



International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)



International
Labour
Office

IPEC Evaluation

TECL Phase II

**Towards the Elimination of the Worst Forms
of Child Labour, Phase II with a focus on
HIV/AIDS:**

**Supporting and monitoring the
implementation of National Plans of Action
in three core countries in Southern Africa:
South Africa, Botswana, & Namibia**

RAF/08/P52/USA

P.250.16.100.052

**An independent mid-term evaluation by a team of external
consultants**

March 2011

IPEC/EVAL/2011/09

This document has not been professionally edited.

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 by a team of external consultants¹. The field mission took place in March 2011. 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 Joy Stephens, (team leader), Trywell Alusopa, Catherine Chinyandura and Elna Hirschfeld (National consultants for Botswana, Namibia and South Africa)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Acronyms and Abbreviations..... | v |
| Executive Summary | vii |
| 1. Introduction and background | 13 |
| 1.1 The TECL II Programme | 13 |
| 1.2 The Mid-term Evaluation process | 14 |
| 1.2.1 Scope and purpose of the evaluation..... | 14 |
| 1.2.2 Methodology | 14 |
| 1.2.3 Constraints and Limitations of the study..... | 15 |
| 1.3 Report Structure | 15 |
| 2. Supporting the adoption and implementation of NAPs | 15 |
| 2.1 Role and contribution of TECL II..... | 15 |
| 2.2 Potential Impact and Progress on NAP implementation..... | 16 |
| 2.2.1 Botswana | 17 |
| 2.2.2 Namibia | 18 |
| 2.2.3 South Africa | 19 |
| 2.3 Common lessons learned and Recommendations | 21 |
| 3. Supporting the strengthening of legislation | 22 |
| 3.1 Role and contribution of TECL II..... | 22 |
| 3.2 Impact: Progress on amendment of legislation | 23 |
| 3.2.1 Botswana | 23 |
| 3.2.2 Namibia | 24 |
| 3.2.3 South Africa | 24 |
| 3.3 Building capacity for law enforcement | 25 |
| 3.3.1 Botswana and Namibia..... | 25 |
| 3.3.2 South Africa | 25 |
| 3.4 Common lessons learned and recommendations | 26 |
| 4. Capacity building, sensitization, and awareness raising | 27 |
| 4.1 TECL activities | 27 |
| 4.2 Effectiveness of capacity building and sensitization..... | 27 |
| 4.2.1 Specific CB&S needs mentioned by stakeholders or noted by the evaluation | 28 |
| 4.2.2 Capacity building: lessons learned and recommendations..... | 28 |
| 4.3 Capacity building of education sector through SCREAM..... | 29 |
| 4.4 Sensitization efforts with Workers and the private sector..... | 29 |
| 4.4.1 NACTU: CL Policy and Celebration of Women's Day (South Africa) | 30 |
| 4.4.2 BOCCIM: Sensitization of Business Councils (Botswana) | 30 |
| 4.4.3 Fair Trade in Tourism: Tourism Child Protection Code of Conduct (South Africa) | |
| | 31 |
| 4.5 National awareness raising campaigns..... | 32 |
| 4.5.1 Broad findings | 32 |
| 4.6 Common lessons learned and recommendations | 32 |
| 5. Building the knowledge base | 33 |
| 5.1 Research studies | 33 |
| 5.2 Supporting national surveys and CL monitoring | 34 |
| 6. Summary of upstream key findings | 35 |
| 7. Direct Targeted Interventions..... | 36 |
| 7.1 Broad Progress to date..... | 36 |
| 7.2 Recommendations regarding target numbers:..... | 38 |

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 7.3 | Direct Interventions in Botswana..... | 39 |
| 7.3.1 | Progress to date | 39 |
| 7.3.2 | Examples of Good practices..... | 39 |
| 7.3.2 | Specific Recommendations | 40 |
| 7.4 | Direct Interventions in Namibia..... | 41 |
| 7.4.1 | Progress to date | 41 |
| 7.4.2 | Special Issue | 41 |
| 7.4.3 | Specific Recommendations | 42 |
| 7.5 | Direct Interventions in South Africa | 42 |
| 7.5.1 | Progress to date | 42 |
| 7.5.2 | Children on the street: Examples of lessons learned and good practices..... | 43 |
| 7.5.3 | Specific recommendations | 43 |
| 7.5.4 | Discussion on the change from monitoring to implementing | 43 |
| 7.6 | Lessons learned and recommendations | 44 |
| 8. | Implementation process..... | 45 |
| 9. | Design of TECL II..... | 46 |
| 9.1 | Broad Findings | 46 |
| 9.2 | Addressing the recommendations of TECL I evaluation..... | 47 |
| 9.3 | Specific issues | 47 |
| 10. | Broad Conclusions | 48 |
| 11. | Major Recommendations | 49 |
| | Annexes..... | 51 |
| | Annex 1 Terms of reference..... | 52 |
| | Annex 2: List of Organizations/Persons interviewed..... | 75 |
| | Annex 3: Documents reviewed or consulted..... | 79 |
| | Annex 4: Transcripts of Interviews with Beneficiaries..... | 80 |
| | Annex 5: Some reflections on how to monitor withdrawal from excessive hours of work.... | 83 |
| | Annex 6: Mid-term term evaluation itinerary | 85 |

Acronyms and Abbreviations

| | |
|----------------|--|
| AP/APSO | Action Programme/Summary Outline |
| APEC | Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labour (title of NAP in Botswana and Namibia) |
| AR | Awareness raising |
| BFTU | Botswana Federation of Trade Unions |
| BOCCIM | Botswana Confederation of Commerce, Industry and Manpower |
| BUSA | Business Unity South Africa |
| CB | Capacity building |
| CL | Child Labour |
| CLC | Child Labour Committee |
| CLMS | Child Labour Monitoring System |
| CLPA | Child Labour Programme of Action (title of NAP in South Africa) |
| COSATU | Congress of South African Trade Unions |
| CS/CSO | Civil Society/Civil society organization |
| CSEC | Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children |
| CTA | Chief Technical Advisor |
| CUBAC | Children used by adults to commit crime |
| DBE | Department of Basic Education (South Africa) |
| DBMR | Direct Beneficiaries Monitoring and Reporting |
| DED | Design, Evaluation and Documentation-IPEC |
| DSD | Department of Social Development, South Africa |
| DSS | Department of Social Services (Botswana) |
| DWAF | Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa |
| FBO | Faith based organization |
| FEDUSA | Federation of Unions of South Africa |
| FTT | Fair Trade in Tourism |
| HH | Household |
| IA | Implementing Agency |
| IC | Implementation Committee (South Africa) |
| ILO | International Labour Organization |
| IMS | Information & Monitoring System |
| IPEC | International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour |
| LAC | Legal Assistance Centre (Namibia) |
| LFS | Labour Force Survey |
| M&E | Monitoring and evaluation |
| MDA | Ministries, departments, and authorities |
| MGECW | Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare |
| MLHA | Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs (Botswana) |
| MLSW | Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (Namibia) |
| MOE | Ministry of Education |
| MOSS | Ministry of Safety and Security (Namibia) |
| MOYS | Ministry of Youth and Sports (Namibia) |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| NACTU | National Council of Trade Unions (South Africa) |
| NAP | National Plan of Action (against child labour) |
| NFE | Non Formal Education |
| NGO | Non-government Organization |
| NLC | New Life Centre (South Africa) |
| NPC | National Programme Coordinator (for TECL II) |
| NSC | National Steering Committee |
| NSC | National Steering Committee (for the NAPs in Namibia and Botswana) |
| OVCs | Orphans and vulnerable children |
| PACC | Programme Advisory Committee on Child Labour |
| Prodoc | Project Document |
| PS | Permanent Secretary |
| RECLISA | Reducing Exploitive Child Labour in Southern Africa |
| SA | South Africa |
| SADOL | South Africa Department of Labour |
| SAPS | South African Police Service |
| SCREAM | Supporting Children Rights through Education, Arts and the Media |
| SP | Social Partners (refers to Workers/Employers organizations) |
| SPIF | Strategic Programme Impact Framework |
| TECL | Towards the Elimination of the worst forms of Child Labor |
| TPR | Technical Progress Report |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| USDOL | United States Department of Labour |
| WFCL | Worst Forms of Child Labour |

Executive Summary

Background

Towards the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Phase II (TECL II) is operational in South Africa, Botswana, and Namibia. It builds upon the foundation of TECL I which saw the drafting of National Action Plans (NAPs) for the elimination of child labour in each country, and its major focus is supporting their implementation. TECL II also supports direct interventions through partners which aim to withdraw 2800 and prevent 5600 children from child labour (CL) in agriculture, commercial sexual exploitation (CSEC), children used by adults to commit criminal offences (CUBAC), and excessive household chores. The donor is the United States Department of Labour (USDOL) and the budget is USD 4,750,000. The programme commenced in September 2008 and now has a completion date of June 2012.

Development Objective: Contribute to the elimination of WFCL and forms of child labour in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa by supporting the implementation of NAPs in these countries.

Immediate Objectives:

- By the end of the project, capacity of the key partners will have been strengthened to more effectively mainstream child labour issues into legislative and policy frameworks and take action against WFCL, and awareness will have been raised among the general public and among key stakeholders.
- By the end of the project, models of interventions (focusing on education and HIV/AIDS) for addressing selected WFCL and prioritized forms of child labour in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa will have been developed, test, and - in South Africa - further mainstreamed through pilot interventions involving direct action programmes (3 outputs)

The evaluation process

This is an independent mid-term evaluation of TECL II projects and activities to date. It was carried out in March 2011 by a team of consultants. Interviews were held with key stakeholders including the donor, ILO Geneva and Pretoria, and TECL II staff and in each country with government officials in the relevant ministries, representatives of Employers and Workers Organizations, implementing agencies, social workers, police, labour inspectors, community leaders, child beneficiaries and their families. Field visits were made to direct interventions in Johannesburg (South Africa); to Ondangwa and Tsumeb in northern Namibia; and to Francistown, Palapye, and Tsamaya in eastern Botswana. Following each country visit the preliminary findings were shared with key stakeholders to gather their reflections and correct any factual errors.

Key findings: Immediate Objective 1.

Excellent progress has been made in activities and outputs related to supporting the implementation of the National Action Plans (NAPs), amendment of legislation, training of law enforcers, and capacity building of the implementation committees for the NAPs. At mid-term point TECL is roughly 70% of the way towards achieving its upstream targets and should have no problem in meeting all of them within the given time-frame.

TECL II inputs have ranged from installing a gigantic Red Card to Child Labour banner during the World Cup, to running or providing technical input into a range of workshops, to quiet diplomacy and advocacy to support the forward movement of legislation and the NAPs. Key to its achievements is relationship building. The various capacity building and sensitization workshops have been a critical input and proved very influential in gaining the engagement of stakeholders, and building the

knowledge and skills of practitioners to implement or enforce policy and legislation. Many opportunities and needs remain, not least to ensure that capacity and sensitization filters right the way down the chain to community level, and TECL II needs to be in a position to respond to these..

Challenges common to all the country programmes (though with varying degrees) include the high turnover of government staff and with them the loss of institutional memory; weak information flow within ministries; the practice of sending junior substitutes to NAP meetings; policies which are not implemented properly, sometimes because the relevant officials are not aware of their existence, or lack an appreciation of their purpose, all of which need addressing with further capacity building; the slow pace of legislation reform; finding the right trigger to animate the Workers and Employers Organizations to play a stronger role; establishing supportive linkages and structures between central government and community level - bureaucracy tends to create blockages rather than facilitate flow.

South Africa

TECL plays a smaller role in this country in view of their more advanced capacity. During the past year a sense of ownership and determination has emerged in the government, particularly following the Labour Minister's visit to The Hague and some decisive leadership by the Department of Labour (SADOL). The Treasury is supportive and they report that funding is not a constraint. It is hoped that this will be an example of an emerging Good Practice.

A key milestone has been the adoption of their NAP (known as CLPA) in 2009. Initial meetings of their CLPA Implementation Committee (IC) were not well attended, but following an initiative by SADOL, the key stakeholders have become much more seriously engaged, and are now setting about mainstreaming the action steps outlined in the CLPA. The Department of Basic Education (DBE) has been particularly active, and other supportive partners include the Police and the Department of Social Development. Attention is now turning to implementation level and recent meetings of the IC have been attended by labour inspectors or members of the provincial child labour implementation committees (CLICs). This is a good strategy to empower and strengthen linkages to implementation level.

The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework developed with TECL assistance is in place and with stakeholders providing regular reports on their progress, SADOL has embarked on producing the first ever report on the State of Child Labour. They hope to have it ready within the next two months and this will represent a major achievement.

Other key milestones include the amendment of the Basic Conditions of Employment Act so that it covers child labour in the informal sector, and the promulgation of the List of Hazardous Work and its regulations to accompany this Act, together with the Child Justice Act (2010). Apart from the Human Trafficking Bill which is still in process, all the necessary legislation is in place to combat child labour. Attention is now focusing on the training of law enforcers and the production of popular versions in local languages. Training of law enforcers is an on-going process.

The opportunity offered by the Football World Cup was exploited to spread awareness about child labour and a special task force was established to ensure that children were protected from exploitation. This campaign was highly successful and there were no recorded incidents. The National Council of Trade Unions (NACTU) have developed their own Child Labour Policy and celebrated Women's Day with a child labour theme. It is recommended that other Social Partners (SPs i.e. Workers and Employers organizations) follow their example. TECL supported sensitization efforts by the South Africa Human Rights Commission and by Fair Trade in Tourism. The latter developed a Code of Conduct with action obligations to control sex tourism. To date nearly 40 high-profile travel/tourism companies are signatories.

Botswana

The pace of progress has been slower than hoped. The Lead Ministry is struggling to activate certain stakeholders and their NAP is not yet adopted by Cabinet. High turnover of government staff is one reason. Strong support has come from the Police and the Ministry of Education. The latter have embarked on mainstreaming and are engaged in a rolling programme of training educators to ensure that they understand and implement education policies which will have a positive impact on child labour. They have adapted SCREAM materials and inserted them into the school curriculum. Work on a monitoring and evaluation system for the NAP is in progress and more work need to be done to develop a viable set of indicators as part of the child labour monitoring system to guide NAP implementation.

A review of legislation was carried out. The List of Hazardous Regulation has been drafted but not yet passed; regulations are in progress. A strong and comprehensive Children's Act came into force in 2009 and laws are now being amended to reflect this marker. TECL has supported a variety of capacity building workshops with key stakeholders, including a joint training of labour inspectors, social workers, and police in two districts, and the development of a training manual. These have been well received and influential.

The Minister of Labour has made several very strong statements regarding on the radio and TV, and the issue received good coverage during the World Day against Child Labour. A variety of awareness raising and sensitization activities have been carried out, some of them by the SPs, as well as the training of two business councils in Palapye and Francistown.

Namibia

Momentum is building rapidly on their NAP and it is hoped that this will be another emerging Good Practice. The decisive factor has been strong support from the President who has made a series of powerful statements regarding CL backed by action. The TECL and ILO Turin Training Centre workshop on Policy & Legislative Responses to CL was influential in bringing more stakeholders on board. The list of committed partners now includes Labour, Education, Police, Justice, Youth, Child Welfare, and Employers. All of them stress the value which they have gained from networking together. All of them have embarked on the process of mainstreaming NAP and the introduction of the monitoring and evaluation framework has assisted them in understanding how to set about this process. The Ministry of Education is a particularly vocal advocate against CL, and their actions in mainstreaming are an example of Good Practices which deserve to be shared widely. They have issued numerous directives to schools to implement policies that should have an impact on improving access and attendance and thus on reducing child labour.

However Namibia's NAP is not yet adopted, nor is the List of Hazardous Work. The Child Care and Protection Bill and the Child Justice Bill are moving very slowly through the necessary processes and are scheduled to be tabled in Parliament in May 2011. TECL assisted with a joint training of law enforcers including police, social workers, and labour inspectors. This was followed by a joint mission (acting under a Cabinet directive) to investigate and report on cases of child labour in the regions. A follow-up mission some months later found a high degree of compliance.

Key findings: Immediate Objective 2.

The direct interventions with implementing agencies (IAs) have started slowly, and progress towards their outputs is not moving as strongly as would be hoped at this stage of the programme. While they will undoubtedly contribute to their immediate objective, they are unlikely to meet their outputs in the number of children to be withdrawn from the specified sectors; even the numbers for prevention look challenging. With less than 12 months to go, the biggest Action Project (AP) targeting 3600 children in South Africa has not yet begun, and one AP targeting 1050 children in Namibia is on hold.

The decision to implement and not monitor in South Africa has occupied the team and the evaluation believes this has contributed to the slow start. In Namibia and Botswana two civil society organizations (CSOs) are being partnered by each as it was difficult to find CSOs with relevant experience. In neither country is the NGO sector strong or well-developed; none of the agencies there had previously partnered ILO-IPEC for this type of direct intervention. While the decision to limit the number of partner agencies is logical for close monitoring and cost-efficiency, considerable responsibility rests on a few. Contracts were signed by August 2010, but due to start-up activities, several of the IAs could not begin serious identification of target beneficiaries until January 2011.

Some of the challenges inhibiting progress relate back to the design which rests on a number of flawed assumptions, namely: that beneficiaries would be found clearly categorized in the designated CL sectors (agriculture, excessive household chores, CSEC and CUBAC) and in the specified quantities and proportions; that the government would implement direct interventions in South Africa with its own funds; and that it would commit to meet TECL selected target numbers and sectors. These challenges are compounded by ambiguity (in theory and in practice) in delineating one CL sector from another partly due to the rigor of the Direct Beneficiary Monitoring System, and partly due to some confusion among the IAs as to whether they may target children in any sector of child labour, in the lack of clear guidelines from ILO-IPEC on how to define withdrawal for the category of children enrolled in school but classified by national surveys as engaged in CL due to their excessive hours of work.

Given the challenges and the difficulty of addressing WFCL sectors such as CUBAC and CSEC, the time-frame of 18 months for the APs is too short and the budget too small to achieve meaningful sustainable impact. The design process has built capacity but has not been empowering or provided funding to the IAs for feasibility studies² prior to signing contracts committing them to meet the given targets. The tight budget is causing a high turnover in their field staff which is further delaying progress.

There is however no question that the APs are being conscientiously implemented. They are addressing the needs of children in CL or at risk; they are sensitizing and raising awareness in the target communities, building local capacity and establishing sustainable community structures or linkages to government services.

Botswana is showing the greatest progress. One partner is making very strong progress largely due to its greater experience and established presence in the target area. Both partners are using traditional structures to ease their entry into the communities. Several strong and active community child labour committees have been established. In South Africa two small APs are underway, both with partners who are experienced in addressing the needs of street children and those at risk of CSEC. They are getting good cooperation from government officials such as police and social workers. In Namibia things are more delayed, partly due to the floods which have closed schools for several months and are preventing outreach workers reaching communities, and partly due to the dismissal of one IA. Community level structures also appear to be weak in Namibia and regional bureaucracy strong, and this is hindering progress.

The IAs are finding many cases of eligible children who are not currently receiving the statutory welfare grants, either due to lack of knowledge about the existence of such grants, or lack of documentation. Mostly they are receiving good cooperation from government workers such as police and social workers, but there are weaknesses in some localities. One of the lessons learned is that children engaged in CSEC and CUBAC are very distrustful of authority and easily abscond during the withdrawal process if they are obliged to meet with government officials.

² Some feasibility studies were done prior to TECL II but not by the IAs

Key Findings: Design and Implementation process

The broad design is well-conceived. It is built upon the principle of supporting national efforts. The activities are relevant, logical, and coherent, and build upon the foundations laid in Phase I. It has a strong emphasis on sustainable outputs such as legislation, capacity building, and awareness raising, and it engages with a wide range of stakeholders. Weaknesses are its relatively short time-frame and tight budget, which are limiting TECL's ability to effectively respond to opportunities. Target numbers and CL sectors specified in the design are also presenting a challenge in the downstream activities.

