands of such a programme. To give them the respect and credibility to guide this process they too need to have the capacity to do so.

Efforts to mainstream child labour have been effective with a number of good practices documented. These include national policies, incorporation into social work curricula. Various methods were used in awareness-raising: workshops, production and dissemination of awareness-raising materials, such as booklets, posters, radio and TV programmes, video presentations, drama, and music performances. At schools, the formation of child's rights clubs empowered children to participate in raising awareness. This was done through drama, drawing, poetry and music. The few schools visited where there were child rights clubs was very impressive.

The formation of Child Labor Committees has been a tangible indicator of mobilising communities to become aware, able to identify children in these situations, and have them withdrawn and returned to school was itself seen as an indicator of its success. A number of success stories have emerged as good practices to indicate the extent to which awareness raising has led to the withdrawal of children.

The implementation of a Child Labour Monitoring System has not been that effective and seems to be beyond the capacity of this project. To implement an effective CLMS, at a country, organization and community level requires a good coordination and integration system which is not yet in place. It seems more appropriate that an entire programme be dedicated to developing and implementing a CLMS which is going to be essential to assess the impact of programmes to eliminate the WFCL.

In general there seems to have been limited achievement and impact in the sub-regional work, although the good practices document that will be published is certainly a positive indicator in this regard.

The lack of coordination and synergy of IPEC programmes at the country level was problematic with a perception of rivalry amongst the different IPEC programme managers. Although the pooling of resources among different IPEC programmes was meant to facilitate greater co-ordination, this was not the case.

ILO/IPEC would be doing a great disservice by simply ending the Capacity Building Programme which has gone a long way in building the foundations for eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone Africa. The next stage is to build on and consolidate the gains made during the first phase of the Capacity Building Programme, and pave the way for a more sustainable intervention.

3.2 Recommendations

Based on the above, the following recommendations are proposed:

IPEC Management/ILO

- i. It is strongly recommended that the Capacity Building Programme is extended for a further 3 to 5 years.
- ii. The scope for such a programme should be more holistic and provide an integrated approach to capacity building that takes into account content-specific capacity, as well as human resource, institutional and infrastructural support that might also be needed to effectively implement the programme.
- iii. In general there should be a reduction in bureaucracy in proposal writing and disbursement of funds to speed up the process. Consider devolving power

from Geneva, to ILO field offices and to country programmes so that increasingly some significant financial approval is done in the country where the action takes place. An approval committee can be instituted to approve certain amounts of funds in country. A review of this process is recommended as well an increased focus on training in proposal writing and reporting for ILO-IPEC partners.

- iv. To extend the duration of similar regional capacity building projects to 4 - 5 years, or if a project is of shorter duration then the outputs should match the time frames.
- v. There has to be greater coordination and synergy between the different ILO/IPEC programmes so as to avoid unnecessary confusion amongst stakeholders but also to maximise the resources that are available. Where new country programmes are going to be implemented the ILO-IPEC should ensure that previous ILO-IPEC country programmes do not overlap.
- vi. As part of a learning and reflection process ILO/IPEC should take recommendations on previous evaluations and mid-term reviews seriously, otherwise it defeats the purpose of learning from one programme to the next and learnings are lost.
- vii. Clear guidelines on the role and responsibilities of the NSC should be incorporated into a standard Terms of Reference and be part of the MoU. The composition of NSC to be reviewed and additional partners included.
- viii. Standard monitoring tools should be developed that could be adapted for each project if necessary, that will help to track outcomes and assess the impact (this goes beyond activity and progress monitoring which are captured in progress reports and checklists). There is also a need for developing project monitoring tools for increased qualitative monitoring. Monitoring tools should also be implemented at a community level, with CLC members being empowered on how to implement them.
- ix. The tracking and tracing methodologies should be finalised and a standard system put in place for all projects – this should be an integral part of all projects.
- x. Future projects should build upon and further expand the networking and linkages undertaken by the CBP. More creative networking instruments could be devised, for example, promoting visits among partners to each others projects, more frequent review meetings, could be quarterly other than wait for six months, and so on.

- xi. With CLMS a national task force of key government agencies involved in CL issues should be established. This should be a separate investment as a regional project, possibly where a TBP is in place or foreseen.
- xii. There is a need for increased direct collaboration with local governments i.e. to give them an opportunity to directly implement activities as a way of fostering involvement and ownership of child labor interventions by local government structures.
- xiii. In order to strengthen the Ministry of Labour and CLU it might be necessary to negotiate with the Ministry to place a Technical Assistant in the Ministry for a period of 3-5 years with the purpose of strengthening the Unit and providing support to the functioning of the NSC

Donor

- i. It is highly recommended that for future IPEC interventions aimed at building capacities of implementing agencies, provisions of financial resources be made to assist IA with adequate equipment, transport and resources if this is what is needed to build capacity to effectively implement activities towards eliminating the WFCL. Investment in such material resources should also be conceived as a concrete aspect of building capacity of IAs.
- ii. Budgetary limitations that are beyond control of the project should be open to negotiation rather than excluding key areas of work. Field offices should have access to a contingency fund that can be easily accessed (and must be accounted for). In this way complimentary activities that are not necessarily planned for in advance, can be accommodated as well as currency fluctuations that negatively affects project budgets.

Appendices

1. Terms of Reference
2. Standard evaluation matrix
3. Recommendations from IPEC staff meeting in Ghana



**IPEC International Programme on the Elimination of Child
Labour
ILO/IPEC**

**Final Version: Basis
for Contract
Jan. 24, 2006**

**Terms of Reference
for
Independent Final Evaluation**

**Building the Foundations for Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in
Anglophone Africa (CBP)**

ILO Project Code	RAF/02/P51/USA
ILO Project Number	P340.02.100.051
ILO Iris Code	
Core Countries	Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda, Zambia
Additional Countries	Etiopía, Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania
Duration	36 months
Starting Date	September 2002
Ending Date	May 2006
Project Language	English
Executing Agency	ILO-IPEC
Financing Agency	US DOL
Donor contribution	USDOL: US \$5,301,486

I. Background and Justification

1. The aim of IPEC is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially its worst forms. The political will and commitment of individual governments to address child labour - in cooperation with employers' and workers' organizations, non-governmental organizations and other relevant parties in society- is the basis for IPEC action. IPEC support at the country level is based on a phased, multi-sector strategy. This strategy includes strengthening national capacities to deal with this issue, legislation harmonization, improvement of the knowledge base, raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour, promoting social mobilization against it, and implementing demonstrative direct action programmes (AP) to prevent children from child labour and remove child workers from hazardous work and provide them and their families with appropriate alternatives.
2. It is increasingly acknowledged that child labour is a problem of vast dimensions in many economic sectors in Africa. These sectors include agriculture, fishery, mining, transport, domestic services and the urban informal sector. In addition the exploitation of children in commercial sex and in armed conflict poses grave problems. There is therefore an urgent need to address the child labour problem as it is spelled out in ILO Convention 182. on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour. There is however limited capacity to fully apply ILO Convention 182 in many countries in Anglophone Africa. Thus there is an urgent need to strengthen and build capacity at all levels of society to facilitate concerted national efforts against the worst forms of child labour.
3. In recognition of such an urgent need, ILO/IPEC with USDOL funding began implementing the project, ' Building the Foundations for Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone Africa' in September 2002. The project with a 36 month duration has based its activities in Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia with additional non core countries of Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania⁹.
4. The capacity needs pertinent to the sub-region were outlined in several national needs assessment workshops carried out in the five countries in May and June 2002 and further explored in a sub-regional Strategic Programme Impact Framework (SPIF) workshop undertaken in late June 2002. The Area of Impact Framework (AOI) was developed during the sub-regional workshop and it identified the major capacity building needs common to all countries in the sub-region. The Area of Impact framework is available in the project document.
5. Based on these two frameworks and on the past ILO/IPEC experience in the five core countries, the project was designed to have a two pronged strategy to build capacity of national institutions and organisations to apply ILO Convention 182 to implement interventions against WFCL as well as to identify the sub-regional capacity building needs.

⁹ The actual start date for the CBP was February 2003. The project has been extended by 8 months from September 2002 to end May 2006.

6. Component one (of the box below) was designed to be implemented through an innovative **menu of model intervention approach**. During the programme start up a SPIF exercise was carried out in all countries involving key stakeholders including grassroots-level actors. The SPIF matrix provided an overall picture of the problems, stakeholders and priorities and served as a basis for selecting interventions. This ensured that support will be in line with the needs in a particular country at a particular point in time.
7. The menu of model interventions was designed to take into account interventions that were/are being implemented during previous phases of country programmes and to be able to build on experiences gained and achievements sustained from these country programmes. The menu of model intervention approach was designed to ensure that no country is being put in a position where they may end up re-inventing the wheel as would have been the risk if national level outputs were pre-defined in the project document. This menu of model intervention approach has been replicated in other ILO/IPEC projects and has potential to be a future general modality of IPEC.

COMPONENT	OBJECTIVES
<p>Component 1: National Levels The national level, at which capacity building projects will be implemented by national institutions and/or IPEC national offices for the benefit of organizations and institutions within this particular country. Capacity building at national level will take special account of national features.</p>	<p>By the end of the programme, governments, workers' and employers' organizations, NGOs, and other partners will have the technical skills and organizational capacity to formulate and implement policies, programmes and other initiatives to facilitate prevention, protection, withdrawal, rehabilitation and reintegration of children engaged in WFCL</p>
<p>Component 2: Sub-regional Level At the sub-regional level, at which activities directed at all the countries benefiting from the programme will be undertaken. These activities will be those aimed at sharing experience and information across the sub-region and/or those that are relevant to all countries benefiting from the programme.</p>	<p>By the end of the project, knowledge and experience on child labour and good practice interventions will be identified and shared at sub-regional level including the four non-core countries of Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania.</p>

8. The capacity building programme will focus on:
 - ✓ Training (including on-the-job training) for IPEC partners and other central stakeholders on technical issues related to WFCL
 - ✓ Building the knowledge base on the WFCL
 - ✓ Sharing of experience
 - ✓ Supporting networking, integration and mainstreaming with other programmes and agencies in development
 - ✓ Social mobilization and awareness raising
 - ✓ Direct action and capacity building at community level
9. As of September 2005 53 action programmes have been implemented or in the process of being implemented to support the two components and three Action Programmes were in the pipeline. A list of action programmes is provided in Annex 2.

Evaluation Background

10. As per IPEC procedures, a participatory consultation process on the nature and specific purposes of this evaluation was carried out. The present Terms of Reference is based on the outcome of this process and inputs received in the course of the consultative process.
11. A mid-term evaluation was carried out in September-October 2004. The mid-term evaluation found that the CBP project was contributing to enhanced awareness, social mobilisation, mainstreaming and direct support in tackling the worst forms of child labour. Targets for direct action were deemed to have been realistic and the evaluation team felt may even be surpassed. Greater community participation, local ownership and child participation has increased the prospects for sustainability. The need for more thematic linkages, better sustainability provisions and innovative strategies for additional resource mobilisation is increasingly recognised, but stakeholders need to integrate these elements much more in future activities. The mid-term evaluation also noted that the SPIF methodology and the menu of intervention of the project could both function as effective tools for participatory planning and the development of targeted interventions, but that it was still too early at that stage in the project to judge their merit for monitoring project implementation. The mid-term evaluation also made recommendations ranging from extending the duration of the project, limiting the geographic scope of the project, further linkages with the Time-Bound Programmes in Kenya and Ghana and to document the good practices and lessons learned of the project. (*Building the Foundations for Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Anglophone Africa*. Mid-term Independent Evaluation by a Team of External Consultants, November 2004)

II. Scope and Purpose

Scope

12. The scope of the present IPEC evaluation includes all project activities to date including Action Programmes. The evaluation should look at **the project as a whole** and address issues of project design, implementation, lessons learned, replicability and recommendations for future programmes and any specific recommendations for use in any future intervention.

Purpose

The purpose of the present evaluation should be to assess whether the objectives of the project were achieved by comparing the intended outputs with the actual outputs. The evaluation should assess the overall impact of the project at different levels such as at policy level, organizational (partner) level, beneficiaries level, community level and household level. The evaluation should try to assess the effectiveness of the project operation/implementation and management both at the implementing agency level and at IPEC level. It should analyze strategies and models of intervention used, document lessons learned and potential good practices, and provide recommendations on how to integrate these into planning processes and implementation of future IPEC activities in the project countries. A particular focus should be to identify elements of effective models of intervention and assess the modalities of the menu of interventions approach including its potential use and its strengths and weaknesses.

III. Suggested Aspects to be Addressed

The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency** and **sustainability** as defined in the *ILO Guidelines for the Preparation of Independent Evaluations of ILO Programmes and Projects* and for gender concerns see: *ILO Guidelines for the Integration of Gender Issues into the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of ILO Programmes and Projects, January 1995*. The following are the broad suggested aspects that can be identified at this point for the evaluation to address. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluation team in accordance with the given purpose and in consultation with DED. The evaluation instrument prepared by the evaluation team will indicate further selected specific aspects to be addressed.