The programme had a delayed start as the full compliment of staff was not in place until August 2009. The loss of time and financial constraints are an on-going challenge. Yet, despite these and some personnel changes, implementation is running relatively smoothly. Travel costs are high in the sub-region and the delay in the procurement of vehicles has exhausted the travel funds and limiting the extent to which monitoring visits and joint learning workshops may take place between the three countries. The budget poses some additional problems, being allocated by activity rather than by country. Since many activities depend upon stakeholder proposals, this unknown quantity makes planning difficult in each country. Nevertheless, the achievements of the project outputs and activities are evidence of its sound management.

The evaluation is not convinced that the decision to change from monitoring the impact of government main-streaming and interventions in South Africa to implementing their own TECL direct interventions through partner NGOs was the right one, or a necessary one. The driving rationale behind the change was the understanding that the target numbers of the Project Document are not negotiable, plus a lack of consensus on how to monitor children benefiting from government interventions. However the decision was made in a consultative manner with all the relevant parties in South Africa.

Major recommendations:

Overall

1. Support greater integration of the three country programmes through face to face workshops to share lessons learned and good practices, and exchange visits where appropriate
2. Find ways for the budget to facilitate more frequent monitoring and support visits at all levels
3. Do not allow challenges in the downstream area to jeopardize upstream momentum

Objective 1 Upstream

4. Go where the energy is. Build on opportunities and successful partnerships.
5. Seek additional funds and/or prioritize remaining funds for capacity building and sensitization
6. Continue to engage in sector-targeted sensitization and skills transfer with key stakeholders who have not yet embarked on mainstreaming. Renew efforts to reach potentially important relevant government stakeholders such as agriculture
7. Find ways to energize existing umbrella social partners, and/or explore establishing relations with active individual members of the umbrella organizations.
8. Explore innovative ways to engage with the private sector whose goodwill and resources are largely untapped
9. Explore ways to provide CL awareness to new partners, especially those who have significant presence and wide-reaching networks at community level e.g. Faith-based organizations (FBOs), agriculture extension services, HIV/AIDS educators and care workers.

Objective 2 Direct Interventions

10. The target numbers and sectors for each country need to be revised. The evaluation recommends fewer numbers for withdrawal, and that beneficiaries may be drawn from any sector of child labour (particularly including WFCL such as begging and child domestic work)
11. Abolish the withdrawal targets for the remaining AP in South Africa and focus purely on prevention activities and/or develop guidelines that clearly define how to achieve a "withdrawal" from excessive working hours if the child is already enrolled in school.
12. As a matter of urgency TECL should facilitate exchange visits for the sharing of lessons learned and good practices from strong partners to weaker partners.
13. TECL should provide greater monitoring support and guidance particularly where partners are struggling to find supportive local structures and cooperative government workers for referrals.
14. ILO-IPEC and its DBMR should develop detailed guidelines regarding the CL category "enrolled in school but engaged in excessive hours of work", or if guidelines exist, ensure that IAs understand how to handle these cases.

1. Introduction and background

1.1 The TECL II Programme

1. Towards the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (TECL) Phase II with a focus on HIV/AIDS: Supporting and monitoring the implementation of National Plans of Action in three core countries in Southern Africa
2. TECL II is operational in South Africa, Botswana, and Namibia, and has an undertaking to share lessons learned with Lesotho and Swaziland. It follows on from TECL Phase I which was implemented in Swaziland and Lesotho in addition to the countries above. The donor for both Phase I and II is the United States Department of Labour (USDOL) and the budget for Phase II is USD 4,750,000. TECL II officially commenced on 30th September 2008 with a duration of 42 months, to which a no-cost extension of 3 months has been added giving a completion date of June 2012.
3. Phase II builds upon the achievements of TECL I that supported the implementation of the Child Labour Programme of Action (CLPA) in South Africa and laid the basis for concerted action against child labour in the other four core countries, putting into place National Actions Plans (NAPs) on the elimination of child labour (CL). South Africa, Botswana, and Namibia were chosen as the main target countries for TECL II because they had drafted and endorsed NAPs, included memoranda of understanding with the ILO on steps to eliminate child labour, and were deemed to have a good chance of success for TECL II interventions.
4. The Project has the following objectives:

Development Objective: Contribute to the elimination of WFCL and forms of child labour in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa by supporting the implementation of NAPs in these countries.

Immediate Objectives:

- By the end of the project, capacity of the key partners will have been strengthened to more effectively *mainstream* child labour issues into legislative and policy frameworks and take action against WFCL, and awareness will have been raised among the general public and among key stakeholders (8 outputs)
 - By the end of the project, *models of interventions* (focusing on education and HIV/AIDS) for addressing selected WFCL and prioritized forms of child labour in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa will have been developed, test, and - in South Africa - further mainstreamed through pilot interventions involving direct action programmes (3 outputs)
5. The eleven outputs can be broadly summarized under the following seven headings and these provide the format for reporting on the evaluation's findings:-
 - Support to the adoption and mainstreaming of NAPs and the necessary monitoring tools
 - Revision of legislation and drafting of tools to support implementation
 - Capacity building support for key stakeholders, including development of training materials and adaptation of SCREAM
 - Commissioning of research studies and their dissemination
 - Awareness raising campaigns and the sharing of lessons learned
 - The withdrawal of 2800 children and the prevention of 5600 through direct action programmes, or the monitoring of up-scaled government services

- Documentation and sharing of lessons learned and good practices for replication and mainstreaming into government policies and programmes

1.2 The Mid-term Evaluation process

1.2.1 Scope and purpose of the evaluation

6. The purpose of the evaluation is to

- Review progress and achievements to date
- Examine the likelihood of the Project achieving its stated targets and objectives
- Examine delivery of Project inputs and activities
- Investigate and analyze constraints and impact
- Draw out lessons learned and emerging good practices
- Provide information and analysis to help the Project revise work plans, strategies, resources

7. This MTE covers all Project activities to date, including those implemented by partners in the three countries of Botswana, Namibia, and South Africa.

1.2.2 Methodology

8. The evaluation was carried out by an independent team which included an international consultant and team leader and three national consultants with relevant expertise and background, one for each country. The bulk of the information was gathered during field work in the period 7-25 March 2011. The International Consultant visited all three countries where she was assisted by the respective National Consultant. Field work in each country culminated with a half-day Stakeholders Workshop where the preliminary findings were presented and discussed. Full details of the itinerary, work plan, evaluation instruments, and list of organizations and individuals interviewed may be found in the annex.

9. The evaluation team made field visits to the following sites to observe activities and interview partners and beneficiaries:

- South Africa - Pretoria and Johannesburg (Hillbrow and Benoni in Gauteng Province)
- Namibia - Windhoek, Odangwa, Oshakati and Tsumeb
- Botswana - Gaborone, Palapye (Central District); Francistown and Tsmaya (North East District)

10. Key informants interviewed include the donor USDOL and U.S. Embassy, government stakeholders, Social Partners (tripartite), Implementing Agencies (IAs), local government, Community Child Labour Committees and local leaders, school teachers, child beneficiaries and their families, related agencies e.g. UNICEF, the TECL II team, in Pretoria the Director of ILO, and ILO regional specialists, and in ILO Geneva with the Desk Officer and the evaluation section, DED.

11. The broad approach has been to maintain an objective viewpoint, to solicit the views of as many stakeholders and beneficiaries as possible, and to analyze these in order to arrive at findings which are as representative and valid as possible.

12. Standard methods were employed: individual or small group interviews, and focus group discussions (FGD) with beneficiary children and with outreach officers/monitors. Information gathered has been triangulated against documents, technical progress reports (TPR), and other relevant documents. The preliminary findings were reflected at the evaluation workshops, and the plenary discussion from each of these has been fed into the overall findings of this report.

1.2.3 Constraints and Limitations of the study

13. Lack of time has been the major constraint, with three countries to cover in 3 weeks. Field visits to the direct interventions involved overland trips totalling around 2400kms, which reduced the time available for data gathering. The evaluation team compressed a wide range of activities into this tight time-frame, but it was not possible to go into depth in every area. The emphasis in the evaluation has been to pull together the major findings and commonalities. It is regretted that in the time available it was not possible to review the extent to which Lesotho and Swaziland had been included in the Project.
14. In Namibia, floods prevented the evaluation team visiting beneficiaries in one of the two sites planned. But elsewhere travel went smoothly. Some stakeholders were not available for interview at the time requested. In most cases these were reached either by a telephone or interview at a later date by the national consultant.

1.3 Report Structure

15. Chapter one provides background information. The findings are presented from Chapter Two onwards based on the Project log frame of objectives and a consolidation of the seven outputs above. Each section looks first at the contribution of TECL, the role played, the methods, strategies, and approaches used, then at the impact and the progress made towards the desired outputs among their partners and the ultimate objective. Country- specific findings are provided within each sub-section and at the end of each section is a summary and a list of broad recommendations. An assessment of project management and implementation is provided in Chapter Nine, and certain issues in the design are discussed in Chapter Ten. The report ends with a summary of broad conclusions and recommendations. In the annexes supplementary materials is provided on the evaluation instruments, persons and organizations interviewed, the three stakeholders' evaluation workshop reports, and the Terms of Reference for the evaluation.

2. Supporting the adoption and implementation of NAPs

2.1 Role and contribution of TECL II

16. The National Action Plans (NAPs) for the Elimination of Child Labour are the keystone on which TECL II is built, and TECL's over-riding purpose is to support their implementation. These NAPs were drafted in a consultative process led by the custodian ministries for child labour elimination (the Ministry of Labour or its equivalent) during TECL I.
17. In Botswana and Namibia TECL II has focused on kick-starting the implementation process through the creation of an enabling environment, concentrating on support to the Lead Ministries, the restructuring and capacity building of their Programme Advisory Committees on Child Labour (PACC) , followed by support to related ministries/departments/authorities (MDAs) to integrate action steps outlined in NAP into their annual plans and budgets. SPIF workshops were held in Namibia and Botswana at the start of TECL II to assess whether the goals of their NAPs were still valid and to develop work plans and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems. These workshops served to rejuvenate the key stakeholders and structures which had been established during TECL I.
18. In South Africa (SA), implementation had already started during Phase I of their Child Labour Plan of Action (CLPA). TECL II expressed their readiness to support departments and other stakeholders but only if invited. This approach has assisted in cementing relations between the Project and the Government. Looking back on the activities and role of TECL I, SADOL commented that '*even though at the time it was painful, it has been critical in getting us to where we are now.*'

19. The TECL II team expressed their disappointment that the South Africa (SA) stakeholders had not taken advantage of the project's technical support which they had previously indicated they would request - even though the Department of Labour (SADOL) made it known that MDAs were free to approach TECL directly. Yet this can also be viewed as a positive finding - evidence of the ownership and capacity which has emerged within the government. At the same time TECL should not assume that information of this nature is passed on. Newly arrived appointees had no recall on this offer. Given the constant turnover in staff TECL needs to constantly seek informal meetings to explain its role. As relationships with government partners are currently very cordial and relaxed, it is believed that TECL could be more pro-active if they wish.
20. The National Programme Coordinators (NPCs) are the key advocates in each country through whom TECL maintains relationships and provides inputs to the NAP process. TECL is fortunate to have a strong team of NPCs who have fostered cordial working relationships with the NAP stakeholders. The hiring of the SA/NPC from within SADOL has also greatly assisted in developing mutual understanding and respect. The NPCs not only attend all meetings of the NSC but have commonly been invited to sit on a number of other related committees which provides further *fora* in which to advocate the case of child labourers. In SA the NPC is represented on the National Child Protection Committee that played a key role in the development and implementation of a Child Protection Strategy in time for the 2010 FIFA World Cup. Their role is clearly appreciated. *"TECL II have sharpened our thinking on CL, given us direction and focus, and impetus"*, commented one stakeholder.
21. In addition to technical input, TECL II has provided capacity building/sensitization trainings and workshops to members of the PACCs. The ILO Turin Training Centre sponsored workshops on Policy and Legislative Responses to Child Labour (PLRCL) have built capacity and played a role in activating dormant partners. Other approaches have included informal meetings, targeted one-on-one interviews, and orientation visits. The combination is important. All of these tactics have proved useful to jump-start processes when action has stalled. In Namibia TECL facilitated an orientation tour to Zambia for key NSC members and the Minister of Labour attended the meetings in The Hague. Although attribution is difficult, these two exposure trips might explain the greater engagement and progress in Namibia when compared to Botswana.
22. TECL commissioned the development of a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) tool for the NAPs. This has played a dual role for it has also assisted the partner Ministries in understanding better the process steps in main-streaming, and thus has contributed to kick-starting implementation. *"TECL have helped our department to develop a systems approach and a reporting framework,"* commented one stakeholder following the related workshop.

2.2 Potential Impact and Progress on NAP implementation

Table 1: Progress on NAP Adoption and implementation

| OUTPUT 1.5: The adoption process of the NAPs by appropriate bodies is identified and supported, and draft M&E systems proposed/produced | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| TARGET ACTIVITY/OUTPUT | BOTSWANA | NAMIBIA | SOUTH AFRICA |
| Support to adoption process of NAPs | In process | In process | Adopted Feb 2009 |
| Publication of popular version | In process | Available | Available |
| Drafting of reporting/ M&E system | Testing in process | In process | In place. First Report in preparation for Cabinet |
| Facilitation of mainstreaming (M/S) of NAPs | M/S underway in MLHA, MOE and Police | M/S underway in , MOE, MOSS, Justice, MGECW, MOYS and MLSW | M/S underway in SADOL, DBE; DSS; SAPS |

2.2.1 Botswana

23. Child labour is embedded within their National Development Plan 10 which specifically refers to the country's Action Plan for the Elimination of Child Labour (APEC). Despite some strong statements by the Minister of Labour on child labour, things have not moved as fast as hoped. APEC is not yet endorsed by the Cabinet. Endorsement should result in a directive from the Cabinet which would assist in bringing other Ministries and Departments (MDAs) on board. Changes in personnel within the Ministry of Labour & Home Affairs (MLHA) may partly account for the slow progress.
24. According to MLHA attendance at their PACC meetings is good, but the evaluation believes the consistency of engagement varies with the high staff turnover. There is a need for MLHA to display stronger leadership. The Deputy Permanent Secretary (PS) of MLHA is the nominal Chair but he has referred this role to the Labour Commissioner who in turn has referred it to the Deputy Labour Commissioner³. The latter acts as the *de facto* CL point person but there is no formal recognition of this role and no budget line for CL within MLHA budget. As the Lead Ministry it is essential that they are perceived by other players as leading the way by example. But they have some way to go in main-streaming APEC into their own plans, sensitizing the lower echelons within MLHA, and rolling out the training of Labour Inspectors, aside from convincing other MDAs to follow suit. The evaluation agrees with MLHA that the appointment of a *designated* Child Labour focal person would strengthen their leadership.
25. There are some signs that things may be about to improve. The most recent Labour Commissioner (the third since TECL II began) stressed that she is now in a position to turn her attention to child labour issues. It is hoped that the impending promotion of the committed deputy PS to the rank above will create the strong pro-active leadership team which is desired. TECL should explore new strategies for re-igniting the NAP. As one of the PACC members noted *'This programme needs passion'*.
26. In terms of mainstreaming APEC, the Ministry of Education (MOE) is the only MDA so far to take it seriously. They have held retreats and workshops to examine the relationship between their mandate and the goals and action outlined in their APEC. Examples of concrete action include i) a directive from the PS of MOE to the districts to look into all issues which push children out of school; ii) the re-alignment of DOSET (non-formal education programme) with the primary school curriculum so that DOSET enrolled children may sit for primary school exams which will enable them to mainstream back into the formal system; iii) Plans for mobile schools in remote rural areas are in the pipeline.
27. The APEC point person in MOE explained that it was her participation at a workshop for educators at the ILO Turin Training Centre which opened her eyes to the links between child labour and education. *"The training was excellent and gave me the practical skills to set about mainstreaming. Each ministry needs to be shown in a step by step manner how child labour fits within their sector's mandate. TECL should engage in targeted sector-specific sensitization and training"*
28. TECL have provided assistance to carry out a pilot test of the M&E system in MOE, DSS and Police. Other government stakeholders are not engaged as yet and MLHA believe they need more guidance to understand their mandate.
29. Law enforcers benefited from a TECL sponsored joint training of labour inspectors, police, and social workers in Central and North-East Districts which built their knowledge and skills on the identification and handling of CL cases. The Police are reported to be very supportive and looking into ways of integrating CL into their training curriculum. TECL II participated in discussions and provided support to the Department of Social Services (DSS) to mainstream CL issues into their Social Development Policy, and their review of poverty alleviation strategies and safety nets. It is

³ The evaluation were unable to meet the Deputy Labour Commissioner as she was on maternity leave

unfortunate that DSS are not regularly attending PACC meetings. One reason is that they are very focused on rolling out training for the Children's Act (2009) which will naturally support APEC's goals.

Specific recommendations

- Prioritize endorsement of APEC by Cabinet and its launching by MLHA
- Explore new strategies to energize and strengthen the leadership of MLHA, concentrating on building strong personal relationships with the key players, and capitalizing on the opportunities for fresh advocacy which changes in government personnel present. As part of its exit strategy TECL should encourage the establishment of a Child Labour Focal point in MLHA which would expand capacity and ensure sustainability.
- Provide target-specific guidance to help passive stakeholders understand their particular mandate and its relevance to CL/APEC. This should be directed at all those named as having roles and responsibilities in APEC who have not yet embarked on mainstreaming
- As mainstreaming progresses the focus should shift to finding the right modalities to facilitate the operationalization of the policies and programmes.
- The SPs should be motivated to play a stronger role (see 4.4)

2.2.2 Namibia

30. Momentum has really grown during the past year, and the prospects for APEC are very promising. A committed and active PACC framework of stakeholders has evolved who act as a team. Factors which have supported the emergence of this team include first and foremost, several strong statements on child labour from the President of the country. *"Previously child labour was not taken seriously but now the political will is there due to the declaration by the President"* said one government stakeholder.
31. Acting on the President's command, the Cabinet commissioned a joint team from the key MDAs to go to the regions and identify and report on cases of child labour in the agriculture sector. According to the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (MLSW) this was an instructive exercise, which extended sensitization, and highlighted gaps in policies and implementation. Other supportive factors include a number of public statements from the Minister of MLSW, the orientation visit to Zambia by PACC stakeholders, and TECL II's capacity building workshops, in particular the ILO Turin PLRCL workshop which recruited serious engagement from the Police and Ministry of Justice
32. Commitment within MLSW is generally strong, but APEC still lacks endorsement by the Cabinet. Leadership of PACC/APEC is shared between the Permanent Secretary of Labour with the support of the Deputy Director of International Relations, and the Deputy Director of the Labour Inspectorate. This provides linkage to domestic and international efforts. But both desks claim to be overloaded and do not have *'one tenth of the resources needed to implement APEC.'* This may explain the slow progress on APEC's endorsement. Although the M&E framework for APEC has been introduced to the stakeholders and been positively received, MLSW do not feel confident that they will get compliance. MOSS says the M&E framework has helped them to translate APEC into concrete steps.
33. The Ministry of Education (MOE) is the most fervent in their support and has made considerable progress in integrating APEC into their annual plans and thus resourcing it. Relevant areas include building more hostels for rural areas; review of policies/practice on fee exemption, and pregnancy; school feeding programme; enrolment of out-of-school children, establishment of mobile schools for San and pastoralist communities, and establishment of primary schools on commercial farms. They do not see the main-streaming of APEC as an add-on but an integral part of their work. Both the Minister of Education and the PS are strongly supportive and active while the MOE representative on PACC is a passionate advocate and action-taker: *'If a child is not in school, it is my concern; since the beginning of the year I have constantly written letters demanding action on various points of*

policy, for example we have sent a directive to schools to stop the practice of school children working in teachers' homes.'

34. Both the Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare (MGECW) and the Ministry of Youth and Sports (MOYS) are active and engaged in mainstreaming. MGECW administers three types of grant which orphans and vulnerable children (OVCs) may access; their social workers are the frontline people addressing child protection issues including child labour. They have purchased unused buildings for turning into places of safety for women and children. MOYS have a diversion programme which rehabilitates young offenders, and their vocational skills programme aims to improve the employment and income opportunities for youth. They have offered their multi-purpose youth centres for CL related activities. They appreciate the opportunity PACC meetings provide for networking with other stakeholders.
35. The ILO Turin workshop was instrumental (together with the efforts of the TECL II team and IPEC) in bringing the Police (Ministry of Safety & Security MOSS) and Ministry of Justice fully on board. According to MOSS this training was extremely helpful, and they are now fully committed and working closely with Labour Inspectors, prosecutors, probation workers and social workers. They also stressed the usefulness of the networking they engage in through PACC.
36. While TECL cannot take full credit for the emergence of this strong team - just as they cannot take the blame when it fails to emerge - it is vital that TECL supports them to achieve maximum progress while things are favourable. In the hope that this is an emerging Good Practice, TECL should document carefully the processes, outcomes, and lessons learned.

Specific Recommendations

- Prioritize adoption of APEC
- Support the strong team of stakeholders in whatever way possible to maintain momentum on the implementation of APEC (e.g. personal encouragement, sharing their achievements as an emerging good practice, through further trainings and roundtable discussions/orientation visits (if resources permit) using their expertise to advise counterparts e.g. in Botswana or other domestic ministries) Document the lessons learned and good practices so that these can be shared in the region. PACC could benefit by recruiting appropriate representation from the regions (following the model of South Africa)
- The Direct Interventions highlights the lack of active community level structures such as Child Labour Committees. These are normally of great assistance to community level interventions and to the roll-out of policy. MLSW should consider supporting their establishment in key areas. If Child Protection Committees already exist then CL issues should be integrated into these.
- TECL need to find a way to sensitize and strengthen all of civil society (CS) (not only their Implementing Agencies) to play a stronger role in advocacy and direct action.
- MLSW recommends stronger engagement with faith-based organizations (FBOs). Given the weakness of the NGO sector, the evaluation supports this recommendation

2.2.3 South Africa

37. Huge strides have been made during TECL II in terms of government commitment and ownership. As a result it is expected that significant progress will be made during the time-frame of CLPA. A key milestone was the adoption of their NAP known as the Child Labour Plan of Action (CLPA 2) by the Cabinet in February 2009. According to the Department of Labour (SADOL) ownership and commitment are there at the highest level and getting the funds they need is not a problem; for example the Treasury is actively supporting them in obtaining supplementary funds to celebrate the World Day against CL as announced by the Minister of Labour.

38. SADOL's leadership of the CLPA process has been strengthened. Key factors have been the visit to The Hague by the Minister of Labour who returned with renewed enthusiasm. SADOL are in the process of professionalizing the Labour Inspectorate and ensuring that they are fully trained on how to deal with CL cases and TECL has given technical input to this process. The training is proving effective in boosting enforcement. Linkages to action level have been strengthened by the revitalization of Child Labour Implementation Committees (CLICs) or the integration of CL into Child Protection Committees in the various provinces. It is good to see that SADOL recognize the crucial importance of this level for implementation, and have invited labour inspectors or CLIC representatives to attend recent meetings of the CLPA Implementation Committee (IC).
39. After a number of CLPA Implementation Committee (IC) meetings were cancelled due to low attendance, SADOL sent a plea letter to other MDAs at Director General level, and this resulted in much improved attendance and engagement. The Department for Basic Education (DBE) have since made good progress at the mainstreaming of their action steps in APEC, for example they have extended their no fees policy to cover 60% of children in locations deemed vulnerable to child labour, and their Learner Attendance Policy has established monitoring of children's attendance by teachers and community members coupled with positive interventions when necessary.
40. Other supportive MDAs taking relevant action include the Department of Social Development (DSD) and the SAPS (South Africa Police Service). But it is regrettable that the engagement of the Department of Water and Forestry (DWAF) which was very active during TECL I, has been lost. The main reason is the splitting of the department into two separate entities and the loss of key personnel. Efforts should be made to re-engage with them, in view of the impact study on their prioritization tool which is a specified output of TECL II, and the need for scaling up of this intervention.
41. SADOL noted that partners are learning that mainstreaming does not cost a great deal *it is all about applying the CL lens in order to shift priorities*. They have learned that building personal relations plays an important role in garnering support. Due to their CL focus, SADOL sit on the National Child Protection Committee (under DSD) *"We have learned support must be two-ways. We must support our partners in their issues if we expect them to support us in ours,"* was their comment. This is a lesson that needs to be shared and applied everywhere.
42. Compared to TECL I, TECL II has taken a softer approach in South Africa and this has worked well in allowing the government to feel that they indeed control the CL agenda. TECL participates in decision-making bodies such as the IC and has offered technical support to any stakeholders who request their assistance. TECL II expressed a degree of disappointment that so far only SADOL have taken up their offer of assistance for the training of Labour Inspectors. In view of the high turnover of government staff, the evaluation recommends that TECL is more pro-active: any change in individual representation on IC warrants a personal repetition of the offer (MLHA have given their permission for TECL to directly approach any stakeholder). TECL also needs to find ways to support the provinces in the implementation of policies and programmes
43. SADOL report that the development and introduction of the M&E tool (TECL input) has greatly assisted them in getting the CLPA stakeholders to submit regular 2 monthly reports on their progress. DBE have been the most prompt in providing reports to the IC. DBE explained their approach: *We went through the M&E reporting too in our department and identified all the units and areas responsible. Then our Director wrote to all of these sharing a copy of the tool. The reporting system is working well"*. With regular reporting in place, SADOL have embarked on preparing the first ever Report (mandated to be published every 2 years) on progress: The State of Child Labour. They would like to have TECL assistance in the best way to package the information for the Minister to report to Cabinet. It would be good to see progress towards the step beyond reporting - where the IC becomes the place where information is analyzed and adjustments made to priorities in APEC.

Specific Recommendations

- When IC representatives change, ensure that the new member is fully aware of TECL's offer of assistance.
- Initiate efforts to get DWAF back on board, and make them aware of TECL's offer.
- Find opportunities to engage at provincial level. (Some provinces are reluctant to engage with TECL without receiving a clear directive from above).

2.3 Common lessons learned and Recommendations

44. TECL II has made excellent progress in laying the groundwork for implementation of the NAPs.

Recommendation: Continue the good work

45. High-ranking support is crucial and it pays to invest resources in winning support at the very top. The question has been asked: does the NSC or the Lead Ministry have the mandate to ensure compliance to NAP? The short answer is they do not; they can only persuade. There is no clear answer to where such authority lies, except to state that support from the heights always results in action. Exposure/orientation visits can be a very powerful tool in garnering support and these may have been the influential factor in building momentum in Namibia. In Botswana, it appears that a Cabinet directive to stakeholder MDAs will follow adoption of the NAP but it is not known if this applies in the other countries.

Recommendation: Continue efforts to win support at the top. The ILO Director in Pretoria stated his readiness to assist in whatever way called for and this offer should be exploited when appropriate.

46. Consider exchange/orientation visits in region to energize the uncommitted and demonstrate what can be achieved

47. Strong pro-active leadership by the Lead Ministry is essential for buy-in and action by other stakeholders. Timely directives can get things going when stalled. But stakeholders mentioned the need for something stronger: the need for CL to have a champion. The role of a passionate champion should not be under-rated, for this sentiment is infectious. They may not necessarily be found within the Lead Ministry. Progress is exponential once there are *at least 2-3* committed stakeholders because of the synergies.

Recommendation: It is worthwhile for TECL to identify candidates qualified to play this role and invest resources in boosting their profile and network circle.

48. A common dilemma facing the NSCs is the level of representation they desire. High-ranking representatives have the authority to make and implement decisions, but rarely the time to attend meetings. Subordinates are more likely to attend regularly but have to refer decisions upwards.

Recommendation: If this is a point of contention for an NSC, then it is worthwhile considering mandating 1-2 expanded meetings per year to be attended by high-ranking, the remaining meetings being attended by an appointee who reports to them (and who also attends the expanded meetings).

49. Frequent transfers of staff are the norm within government. TECL should view changes in government personnel as an opportunity rather than a threat. They and the Lead Ministry should not assume that lack of participation means lack of interest; and the common reason for non-attendance at meetings is lack of awareness about the existence of such a committee by a newly appointed official (and lack of awareness by the Chair of a change in personnel in that stakeholder).

Recommendation: Transfers of government staff must be pro-actively planned for Committee members moving on to new positions must take responsibility to inform the Chair and orientate their

replacement. TECL should encourage the NAP committees to develop a basic orientation pack for new members which includes the minutes of the past year.

50. Lack of progress on main-streaming relates to two main factors: misconceptions about what it involves (perceptions that it requires extra work and funds, or is not relevant to their sector), or lack of guidance and experience on the practical 'how-to'. Unfortunately the NAPs are overwhelming in their detail; they are a useful tool but daunting to prospective main-streamers - the Namibia APEC lists over 100 action steps for MGECW.

Recommendation: Where key government stakeholders remain uncommitted, TECL and the Lead Ministry should engage in sector-targeted capacity building for main-streaming, learning from the experience of MOE in Botswana.

51. The flow of communication *within a* particular ministry is just as important as the flow across ministries, and NSC representatives must take more seriously their responsibility for providing feedback within their MDA

Recommendation Placing an update in an existing MDA newsletter and small group feedback are strategies suggested by stakeholders.

52. The agriculture sector is an important player that has not yet been effectively targeted or reached (except organized agriculture in SA).

Recommendation: TECL should find innovative ways to engage with this sector, both with its government stakeholders and with the agriculture unions and employers organizations. For example, CL issues could be integrated into the training of agriculture extension workers.

53. In all three countries, stakeholders observed that SPs engagement is weak. They are present (sometimes) but they are largely passive. It is important that they support the NAP by completing the drafting, adoption, and rolling out of their own CL polices and Codes in line with NAP. Further discussion on their role in Section 4.5).

Recommendation: Engage in a concerted effort to galvanize the umbrella SPs or explore the option of inviting non-umbrella sectoral SPs (e.g. an agriculture or teachers' union) to sit on PACC/IC. Targeted capacity building exercises or exchange visits may help to activate current partners.

54. As the NAPs move towards the Implementation of Policy phase, strong linkages between upstream and downstream are crucial for success.

Recommendation: In Botswana and South Africa TECL and/or the Lead Ministry have assisted in the establishment of child labour committees, and something similar is needed in Namibia. The good practice begun in South Africa of inviting provincial labour inspectors to attend coordination meetings should be shared and encouraged.

3. Supporting the strengthening of legislation

3.1 Role and contribution of TECL II

55. In Botswana and Namibia TECL sponsored a comprehensive review of national legislation to identify gaps and needs. The review reports were presented to, and approved by the PACCs. They have given technical support to the passing of new legislation where necessary and have facilitated the drafting of Lists of Hazardous work and their regulations.
56. In South Africa TECL has assisted in designing tools to aid stakeholders with rolling out implementation of the CL issues in the Children's Act and Child Justice Bill, and in all three

countries it has developed materials and been a core facilitator in the training of law enforcers on CL legislation.

3.2 Impact: Progress on amendment of legislation

57. This section examines progress towards a comprehensive set of laws, regulations and protocols, and enforcement agents in each country. While it is not possible to clearly attribute all the progress (or its lack) to TECL II, it does provide a measure of the effectiveness and impact of TECL's strategies and activities in this field.

Table 2: Progress on amendment of legislation and enforcement

| OUTPUT 1.1 - 1.3: Strengthening of labour laws and other legislation and drafting of tools to support implementation | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| TARGET ACTIVITY/OUTPUT | BOTSWANA | NAMIBIA | SOUTH AFRICA |
| Review of legislation needs | Done | Done | N/A |
| Amendment of Labour laws | See 3.2.1 | No need | Employment Act being amended |
| List of Hazardous CL | Drafted | Drafted | Promulgated |
| Regulations to support List | Not yet | In process | Adopted Jan 2010 |
| Common language version of List | Not yet | Not yet | Published |
| Other new supportive legislation | Children's Act 2009 | In process: Child Care & Protection Bill; and Child Justice Bill | Child Justice Act 2010 (includes CUBAC) Basic Conditions of Employment Act amended to cover informal sector |
| Training of Labour Inspectorate | Done. In roll-out | Done. In roll-out | In process of roll-out |
| Training of Police | Done. In roll-out | Done. In roll-out | In process of roll-out |
| Training of Social Workers | Done but needs roll out | Done but needs roll-out | In process of roll-out |

Sources: TPRs and evaluation interviews

3.2.1 Botswana

58. Following a review of national legislation, TECL focused on supporting the drafting of the List of Hazardous Work. The process was consultative with a PACC team visiting districts where they held discussions with community leaders, traditional *ngotla* Chiefs, children, and other relevant stakeholders. The result is a comprehensive List which was approved by the Labour Advisory Board. The Minister, however, subsequently requested that the List be revised and reduced. The process appears to have stalled following a change in the Labour Commissioner and informal lobbying has not been successful as yet to get things moving once more. Nevertheless the drafting of regulations to accompany the List has begun.
59. The new Children's Act promulgated in 2009 is very strong and comprehensive and covers child trafficking. Stakeholders pointed out a number of gaps or inconsistencies which now need to be addressed. This includes amending the Employment Act to bring it into line with the Children's Act which states that employment of Under 18s is only allowed in apprenticeships; and making schooling compulsory in the Education Act.

On-going priorities and gaps:

- Adoption of Hazardous List, and regulations
- Harmonization of Employment Act and Education Act with Children's Act (2009)

3.2.2 Namibia

60. The legislation review noted the need for amending legislation to better protect and treat cases of commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC), children used by adults to commit crime (CUBAC), and trafficking, and the need to regulate the type of agriculture work (both formal and informal) which is allowed.
61. The List of Hazardous Child Labour has been drafted but not yet adopted, though work is about to begin on the accompanying regulations. Both the Child Justice Bill (covers trafficking and CUBAC) and the Child Care & Protection Bill are still in process. The latter has been in development for over ten years now. The slow pace has been frustrating at times, but all the stakeholders note that the bills are strong and once adopted represent a big step forward for children's rights.
62. There are still a number of gaps and challenges that were pointed out by stakeholders. MOSS say that the Labour Act is good, but out of ten CL prosecution cases brought before the courts, between 8 and 9 are withdrawn because prosecutors lack the knowledge and necessary codes to handle the cases correctly. The MOYS are an active member of PACC through their responsibility for the diversion programme in the juvenile justice system. The Education Act urgently needs amendment as it currently denies the right to enrolment in first grade for children over 10 years of age.

On-going priorities and gaps

- Adoption of Hazardous List, Child Justice, and Child Care & Protection Bills, and drafting of relevant regulations
- Strengthen legislation to adequately cover CUBAC
- Draft regulations for formal/informal agriculture labour.
- Codification of CL sections of the Labour Act for prosecutors
- Amendment of Education Act to provide access to over 10s.

3.2.3 South Africa

63. South Africa now has all the necessary legal arsenal to control child labour. The Basic Conditions of Employment Act (BCEA) has been amended to include children working in the informal sector and now reads "*no-one permitting a child to engage in child labour*" - i.e. parents or guardians can be held responsible if their children are working in the informal sector even though they are not legally employed. The Hazardous List and regulations have been adopted, and common language versions have been published or are in process. They have refrained from defining light work as their position is that a child under 15 years should not be in any work. Through criminalization of non-compliance, police and labour inspectors now have greater powers, and an increase in the fines for child labour violation is being considered.
64. The Human Trafficking Bill is still in process but the regulations for the Children's Act (2005) have been passed, and the Child Justice Act came into effect in April 2010. The DSD are currently engaged in drafting national guidelines for the Prevention and Response to Child Exploitation. TECL and CLPA stakeholders, including the Police and SADOL, are part of this process.
65. There is a comprehensive plan to roll out training on the new legislation to all law enforcers, including social workers. DSD noted that the number of social workers is very inadequate. They estimate that 16-17,000 probation/social workers are needed to ensure effective implementation of the Children's Act but they currently have only 400. Government commitment is there and DSD have been given the budget to recruit and train more. The SAPS have become one of the most committed stakeholders. Using the framework of the List of Hazardous Child Labour, the Child Justice Act, and the Children's Act, they have already inserted these into the Crime Information

System to create the necessary codes to assist in enforcement and prosecution, and their Organized Crime Unit have established a Trafficking Desk.

66. A proposed activity (1.3.1 in the TECL II Prodoc) in South Africa was to : *Provide assistance and input to the NPA (National Prosecution Authority) in seizing assets of perpetrators (including the design and testing of guidelines and/or protocols for various stakeholders involved in combating the worst forms of child labour)*. This was cancelled on the grounds that there were too few cases of successful prosecutions. But the raison d'être for this activity was to address the lack of successful convictions. It proposed to deter perpetrators by setting up protocols to bring a civil suit for damages against them which would be easier to get through the courts than a criminal prosecution. While the decision to focus on activities with a broader impact is sound, , this concept should not be lost but kept in mind for the future. The Police in both South Africa and Namibia confirmed that this could be an important tool to prevent child exploitation, especially CSEC.

3.3 Building capacity for law enforcement

3.3.1 Botswana and Namibia

67. TECL supported joint trainings for labour inspectors, police, and social workers in both countries. The pilot training used a training manual developed in Malawi, but both countries have now developed training manuals adapted to their contexts. Joint trainings are a good practice as they ensure consistency in approach and harmony in implementation. "*Now we all speak the same language*", commented several participants.
68. Prior to the training, TECL carried out a questionnaire survey among law enforcers in Botswana to establish the baseline in knowledge and practice. This showed that although CL is on the standard labour inspection form, inspectors had routinely scribbled "Not Applicable". The training has helped to deepen their understanding and ensure that they ask the additional questions about child labour to employers.
69. In Namibia the training was followed by a joint mission to the regions - acting on the President's request and Cabinet directive - to identify cases of CL in commercial and informal agriculture. Participants found this exercise very fruitful. Compliance orders were issued by labour inspectors. A follow-up mission found a high rate of compliance. Replication of this approach is dependent upon adequate government funding of the inspection mechanism. While this should be part of routine surveillance, it will need intensive follow-up (with necessary budget) in the initial stages to check that it is being competently carried out. The Namibian Police have a good relationship with Labour Inspectors at local level and often go together to inspect premises. Their support in this potentially risky activity is much appreciated by the Labour Inspectors. The Police in Botswana are considering integrating CL into their police academy training curriculum.

3.3.2 South Africa

70. The Visible Policing Division of the SAPS currently has a rolling training programme for police on how to treat CL cases. Their Vulnerable Children's learning programme training covers the treatment and understanding of CL and CUBAC and child sex offences with step by step guidelines. This training is receiving priority and to date 6,000 police have been trained. But in a country with a police force of over 100,000 officers there is still a long way to go. Nevertheless, the commitment and a well-structured programme of 1 day, 2 day and 5 day training courses are in place, and it is very encouraging to see their close engagement on inter-sectoral committees such as IC, National Child Protection Committee and Intersectoral Child Justice Committee. They have instructed all police stations to work closely and support the Labour Inspectors. The SAPS expressed an interest in obtaining from ILO-IPEC documented Good Practices on Trafficking from other regions of Africa e.g. Tanzania.