Design

- Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent and took into account the validity and practicality of institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders.
- Analyse whether available information on the socio-economic, cultural and political situation in the five core countries was taken into consideration at the time of the design and whether these were taken into consideration and reflected in the design of the project.
- To what extent were external factors identified and assumptions identified at the time of design?
- Assess whether the problems and needs were adequately analysed and determine whether the needs, constraints, resources and access to project services of the different beneficiaries were clearly identified taking gender issues into concern.
- How well did the project design take into account local efforts already underway to address child labour and promote educational opportunities for target children and existing capacity to address these issues?
- How well did the project coordinate and collaborate with other child-focussed interventions supported by IPEC or other organizations in the target countries (including the USDOL funded Education Initiative projects as appropriate).
- Assess the use of SPIF for project design was it useful?
- Were the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives clear and logical? Do the various Action Programmes designed under the programme provide clear linkages and complement each other regarding the project strategies and project components of intervention? How were the APs regions and sectors selected?
- Analyse in particular the effects of limiting support to capacity building on child labour and excluding support to strengthening basic capacities beyond support in-built in AP design and monitoring.
- What was the advantage and drawbacks of a regional project design? Was the regional approach the most effective way to achieve the project's objectives?

Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness)

- Examine the preparatory outputs of the delivery process in terms of timeliness and identifying the appropriate resources/persons to implement the process
- How were the recommendations from the mid-term evaluation followed up by the project? Especially regarding, increased efforts to reform the NSC, decreased time for AP approvals, Child Labour Committees more actively involved in monitoring activities, gender issues acknowledged and integrated into project activities.
- Assess the efficiency of the programme i.e. compare the allocated resources with results obtained. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?
- Examine delivery of project outputs in terms of quality and quantity; were they delivered in a timely manner?

- Assess whether the project has achieved its intended outputs and whether it has achieved its objectives
- Were project revisions and extensions effective in helping the project meet its overall objectives and complete all of its Action Programmes as originally planned?
- Examine in particular the usefulness and impact of the partner consultation cycle built into the project, with special attention to its possible contribution to increased/improved networking and collaboration among partners.
- Examine any networks that have been built between organizations and government agencies working to address child labour on the national, provincial and local levels.
- Assess the level of government involvement in and support for the project
- Examine the capacity constraints of implementing agencies and the effect on the implementation of the designed Action Programmes.
- Assess the effectiveness of the different action programmes implemented and their contribution to the immediate objectives of the project. Has the capacity of community level agencies and organizations in the five core countries been strengthened to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate actions to prevent and eliminate child labour? Will the entire target population be reached? Are the expected outputs being delivered in a timely manner, with the appropriate quantity and quality?
- Which are the mechanisms in place for project monitoring? Please assess the quality and use of work plans and monitoring plans.
- How did factors outside of the control of the project affect project implementation and project objectives and how did the project deal with these external factors?
- Assess the progress of the project's gender mainstreaming activities.
- Assess the use of SPIF for review and monitoring as part of project implementation. Is it useful?
- How effectively did the **project leveraged resources** (e.g., by collaborating with non-IPEC initiatives, governments and other)?
- How successful have the projects been in mainstreaming the issue of child labour into ongoing efforts in areas such as education, employment promotion and poverty reduction? Please provide concrete examples as appropriate.
- How effective has the project been at building the capacity of national IPEC staff and implementing agencies' staff as well as capacity of government ministries and agency personnel to combat child labour? Please provide concrete examples as appropriate.
- How well did the local management structures (National Steering Committee, Local Steering Committees) work? Assess the participation of different relevant actors in the NSC. How did these structures participate in terms of programme implementation? How did this participation affect the outcomes of the project?
- How effective was the project in working with other IPEC projects in the region (TBP Ghana, TBP Kenya and the HIV/AIDS project in Zambia and Uganda) How did the project take advantage of possible synergies and economies of scale.
- How were the strategies for child labour monitoring implemented and coordinated? How effective was the project in implementing child labour monitoring systems (CLMS) and how effective were the systems themselves in tracking child beneficiaries and providing the project with information on whether children were withdrawn or prevented from WFCL.
- In what ways did the non-core countries (Ethiopia, Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania) benefit from the project?

Relevance of the Project

- Examine whether the project responded to the real needs of the beneficiaries
- Validity of the project approach and strategies and their potential to replicate, in particular menu of intervention approach and built in planning.
- Assess whether the problems and needs that gave rise to the project still exists or have changed

- Assess the appropriateness of the sectors/target groups and locations chosen to develop the project.

Sustainability

- Assess to what extent a phase out strategy has been defined and planned and what steps are being taken to ensure sustainability
- Assess in particular the usefulness to partners of the specific ‘sustainability plans’ instituted by the project in 2004/2005.
- Assess what contributions the project has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the project to partners
- Identify and assess the long-term commitment and the technical and financial capacity of local/national institutions (including governments) and the target groups to be able to continue.
- Examine whether socio-cultural and gender aspects endanger the sustainability of the project and assess whether actions have been taken to sensitize local institutions and target groups on these issues
- Assess the project’s focus on upstream policy work in terms of ensuring the sustainability of efforts?
- Are the child labour monitoring systems likely to be sustainable in each of the project countries?

Special Concerns:

- Assess the implications of a regional approach versus a national approach.
- Examine whether sharing of experiences between countries took place as had been envisioned in the project design.
- Examine the built in planning process: self evaluation cum planning process.
- The menu approach as a viable modality including possible modifications.

IV. Expected Outputs of the Evaluation

13. The expected outputs to be delivered by the evaluation team are:
- A desk review
 - An evaluation instrument prepared by the evaluation team leader
 - Field visits to the project countries of Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia
 - Small workshops facilitated by the evaluation team leader in each of the project countries including pre-workshop programme and briefing note
 - Present preliminary findings to and collect further data from the project team in Lusaka at the end of the field visit
 - Draft evaluation report including stakeholder workshop proceedings and findings from field visits by evaluation team
 - Final Report including:
 - ✓ Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
 - ✓ Clearly identified findings
 - ✓ Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations
 - ✓ Lessons learned
 - ✓ Potential good practices and effective models of intervention.
 - ✓ Appropriate Annexes including present TORs
 - ✓ Standard evaluation instrument matrix

14. The total length of the report should be a maximum of 30 pages for main report, excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated. The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.
15. All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided both in paper copy and in electronic version compatible for Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO-IPEC and the consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of ILO-IPEC. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.
16. The final report will be circulated to key stakeholders (those participants present at stakeholder evaluation workshop will be considered key stakeholders) for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED) of ILO/IPEC Geneva and provided to the team leader. In preparing the final report the team leader should consider these comments, incorporate as appropriate and provide a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated.