71. SADOL are engaged in professionalizing the labour inspectorate and ensuring that all are trained on CL and the latest legislation, including the List of Hazardous Work. TECL provided technical input into this training and another for border area police on child labour and trafficking. SADOL report that they are seeing the impact in that reported cases of CL are achieving convictions. An example is a case of child labour identified on a farm in Northern Cape Province where a 25,000 Rand fine was issued. During the week of the evaluation a provincial labour inspector and police officer responded to an allegation of child labour and within a few hours SADOL had received their report on the incident. One successful strategy they have developed against CL is for Labour Inspectors and Police Officers to blitz target selected localities without warning.
72. DSD are involved in training their Child Protection Officers at provincial level. Cases (including CL) are registered on an electronic Child Protection Register, for purposes of tracking and monitoring protection. The Director of Social Crime Protection in DSD noted the need for an integrated training for Labour, Probation, and Police Officers so that they have a common understanding and an integrated approach. According to them 5-9,000 children are arrested monthly in South Africa. Some of them only have Grade 3 education at age 17, and a number originate from outside South Africa.
73. The evaluation found examples of good cooperation at ground level between police, social workers, and implementing agencies. SAPS provide protection to New Life Centre (NLC) staff when engaging in difficult situations such as visiting brothels etc, and plan to invite NLC staff to their next training on "children in conflict with the law". DSD social workers respond to cases referred to them by TECL's implementing agencies and regularly inspect the premises of drop-in shelters and places of safety before renewing service agreements with them which allow the agencies to access social grants.

3.4 Common lessons learned and recommendations

74. Gaps remain, and the process of review and amendment is almost never-ending. The pace of legislative reform is very slow, and the evaluation acknowledges that TECL may have little influence. However, stakeholders observed that certain legislation amendments have moved faster. An effective advocacy campaign of support by all stakeholders may be the critical component.

Recommendation: Study and learn from the good practices of examples where legislation reform has been achieved in a timely manner. TECL should carefully assess where best to target its advocacy, and how other partners could support it.

75. Case studies of successful examples and good practices are an excellent learning mechanism. Stakeholders generally were not aware of efforts beyond their country's borders but expressed their desire to learn from successful efforts within the region or elsewhere in Africa.

Recommendation: TECL and ILO should foster greater sharing so that stakeholders benefit from lessons learned and good practices in other countries. Note particularly the request from SAPS regarding trafficking.

76. The joint trainings have been strongly appreciated by stakeholders and are a most effective way to ensure harmony of interventions in practice.

Recommendation: In the time remaining, TECL II support should focus on supporting the roll-out of joint trainings for law enforcers. (See 4.2 below regarding the need for post-training follow-up.)

77. Legislation amendment and enforcement doubles its effectiveness if backed by raised awareness.

Recommendation: Ensure that as soon as new legislation is adopted that it is adequately supported by education and awareness raising through the social partners and civil society, particularly targeting

employers and at-risk communities. For this purpose TECL should actively pursue the publication and dissemination of common language versions of CL legislation in relevant local languages.

4. Capacity building, sensitization, and awareness raising

4.1 TECL activities

78. These topics are treated together in this section because of the overlap between them. TECL II activities in this broad field relate to the following outputs:

- 1.4 Capacity building exercises for key stakeholders conducted using developed training modules, tools and manuals
- 1.6 Capacity of the education sector strengthened to combat child labour through the adaptation of the SCREAM education pack
- 1.8 National awareness raising campaigns on child labour designed and implemented and the lessons learned shared within the sub-region

79. TECL's role has variously included organizing, funding, facilitating, developing training tools and materials, and providing technical input. The key trainings have been:-

- Training of NSC members in Botswana and Namibia
- Training of law enforcers
- ILO/Turin training on Policy & Legislative Responses (PLRCL)
- Training of Implementing Agencies for their APs and beneficiary monitoring
- Sensitization workshops for IAs and local stakeholders
- Support of mini action programmes by the Social Partners

4.2 Effectiveness of capacity building and sensitization

80. This is a strong area of achievement for TECL II and demonstrates their desire to build a sustainable response to CL. Capacity building (CB) is a blanket term applied to many different types of workshops and trainings and it is helpful to unpack the term.. TECL has used workshops to fulfil multiple purposes, to mixed groups of stakeholder participants, e.g. to:

- raise awareness through providing participants with a basic foundation knowledge in CL
- sensitize them to their roles and responsibilities
- re-energize dormant stakeholders and act as a spark-point for action
- provide participants with specific practical skills
- foster introductions between different groups of stakeholders
- ease entry point for a new intervention or partner

81. Workshops have proved to be a very effective way to arouse a response from recumbent partners (iii). Several stakeholders reported that it was their participation at a CB workshop that enabled them to grasp fully the CL issues and thus ignited them to the cause. The SPIF workshops at the outset of TECL II are a good example. The ILO Turin PLRCL training was strongly appreciated by those who had little or no prior knowledge of the CL field; those already familiar with CL, felt that although they had learned little that was new, they did appreciate the practical exercises. Sensitization workshops were held for Implementing Agencies and community leaders in Botswana and Namibia

in the target areas for the direct interventions. These were useful and successful at purposes i) and v) and vi) and even ii).

82. Even where basic awareness raising and sensitization (AR&S) is the main aim (i and ii), it is helpful to consider follow-through and the next step. Do they want the participants to take some action once they leave the training hall? A common expectation is that the participant will share what they have gained with their colleagues - but this trickle effect should not be assumed. And if any action is hoped for, is there going to be a follow-up meeting or any further support provided to help that take place? This can make the crucial difference in effectiveness. An example of this need is the training of Business Councils in two districts in Botswana. The training was effective in awakening conscience but without follow-up may not produce the results desired (see 4.4.2 below) . An excellent example of trickle-down effect is that the Namibian police now include CL issues when making their regular outreach visits to schools, churches, youth clubs etc.
83. Where skills transfer is the main purpose (iv) follow-up is essential. Even though labour inspectors and social workers in the target localities were supposedly participants in the joint trainings, IAs report that some of them are uncooperative in referrals or absent members of CLCs. Stakeholders tend to look on training workshop as the end-point of capacity building rather than the start-point, so TECL and its government partners need to ensure that the desired outcome for each and every participant group is considered, and the action steps which they might take after the workshop is over.

4.2.1 Specific CB&S needs mentioned by stakeholders or noted by the evaluation

- MLHA Botswana feels that PACC members need more guidance to understand the links between CL and their mandate. SADOL would like further CB of their IC members in order to lift debate to a higher level
- Education and social workers in Botswana need better understanding of the V in OVCs. Their focus is mostly on orphans, and some very vulnerable children are not receiving social grants or fee exemptions because their parents are living (but maybe separated, unemployed, and landless)
- Some School Heads are not aware, or sympathetic to new policies e.g. to admit pregnant girls, to allow >10s to enrol, to provide school feeding etc..
- In North East District, Botswana - one of two districts targeted in the training of law enforcers - community child labour committee reports that the labour inspector is the one member who has never attended. This may be an isolated case but it calls for a review of the training content and methods before further roll-out.
- In Namibia prosecutors need training for CL cases
- MOYS Namibia noted the need for practical skills training of their Youth Officers who implement activities in the Child Justice Unit

4.2.2 Capacity building: lessons learned and recommendations

84. CB is vitally important in every sector and stakeholder - the main reason for non-compliance with policy is lack of understanding. Many opportunities remain in Namibia and Botswana. Stakeholders stressed that what is most needed now is practical skills for dealing with CL, from how-to-mainstream to counselling and good practices in community mobilization.

Recommendation: CB should continue to be prioritized and supported with sufficient budget (in Namibia and Botswana) to be able to respond to appropriate requests.

85. CB trainings need to be continuously repeated, for refresher purposes, and to sensitize new staff. It is wrong to assume that everything is grasped the first time, or that in training one member of a division

or unit, the information will filter down. Trainings need to be supplemented by follow-up support to see if the information has hit its target.

Recommendation Every training plan should include preparations for follow-through and follow-up.

86. At this stage TECL should concentrate on ensuring that the information imparted in a training at one level filters through to those on the front line (and upwards if need be) in all geographical regions. They should also assist their partners to put in place a systematic post-training review and spot-check survey to identify where further effort is needed.
87. Opportunities remain for CL to piggy-back on existing community-level interventions. TECL has done little (apart from research studies) to address its HIV/AIDS focus. CL should be inserted into the training of all HIV/AIDS educators and community based care workers; or into the training of agriculture extension workers; into the training and curricula of adult literacy classes since children of illiterate parents are more prone to CL.

Recommendation: Facilitate the integration of CL into other training curricula of outreach workers.

88. As yet little has been done to share lessons learned and good practices and learning visits between the countries (and beyond). It is understood that such things are planned in the second half of the project. This should not be delayed overlong since its value becomes less as implementation near completion. The evaluation recognizes that cost is the main constraint in bringing partners from the different TECL countries together. This is regrettable as there is so much value in sharing and learning from each other. Those who went on the orientation visit to Zambia were very positive about its value.

Recommendation: Engage in greater sharing of good practices. Explore ways to raise funds to facilitate learning visits for critically important stakeholders who are not yet fully on board.

4.3 Capacity building of education sector through SCREAM

89. SCREAM has been adopted by MOE in Botswana and is being implemented with its own funding. Certain modules have been contextualized, and inserted within the school curriculum for human rights classes. Two hundred educators have been trained in CL and SCREAM, and MOE have a rolling plan to cover the entire country.
90. In Namibia and South Africa the initial response was less positive. SCREAM was perceived as being imposed on them by TECL. Even MOE in Namibia was unenthusiastic when first presented with this activity since they already had some modules and tools in use that they felt excellently covered CL. Nevertheless they have now been convinced to adapt portions of SCREAM and insert it into the Life Skills curriculum, including the training of 500 educators on CL. This demonstrates successful advocacy and tactful handling by the TECL II team. But it may deter government initiative and sense of ownership of the CL agenda. In South Africa there appears to have been little or no action and the evaluation team were unable to speak with the relevant person within the curriculum development division.
91. SCREAM is a useful pack that should be in the hands of all the field workers of every Implementing Agencies so that they may use it in the extra-curricular activities with their beneficiary children. In South Africa and Namibia it is being utilized, but in Botswana the IAs do not appear to have copies or be making use of it. It would have been useful in the Children's Camp run by Childline.

4.4 Sensitization efforts with Workers and the private sector

92. ILO-IPEC programmes normally foster close links with Workers and Employers Organizations, referred to here as social partners (SPs), as the means of reaching the private sector and the

workforce, and TECL II is no exception. Umbrella SPs are represented on the NAP steering committees, and the NAPs recognize their role in raising awareness among their constituencies.

93. As members of NSCs the SPs have participated in a number of trainings and NAP related missions. Some SPs have participated or organized their own awareness raising efforts (see below). Some have made progress in drafting internal CL policies or codes, but none of these have been officially adopted and rolled out among their membership as yet.
94. The perception among stakeholders is that the level of participation of the tripartite Social Partners (SPs) in the NAP processes is poor. They are present on the NSCs (sometimes) but they are largely passive, because it is often a junior member who is sent. They have not yet whole-heartedly embraced child labour as a cause worthy of their support and relevant to their affiliates.
95. The Unions are said to have been occupied with internal conflicts and other issues (according to Sept. 2010 TPR). The CTA tried to address the problem by holding a joint mission to Namibia with the ILO Workers Specialist but still the level of engagement has not picked up. As a result TECL decided to support mini action programmes that could guarantee results rather than fully fledged APSOs that might never get done.
96. Their lack of interest suggests that the right "switch-on" key has not yet been found. . TECL should develop alternative approaches to win their engagement, and consider carefully which messages are the best ones. The evaluation noted that that Employers and Workers are generally grouped together by TECL and treated in the same manner - but their perspectives are opposing and so different nuances are needed. With employers, for example, there is the ethical message of corporate social responsibility, and there is the business promotion message that it makes sound economic sense to invest in tomorrow's workforce, and that being renowned for philanthropy can be good for business. One interviewee mentioned the importance of "*putting a human face to CL*" and this might be one of the keys that are needed in addition to workshops and seminars. A very interesting example of the powerfulness of this approach has been provided by the ILO Pretoria Office who decided to allocate a day to mentoring ex CSEC girls living at the New Life Centre's place of safety. The results of this exercise have resulted in continuing involvement beyond the workplace and work hours and are still multiplying.
97. With regard to the NSCs, if some umbrella SPs continue to remain disengaged, then TECL and its government partners should consider whether they are engaging with the right ones. Child labour needs progressive forward-looking partners, and/or those who are literally close to the grass-roots of child labour such as agriculture unions. If the policy of engagement with the umbrella organizations is not achieving the desired response, then it is justified to explore other options. For example, in South Africa AgriSA - an affiliate member - now sits on the CLPA IC representing the umbrella employers' organization Business Unity South Africa (BUSA).

4.4.1 NACTU: CL Policy and Celebration of Women's Day (South Africa)

98. National Council of Trade Unions (NACTU) has drafted a child labour policy with assistance from TECL which they propose to submit to their Congress in July 2011. They also held a very successful Women's Day event with their affiliates. The theme they chose was: *Fight CL through the eyes of a woman*. The event was well attended with close to 700 people present. The choice of this theme indicates the serious commitment, and their understanding of the linkages.

4.4.2 BOCCIM: Sensitization of Business Councils (Botswana)

99. The Botswana Confederation of Commerce, Industry, and Manpower (BOCCIM) have drafted and adopted a Code of Conduct for their affiliates which includes CL but have been unable to roll this out due to lack of funds. TECL also supported their mini action programme to train two Business Councils. The evaluation met with one participant who says the training changed her attitudes:

"The knowledge I learned gave me confidence to intervene and try to assist. To all of us it was a shock. Not everyone is sympathetic, but many are. As business people we are the ones who can sensitize and reach out to other business people. Business people could place promotional literature in their shops. It is good for business if we are seen to support efforts such as this".

100. Her hair salon business already carries literature on HIV/AIDS and condoms, and she trains her assistants in safe practices. She would like to display flyers on CL as well but (but has been given nothing). She would like to see an CL action support group. She knows of some employers who support individual orphans but believes that they would be willing to do more - e.g. to support NGO efforts, shelters, orphanages. *They could give 10% of their income - to some that is nothing."*
101. This example illustrates the goodwill and energy within the business community which could be tapped into if only the right entry point can be found. It also illustrates the need for follow-through. This training participant is inspired to take the next step. It would be good if BOCCIM can be assisted to run a mini pilot project to see if an action group can be established out of the training, and also to extend the training to other Business Councils.
102. This particular individual is a role model who should be linked to the APs active in the area (she was not aware there were direct intervention programmes in her locality) as her entrepreneurial knowledge and good practices might be a useful resource for their income generation activities and her personal story could be an inspiration to their beneficiaries:

"I had no further education or training - only secondary school. I had always wanted to start my own business, during school break hours I used to practice styling the hair of my friends. I began by selling secondhand clothes - I had read in Farmer's Weekly this was a good way to build up capital. I had no other outside help or loans. When I had sufficient savings I opened my first salon. Since then my business has prospered and my turnover (before expenses) is around 10,000 pula weekly.

103. This example has been described in some detail as it illustrates the synergies which can be achieved if the linkages are there at local level.

4.4.3 Fair Trade in Tourism: Tourism Child Protection Code of Conduct (South Africa)

104. This has been an excellent and very relevant project supported by TECL II from which many useful lessons have been learned. The main activity was the drafting of a Code of Conduct for the commercial tourism sector. The Code covers child protection from exploitation, specifically from CSEC and child sex tourism (CST). It obliges signatories to take practical action steps, provides detailed guidelines on these, and a monitoring policy to ensure compliance. The information hand-out pack contain attractive flyers that can be handed out to tourists or left in lobbies, as well as information on the Code and related topics such as child trafficking. Sensitization workshops were held throughout the country to highlight the importance of the Code and businesses were invited to sign up.
105. This is an example of a good practice both in design and execution. According to FTT 39 companies have signed the Code to date including travel companies, hotels, and car rental companies. e. With the snowball effect, millions of tourists could be reached. Key factors in their successful approach are:-
 - A clear mandate to act. FTT are the SA representative on Code International board.
 - Consultations with knowledgeable parties, including TECL/ILO, UNICEF (co-funder).
 - Support of government (DSD, Department of Tourism, Dep of Trade & Industry).

- Partnering NGOs working in the CSEC field e.g. Childline, the SA Network Trafficking.
- Targeted the top-range businesses first, believing that others would follow their lead.

Recommendation: Document and share this approach widely among SPs as an example of a good practice in how to design and implement a code of practice and use the snowball effect.

4.5 National awareness raising campaigns

4.5.1 Broad findings

106. Awareness raising has featured strongly in TECL II. The methods employed have been appropriate, varied and wide-ranging, and cost-effective in terms of the numbers reached. They have included use of TV (the NPC in Namibia has made 6 appearances talking about CL) radio, print media, the placement of material on the ILO sub-regional website (TECL should make sure this is regularly updated), newsletter, and other print materials and posters. There have also been public statements by high-level politicians, and such statements are very influential in mobilizing support. Following his visit to the Hague last year, the Minister of Labour in South Africa has secured funds for the country to launch celebrations of the World Day Against Child Labour (WDAKL)⁴ It is expected this will become an annual event.
107. Full advantage was taken in all countries of the opportunity offered by the 2010 FIFA World Cup. A large banner of the Red Card to Child Labour was displayed from the ILO building in Pretoria, visible to vehicles passing on the motorway. Credit must go to the team of trainers and planners under DSD for their intensive efforts to build awareness and prepare for every eventuality. As a result, there were no reported cases of child abuse or exploitation during the World Cup. This effort leaves a sustainable legacy.
108. In Namibia the strategy of inviting dignitaries to attend important CL events so that the media automatically give coverage is a good practice worthy of replication. Another good practice is the sensitization of traditional *ngotla* chiefs in Namibia and Botswana who are powerful gatekeepers whose words and attitudes are very influential in communities. A further good practice from TECL Namibia is the keeping of an electronic database tracking all the requests for materials.

4.6 Common lessons learned and recommendations

109. Capacity building has proved an excellent strategy for recruiting and strengthening participation.

Recommendation: Continue sharing and building upon good practices and opportunities which have already shown signs of fruit. Ensure good practices are documented, shared, and replicated where appropriate

110. Some excellent media coverage has been achieved but gaps still remain regarding the sensitization of potentially relevant institutions/organizations, and the public at large.

Recommendation: Continue to seize every opportunity to raise the profile of CL 'as a problem that can be addressed'. Adapt the lessons learned from the HIV/AIDS campaign which has been very successful at awakening public consciousness. An overlooked partner in the TECL II programme is civil society, including NGOs and FBOs. The churches have an extensive network down to the very lowest levels and are the ideal vehicle to carry CL message since human rights is part and parcel of their teaching. Some of them have been active in HIV/AIDS education campaigns.

⁴ Stakeholders point out that the WDAKL conflicts with high-level meetings at ILO Geneva which Labour Ministers normally must attend thus preventing them from lending their weight to celebrations in their home country

111. There are instances of good initiatives among the SPs, but they are not generally widespread. Some stakeholders commented that times have moved forward and that ILO-IPEC should not get stuck in the rut of tripartism; they perceive CL as being primarily a child rights rather than a labour issue, and this may reflect the position of the Unions and explain why the unions are not whole-heartedly engaged.

Recommendation: Try alternative approaches to engage the SPs. Consider ways to tap into the material resources and goodwill of the private sector, using some strategies from FTT as a model.

112. Advocacy is an essential tool to build general awareness and ensure the implementation of policy and legislation. As yet, only a few partners are aware of its potential, or skilled in the practice of effective advocacy.

Recommendation: Forward momentum on the NAPs could be strengthened through stronger CSO representation on the NSCs. CSOs could play a crucial role as advocates and as conveyors of information and practice from communities to policy makers, so that it becomes a sustainable interface.

5. Building the knowledge base

113. Activities and outputs covered in this heading include the following:

- 1.5.6 Provide assistance to stakeholders on indicators identified within current information & management systems (IMS) and propose amendments to IMS to include CL indicators. Provide input for their analysis.
- 1.7.1 Comprehensive analyses done and published on available national data on child labour
- 1.7.2 National situation analyses on CL in agriculture, CSEC and CUBAC
- 1.7.3 Studies done on impact of HIV/AIDS on CL
- 1.7.4 Rapid assessments on CL in agriculture, CSEC and CUBAC
- 1.7.5 Assess and document impact on children of water service delivery

5.1 Research studies

114. A study on the Impact of HIV/AIDS has been completed in Namibia and is underway in Botswana. Studies on CL in agriculture are in process in both countries. Stakeholders reported that such studies give strong support to their advocacy and mobilization efforts. Planned studies on CSEC (Botswana) and CUBAC in Namibia were not carried out as it was felt existing studies were adequate.
115. The delay in assessing and documenting the impact of the water service delivery in SA is regrettable because momentum built up during TECL I with the relevant government department has been lost. TECL II aims to build on the lessons learned during TECL I and the water service prioritization tool is one area of TECL I achievement highlighted in TECL II Prodoc. Furthermore, it could have been a useful part of preparatory studies for the direct intervention to address excessive household chores in South Africa. It would still be an interesting study to compare, for example, trends in school enrolment and attendance and performance in a community where piped drinking water has been provided during the past 3 years, with a similar control area where water has to be carried long distances. [Further information supplied in Annex 4

Recommendation: Ensure the impact study on CL and water service delivery is carried out

5.2 Supporting national surveys and CL monitoring

116. Each country has a number of national surveys into which CL measures and indicators are incorporated. TECL has provided technical support into the analysis of child labour data from the Botswana Labour Force Survey (LFS) of 2005. The Botswana LFS is conducted only once in 10 years which is hardly frequent enough to inform and re-direct efforts to combat CL. South Africa have an LFS and the Activities of Young People Survey. TECL or ILO has provided input into the development of a CL module for the former. But according to SADOL, while the LFS provides data on shifts in CL, the latter is much more useful. But the two *"do not talk to each other"* for the measures used are different. This seems a case where technical input has not been sufficiently geared to needs.
117. As part of the M&E for the NAPs, each sector is expected to develop and report on their CL indicators. TECL is supporting consultants in Botswana and Namibia to assist the PACCs to develop CL indicators which can be incorporated into existing IMS. In some cases these CL indicators already exist, in other cases they have to be developed. Some challenges are being encountered in implementing this approach. For example, one of the CL outcome indicators developed in Botswana is 'Number of children working in bars'. But this indicator is cross-cutting and does not fall clearly under any single MDA's mandate. More to the point, how feasible is it to measure? Stakeholders have doubts that even where the indicators have been developed, the concerned bodies are unlikely to have the capacity to measure them. Measuring child labour itself requires enormous skill because it tends to vanish during the measurement process! How frequently does it need to be measured? And what is the cost of measuring in terms of time and financial resources. Sometimes the tools and indicators designed to support action, can detract resources from the action.
118. But the main challenge is the M&E framework whereby the Lead Ministry will collate this information and debate it on a higher national level. For example, South Africa also has the Child Register which is a child protection tracking system, the Justice system tracks children in conflict with the law, and the education EMIS tracks changes in enrolment etc. But where is the interface that brings these together?
119. The Botswana consultant to the M&E process recommends an overall unified framework of CL indicators for effective M&E. To achieve this careful thought needs to go into feasibility of measurement (cost- and time-effectiveness), to establish whether new measures are really essential or whether pre-existing indicators will suffice. Sequential thinking is needed on a) the key purposes of measuring, in order to arrive at b) how frequently a measurement is needed, in order to decide on c) the right measures and indicators, and finally d) where and how they can be integrated and measured and by whom. Being clear about the purpose is the key. For example, if a broad infrequent measure is needed then the Labour Force Surveys or Children's Activities surveys may suffice. If the tracking of individual at-risk children is the most important purpose, then the Child Register of DSD in South Africa is a suitable model. But if an annual pulse-taking is required (to refocus annual plans and budgets), then a few cost-effective, rapid indicators should suffice. For example, one such 'pulse' indicator could be looking at annual trends in grade level attained at a certain age (e.g. age 13 or age at which children should complete primary schooling). This is a good indicator of child labour/work since it reflects age at first enrolment, attendance rate, and performance (all affected by hours of non-school work), and the data for analysis may already exist in the education databases (EMIS) and simply need the addition of an analysis command.
120. **Recommendation:** TECL (with support from relevant ILO/IPEC officers) need to continue to give strong guidance and support to this area in order to get greater clarity on the points raised above. If there is not sufficient time during regular PACC/IC meetings to have a full discussion, then it could be worthwhile to sponsor a roundtable discussion in each country.

6. Summary of upstream key findings

- The Upstream activities are shaping up to be very successful. TECL estimate that they are 70% of the way towards their targets and the evaluation findings support this estimate. There has been good progress on nearly all the activities and outputs, and it is anticipated that TECL will meet its targets by the end of term.
- The design of the upstream part of the programme is relevant, and the approaches, strategies, and methods employed are appropriate and effective.
- The key to sustainability of effort lies in on-going sensitization of key high-level officials and capacity building/skills training for implementation level. In the time remaining, key departments and desks whose support is not fully apparent should be individually targeted with a sector-specific package. Capacity building and sensitization have proved to be very effective and should be a priority area for any remaining funds.
- Areas needing greater thought and effort include impact monitoring and the best approach (database) to collate, analyze, and manage data from a variety of sources.
- New targeted strategies are needed to get the agriculture MDAs on board, to strengthen the engagement of the social partners, and to develop new productive connections to the CSO sector - and to the private sector.

Findings related to Immediate Objective 2.

7. Direct Targeted Interventions

Table 3.1: Progress towards targets for child beneficiaries: by sectors

| Immediate Objective 2.0: By the end of the Project, models of interventions will have been developed and tested, and - in South Africa - further mainstreamed through pilot interventions involving direct action programs | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|--------------|---------|-------------|
| TARGET ACTIVITY/OUTPUT | BOTSWANA | | NAMIBIA | | SOUTH AFRICA | | TOTAL |
| | Target | to date | Target | to date | Target | to date | Target |
| CUBAC withdrawal | 0 | N/A | 25 | N/A | 200 | | 250 |
| CSEC withdrawal | 25 | N/A | 0 | N/A | | N/A | |
| Agriculture withdrawal | 675 | N/A | 675 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 1350 |
| Household chores wd | | | | | 1200 | N/A | 1200 |
| Total | 700 | 16 | 700 | 5 | 1400 | 24 | 2800 |
| CUBAC prevention | 0 | N/A | 400 | N/A | 400 | N/A | 1200 |
| CSEC prevention | 400 | N/A | 0 | N/A | | | |
| Agriculture prevention | 1000 | N/A | 1000 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 2000 |
| Household chores pv | | | | | 2400 | N/A | 2400 |
| Total | 1400 | 115 | 1400 | 36 | 2800 | 78 | 5600 |

Table 3.2: Progress towards targets for child beneficiaries: by implementing agency

| Country/Agency | Withdrawal | | | Prevention | | |
|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| | Target | Achieved | Identified | Target | Achieved | Identified |
| Botswana Total | 700 | 16 | | 1400 | 115 | |
| Humana | 500 | 10 | 100 | 1000 | 80 | 488 + |
| Childline | 200 | 6 | N/A | 400 | 35 | 32 |
| Namibia Total | 700 | 5 | | 1400 | 36 | |
| LAC | 350 | 5 | N/A | 700 | 36 | N/A |
| [Caprivi*] | 350 | 0 | N/A | 700 | 0 | N/A |
| South Africa total | 1400 | 24 | | 2800 | 78 | |
| Kids Haven | 75 | 18 | N/A | 200 | 22 | N/A |
| New Life Centre | 125 | 6 | N/A | 200 | 58 | N/A |
| ? (HH chores) | 1200 | 0 | 0 | 2400 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Total | 2800 | 45 | 100+ | 5600 | 229 | 500+ |

• Dismissed. New partner yet to be determined

N/A Not available

Sources for both tables: Prodoc plus APSOs of specific direct interventions and information provided by IAs during interviews in March 2011

7.1 Broad Progress to date

121. The decision was made to work with a limited number of Action Programmes (APs), partly due to the dearth of NGOs with relevant experience and partly due to budget constraints. Two implementing agencies (IAs) were selected for each country, with a third for South Africa. Five are currently

implementing. These are Legal Assistance Centre (LAC) in Namibia; in Botswana Humana People to People and Childline Botswana; In South Africa New Life Centre (NLC) and Kid's Haven (KH). One AP is on hold in Namibia, and one yet to start (South Africa). Preliminary activities included sensitization of key stakeholders in the target areas, and capacity building of the management level of the IAs.

122. All the IAs are committed and working diligently within the constraints under which they operate, but only Humana AP Botswana has achieved a strong start (see 7.3.1). The others have encountered a number of challenges which have delayed their progress. As things stand - without adjustments - it is unlikely that the direct interventions will reach the *withdrawal* target numbers in the given time-frame and budget. With regard to *prevention*, the IAs say they are confident they can reach the targets - but two large APs await implementation. The evaluation believes the prevention numbers may be attainable *providing* greater support is extended.
123. In their defense three important points should be understood. Firstly, some valuable work is being done by the APs in building sustainable community structures and developing good practices. Secondly, there are many cases of prevention in the pipeline waiting for the regulation three monthly monitoring visits before they can be counted. Thirdly, the evaluation does not see the achievement of the specified target numbers as the goal of the direct interventions. The Immediate Objective is that *models of intervention have been developed and tested (and mainstreamed)*. The Project is well on track to achieve the first two parts of this objective and its experiences are providing some extremely useful lessons. The evaluation believes it would be detrimental to press for achievement of target numbers at the risk of jeopardizing the quality and sustainability of its impact, or of jeopardizing the strong progress in the upstream arena.
124. The reasons for the slow progress towards the target numbers include:
- *CL Sectors*. Lack of cases in the designated sectors. CSEC and CUBAC cases are difficult to confirm and achieve a sustainable impact with limited resources and especially within a limited time-frame. Even in agriculture, cases eligible for *withdrawal* (i.e. not enrolled in school) initially appear to be less than anticipated within the target localities (see reason 3. below).
 - *Conceptual issues*. The perception that APs may only count cases falling within the specified target sectors, and may not include cases in other sectors. (e.g. Humana identified 143 cases of children engaged in domestic work or excessive household chores but "*all were disqualified*" for not being in the given sector. If this is correct, then the design shows a weakness, for children in child labour commonly shift between sectors according to season and opportunity. While it is helpful to conceptualize CL in sectoral terms when looking to sensitize stakeholders at national level, in downstream implementation the sectoral approach is irrational and limiting.
 - Measures.
 - Lack of *clarity* or consistency in the measures for excessive hours of work CL (any sector). For example, LFS surveys turn up high numbers of CL in agriculture, but the majority of these cases concern children who are enrolled in school but working excessive hours. There is insufficient guidance from ILO/IPEC as to how APs may address and monitor children for *withdrawal* when they are *already* enrolled in school. In the past, or in less developed African countries, "withdrawal" has largely taken place very simply through re-enrolment in full-time education or training. But in TECL II countries, If the child is already enrolled in school but working too many hours at weekends or evenings, the challenge is how to define the permitted number of hours and even more challenging how to monitor the hours which they are actually working (naturally this is much harder than monitoring whether a child is attending school or not). The IAs need to have clearer guidelines from ILO/IPEC to guide them in this emerging situation [See annex A4 for some suggestions].

- *Design assumptions.* The assumption in the design that the government of South Africa would implement its own direct interventions has caused delays. Further delays have been experienced in trying to arrive at a common understanding of what it means to withdraw a child from excessive household chores. Consequently the major household chores AP for South Africa are still not off the ground (and one in Namibia is on hold after the IA was dismissed).
- *Lack of prior experience* **None** of the IAs has prior experience of *withdrawal*⁵ from CL under ILO's protocols and the revised DBMR. Only one IA has relevant experience with community mobilization. This task is taking longer than estimated in the design, where the community has no pre-existing structures, or where the IA has no experience of this activity, or no established relationship of trust with the target community. This raises the question of whether CB by TECL to the IAs has been sufficient. While additional CB should not be ruled out, APs seem to be most in need of support visits to help them see the right way to overcome obstacles and become established.
- *DBMR.* The stringent requirements of the DBMR has meant that cases may not count even though time and resources have been expended on them
- *Budget* **The** tight budget for the APs affects the education level of the field workers they can attract. They are mostly young and inexperienced. They have potential, but require a longer apprenticeship to grasp the approaches and reporting regulations, and therefore consume (or should be consuming) more management time. Due to the low pay there is a high turnover, requiring further training and support. The low budget has also limited the amount of supervision which can be provided by the IAs.
- *Monitoring support.* The monitoring travel budget is almost exhausted⁶. This means NPCs cannot offer the degree of support they would wish.

7.2 Recommendations regarding target numbers:

- Convert a proportion of the withdrawal target numbers to prevention. The precise number would need to be discussed with the relevant parties.
- Allow APs to address and count all CL sectors falling within their geographical target area providing they deliver the requisite services and monitoring..
- Convert all the withdrawal target numbers for the AP Excessive HH Chores (SA) to prevention
- **And/Or** Draft and test/pilot guidelines on how withdrawal from excessive hours should be conducted and monitored. For example, school attendance records and evidence of improved academic performance (teachers reports) would be a good indicator of reduced working hours since monitoring the precise number of hours which each child works every day is clearly not feasible (with limited budget and time), although children's perceptions (or their own measurement) on the reduction in their hours should not be discounted.
- Other recommendations which impact on achievement of target numbers are discussed below.

125. It is not clear to the evaluation why these particular sectors and geographical localities were selected, or who was responsible for the choice, nor the extent of needs assessment conducted during the design stage. But the categorization of child beneficiaries into CL sectors for the purposes of direct interventions has proved more of a hindrance than an aid. In reality, poverty does not respect sectoral boundaries, and children will commonly engage in a combination of activities, or shift from one to another. This is particularly true regarding "prevention" beneficiaries where no-one can reliably predict which CL sector a child risks.

⁵ The South Africa partners worked in prevention services under TECL I

⁶ Due to the high costs of renting vehicles in Botswana and Namibia

126. *Broad recommendation for design of future projects:* be more holistic in approach i.e. avoid categorization into CL sectors with set target numbers per sector because this does not match easily with reality. Furthermore, in community level work, it can be damaging to community relations and future efforts to select one child for help (CL in designated sectors) and not the neighbour child (CL in non-designated sector, or unable to be clearly categorized).

7.3 Direct Interventions in Botswana

7.3.1 Progress to date

127. Botswana has made the strongest progress of the three countries. Factors which have assisted are:
- pre-existence of strong local structures (*chieftain kgotla system*, and Village Development Committees (VDCs), Ward Development Action groups for OVCs among others); the IAs are using these to build Child Labour Committees (CLCs) as springboard for community mobilization
 - Humana has considerable experience in community mobilization, plus a presence in the target area since 2001. The local communities already trusted them and therefore response has been quicker.
 - Humana provide a high level of on-the-job training and support to their field staff. Their ability to do so depends largely on their accumulated experience but also upon their donation of a vehicle (and funds?) over and above what is budgeted for in their APSO.
128. Childline report some challenges in the capacity and confidence of their outreach officers to enter communities and request TECL's assistance to address these. They are also not receiving the desired cooperation from government social workers when they make referrals. According to them, DOSET (adult education system) is not meeting the needs of older children (>10 years) to help them re-integrate to schools.

7.3.2 Examples of Good practices

129. **CLCs** The evaluation met with two strong CLCs⁷ in Tsmaya (Childline area) and Palapye (Humana). Childline say that they do everything through the *kgotla*. They are also finding fruitful partnerships with local churches. But the sensitization effort for councillors (political) has failed to engage their commitment.
- In Tsmaya village, CL issues are a regular agenda item on the *kgotla* meetings and the Chief is the Chair of the CLC. The School Head, Social Worker, Police, and Church are committed members and monthly meetings are well attended (though the Labour Inspector has never attended). The CLC is informally linked to the Village Development Committee and to other village level committees. The CLC displays leadership, ownership, and initiative. An example - they targeted and sensitized three large commercial farms in the area, using the argument that the farm owners would benefit by improved productivity and better educated workforce in the future if they ensured that all children attended school in the present. Their wish to focus on eliminating the root causes: "*We need empowerment, not food baskets*". They have initiated discussions with the agriculture officer and the Land Board to establish a pilot Backyard Garden for income generation.
 - In Palapye (Humana) the CLC is strong and consultative. There is a clear reporting mechanism and accountability to the community on CL issues. They summed it as "*child labour is our problem and we have to take responsibility for it.*" Factors in their engagement include: well organized meetings with clear targets; spirit of volunteerism; open consultation;

⁷ The evaluation cannot say how representative these are.

close cooperation with Humana; successful stakeholder workshop that trained/sensitized the CL committee; and members' passion for CL issues.

130. **HR management** Humana is a strong NGO with a track record in community mobilization, and their good practices need to be shared more widely. They get the Chiefs to recommend recruits for outreach officers. Their management structure and systems provide strong support to new recruits, so that staff turnover is not a threat. The key is a strong Coordinator located within the project area and a practical apprenticeship approach to capacity building of the outreach officers *"The management spend their time in the field working alongside the outreach officers showing them how to do things. When we are not there we ask the outreach officer to report to some local leader (Chief, clinic, school) each day on what work they have done. This builds local ownership and helps us monitor their activities while occupied elsewhere."*
- This Good Practice depends to some extent on Humana's generous donation of its own vehicle and TECL should take steps to facilitate its replication in other target areas where IAs are not similarly resourced. But it serves to illustrate that too little money has been budgeted in general for HR allowances, transportation and supervision, and this has impacted on effectiveness.
131. **Monitoring.** Humana has developed a tool which helps to link codes between the different reporting forms of the DBMR and have created their own electronic database. They have also developed a referral card and a file for each child in their office detailing all the services delivered.
132. **Children's Camp.** With the assistance of a local church, Childline has taken 40 CL beneficiaries on a week's camp in a nature reserve. The week's activities included bush walks and talks by rangers, counselling about the risks of child labour, team-building games etc. The value of this activity is immense in terms of prevention and rehabilitation. It has brought traumatised girls in touch with each other, created important support friendships, and boosted morale and confidence of the children. It is recommended as an example of a Good Practice, both in terms of its content, and in terms of its cooperative approach with the nature reserve staff and the local church. One regret is that Childline do not have copies of SCREAM which could have been utilized in this situation.

7.3.2 Specific Recommendations

- Childline have requested support to better orientate their outreach workers how to go about their tasks. It is strongly recommended that they are sent to work alongside Humana team for a period of time or vice versa.
- Document and share Humana approaches with LAC (Namibia) and find funds to facilitate an exchange visit.
- With government stakeholders discuss ways for the CLCs to report their activities through official channels. This approach could generate greater sense of ownership and competition among government stakeholders at provincial/district level.
- PACC stakeholders should use their authority to address weaknesses identified in labour inspectors, social workers, and implementation of policy in schools in target areas.
- The CLCs reported the practice of what might be classified as a type of debt bondage. It concerns the Basarwa tribe who work as inter-generational family retainers on commercial farms (many white-owned) and who run up debts due to low pay. The evaluation recommends a rapid assessment to learn more.