V. Evaluation Methodology

17. The following is the proposed evaluation methodology. While the evaluation team can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by DED provided that the research and analysis suggests changes and provided that the indicated range of questions is addressed, the purpose maintained and the expected outputs produced at the required quality.
18. The evaluation team will be asked to use the **standard evaluation instruments** that ILO/IPEC has developed for documenting and analyzing achievements of the projects and contributions of the Action Programmes to the project. The evaluation team may also use any other instruments that they see appropriate for this exercise.
19. The evaluation will be carried out using a desk review of appropriate material, including the project documents, progress reports, previous evaluation reports, outputs of the project and action programmes, results of any internal planning processes in the countries and relevant materials from secondary sources. At the end of the desk review period, it is expected that the evaluation consultant prepare a brief document indicating the methodological approach to the evaluation, the evaluation instrument, to be discussed and approved by DED prior to the commencement of the field mission.
20. The evaluation will be carried out using a desk review, field visits to Ghana, Kenya, Uganda, Nigeria and Zambia for consultations with project staff and project partners and other key stakeholders. A series of half day workshops will

be held in each of the project countries and a sub-regional level workshop will be held in Lusaka, Zambia at the end of the field visit.

21. The evaluation team will interview the donor representatives, IPEC HQ, and ILO/IPEC regional persons through a conference call early in the evaluation process, preferably during the desk review phase.
22. The evaluation methodology includes a two day stakeholder workshop with IPEC staff in order to gather further data and to present the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations and obtain feedback. This meeting will take place at the end of the fieldwork. It is suggested to use the SPIF as a tool for analysis during this workshop. Other planning tools already used as part of the built in process should also be used in this workshop. The results of this meeting should be taken into consideration for the preparation of the draft report. The consultant will be responsible to organize the methodology of the workshop. The definition of the number of participants of the workshop and logistics will be under the responsibility of the project team.

Composition of the evaluation team

The evaluation team will consist of one evaluation team leader that previously has not been involved in the project with any assistance he/she may consider necessary and five national evaluation consultants in each of the project countries. The team leader will have the final responsibility during the evaluation process and the outcomes of the evaluation, including the quality of the report and compliance with deadlines.

The background of the **evaluation team leader** (International Consultant) should include:

- ✓ Relevant background in social and/or economic development
- ✓ Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institution building and local development projects.
- ✓ Experience in evaluations in the UN system as team leader
- ✓ Relevant regional experience preferably prior working experience in the sub-region
- ✓ Experience in the area of capacity building processes and training as well as experience in children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework are highly appreciated.
- ✓ Experience at policy level and in the area of education and legal issues would also be appreciated
- ✓ Familiarity with and knowledge of specific thematic areas
- ✓ Fluency in English
- ✓ Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings

Five national consultants will be engaged for the period of one week prior to the team leader's field visit and during the duration of the team leaders' field visit. The national consultants will be responsible for preparing a background report for the consultant as well as note taking during the half day workshops. The national consultants will begin the desk review one week prior to visit (or an appropriate length of time in proportion to the size of activity per country in consultation with project staff. See tentative schedule for dates).

The background of the **evaluation team member** (National Consultants) should include:

- ✓ Experience in evaluation of development projects, in particular with local development projects.
- ✓ Relevant background in social and/or economic development

- ✓ Experience in the area of capacity building and children’s and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework in the country context would be highly appreciated
- ✓ Experience working in their country
- ✓ Fluency in English
- ✓ Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings

The evaluation team will be responsible for undertaking a **desk review** of the project files and documents, undertake **field visits** to the project locations, **and facilitate the workshops**.

The team leader will be responsible for **drafting** the evaluation report. Upon feedback from stakeholders to the draft report, the team leader will further be responsible for **finalizing** the report **incorporating** any comments deemed appropriate.

The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the IPEC-DED section and with the logistical support of the project office in Lusaka and with the administrative support of the ILO office in Lusaka. DED will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting it to the team leader.

It is expected that the evaluation team will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct.

Timetable and Workshop Schedule

The total duration of the evaluation process including submission of the final report should be within two months from the end of the field mission.

The evaluation team leader will be responsible for 45 days *of which 5.5 weeks will be in country visits to Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia.*

The tentative timetable is as follows:

Phases	Tasks	Dates
I: Desk Review	Desk review of relevant project documents	Feb. 1-5
Field Visits	Zambia: consult with staff/partners	Feb. 6-10
	Nigeria: consult with staff/partners	Feb. 13-17
	Kenya: consult with staff/partners	Feb. 20-24
	Uganda: Consult with staff/partners	Feb. 27-March 3
	Ghana: Consult with staff/partners	March 6-10
III. Sub-regional Meeting	Meeting with project management and staff in Ghana	March 13-14
IV: Draft Report	Team leader drafts evaluation report	March 15-24
V: Stakeholders comments	Draft report circulated by DED to all key stakeholders for their comments. Comments consolidated and send to team leader for finalizing the report	March 27-April 7
VI: Final report	Team leader finalizes the evaluation report taking into consideration the consolidated comments	April 14th

Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings

Available at HQ and to be supplied by DED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • DED Guidelines and ILO guidelines
Available in project office and to be supplied by project management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports/Status reports • Technical and financial report of partner agencies • Other studies and research undertaken • Action Programme Summary Outlines Project files • National workshop proceedings or summaries • Country level planning documents • SPIF documents

Consultations with:

- Project management and staff
- ILO/IPEC technical and backstopping officials
- Partner agencies
- Boys and Girls that were withdrawn or prevented as a result of direct action APs undertaken in the core countries.
- Parents of girls and boys that were withdrawn or prevented
- Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups
- Community members
- Government representatives, legal authorities etc as identified by evaluation team
- Telephone discussion with USDOL

Final Report Submission Procedure

For independent evaluations, the following procedure is used:

- The **team leader** will submit a draft report to **IPEC DED in Geneva**
- IPEC DED will forward a copy to **key stakeholders** for comments on factual issues and for clarifications
- **IPEC DED** will consolidate the comments and send these to the **evaluation team leader** by date agreed between DED and the evaluation team leader or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders.
- The final report is submitted to IPEC DED who will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including the donor.

VI. Resources and Management

Resources:

The resources required for this evaluation are:

For the evaluation team leader:

- Fees for an international consultant for 45 work days

- Fees for international travel from consultant's home to Lusaka-Accra-Abuja-Kampala-Nairobi-Lusaka in accordance with ILO regulations and policies
- Fees for local DSA in Lusaka, Accra, Abuja, Kampala, Nairobi

For the evaluation team members (five members):

- Fees for a national consultant for 10 days
- Fees for DSA in project sites during field visit as applicable

For the evaluation exercise as a whole:

- Fees for local travel in-country in each of the five countries
- Stakeholder workshop expenditures in each country
- Sub-regional workshop costs including travel and DSA for the NPC of each of the five countries
- Any other miscellaneous costs

A detailed budget is available separately.