7.4 Direct Interventions in Namibia

7.4.1 Progress to date

133. Direct interventions have got off to a troubled start in Namibia. The Caprivi APSO was withdrawn from New Caprivi Hope due to mismanagement of funds, and LAC is struggling to get traction in their communities. Floods have further delayed progress.
134. LAC is a strong NGO but legal education and advocacy is their field and they have limited experience in community mobilization and CL interventions. Apparently, there were no other suitable contenders. Given their good understanding at management level, and the right exposure - sharing of lessons learned and good practices from other countries, or exchange visit - they should learn fast. It is practical skills which their field workers are generally lacking. A further concern is the distance from their Head Office and the high cost of monitoring support. They really need to have a full-time Coordinator in the target area to support their inexperienced field team.
135. An additional challenge is the dearth in Namibia of village-level structures on which to construct their community support. VDCs do not appear to exist, and LAC has no plans in its AP to establish CLCs. This makes it extremely hard for young inexperienced field workers to build trust and gain entry to a 'cold' community. LAC reports that some communities are resistant, even combative. This may be isolation and lack of previous projects entering those communities, or it might be that LAC is (wrongly) identified as a legal enforcement agency. In addition, the field monitors have to cover a fairly wide geographical area (with limited transport allowance) and they are paid very little (per activity). They say they look on it as a volunteer job.
136. Nevertheless, there are some positive signs, and it is likely that the pace will pick up as LAC staff develops the trust of the community. Their low numbers to date are partly due to the fact they began intensive beneficiary identification only after schools re-opened in January 2011, and many of them have remained closed due to floods. Thus insufficient time has elapsed to meet the DBMR 3 monthly monitoring requirements for qualification as a prevention/withdrawal case.
137. Other challenges include the lack of cooperation from schools despite the fact that LAC had a letter of introduction from the PS of MOE, schools heads demanded authorization from the Regional Education Office. This has now been addressed.
138. Positive practices identified by the evaluation include the induction training of monitors which included introductions to key government partners. The monitors have found this facilitated their access to such people. Unfortunately the labour inspectors did not attend. LAC are providing SCREAM training in after-school classes and youth clubs, and are doing a good job in assisting out-of-school children to access the papers they need to allow them to attend school and receive welfare grants.

7.4.2 Special Issue

139. LAC is in discussions with TECL to take on the Caprivi project which is on hold. This would double their target numbers. The time-frame is very short and so is the budget. The evaluation appreciates the logic of approaching an existing partner but has real concerns that this will overload LAC and jeopardize their existing programme. There is a high risk either that the target numbers will not be achieved or that token numbers will be achieved - pointless because they will leave no sustainable impact.
140. The evaluation **recommends** that the target numbers are lowered, or that additional monitoring funds are found to enable the NPC to make regular support visits (and/or to enable LAC to place a strong Coordinator in the field - with transport - who could possibly move between the two areas).

7.4.3 Specific Recommendations

- One monitor has more experience than others since she already works for another NGO and has encountered fewer problems. Her approach is to go to the Headmen who organize a community meeting for her where she presents the project and requests their help in identifying children. The evaluation recommends transferring her skills and knowledge to the other monitors. Additional transport allowance would enable her to become a roving mentor.
- This same field monitor sees the need to begin income generation activities immediately. The evaluation strongly supports this (see 7.6 point 1)
- TECL must source funds to facilitate exchange visits and inter-country sharing of good practices, (mostly from Humana).

7.5 Direct Interventions in South Africa

7.5.1 Progress to date

141. The major AP targeting 3600 children (sector: excessive household chores) is still in the planning stages. Delays occurred due to misunderstandings as to how to manage and monitor a withdrawal from this sector. Some stakeholders understand withdrawal to mean removal of the child from its home, and quite rightly would not support that action. But if the child remains in the home, how can they be counted as withdrawn? Some suggestions are made under 7.7. In view of this issue and the delayed start the evaluation recommends that this AP should only target children for prevention. If it can focus on the chore of water carrying then this will build on the achievements of TECL I and link to the impact study on water service prioritization.
142. Two smaller but nonetheless important projects targeting WFCL (CSEC and CUBAC) are off the ground. These are being implemented by Kid's Haven (KH) and New Life Centre (NLC), both of whom are good choices since they have prior experience with TECL and with children in CSEC and CUBAC. KH has greater capacity and experience than NLC and it is very good to see the mentoring role which KH is playing for NLC. Both organizations are conscientiously monitoring their target children, but KH must guard against over-crowding their residential shelter (they are aware of this problem and currently refer children to other shelters in the city). Although they have a long way to go to reach their numbers, the evaluation is impressed with their approaches and efforts, and appreciates the special nature of the challenges which they are encountering.
143. These are hidden sectors. Children on the street are unlikely to own up to being in CSEC or CUBAC on first acquaintance, or to admit their real age. According to one outreach worker it may even take 2 years of contact before a child trusts one enough to admit to being in CUBAC. For every 5 cases on which they expend time and money identifying, counselling, and providing services, only 1-2 will ultimately meet the DBMR qualifications with some failing at the last hurdle, so that the IA has to start again with a new intake. With the short time-frame of the APs this presents a challenge.
144. The nature of CSEC and CUBAC means that withdrawal is unlikely to be a one-off event. The process can be protracted, as children move in and out of WFCL. Ironically, another obstacle is that the legislation and policy framework (the new Children's Act) is very strong. It requires the IAs to notify the relevant authorities, and in the case of a withdrawal they are obliged to take the child to police, Home Affairs (if no documents), and government social worker. During this process the children commonly become suspicious and abscond. *"CSEC girls have had so many promises made to them they don't believe adults who tell them to quit. They get suspicious and disappear when we take them to the DSD office, when the social worker tells them they must search for their parents. The children need a less threatening place they can come to. As teenagers they want to sort out their problems on their own, and this takes time".*

145. Another question is whether street child engaged in begging (SCIBs) who are rehabilitated from street life can be counted in the withdrawal numbers. To date KH have only counted such cases in the prevention category because they are not CUBAC. Begging is listed as a type of work in the CLPA.
146. The evaluation recommends that such cases should count as withdrawal providing the necessary services and monitoring are performed.

7.5.2 Children on the street: Examples of lessons learned and good practices

- Both IAs have observed that children who have been on the streets a long time are resistant and suspicious of people who try to intervene. It is best to target newly arrived children have more trust.
- Successful KH strategies include approaching children begging at traffic lights, and targeting schools near railway lines because they have learned that quick access to city centre is a pull factor into street begging. Peer influence is a big pull factor, and the influence spreads within schools. They are giving talks about CL to school classes, and offer confidential meetings for children who wish to talk further. They have had a strong response to the latter.
- NLC have formed a WFCL task team/forum with churches and other NGOs. The task team conducts night tours of the city streets, brothels, and vandalized buildings. They have asked churches and youth clubs to refer cases to them. Their practice of removing CSEC girls to a shelter in a quiet suburb provides the girls with access to better schools and the right environment to reflect on what they want to do with their lives.
- Both partners are helping children to access the necessary documents to enrol in school and access grants. Quite a number have come from outside the country.

7.5.3 Specific recommendations

- The AP to start up in SA addressing CL in excessive household chores should focus only on prevention, not withdrawal
- Children withdrawn from begging on the streets should qualify as withdrawn for the purposes of the target numbers, providing the necessary services and monitoring are performed.

7.5.4 Discussion on the change from monitoring to implementing

147. In the design it was not intended for TECL to implement direct interventions in South Africa, but rather to monitor the impact of mainstreaming into government priorities. This would be a logical step forward. But the wording of Prodoc is rather confusing:

In South Africa the strategy in TECL II is to monitor the impact of mainstreaming child labour into government policies and programmes in direct interventions with child beneficiaries. (...) the interventions themselves will be funded by government programmes and policies (page 41, 2nd paragraph)

148. Does this mean that the government will simply continue to mainstream, or that in addition they will budget funds for some kind of direct intervention "project"? Prodoc gives an example of what is envisaged: mainstreaming the tool developed in TECL I for prioritizing water service delivery to rural areas where children spend hours carrying water. *"TECL II will work with government departments (...) to monitor the impact of the water service delivery on children in the affected area."* (page 42, 1st paragraph)
149. The confusion multiplies because target numbers have been attached - 1,400 withdrawn and 2800 prevented and provided with services (page 58 Prodoc) - even though TECL will not be funding but only monitoring. Government sources say they were not consulted in the design stage, and knew

nothing about such target numbers, and never had the intention to fund their own direct interventions as this is not the way they operate.

150. Whatever the understanding in the design stage, during the course of TECL II, the interpretation that the government was supposed to fund its own direct interventions gained ground. The TPR of September 2010 under Problems/Issues page 25/65 reads:

The budget for South Africa was intended to be slightly smaller than the other two countries because South Africa was expected to use its own funds to withdraw and prevent children while the project would monitor. This didn't happen and the project took the decision to develop APSOs that cover direct services for children to be able to meet the target numbers.

151. The evaluation regrets the lost opportunity to monitor the impact of mainstreaming. It would be very valuable to analyze the benefits of introducing piped water to a community in terms of the number of children affected, the reduction in their water-carrying hours, along with any improvement in their attendance rate and performance in school. [For further details on how this might have been accomplished, see Annex A4]
152. What has been the impact of the decision? No extra funding was provided. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the diluting of the budget has impacted on the resourcing and progress of *all* the direct intervention APs. The TPR confirms this is the case:

The overall TECL II budget is insufficient especially the budget that was allocated to direct action programs. As such each country has had to limit itself to only 2 APSOs to accommodate numbers. The project was therefore forced to cut out most things from the APSOs so as to work within the budget available without compromising the quality of services. (September 2010 TPR page 25)

153. What activities were cut from the APSOs? The evaluation has noted the absence in the APSOs of awareness raising activities and believes that their inclusion would have greatly facilitated a speedier and easier entry into the target communities.
154. The question is not only did TECL II make the right decision. The fundamental question is: does ILO/IPEC conceive mainstreaming into government policies and programmes as sufficient in itself, or do they believe it will always have to be supplemented by NGO supported interventions? If the latter, then why is engagement in building and sensitizing the NGO sector not a more visible component of ILO programmes? The evaluation's view is that the impact of mainstreaming will always be far larger and more sustainable than can ever be achieved through piecemeal direct interventions. N

7.6 Lessons learned and recommendations

155. The time-frame of 18 months is too short for the APs to achieve entry into a 'cold' community and sustainable impact on children's lives. Income generation with vulnerable families (illiterate, lacking skills, capital, and resources such as land) requires a minimum of 2-3 years to be successful.

Recommendations:

- The target numbers and sectors for each country need to be revised to make them achievable without compromising quality.
- Move forward as soon as possible on the two remaining APSOs (South Africa and Namibia). Regarding target numbers see recommendations under 7.2.

156. The tight budget for the APs is impacting on their effectiveness (low capacity and high staff turnover, lack of sufficient preliminary sensitization activities to win support of communities, insufficient supervision due to transport cost).

Recommendations:

- Source funds to boost the budget line for monitoring of direct interventions

157. The partners need greater support from each other and from TECL.

Recommendations:

- TECL urgently needs to facilitate the sharing of lessons learned and good practices among the IAs and to provide greater monitoring support.
- TECL should aim to provide guidelines for IAs as to how children already enrolled in school but still engaged in excessive hours of work - regardless of the sector - can be withdrawn and monitored in direct interventions. Guidelines are needed for the point at which one of these children may be categorized as 'withdrawn' if they are already enrolled in school. (See suggestions in Annex A4)

8. Implementation process

158. On paper TECL II began in September 2008, but in reality it started with the arrival of the CTA in February 2009. The National Programme Coordinators were not all recruited until August 2009. The decision to delay the start until this particular CTA was available was supported by good reasons,, but it should have been shared frankly with all the parties concerned and the start date delayed and consideration should have been given to implement a bridging programme to facilitate better continuity between Phase I and II. The no-cost extension of 3 months does not entirely recover the time lost.

159. TECL II has a very strong team in the CTA and three NPCs. They are competent and strongly motivated and TECL is fortunate to have them. They have established cordial and productive working relationships with all the stakeholders. The ILO Director is strongly supportive of TECL II, and the team is making use of the ILO specialists based in Pretoria when required. Other than the issues outlined below there have been no particular management problems, and the CTA and team have made good decisions in revising the budget.

160. The main challenges in implementation have been the distances and costs involved between the countries; the loss of the Finance Officer; the centralized decision-making processes within ILO; the delay in the procurement of vehicles for Namibia and Botswana; and the decision to implement direct interventions - rather than monitor - in South Africa.

161. Insufficient funds have been budgeted to support sufficient monitoring visits by the CTA, or by the NPCs to the field programmes, or to support sharing and integration between the countries. The evaluation supports the budget revisions that boosted budget lines for monitoring and capacity building, but feels they are still not sufficient.

162. The vehicles purchased for Namibia and Botswana arrived in September 2010 and one of them had to be re-fitted to local specifications so that it was only available from January 2011. In fact, the trip made by the evaluation team was the first time that it had been outside the capital city. While waiting for the vehicles the budget line for travel has been almost exhausted so that there is practically no money to put fuel in their tanks. In retrospect it might have been better to purchase secondhand vehicles in-country.

163. Not enough effort has been made to integrate the three country programmes of TECL II. Partly this is due to budget constraints which appear to be greatly limiting the amount of travel between countries. The budget is not allocated by country but by activity. Rather than fusing the three country programmes together, this situates them as competitors for budget-line funds. The fact that this has not created strife demonstrates firm management and reasonableness. Nevertheless there are some cracks in the framework which could widen. The NPCs sense that they are flying blind, not knowing when their fuel is going to run out and this is handicapping TECL effectiveness. It is confusing for stakeholders to one moment be told by the NPC that they should submit requests, and the next be told that funds are not available. One stakeholder went as far as to comment "*The NPC needs to be empowered; she is not allowed to make any decisions but has to refer everything upwards.*" With some budget lines near depletion, frank communication and excessive transparency are required.
164. Reporting and planning meetings are held annually when the NPCs and CTA come together to set priorities for the year ahead. But in a responsive programme such as TECL, requests for assistance can come forward from stakeholders at any time mid-year, while other plans may stall. There is a need for additional meetings mid-year between the team. Constant communication as to how budget expenditure is going would help improve efficiency. The decision-making processes within ILO tend to be quite convoluted and although they are consultative, too many minor decisions have to be passed upwards. The dismissal of the Finance Officer based in Pretoria and the delays in his replacement has created additional challenges.
165. In the time remaining TECL needs to make a greater effort to share lessons across borders amongst the three countries in joint inter-country workshops but also to include countries such as Lesotho and Swaziland as outlined in its Prodoc. As things stand the sense is more of three separate country programmes, rather than an integrated whole. The time for sharing lessons and good practices is during implementation, not at the end.
166. The decision to implement and not to merely monitor direct interventions in South Africa would appear to be at least partly responsible for under-budgeting in the direct intervention IAs.

9. Design of TECL II

9.1 Broad Findings

167. The strengths of the design are that it is generally well-conceived, its focus and activities are relevant, and there is coherence in the internal logic and flow from objectives to outputs and activities. It is focused yet pulls in a wide range of stakeholders, it targets sustainable outputs such as capacity building and awareness, and it builds upon the foundation laid down during TECL Phase I. Most importantly, it is built upon the principle of supporting national efforts.
168. It is ambitious in design in that it covers three countries, but compared to TECL I which worked in 5 countries with only 2 programme staff; staffing levels appear adequate given the small number of IAs (6 in total). The main weakness is that the budget is inadequate in many areas, but particularly in travel and accommodation costs which may have limited orientation visits, cross-country and in-country sharing, and monitoring trips. These are middle-income countries, and costs are therefore higher than some other African countries.
169. A further weaknesses are its short time-frame which does not support sustainable interventions and impact, a budget which "*does not do justice to its ambitions*", and a few unfortunate targets and ideas which seem to have been plucked out of thin air rather than being grounded in reality and frank consultations with potential partners. Clarity of language and meaning is not a strong point of its Prodoc and this may account for some of the confusion in understanding its intentions with regard to activities such as knowledge tools to support action against perpetrators. In places there is even a

sense that some issues (such as monitoring interventions in SA) are deliberately fudged because intentions were not clear in the design stage.

170. No serious feasibility studies were made in the target areas (where the direct interventions are now taking place) so that the total number of beneficiaries, the balance between withdrawals and prevention, and the target sectors are not based on reality. Some assumptions were made: i) that the SA government would implement direct interventions; ii) that the target numbers in the required sectors would exist; iii) that children in WFCL such as CSEC and CUBAC would remain withdrawn, and that this process could be accomplished within an 18 month time period. The budget is not sufficient given the high costs of travel in the sub-region and the distances between and within the three countries.
171. The short time-frame limits the establishment of sustainable capacity building processes and impact, both upstream and downstream. Many stakeholders commented that the change process in government is very slow; a minimum of 5 years is essential to achieve a sustainable impact. The evaluation feels this is just as true at downstream level. The design's short-sighted vision provides help to a snapshot frame of children currently in difficulties, but does not pay sufficient attention to addressing the structural socio-economic injustices experienced by the vulnerable communities which are the breeding grounds for child labour

9.2 Addressing the recommendations of TECL I evaluation

172. Design recommendations from the final evaluation of TECL I which have been addressed:
- The programme is more realistic and focused (apart from the direct interventions)
 - In the outputs and activities there is generally a clear focus on what is within TECL's control to achieve
 - With the appointment of three NPCs, the staff compliment has been increased. It is now appropriate for the scope of the programme, and issues of diversity have been addressed. (Although some might accuse the team of being female gender-biased! - this is not a criticism.)
173. Areas where the recommendations of TECL I have not been addressed, or need greater effort:
- The design of APs must ensure the active participation of the IAs so that there is buy-in and ownership.
 - Sub-regional activities (face to face forums) in terms of sharing and learning should be built into the design (in this case reflected in greater budget).
 - Continue to explore with ILO-IPEC possibilities for a more efficient and simplified reporting and procurement process . . . ILO-IPEC should put mechanisms for accountability in place so that the CTA is able to sign off on more than is currently possible.

9.3 Specific issues

174. The design emphasizes that TECL will be guided by government NAP priorities, yet it lays out a list of activities. Consultations may have been held with stakeholders during the design, but government staff change, and disconnect results e.g. SCREAM activity. If this responsiveness and guidance are truly key components of TECL, then its design and implementation need to ensure greater flexibility.
175. Some people expressed regret that South Africa was included instead of Lesotho. The latter met the entry qualifications as it had also completed its NAP during TECL I and has a higher incidence of CL than the other countries. The ostensible reason is the limited funds and the hope that South Africa (SA) will be a role model for the region. SADOL/SA attended the meeting of South-South Initiative countries in Brazil and says they are committed but have not yet teased out the concrete steps which

need to be taken. At the same time they (and other stakeholders in the sub-region) expressed doubts that this approach would work in southern Africa. Largely because of the Big Brother syndrome, which means the smaller siblings are perennially trying to loosen their ties to SA and reject SA's 'leading' role. SA is so much bigger and advanced economically, that the good practices developed there are unlikely to fit the smaller countries.