Management:

The evaluation team will report to IPEC DED in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with DED should issues arise. IPEC project officials and the ILO Office in Lusaka and Pretoria will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission.

ANNEX 1
Terms of Reference
For
National Consultant
Of
Final Evaluation
of
CBP Anglophone Africa
January -April 2006

ILO Project code:	RAF/02/P51/USA
Starting date:	September 2002
Ending dates:	May 2006 (revised)
Programme locations:	Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia
Programme language:	English
Executing agency:	ILO-IPEC
Financing agency:	US-DOL
Donor contribution:	US \$5,301,486

The Terms of Reference for the overall mid-term evaluation assignment sets forth the overall background and setting of the exercise.

Refer to the overall Terms of Reference for:

- Background and Justification of the exercise
- Scope and Purpose
- Suggested Aspects to be Addressed

Expected Outputs of national consultant:

- Background report based on project documents (due the day of team leader's arrival scheduled dates in-country)
- Technical (theme, culture, language as appropriate) support to the team leader during field visits
- Facilitation support to team leader during stakeholder workshop
- Notes taken during the stakeholder workshop

Composition of the evaluation team:

The national consultant and the team leader will be the evaluation team.

Duration of Work:

The national consultants will be engaged for one week of desk review prior to the arrival of the team leader for the field visit or at a date convenient to the national consultant as long as the required report is ready for the team leader on the scheduled dates of the field visit. The national consultant will also be engaged for the period of the field visits and the national stakeholder workshop as per schedule. The national consultant should be available to conduct the field visits with the team leader. (See schedule below)

COUNTRY	TASKS	DATES
Zambia Jessie	Background report	Jan 30-Feb 3 Deadline: Feb. 3
	Field Visit	Feb 6-10
	Workshop	TBD
Uganda Rayna	Background report	Feb 6-10 Deadline Feb. 10
	Field Visit	Feb. 13-17
	Workshop	TBD
Kenya Rayna	Background report	Feb. 13-17 Deadline Feb. 17
	Field Visit	Feb. 20-24
	Workshop	TBD
Nigeria Jessie	Background report	Feb 20-24 Deadline Feb. 24
	Field Visit	Feb. 27-March 3
	Workshop	TBD
Ghana Jessie	Background report	Feb. 27-March 3 Deadline March 3
	Field Visit	March 6-10
	Workshop	TBD

Profile of the national consultant:

- ✓ Relevant background in social and/or economic development
- ✓ Experience in evaluation of development projects
- ✓ Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and some experience in capacity building/training issues
- ✓ Fluency in English for report writing

Resources and Management:

The evaluation team will report to IPEC DED in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with DED should issues arise. IPEC project officials in each project country will provide administrative and logistical support to the evaluation team during the evaluation mission.

Resources required for the national consultant for this evaluation exercise are:

- Fees for two work weeks maximum per project country
- Local travel fees for field visits including any DSA as appropriate

ANNEX 2:

Ongoing Action Programmes

Approved Action Programmes						
Serial No.	Action Programme number (P340.92.235.051 or P340.02.900.050 BL21Pos 003)	Title of AP and name of Implementing Agency	Amount in local currency	Number of monitoring visits undertaken this year	Start date	Expected completion date
GHANA						
1	RAF/02/P51/USA/GHA/AP/001	Prevention and Withdrawal of Children in Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) in the Accra Metropolitan Assembly – International Needs – Ghana (ING)	US\$39,490	Three	October 2004	November 2005
2.	RAF/02/P51/USA/GHA/AP/002	Mobilising Community Structures (CLCs) for the prevention and withdrawal of Children in fishing. International Needs – Ghana (ING)	US\$60,518	Four	November 2004	November 2005
3.	RAF/02/P51/USA/GHA/AP/003	Prevention of young girls in the Tolon/Kumbungu and Savelugu/Nanton Districts in the Northern Region from Embarking on “Kayaye” Regional Advisory Information and Network System (RAINS)	US\$62,108	Two	September 2004	November 2005
4.	RAF/02/P51/USA/019/GHA/AP/04	“Stop Child Labour” Interactive Theatre Project - : Centre for Community Studies, Action and Development (CENCOSAD)	US\$32,174	Three	October 1 2004	September 2005
5.	RAF/02/P51/USA/083/CBP/AG-04	Curriculum Improvement/Revision towards the Production of Child Labour Sensitive Social Workers - School of Social Work, Osu-Accra (SSW)	US\$30796	Six	1 Oct 2004	30 th Oct 2005
6.	RAF/02/P51/USA/GHA/AP/004	Progressive Elimination of Child Labour in Illegal Mining and Stone Quarrying in Adansi West and the Ga Districts of Ghana - Youth Development Foundation (YDF)	US\$40,050	Three	20 th October 2004	30 th September 2005

Dec 2005

April 2005

7.		Ghana National Advocacy Strategy Development Towards the Progressive Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour	US\$34,942	Three	May 2005	November 2005
KENYA						
8	P.340.02.100.051 BL 21 Pos 034	Media campaign for awareness raising and social mobilization towards WFCL in Kenya Association of Media Women in Kenya (AMWIK)	54,274	3	April 2004	Completed in March 2005
9	P.340.02.100.051 BL 21 Pos 066	Strengthening the capacity of child labour committees and building linkages at the community level for prevention and withdrawal of children engaged in the worst forms of child labour in the informal sector in selected urban centres in Kenya. Child Welfare Society of Kenya (CWSK)	38,392	0	May 2004 (implementation delayed till September 04)	April 2005 (Now extended to August 2005)
10	P.340.02.100.051 BL 21 Pos 041	Using existing local trade union structures to mobilize grassroots involvement to deal with the worst forms of child labour at the grassroots level in three districts in Kenya and moving The fight upstream to the policy level Central Organization of Trade Unions (COTU)	63,946	1	May 2004	April 2005 (Now extended to July 2005)
11	P.340.02.100.051 BL 21 Pos 069	Eradicating child labour through education, skills training and small enterprise development Undugu Society of Kenya (UNDUGU)	82,876	3	May 2004	The project's IPEC support ended in April 2005 and with UNDUGU's self contribution the project will end in November 2005.

12	P.340.02.100.051 BL 21 Pos 0 72	Adjusting/revising national social workers training curriculum to make it more responsive to the problem of WFCL in Kenya University of Nairobi: Department of Social Work	30,482	2	Dec 2004	November 2005
13	P.340.02.100.051 BL 21 Pos 042	Enhancement of capacity of the Federation of Kenya Employers (FKE) in combating hazardous child labour FKE	34,480	2	September 2004	November 2005
14	P.340.02.100.051 BL 21 Pos 091	Strengthening and Enhancement of the capacity of child labour committees and building linkages and networks with other community groups on child labour ANPPCAN (Regional Office)	65,060	1	August 2004	January 2006
15	P.340.02.100.051 BL 21 Pos 020	Capacity building for the Child Labour Division of the Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development to effectively eliminate the WFCL in Kenya	14,958	1	Feb 2005	July 2005
16	P.340.02.100.051 BL 21 Pos 052	Towards a national advocacy strategy for effective elimination of WFCL through policy and legislative reforms in Kenya	30,957	0	May 2005	Feb 2006
NIGERIA						
17	MP1/NG/CBP/USDOL	Incorporation of the Red Card to CL into the 8 th All Africa Games IA: WOTCLEF	5,000	0	October 4, 2003	October 20, 2003
18	MP2/NG/CBP/USDOL	CI Free Home Campaign IA: Impact for Development and Change (IMPACT)	5,000	0	June 12, 2004	June 27, 2004
19	AP5/NG/CBP/USDOL	Strengthening Media Capacity to Eliminate Child Labour and Child Trafficking IA: News Agency of Nigeria (NAN)	39, 658	4	May 28, 2004	June 28, 2005

20	AP1/NG/CBP/USDOL	Developing a National Advocacy Strategy for the Elimination of the Worst forms of Child Labour in Nigeria IA: WOTCLEF	24, 721	3	April 6, 2004	December 5, 2004
21	AP4/NG/CBP/USDOL	Building the Capacity of Children in Domestic Work through education and training to enhance their future prospects in Nigeria IA: WOCON	59, 285	0	April 12, 2004	March 11, 2005
22	AP3/NG/CBP/USDOL	Withdrawal and Protection of Child Domestic Workers in South West Nigeria IA: HDI	53, 742	2	April 19, 2004	March 18, 2005
23	AP6/NG/CBP/USDOL	Development and Production of a manual for the Training of Social Workers on Child Labour Education in Nigeria IA: DAPAL	32, 067	3	August 25, 2004	February 24, 2005
24	AP9/NG/CBP/USDOL	Establishment of Child labour/Neighbourhood Committee in CL Endemic Communities of South-East and South-South Nigeria IA: ANPPCAN	50, 322	0	December 12, 2004	September 11, 2005
25	AP8/NG/CBP/USDOL	Withdrawal and Prevention of 550 Child Domestic Workers in Kaduna Metropolis, Kaduna State, Nigeria IA: HDFN	62,026	4	September 30, 2004	January 30, 2006
26	AP/NG/CBP/USDOL	Facilitating the implementation of CL Programmes in Nigeria IA: CLU	30,000	3	February 21, 2005	December 20, 2005
27	AP10/NG/CBP/USDOL	Awareness creation and social mobilization of faith based organization in combating and eliminating CL in Nigeria IA: CRIB	30,000	2	February 7, 2005	August 6, 2005
28	MP3/NG/CBP/USDOL	Sensitization and advocacy on CL in Ahiazu-Mbaise Local Governemnt Area of Imo State, Nigeria IA:ADPL	5,000	0	December 12, 2004	January 11, 2005
29	AP2/NG/CBP/USDOL	Promoting the participation of children in the fight against CL in Nigeria IA: CDD	30,000	5	July 1, 2005	April 1, 2005

30	MP4/NG/CBP/USDOL	Promoting the participation of children in the fight against CL in Nigeria IA: National Union of Chemical, Footwear, Rubber, Leather and Non Metallic Products Employees (NUCFRLAME)	10,000	0	June 1, 2005	October 1, 2005
UGANDA						
31	P340 02 100 051 Position-076	Integration of Child Labour Education in the Curriculum of Social Work at Makerere University Department of Social Work and Social Administration	US\$30,359	2	21 Feb 2005	Dec 2005
32	P340 02 100 051 Position - 096	Developing a National Advocacy Strategy ANPPCAN (U) Chapter	US\$ 24,256	N/A	April 2005	Dec 2005
33	P340 02 100 051 Position - 077	Withdrawal and Prevention of Children from Hazardous street activities Kids In Need	US\$73,138	2	1 Oct 2004	31 Jan 2006
34	P340 02 100 051 Position - 095	Rehabilitation of Commercially Sexually exploited Children in Kawempe division and Busia Town Council. Uganda Youth Development Link	US\$80,562	2	March 2005	Jan 2006
35	P340 02 100 051 Position -022	Mainstreaming Child Labour into Federation of Uganda's Employers' Programmes. Federation of Uganda Employers	US\$30,095	2	March 2005	Dec 2005
36	P340 02 100 051 Position -051	Strengthening the Capacity of the Family and Protection Unit. The Child and Family Protection Unit, Uganda Police.	US\$ 30,934	2	Feb 2005	Dec 2005
37	P340 02 100 051 Position -075	Creating Awareness and Mobilising Community Action against Child Labour Rural Development Media Communications (RUDMEC)	US\$40,223	N/A	Dec 2004	Dec 2005
38	P340 02 100 051 Position -079	Mainstreaming Child Labour in Uganda National Teachers Union Programmes Uganda National teachers Union	US\$40,000	1	March 2005	Dec 2005

39	P340 02 100 051 Position -092	Strengthening the Capacity of Child Labour Committees to withdraw and Prevent Children from hazardous informal sector activities. ANPPCAN (U) Chapter	US\$74,808	1	1 Jan 2005	Jan 2006
40	P340 02 100 051 Position - 086	Empowerment of Children in the prevention and Elimination of Child Labour National Council for Children (NCC)	US\$30,000	Not yet	September 2005	Feb 2006
41	P340 02 100 051 Position - 053	Strengthening the Capacity of the Child Labour unit, Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social development The Child Labour Unit, Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development.	US\$40,000	"	September 2005	Feb 2006
42	P340 02 100 051 Position - 045	Mainstreaming of Child Labour in the Policies and Programmes of National Organisation of Trade Unions. National Organization of Trade Unions (NOTU), Uganda.	US\$14,950	"	September 2005	Feb 2006
ZAMBIA						
43		Enhancing Children's participation in the debate on the worst forms of child labour (WFCL) being implemented by CHILDREN IN CRISIS – CIC	27, 897	2	03/02/04	28/02/06
44		"National Advocacy Strategy (Contribution to creating Linkages and Networks)" being implemented by CHILDREN IN NEED NETWORK - CHIN	37, 444	3	17/04/04	30/04/05
45		Enhancing capacity of parents to sustain withdrawn children in schools and skills training being implemented by KALULUSHI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL - KMC	15, 000	2	09/09/04	31/03/05
46		Increase public awareness on the worst forms of child labour and building the capacity to enhance smooth elimination of child labour in Mufulira being implemented by ADVOCACY ON HUMAN DEVELOPMENT - AOHD	15, 000	2	09/09/04	31/03/05
47		Enhancing the capacity of artists in the creation of awareness and advocacy towards the elimination of child labour in Zambia being implemented by ARTISTS PROMOTING CHILDRENS' RIGHTS IN ZAMBIA - APCR	31, 275	2	30/09/04	30/09/05