176. Many of the challenges being faced by the direct intervention APs have their roots in the design process. The IAs were not involved when targets and sectors were selected, and were not in a position to conduct their own feasibility studies before signing contracts. This evaluation feels that ILO-IPEC should discard their standard design process and template design for the Direct Action interventions and be prepared to have less central control. One IA rather poignantly commented "*We would love to have the opportunity to design a programme that would really work.*"
177. The design addresses all the important institutions and processes to engage with the exception of civil society. Even those within the ranks of the tripartite structures see the need to add civil society as a crucially important fourth partner in the fight against child labour.
178. This Project has a special focus on HIV/AIDS. At direct action level, many of the beneficiary children are indeed HIV/AIDS orphans or affected children. However, aside from the direct interventions, the focus on HIV was not translated into specific log frame activities other than certain research studies. Prodoc states that "*TECL II will assist the social partners and especially the governments in mitigating the effects of HIV/AIDS on communities and particularly children involved in or at risk of labour.*" Given the risk of CL to which HIV affected children are exposed, it could have been beneficial to have sensitized HIV educators and careers on the risks, for example through inserting CL modules into their standard training curricula or through holding special workshops.
179. Sharing in the other direction, TECL could usefully digest lessons and 'Good practices' from the HIV/AIDS education campaigns which have been very successfully at raising public awareness. Stakeholders expressed their desire to see CL achieve the same level in public consciousness as HIV.

10. Broad Conclusions

Relevance and strategic fit

180. This is a worthwhile and very relevant project, and its objectives and outputs are still valid. It is well aligned with national development plans and naturally supportive of the National Action Plans for the Elimination of CL.

Validity of design

181. The broad design is good, and the approaches and strategies are relevant to the outputs and objectives. The Project document has not provided sufficiently clear guidance on some issues. The lack of feasibility studies in the target areas of the direct interventions and a number of assumptions in their overall design and targets has caused further challenges. The overall time-frame is short and the budget is not sufficient given the high costs of travel in the sub-region and the distances between and within the three countries.

Potential Impact

182. A strong sense of ownership is emerging in South Africa and Namibia, and overall good progress has been made despite a number of challenges encountered during implementation. The achievements in the upstream outputs are particularly impressive, and it is expected that output targets will be met. The strategies and approaches which have been adopted have been effective for their purposes, and

TECL has established a productive working relationship with the key government players. In the downstream interventions it is too soon to make any firm conclusions, but the evaluation has thrown up a number of areas of concern which need to be addressed promptly, through further capacity building, boosting the budget for monitoring support, re-sensitizing gatekeepers, spreading good practices more promptly, and making the target categories more realistic.

Efficiency and effectiveness

183. The programme is being well managed; it has a competent team in place. But effectiveness and integration could be improved by more frequent face to face meetings between the TECL team. Budget constraints are hampering the programme's ability to respond to opportunities and requests as they arise or to build upon successful activities and fruitful partnerships to ensure sustainability. The lack of a (minimum) budget allocation for each country makes planning and effective implementation difficult and impacts on the role and authority of the NPCs. The funds expended on the purchase of vehicles will be wasted unless they can be put to effective use. Integration has not been sufficiently pursued in terms of bringing stakeholders together for the purposes of sharing lessons learned and good practices and this is partly due to the budget constraints.

Sustainability

184. The design of the upstream half of the project is built on the concept of laying a sustainable foundation for action. The support to the mainstreaming and implementation of the NAPs and the accompanying capacity building and awareness raising activities are sustainable by nature. In the downstream interventions the partners are pursuing sustainable approaches through referring children to government social workers, and enabling them to access existing welfare grants.

11. Major Recommendations

Overall

1. Support greater integration of the three country programmes through face to face workshops to share lessons learned and good practices, and exchange visits where appropriate
2. Find ways for the budget to facilitate more frequent monitoring and support visits at all levels
3. Do not allow challenges in the downstream area to jeopardize upstream momentum

Objective 1: Upstream

4. Go where the energy is. Build on opportunities and successful partnerships.
5. Seek additional funds and/or prioritize remaining funds for capacity building and sensitization
6. Engage in sector-targeted sensitization and skills transfer with key stakeholders who have not yet embarked on mainstreaming. Renew efforts to reach potentially important relevant government stakeholders such as agriculture
7. Find ways to energize existing social partners or explore relations with active ones at a lower level
8. Explore innovative ways to engage with the private sector whose goodwill and resources are largely untapped
9. Explore ways to get CL awareness into any partners who have significant presence and wide-reaching networks at community level e.g. FBOs, agriculture extension workers, HIV/AIDS educators and care workers.

Objective 2: Direct Interventions

10. The target numbers and sectors for each country need to be revised. The evaluation recommends fewer numbers for withdrawal, and that beneficiaries from any sector of child labour (particularly including WFCL such as begging and child domestic work)
11. Abolish the withdrawal targets for the remaining AP in South Africa: it should focus only on prevention due to conceptual issues and lack of time.
12. As a matter of urgency TECL should facilitate exchange visits for the sharing of lessons learned and good practices from strong partners to weaker partners.
13. TECL should provide greater monitoring support and guidance particularly where partners are struggling to find supportive local structures and cooperative government workers for referrals.
14. ILO-IPEC and its DBMR should develop detailed guidelines regarding the CL category "enrolled in school but engaged in excessive hours of work", or if guidelines exist, ensure that IAs understand how to handle these cases.

Annexes

Annex 1 Terms of reference



International Labour Organization- International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour ILO/IPEC

Final version

Terms of Reference For

Independent Midterm Evaluation

“Towards the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child labour (TECL), Phase II with a focus on HIV/AIDs: Supporting and monitoring the implementation of National Plans of Action in three core countries in Southern Africa”.

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ILO Project Code | RAF/08/P52/USA |
| ILO Project Number | P.250.16.100.052 |
| ILO Iris Code | 101418 |
| Country | South Africa, Botswana and Namibia. |
| Duration | 45 months |
| Starting Date | September 2008 |
| Ending Date | June 2012 |
| Project Locations | South Africa, Botswana, and Namibia |
| Project Language | English |
| Executing Agency | ILO-IPEC |
| Financing Agency | US SADOL |
| Donor contribution | USDOL: USD 4,750,000 |

List of Abbreviations

| | |
|---------------|--|
| AIDS | Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome |
| AP | Action Programme |
| APEC | Action Programme on the Elimination of Child labour |
| APSO | Action Programme Summary Outline |
| BLNS | Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia & Swaziland |
| C182 | ILO's Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, No. 182 of 1999 |
| CL | Child Labour |
| CLPA | South African Child Labour Programme of Action |
| DBMR | Direct Beneficiaries Monitoring and Reporting |
| DED | ILO/IPEC Geneva's Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section |
| DWCP | Decent Work Country Programmes |
| HIV | Human Immune Deficiency Virus |
| HQ | Headquarters |
| IA | Implementing Agency |
| ILO | International Labour Organization |
| IO | Immediate Objective |
| IPEC | International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour |
| NAP | National Action Plan |
| NC | National consultant |
| PACC | Project Advisory Committee |
| PRSP | Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper |
| TBP | Time Bound Programme |
| TECL | Towards the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Programme |
| TL | Team leader |
| UNDAF | United Nations Development Assistance Framework |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| USDOL | United States Department of Labor |
| WFCL | Worst Forms of Child Labour |

Background and Justification

1. The aim of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child labour (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. A Time Bound Programme (TBP) is essentially a national strategic programme framework of tightly integrated and coordinated policies and initiatives at different levels to eliminate specified Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) in a given country within a defined period of time. It is a nationally owned initiative that emphasizes the need to address the root causes of child labour, linking action against child labour to the national development effort, with particular emphasis on the economic and social policies to combat poverty and to promote universal basic education. ILO, with the support of many development organizations and the financial and technical contribution of the United States' Department of Labor (USDOL) has elaborated this concept based on previous national and international experience. It has also established innovative technical cooperation modalities to support countries that have ratified the ILO's Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, No. 182 of 1999 (C182) to implement comprehensive measures against WFCL.⁸
3. The most critical element of a TBP is that it is implemented and led by the country itself. The countries commit to the development of a plan to eradicate or significantly diminish the worst forms of child labour in a defined period. This implies a commitment to mobilize and allocate national human and financial resources to combat the problem. The TBP process in Southern Africa is one of 19 programmes frameworks of such nature that are being supported by IPEC at the global level.⁹
4. From the perspective of the International Labour Organization (ILO), the elimination of child labour is part of its work on standards and fundamental principles and rights at work. The fulfilment of these standards should guarantee decent work for all adults. In this sense, the ILO provides technical assistance to its three constituents: government, workers and employers. This tripartite structure is the key characteristic of ILO cooperation and it is within this framework that the activities developed by the Time-Bound Programme should be analyzed. However, it has to be taken into account that TECL's focus was not limited to ordinary 'employment' but also extended to work falling outside the definition of employment.

⁸ More information on the TBP concept can be found in the Time Bound Program Manual for Action Planning (MAP), at <http://www.ilo.org/childlabour>.

⁹ The term "national TBP" normally refers to any national programme or plan of action that provides a strategic framework for or plan for the implementation of Convention 182 on the worst forms of child labour. TBP is a generic term for such frameworks and for a concept or proposed general approach which will be used in different ways in different national contexts. In many cases the terminology TBP is not used even though the process and the framework will have many of general characteristics of the approach. ILO/IPEC has formulated the TBP concept and approach based on the work of ILO and partners. ILO/IPEC is providing support to the TBP process as in the different countries through "projects of support", which is seen as one of the many component projects, interventions and development partner support to the TBP process.

5. ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) have subsequently been developed and are being introduced in the ILO to provide a mechanism to outline agreed upon priorities between the ILO and the national constituent partners within a broader UN and International development context. For further information please see :

<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/decent.htm>

6. The DWCP defines a corporate focus on priorities, operational strategies, as well as a resource and implementation plan that complements and supports partner plans for national decent work priorities. As such, DWCP are broader frameworks to which the individual ILO project is linked and contributes to. DWCP are beginning to be gradually introduced into various countries' planning and implementing frameworks. Out of Towards the Elimination of the Works Forms of Child Labour's II (TECL) 3 programme countries, the DWCP has been finalized for South Africa and Namibia:

<http://www.ilo.org/intranet/english/bureau/program/dwcp/country/africa/south.htm>

<http://www.ilo.org/intranet/english/bureau/program/dwcp/country/africa/namibia.htm>

For Botswana the DWCP has been drafted:

<http://www.ilo.org/intranet/english/bureau/program/dwcp/country/africa/botswana.htm>

Programme TECL II¹⁰ Background

7. The project builds on the achievements of TECL I that supported the implementation of the Child Labour Programme of Action (CLPA) in South Africa and laid the basis for concerted action against child labour in Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and Swaziland, by putting into place National Action Plans (NAPs) on the elimination of child labour. South Africa, Botswana and Namibia have been chosen as the main target countries for TECL II because (a) they had drafted and endorsed NAPs¹¹, (b) had concluded memoranda of understanding with the ILO on steps to eliminate child labour; and (c) had therefore good chances of success for the TECL II interventions. The three countries are all qualified as "medium development".
8. TECL I consisted of 34 projects¹² concentrated in three interconnected programme strategies in BNLS countries:
- *Strengthening the knowledge base and cultivating understanding of child labour*, specifically the worst forms of child labour (through quantitative and qualitative research on selected areas of child labour; and analysis of good practices) among others for policy and programme planning, including at national level;
 - *Building capacity in policy and programme design, implementation and monitoring* (through the development of national plans, policy frameworks and draft regulations in selected areas, training of implementers, monitoring systems and awareness campaigns); and
 - *In South Africa, implementing direct action through pilot projects* in selected areas, in this case primarily to add to the knowledge base on intervention models.
9. For more details please refer to TECL I Final evaluation report¹³. The report's recommendations are presented hereby in Annex II.

¹⁰ The TECL II project is referred to as "programme", except in cases of direct quotations from the project document.

¹¹ The NPA is named in South Africa Child Labor Programme of Action (CLPA). We will use the most generic term of National Action Plan (NAP) for the three countries.

¹² Action Programs accordingly with global IPEC terminology

¹³ IPEC Evaluation "Supporting the Time-bound programme for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in South Africa and laying the basis for concerted action in Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and Swaziland

10. South Africa has been included in TECL II to ensure that government-driven action under the NAP – developed under TECL I – is effective and sustainable. The project aims to ensure that the South Africa experience becomes also a source of learning and good practice in the sub region and beyond.
11. Botswana and Namibia have a relatively well-developed system of social services, and are close to achieving the MDG objective on education.
12. The three countries have ratified the ILO Convention No. 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour.

General Programme approach and strategy

13. All project interventions are embedded in the national action plans (NAPs) on child labour (called APECs in Botswana and Namibia and CLPA-2 in South Africa) and in the legislative framework in each country. Where the legislative framework in a given country has been identified to have gaps in terms of addressing child labour concerns, specific interventions will be designed to assist the country in dealing with these gaps.
14. The programme has the following objectives:
 - Development objective: Contribute to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour and other forms of child labour in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa by supporting the implementation of national plans of action in these countries
 - Immediate objectives¹⁴:
 - By the end of the project, capacity of the key partners will have been strengthened to more effectively *mainstream* child labour issues into legislative and policy frameworks and take action against the worst forms of child labour, and awareness will have been raised among the general public and among key stakeholders (8 outputs)
 - By the end of the project, *models of interventions* (focusing on education and HIV/AIDS) for addressing selected worst forms of child labour and prioritized forms of child labour in *Botswana, Namibia and South Africa* will have been developed, tested and – in South Africa - further mainstreamed through pilot interventions involving direct action programmes. (3 outputs)
15. The focus of all project interventions is ultimately on mainstreaming to achieve maximum scale of impact, including by the direct interventions. At the institutional development level, interventions are designed to strengthen capacity for implementation of the NAPs and for ensuring a coherent legislative basis to support the national plans. At the level of direct action, interventions are designed to pilot interventions that can help operationalize the NAPs. So, while the direct interventions at first instance will target individual children, the overall purpose of the direct action is to test methodologies which, if successful, can be replicated and mainstreamed into government's policies and programmes targeted children. The direct interventions will aim at withdrawing child labourers including from the worst forms of child labour (WFCL) in urban settings (i.e. CSEC (including child trafficking, if applicable) and CUBAC) and in rural areas (work in agriculture, excessive chores interfering with education, and hazardous work), and preventing children in vulnerable situations from falling victim to child labour and its worst forms. In the direct action, a special focus will be on obtaining access to education, on children affected by HIV/AIDS, and children from marginalized communities. In all action programmes, TECL II will be working with the social partners and local civil society organizations to improve government services to child labourers and children at risk. An

TECL I RAF/03/50/USA An independent final evaluation by a team of external consultants". Geneva, September 2008

¹⁴ Outputs are presented in Annex III

important part of the overall strategy is to test how government grants (including cash transfer grants) and other social services provided for in law become accessible to poor households including households in need of assistance due to impact of HIV/AIDS. TECL II will be working towards strengthening the link between the NAPs and existing HIV/AIDS prevention and impact mitigation strategies in the countries.

16. The country specific components of this project will be implemented in support of the NAPs. On the one hand, it will focus on strengthening the plans, in particular in the areas of leveraging resources and establishing linkages with other national policy and programme frameworks. This will strengthen the enabling environment for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour at the macro level. On the other hand, the country components have been designed to reduce to a significant extent the incidence of priority worst forms of child labour as identified by the national stakeholders during the formulation of the plans and the SPIF exercises leading to the formulation of the present project document.
17. The action plans for the three countries propose policy measures and action steps that should be taken by key stakeholders to combat child labour.

Approach pursued South Africa

18. In South Africa, the project approach and strategy for TECL II build on strengthening the work done by the TECL I programme. At the most fundamental level, the strategy is one of mainstreaming child labour issues and concerns into key government policies and programme, where relevant. Then, the objectives for TECL II are to further strengthen the mainstreaming process. It is important to upkeep the assistance to South Africa to ensure a deepening of the mainstreaming efforts, though the assistance will obviously be 'lighter', as a result of the work already done.

Approach pursued in Botswana and Namibia

19. In Botswana and Namibia, the aim of the project is to support, 'kick-start', expand or promote actions and initiatives aimed at the elimination of child labour including the worst forms of child labour and other prioritized forms of child labour. TECL II focuses on once-off activities that lay the groundwork for ongoing sustainable action by government and other stakeholders, including employers' and workers' organizations. This is done within the framework of the NAP in each country, which provides the context for programming. TECL II is seen by stakeholders in Botswana and Namibia as an integral and logical element of the NAPs.

Key highlights of current status of the TECL II Programme

20. In the three countries the Project Advisory Committees (PACC) are now fully on board.
21. Awareness creation campaigns continued through mobilization of the public, media, and social partners commenced throughout 2009 by using the print media, radio and will continue up to the end of the project.
22. All three countries have identified implementing partners with whom they are developing APSOs. In each of the countries the APSOs are at different levels of development. South Africa has 5 APSOs. Between Botswana and Namibia they have developed each one, two APSOs which are in the pipeline and four remaining to be finalized; two in Botswana and two in Namibia.
23. All three countries have carried out training and orientation of the implementing partners to get them ready for smooth implementation of the APSOs as well as DBMR training.
24. In July 2010 it was agreed a 3 months no-cost extension of TECL II (from March to June 2012). This decision had basically budget implications. No programmatic adjustments were decided.

25. South Africa

- The implementation of the NAP was conceived on the premise that most of the actions within the plan will deal with the underlying causes of child labour; mainly poverty and lack of access to education. The Intersectoral Committee (IC) chairperson included their field staff from provinces to the IC monthly meeting. Currently a senior officer the Director of Employment Standards chairs the meetings.
- The Department of Social Development has ensured that the National Policy Framework and Strategic Plan focused more on preventing and reducing the incidences as well as management of child abuse, neglect, exploitation of children. The plan is based on four areas; early intervention, prevention, statutory intervention and reunification, and operationally it addressed awareness raising, service delivery, training & capacity building.
- The Department of Water and Environmental Affairs has launched an accelerated programme to deliver clean water and sanitation to rural areas and informal settlement by the year 2016. If this is achieved, the child labour dimension of household chores (water fetching) should be minimized if not eliminated.
- The Minister of Labour requested the technical staff in the department to work out a proposal to establish a national child labour day for South Africa in March 2011.
- The project started implementation of three Action Programmes in May 2010 in two economic sectors, for prevention and withdrawal. In addition, the project supported Fair Trade Tourism in South Africa to launch the code of conduct in the tourism sector. In January 2010, South Africa promulgated the list of hazardous occupations.
- The project has started to build capacity of their partners and the communities within which they operate.
- The Government Statistics Department finalized, with technical support from the project, a Child Labour module which to be attached to the Labour Force Survey.

26. Botswana:

- The country has drafted hazardous list of occupations for children and it is a stage of circulating for review by relevant Ministries, before it is taken to the Attorney General Chambers for gazetting.
- The Government has finalized the comprehensive review of national legislation regarding child labour issues.
- Child labour and Decent Work Country Program has been mainstreamed in the National Development Plan. Child labour also has been extensively addressed in the Children's Act of 2009 which is now taking precedence over other pieces of legislation having a bearing on children's welfare.
- Some government departments have developed their child labour institutional work plans.
- The first pilot training with the Turin Training Centre on "Modern Policy & Legislative Responses to Child Labour was completed in December 2009. It is expected that the Law Faculty at the University of Botswana will mainstream the module in the department's teaching curriculum.

27. Namibia:

- Protection of children's rights was on the agenda of Parliament at the beginning of the current session (2010), as well as in parliamentary reports of the Namibian Parliament throughout August 2010.