48		Mobilisation of church leaders and communities to combat the worst forms of child labour being implemented by ANGLICAN CHILDRENS PROJECT - ACP	89, 160	2	25/04/04	31/12/05
49		Programme for combating child labour through capacity building of rural communities in prevention, withdrawal and awareness strategies being implemented by JESUS CARES MINISTRIES - JCM	95, 487	3	05/04/04	05/10/05
50		A multi media campaign to combat the worst forms of child labour in Zambia being implemented by M-FILMS	56, 635.93	1	05/04/04	31/03/05
51		For the establishment and enhancement of community participation in the prevention and elimination of exploitative child labour in Ndola's high density compounds being implemented by HOSANNA MAPALO	50, 000	2	02/11/04	28/02/06
52		Capacity building and curriculum review towards the prevention and elimination of child labour being implanted by the MINISTRY OF EDUCATION – MOE	62, 282	3	05/10/04	31/01/06
53		Finalising the National Child Labour Policy and domestication of the ILO Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour being implemented by the MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND SOCIAL SECURITY – MoLSS	61, 472	4	21/10/04	28/02/06

Action Programmes in the Pipeline as of March 2005

Pipeline Action Programmes :					
	Proposed title or purpose	Area of intervention	Proposed Implementing agency	Date submitted	Proposed Budget
1.	Empowering children to increase their participation, create awareness and voice their views on WFCL	Awareness raising and social mobilization	Child welfare Society of Kenya	Submitted to Procurement on 01.09.05	USD 15,000
2.	Strengthening the Capacity of teachers, educators and child care givers to promote child participation using the ILO/IPEC SCREAM Pack	Awareness raising and social mobilization, mainstreaming	ANPPCAN	Proposal under development	
3.	National Baseline Survey on Child Protection issues in Nigeria	CDW, Street children and Almajirinchi system and child labour in construction industry	CRC Chair, Department of Public Law, University of Lagos, Akoka, Yaba, Lagos State	AP approved. Awaiting signing of contract	USD 94,379

Appendix 2: Question guide for IPEC evaluation

	IPEC staff	Partners and Implementing agencies	Beneficiaries
DESIGN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the project design process like? Was it reflecting country priorities and did it include the participation of stakeholders? • How and to what extent did the project strategy define capacity building needs? Does the project embody a common understanding of capacity building? • How realistic was the design in terms of scope, timing and proposed linkages between countries? • How well did the project design take into account local capacity and ongoing national efforts? • How well did the SPIF contribute to identifying/verifying the capacity-building needs of core countries and how did this affect the project strategy? What were the added-value of the programming approach under the SPIF and the “menu of interventions”? • Has the design included preparation of a monitoring plan, including the break-down of indicators into 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have you as IPEC partner participated in the design of the project? • Is the project design appropriate, feasible and realistic for achieving the immediate objective of capacity-building? Is it gender sensitive? Where would you have put more emphasis? • Is the project design relevant to the national child labour situation and the needs of the target groups? • What is the contribution of the Action Programmes to the attainment of the project’s immediate objectives? How useful are the model interventions/menu of interventions for the formulation of new APs? • How would you assess your capacity to implement this project and the commitment of stakeholders, and how did this impact on the implementation of the designed Action Programmes? • What was the advantages and drawbacks of a regional project design? Was the regional approach the most effective way to achieve the project’s objectives? 	<p>Beneficiaries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effective were the awareness-raising efforts of the project? Did the project succeed in targeted community mobilisation? Has the awareness and understanding of child labour issues increased among your constituents. In what way? • How would you rate the quality and relevance of the information produced by the project at the regional and sub-regional level, as well as beneficiary level?

	<p>milestone targets?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project design identified direct beneficiaries, who will ultimately benefit from the outcomes? • To what extent did the design take into account the capacity of the IA, and the commitment of stakeholders • Examine the capacity constraints of implementing agencies and the commitment of stakeholders, and how did this impact on the implementation of the designed Action Programmes? • What was the advantages and drawbacks of a regional project design? Was the regional approach the most effective way to achieve the project's objectives? • What lessons can be learned for a future design of a similar programme? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons can be learned for a future design of a similar programme? 	
<p>IMPLEMENTATION (Effectiveness and Impact)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are your experiences in terms of the efficiency of the project implementation up to now? How would you assess the implementation in terms of management issues, the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project has achieved its intended outputs and whether it has achieved its objectives. In which way has the project contributed to capacity-building? 	

	<p>coordination and information sharing between responsible IPEC offices and the creation of synergies?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the reasons and consequences of delays in implementation? How could these be reduced and the delivery rate increased in future? • Have the SPIF and the self-evaluation-cum-planning workshops worked as strategic planning tools and have they been appropriate to ensure national participation and consensus in decision-making? Are these tools used for monitoring purposes in each country? How effective was the follow-up on the decisions taken or the commitments made at the workshop? • Was the selection of the implementing agencies appropriate and reflective of past experiences/clear selection criteria? How satisfactory was the level of involvement and activity of partners? Who are the most active partners and who are the least active? Which explanations can you 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the national institutional framework become more adequate for tackling child labour? Do partners look to the Child Labour Units as a strengthened mechanism to coordinate national activities effectively? Have national networks for tackling child labour been strengthened by the project? • Were project revisions and extensions in helping the project meet its overall objectives and complete all of its Action Programmes as originally planned? • What has been the usefulness and impact of the partner consultation cycle built into the project, and in what way did this contribute to increased/improved/inhibit networking and collaboration among partners? • What other networks were established between government and organisations working to address child labour issues, and what impact has it had on the project? • How effective has the project been at building the capacity of national IPEC staff and implementing agencies' staff as well as capacity of government ministries and agency personnel to combat child labour? Please provide concrete examples as appropriate. • How effective were the awareness-raising 	
--	---	--	--

	<p>give for the differences in performance?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which role do ILO`s tripartite constituents and the National Steering Committee play in capacity-building? How effective are the Child Labour Units? How can their capacity and institutional performance be enhanced? Are project staff resources adequate or are partners in need of training? • What is the main problem regarding the formulation and implementation of direct Action Programmes? Do these programmes make effective use of the model interventions or pre-selected items? • Are there any new programmatic linkages emerging during project implementation that would tie the project to other child labour or IPEC projects? • What has been the usefulness and impact of the partner consultation cycle built into the project, and in what way did this contribute to increased/ improved/inhibit networking and collaboration among partners? 	<p>efforts of the project? Did the project succeed in targeted community mobilisation? Has the awareness and understanding of child labour issues increased among your constituents. In what way?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the impact of the training workshops on stakeholders? Has the capacity of implementing agencies been increased? In what way? What capacity gaps still exist? • How would you rate the quality and relevance of the information produced by the project at the regional and sub-regional level, as well as beneficiary level? • Are there any model interventions that have been identified in core countries and shared with other partners? What are these? • How important is the monitoring of ex-child workers in the context of this project? What systems are in place (databases, longitudinal studies, etc) • What technical guidance and support was provided by project staff, partner organizations and relevant ILO units. Were these adequate? What else was required? • In what way was government involved in 	
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effective has the project been at building the capacity of national IPEC staff and implementing agencies' staff as well as capacity of government ministries and agency personnel to combat child labour? Please provide concrete examples as appropriate. • What technical guidance and support was provided by project staff, partner organizations and relevant ILO units. Were these adequate? What else was required? • How effective was the project in working with other IPEC projects in the region (TBP Ghana, TBP Kenya and the HIV/AIDS project in Zambia and Uganda) How did the project take advantage of possible synergies and economies of scale. • How could a similar project be improved in future? 	<p>the project, and how would you assess their level of support for the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the capacity of community level agencies and organizations in the five core countries been strengthened to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate actions to prevent and eliminate child labour? Will the entire target population be reached? In what way has this happened? Please give some best case practices. • Which are the mechanisms in place for project monitoring? Please assess the quality and use of work plans and monitoring plans. • How did factors outside of the control of the project affect project implementation and project objectives and how did the project deal with these external factors? • Assess the use of SPIF for review and monitoring as part of project implementation. Is it useful? • How effectively did the project leverage resources (e.g., by collaborating with non-IPEC initiatives, governments and other? • How well did the local management structures (National Steering Committee, Local Steering Committees) work? Assess the participation of different relevant actors 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>in the NSC. How did these structures participate in terms of programme implementation? How did this participation affect the outcomes of the project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effective was the project in working with other IPEC projects in the region (TBP Ghana, TBP Kenya and the HIV/AIDS project in Zambia and Uganda) How did the project take advantage of possible synergies and economies of scale. • How were the strategies for child labour monitoring implemented and coordinated? How effective was the project in implementing child labour monitoring systems (CLMS) and how effective were the systems themselves in tracking child beneficiaries and providing the project with information on whether children were withdrawn or prevented from WFCL. • How successful have the projects been in mainstreaming the issue of child labour into ongoing efforts in areas such as national policy development, education, employment promotion and poverty reduction? Please provide concrete examples as appropriate. • Assess the progress of the project's gender mainstreaming activities. 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were the recommendations from the mid-term evaluation followed up by the project? • How could a similar project be improved in future? 	
RELEVANCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the assessment of the choice of strategy the organisation has adopted? Is it relevant to the problem it is aiming to address? Will the results of the project solve the problem as intended? How appropriate was the sector/target group and locations chosen to develop this project? What could have been done differently? • How does the project know whether it responded to the real needs of the beneficiaries? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the assessment of the choice of strategy the organisation has adopted? Is it relevant to the problem it is aiming to address? Will the results of the project solve the problem as intended? How appropriate was the sector/target group and locations chosen to develop this project? What could have been done differently? • How does the project know whether it responded to the real needs of the beneficiaries? 	
EFFICIENCY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess the efficiency of the programme i.e. compare the allocated resources with results obtained. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred? • Examine delivery of project outputs in terms of quality and quantity; were they delivered in a timely manner? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess the efficiency of the programme i.e. compare the allocated resources with results obtained. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred? • Examine delivery of project outputs in terms of quality and quantity; were they delivered in a timely manner? 	
SUSTAINABILITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any phase-out strategy in place and what steps are being taken to ensure sustainability? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did the project coordinate and collaborate with other child-focused interventions supported by IPEC or other 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the level of commitment and the technical and financial capacity of local/national institutions (including governments) and the target groups to be able to continue. • Are the child labour monitoring systems likely to be sustainable in each of the project countries? • Have lessons learned been documented? What are the possibilities for replication of good practices at the sub-regional level? 	<p>organisations in the targeted area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there future activities or commitments of the project partners that will help to ensure sustainability? • Is there any phase-out strategy in place and what steps are being taken to ensure sustainability? • What contributions has the project made to strengthen the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the project to partners • What is the level of commitment and the technical and financial capacity of local/national institutions (including governments) and the target groups to be able to continue. • Are the child labour monitoring systems likely to be sustainable in each of the project countries? • Have lessons learned been documented? What are the possibilities for replication of good practices at the sub-regional level? 	
--	--	--	--

Appendix 3: Recommendations from the IPEC staff meeting in Ghana

The following recommendations are included that relates more directly to ILO Institutional and management issues. This was not included in the main Evaluation Report because many of these issues were only raised at the meeting in Ghana at the end of the evaluation. However, they are important to the extent that it impacts on project implementation, and therefore, has some key proposals that could facilitate and create a more enabling environment for Implementing Partners.

Recommendations are as follows:

- More strategic projections should be made other than number crunching with projections made on staff and capacities required, in other words matching outputs to inputs.
- Procurement limits should be adjusted from US \$20 000 to US\$50 000 and only amounts above US\$50 000 should go to procurement.
- Financial approval should be decentralised to Area Offices and AO staff trained in Technical Cooperation special procedures and
- A new handbook should be developed for CTA (1976 version outdated) that would guide CTA and Project Managers – this would go beyond IPEC
- Creating a bridge fund/contingency fund to keep staff on board as the transition from one project to the next takes place
- All projects backstopped by 1 person per country
- Provision should be made in the budget for team building, staff development and local communication.
- More communication should take place through workshops and meetings rather than by simply sending a CD.
- IPEC should continue to work with tripartite partners in the relevant capacity, but not be compelled to do so where it is not appropriate. These should be included in POM for CTA and Project Managers. POM should also have clear management rules and stages of reporting.
- Up to 1 year should be invested in the development of AP, which would include technical input from Geneva until the final approval. Partners capacity should be enhanced or strengthened during this process
- Funds should be made available for visibility and profile of the programme
- Evaluation findings should be shared across other projects at country level
- ILO must distinguish between the issues of personnel management versus human resource development.
- Role of the CTA and national programme management staff should be clarified

- Guidelines on cost sharing should be developed and the CTA should be well orientated on the national situation and cost sharing guidelines (included in POM)
- Trained ILO staff should be given first priority in upcoming positions; this should be seen as part of career development. There should be a panel with checks and balances and ground rules in place in appointment of project staff
- IPEC should work with other Ministries such as Ministries of Education, Gender, Social Affairs as well as other donor partners – these should be included into the Design phase
- Systematic training for IPEC staff should be done, with in-house training open for all and external training according to the job the person is doing.