- The PACC in Namibia continues to be involved in project activities under the senior leadership of the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare. They meet bi - monthly and as and when the need arises.
- The Ministry of Education took a lead in mainstreaming child labour in the Ministerial plan. It went further to initiate integration of many of their activities in future budgets and sensitized their regional education managers on child labour countrywide as a resource leveraging mechanism. It is currently discussing the possibility of integrating a curriculum to pre-service teachers, lawyers and social workers.
- Child labour has been anchored and mainstreamed also in the National Development Plan. Additionally, Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs has resolved to report quarterly on actions targeting child labour in the Poverty eradication drive initiated by the president.
- Based on a request from the President of Namibia, The Ministry of Labour is currently taking the lead, conducting investigations countrywide on cases of child labour and this is conducted in collaboration with the Ministry of Gender and Child Welfare, Ministry of Education and law enforcement officials.
- The workers' and employers' organizations, Namibia National Workers Union and the Namibia Employer's Federation are in the process of drafting action plans. The workers' organization, in addition, drafted a policy on child labour. The work plans and child labour policy documents are at different stages of finalization. The employers will focus on the agriculture sector while the workers will focus their programme on the charcoal mining sector.
- Namibia is currently in the process of strengthening their commitment towards all ratified UN conventions and that include the ILO conventions under the TECL II project.

Scope and Purpose

Scope

28. The evaluation will cover the TECL II programme in South Africa, Botswana and Namibia. It will focus on the ILO/IPEC programme mentioned above, its achievements and its contribution to the overall national efforts to achieve the elimination of WFCL. The evaluation should focus on all the activities that have been implemented since the start of the projects to the moment of the field visits. (i.e. action programmes/projects)
29. The evaluation should look at the programme as a whole, including issues of initial project design, implementation, lessons learnt, replicability and recommendations for current and future programmes.
30. The contribution of IPEC to the national TBP process normally covers the promotion of an enabling environment, and the role of technical advisor or facilitator of the process of developing and implementing the national TBP strategic programme framework. In order to access the degree to which this contribution has been made, the evaluation will have to take into account relevant factors and developments in the national process.
31. The evaluation should cover expected (i.e. planned) and unexpected results in terms of non planned outputs and outcomes (i.e. side effects or externalities). Some of these unexpected changes could be as relevant as the ones planned. Therefore, the evaluation team should reflect on them for learning purposes.

1.1.1 Purpose

32. The main purposes of the mid-term evaluation are:
- To review the ongoing progress and performance of the programme (extent to which immediate objectives have been achieved and outputs delivered),
 - To examine the likelihood of the programme achieving its objectives,
 - To examine the delivery of the programme inputs/activities and,
 - To investigate on nature and magnitude of constraints, the factors affecting programme implementation and an analysis of factors contributing to the programme's success. The evaluation should aim to identify any emerging potential good practices.
33. The mid-term evaluation should provide all stakeholders (i.e. the project management team and IPEC) with information to assess and revise, as it is needed, work plans, strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements and resources. It should identify the potential impact on mainstreaming policy and strategies and suggest a possible way forward for the future. Specifically it should evaluate the mainstreaming strategy and structures in place and mechanisms to reach TECL II programme's objectives, whether they are the most effective and how they could be improved. The evaluation should further explore and suggest ways to improve the extent of active involvement of government departments and other social partners to the TECL programme.
34. Therefore, the evaluation analytical scope should include identifying levels of achievement of objectives and explaining how and why have been attained in such ways (and not in other alternative expected ways, if it would be the case. The purpose is to help the stakeholders to learn from the on going experience.

Suggested Aspects to be Addressed

35. The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the ILO Guideline, the specific ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.
36. The evaluation will address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability to the extent possible as defined in the ILO Guidelines to Results-Based Evaluation: principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations', Version 1, January 2010 For gender concerns see: ILO Guidelines on "Considering Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation of ILO Programmes and Projects," 2007 (further information is also available at www.ilo.org/gender).
37. In line with results-based framework approach used by ILO-IPEC for identifying results at global, strategic and project level, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analyzing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the Immediate Objectives of the project using data from the logical framework indicators.
38. Annex I contains specific suggested aspects 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 ILO/IPEC Geneva's Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED) and TECL. It is not expected that the evaluation address all of the questions detailed in the Annex; however the evaluation must address the general areas of focus. **The evaluation instrument should identify the general areas of focus listed here as well as other priority aspects to be addressed in the evaluation.**

39. Below are the main categories that need to be addressed:

- Design
- Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness) of Objectives
- Relevance of the project
- Sustainability
- Special Aspects to be Addressed

| |
|---|
| Expected Outputs of the Evaluation |
|---|

40. The expected outputs to be delivered by the evaluation team are:

- A desk review of appropriate material
- Preparation of an evaluation instrument, reflecting the combination of tools and detailed instruments needed to address the range of selected aspects. The instrument needs to make provision for the triangulation of data where possible.
- Field visit to South Africa, Botswana and Namibia
- Stakeholder workshops facilitated by the evaluator leader in Pretoria, Gaborne and Windhoek (including pre-workshop programme and briefing note)
- Draft evaluation report. The evaluation report should include and reflect on findings from the field visits and stakeholder workshops proceedings
- Mid term evaluation report including:
 - Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
 - Clearly identified findings
 - A table presenting the key results (i.e. figures and qualitative results) achieved per objective (expected and unexpected)
 - Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations
 - Lessons learnt
 - Potential good practices and effective models of intervention.
 - Appropriate Annexes including present TORs
 - Standard evaluation instrument matrix

41. The total length of the report should be a maximum of 30 pages for the 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.

42. 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.

43. The final report will be circulated to key stakeholders (those participants present at stakeholder evaluation workshop will be considered key stakeholders), including TECL 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.

Evaluation Methodology

44. 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 and TECL II, provided that the research and analysis suggest changes and provided that the indicated range of questions is addressed, the purpose maintained and the expected outputs produced at the required quality.
45. The evaluation team leader will be asked to include as part of the specific evaluation instrument to be developed, the standard evaluation instruments that ILO/IPEC has developed for documenting and analyzing achievements of the projects and contributions of the projects (Action Programmes) to the programme.
46. The evaluation will be carried out using a desk review of appropriate materials, including the project documents, progress reports, outputs of the programme and the projects (action programmes), results of any internal planning process and relevant materials from secondary sources. At the end of the desk review period, it is expected that the evaluation consultant will prepare a brief document indicating the methodological approach to the evaluation in the form of the evaluation instrument, to be discussed and approved by DED and provided to TECL II for input prior to the commencement of the field mission.
47. The evaluation team will carry out a detailed desk review. The team leader will provide guidance and technical support to the national consultants.
48. The evaluation team leader will interview the donor representatives and ILO/IPEC HQ and regional backstopping officials through conference calls early in the evaluation process, preferably during the desk review phase.
49. The evaluation team will undertake field visits to programme locations in South Africa, Botswana as well as to Namibia. The evaluators will conduct interviews with project partners and implementing agencies, direct beneficiaries (i.e. children) and teachers and facilitate a workshop towards the end of the field visits in each country.
50. The selection of the field visits locations should be based on criteria to be defined by the evaluation team. Some criteria to consider include:
 - Locations with successful and unsuccessful results from the perception of key stakeholders. The rationale is that extreme cases, at some extent, are more helpful than averages for understanding how process worked and results have been obtained
 - Locations that have been identified as providing particular good practices or bringing out particular key issues as identified by the desk review and initial discussions.
 - Areas known to have high prevalence of child labour.
 - Locations next to and not so close to main roads
51. The three national workshops will be attended by IPEC staff (i.e. TECL) and key stakeholders (i.e. partners), including the donor as appropriate. These events will be an opportunity for the evaluation team to gather further data, present the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations and obtain feedback. These meetings will take place towards the end of the fieldwork in each country.

52. The consultant will be responsible for organizing the methodology of the workshop. The identification of the number of participants of the workshop and logistics will be the responsibility of the project team in consultation with the evaluation team leader
53. The team leader will be responsible for drafting and finalizing 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 evaluator 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.
54. The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the IPEC-DED section and with the logistical support of the programme office in Pretoria and with the administrative support of the ILO office in Pretoria. DED will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting it to the team leader.
55. It is expected that the evaluation team will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct and follow the UN evaluation standards and norms.

The team responsibilities and profile

56. Team leader (International consultant):

| Responsibilities | Profile |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of programme documents • Development of the evaluation instrument • Briefing with ILO/IPEC-DED • Telephone interviews with IPEC HQ desk officer, donor • Technical guidance to national consultant • Undertake field visits in South Africa, Botswana and Namibia • Facilitate stakeholder workshop • Draft evaluation report • Finalize evaluation report | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Not have been involved in the project.</u> • Relevant background in social and/or economic development. • Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institutional building and local development projects. • Experience in evaluations in the UN system or other international context as team leader • Relevant sub-regional experience • Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework and operational dimension are highly appreciated. • Experience at policy level and in the area of education and legal issues would also be appreciated. • Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience including preferably international and national development frameworks in particular PRSP and UNDAF. • Fluency in English is essential • Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings. |

57. National consultant (South Africa, Botswana and Namibia):

| Responsibilities | Profile |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of programme documents • Contribute to the development of the evaluation instrument • Organize interviews of stakeholders and field visits in the country • Co-Facilitate stakeholder workshop (under the team leader leadership) • Contribute to the evaluation report through systematizing data collected and providing analytical inputs • Others as required by the team leader | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant background in country social and/or economic development. • Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institutional building and local development projects. • Relevant country experience, preferably prior working experience in child labour. • Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework are highly appreciated. • Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings. • Fluency in English (and other national relevant language) essential • Knowledge of local languages in the field visit areas an asset • Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience desirable. |

1.1.2 Evaluation Timetable and Schedule

58. 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.
59. The evaluation team will be engaged for six workweeks. Three weeks of them will be for on field activities (i.e. data collection, interviews and stakeholders workshop) in country in South Africa, Botswana and Namibia).
60. The timetable is as follows:

| Phase | Responsible Person | Tasks | No of days | |
|-------|---|---|------------|------|
| | | | TL | NC |
| I | Evaluation team | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Briefing with ILO/IPEC Desk Review of programme related documents Telephone briefing with IPEC DED, donor, IPEC HQ and ILO regional | 5 | 2 |
| II | Team leader and national consultants with logistical support by project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-country to South Africa, Botswana and Namibia for consultations with programme staff Consultations with ILO Office in Pretoria Consultations with TECL programme staff /management Interviews with programme staff and partners Field visits Consultations with girls and boys, parents and other beneficiaries | 19 | 8 |
| III | Stakeholder Workshop | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop with key stakeholders Sharing of preliminary findings | 3 | 1 |
| IV | Evaluation team leader | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft report based on consultations from field visits and desk review, and workshop for South Africa, Lesotho and Namibia Debriefing | 7 | 2 |
| V | DED | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Circulate draft report to key stakeholders Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader | 0 | 0 |
| VI | Evaluation team leader | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included | 2 | 1 |
| TOTAL | | | 36 | 14x3 |

TL: Team leader

NC: National consultant

61. Summary schedule

| Phase | Duration | Dates |
|--------|----------|---|
| I | 7 days | February 24 th – March 4 th |
| II-III | 21 days | March 7 th - 26 th |
| IV | 14 day | March 28 th – April 1 st |
| V | 14 days | April 4 th – April 18 ^h |
| VI | 2 days | April 20 th – 24 th |

62. 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 reports of partner agencies • Other studies and research undertaken • Action Programme Summary Outlines • Project files • National workshop proceedings or summaries • National Action Plans • TECL website information |

63. Consultations with:

- TECL project management and staff
- ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials
- Partner agencies
- Child labour programs in the country
- Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups
- Government stakeholders (e.g. representatives from Department Labour, Social Development etc)
- Government representatives, legal authorities etc as identified by evaluation team
- National Partners in the CLPA involved in the further development, enhancement and implementation of national processes
- National Steering Committee
- Policy makers
- Direct beneficiaries, i.e. boys and girls (taking ethical consideration into account.)
- Parents of boys and girls
- Community members as identified by the project management and evaluation team leader
- USDOL (by telephone)
- US Embassy staff (i.e. Regional Labor Officers) in the three countries

Final Report Submission Procedure

64. For independent evaluations, the following procedure is used:

- The evaluator 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 **evaluator** by date agreed between DED and the evaluator 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.

Resources and Management

Resources

65. The resources required for this evaluation are:

- For the evaluation team leader:
 - Fees for an international consultant for 36 work days
 - Fees for local DSA in project locations in South Africa, Botswana and Namibia
 - Travel from consultant's home residence to South Africa, Botswana and Namibia in line with ILO regulations and rules
- For national consultants
 - Fees for 3 national consultants for 14 days each
- For the evaluation exercise as a whole:
 - Fees for local travel in-country
 - Stakeholder workshop expenditures in Pretoria, Botswana and Namibia
 - Any other miscellaneous costs.

A detailed budget is available separately.

Management

66. 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 Pretoria will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission.

ANNEX I: Suggested Aspects to Address

Design

- Determine the validity of TECL II's design, the effectiveness of the methodologies and strategies employed and whether it assisted or hindered the achievement of TECL II's goals as set out in the Project Document.
- Assess whether the programme design was logical and coherent and took into account the institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders.
- Assess the internal and external logic of the programme (degree to which the programme fits into existing mainstreaming activities that would impact on child labour).
- Analyze whether available information on the socio-economic, cultural and political situation in South Africa, Botswana and Namibia was taken into consideration at the time of the design and whether these were reflected in the design of the programme.
- To what extent were external factors identified and assumptions identified at the time of design? Have these underlying assumptions on which the programme has been based proven to be true?
- Assess whether the problems and needs were adequately analyzed 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 programme design take into account local efforts already underway to address child labour and promote educational opportunities for targeted children and existing capacity to address these issues?
- Are the time frame for programme implementation and the sequencing of programme activities logical and realistic? If not, what changes are needed to improve them?
- Is the strategy for sustainability of programme results defined clearly at the design stage of the programme?
- How relevant are programme indicators and means of verification? Please assess the usefulness of the indicators for monitoring and measuring impact. More specifically, have the IPEC indicators used to measure the programme been appropriate for TECL II, in light of the focus on direct action programmes in combination with mainstreaming activities?
- What lessons were learned, if any, in the process of conducting baseline survey for the identification of target children?
- Were the objectives of the programme clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)?
- Were the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives clear and logical? Do the projects designed under the programme provide clear linkages and complement each other regarding the programme strategies and programme components of intervention? Specifically regarding:
 - Programme strategies:
 - Policy, programme planning, research and documentation;
 - Capacity building
 - Targeted action social partners (direct action)
 - Programme Component of Intervention:
 - Capacity building;
 - Policy development and legislation;
 - Monitoring and enforcement;

- Awareness raising;
- Social mobilization; and
- Education

Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness) of Objectives

- Examine the preparatory outputs of the delivery process in terms of timeliness and identifying the appropriate resources/persons to implement the process.
- Assess the effectiveness 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 programme outputs in terms of quality and quantity; were they delivered in a timely manner?
- Assess whether the programme is in process of achieving its immediate objectives, especially in regards to meeting the target of withdrawing and preventing children by means of the pilot interventions.
- Review whether the technical guidance provided by programme staff, partner organizations and relevant ILO units (including ILO Geneva, Area Office Pretoria, and Regional Office) was adequate in terms of nature and extent. How has this advanced / hindered the programmes work?
- Is the programme meeting its stated purpose and outputs in the project document? If not, what were the factors that contributed to the programme's delay and were they justifiable?
- Have unplanned outputs and results been identified and if so, why were they necessary and to what extent are significant to achieve project objectives?
- Assess the programme monitoring system including the PMP, work plans, processes or systems.
- Evaluate the programme's data collection strategies
- How did positive and negative factors outside of the control of the programme affect programme implementation and programme objectives and how did the programme deal with these external factors?
- Assess the programme's gender mainstreaming activities.
- How effective were the APs, research projects, and policy projects, and how are they contributing to the project meeting its immediate objectives?
- How was the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners to develop effective action against child labour enhanced as a result of programme activities?
- To what extent were rapid assessments, policy papers, discussion documents, and other forms of project research shared with relevant stakeholders and linked to programme activities?
- How is the programme responding to obstacles (both foreseen and unforeseen) that arose throughout the implementation process? Has the programme team been able to adapt the implementation process in order to overcome these obstacles without hindering the effectiveness of the programme?

Enabling environment (Capacity Building)

- What has been the level of achievement of the program in strengthening the National Steering Committee and Implementation Committee in each country? What were the key factors for it?
- Examine any networks that have been built between organizations and government agencies working to address child labour on the national, provincial and local levels.

- How effective has the programme been at stimulating interest and participation in the programme at the local and national level?
- Analyze if / how the NAP and other IPEC programmes in the programme countries coordinated with each other and with sub-regional initiatives? Were interventions complementary or competitive? Were there synergies of impact and resource sharing initiatives in place? How do these relationships affect implementation?
- How effectively has the programme leveraged resources (e.g., by collaborating with non-IPEC initiatives and other programmes launched in support of the NAP processes thus far)?
- How successful has the programme been in mainstreaming the issue of child labour into ongoing efforts in areas such as education, alternative employment promotion and poverty reduction?
- How relevant and effective were the studies commissioned by the programme in terms of affecting the national debates on child labour?
- Examine how the ILO/IPEC project interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.
- Assess to what extent the planning, monitoring and evaluation tools have been promoted by the programme for use at the level of NAP and by other partners.
- Assess the influence of the programme on national data collection and poverty monitoring or similar process (such as CLMS) processes.
- Assess the extent to which the ILO/IPEC programme of support has been able to mobilize resources, policies, programmes, partners and activities to be part of the NAP.
- Assess the quality and extent of dissemination (i.e. utility) of situation analysis and rapid assessments produced for the WFCL and children affected by HIV/AIDS

Direct Targeted Action

- Do the IPEC programme and project partners understand the definitions and their use (i.e. withdrawal and prevented, in the pilot projects) and do the partners have similar understanding of the terminology used? Please assess whether the programme is accurately able to report on direct beneficiaries based on partners' understanding of the definitions/terminology.
- Assess the effectiveness of the different projects (action programmes) implemented and their contribution to the immediate objectives of the programme. Has the capacity of community level agencies and organizations been strengthened to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate actions to prevent and eliminate child labour? Has the entire target population been reached? Were the expected outputs delivered in a timely manner, with the appropriate quantity and quality?
- To what extent have children and families affected by HIV/AIDS been selected as a specific target group?
- What kinds of benefits have the target beneficiaries gained?
- How effective were the strategies implemented for child labour monitoring? Are the initiatives on child labour monitoring likely to be sustainable?
- Assess the process for documenting and disseminating pilot projects: scale-up, lessons, etc.
- Identify whether actions have been taken to ensure the access of girls/other vulnerable groups to services and resources.
- Assess the criteria for selecting beneficiaries and implementing agencies for the projects.

Relevance of the Project

- Examine whether the programme responded to the real needs of the beneficiaries and stakeholders.
- Assess validity of the programme approach and strategies and its potential to be replicated.
- Assess whether the problems and needs that gave rise to the programme still exists or have changed.
- Assess the appropriateness of the sectors/target groups and locations chosen to develop the projects based on the finding of baseline surveys.
- How is this programme supporting and contributing to the NAP? Do local stakeholders perceive the country's NAP as different as and broader than the IPEC programme of support to the NAP?
- How did the strategy used in this project fit in with the NAP, national education and anti-poverty efforts, and interventions carried out by other organizations? Did the programme remain consistent with and supportive of the NAP?
- Did the strategy address the different needs and roles, constraints, access to resources of the target groups, with specific reference to the strategy of mainstreaming and thus the relevant partners, especially in government?

Sustainability

- Assess to what extent a phase out strategy was defined and planned and what steps were being taken to ensure sustainability (i.e. government involvement). Assess whether these strategies had been articulated/explained to stakeholders.
- Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners.
- Examine whether socio-cultural and gender aspects endanger the sustainability of the programme and assess whether actions have been taken to sensitize local institutions and target groups on these issues.
- Assess programme success in leveraging resources for ongoing and continuing efforts to prevent and eliminate child labour in the context of the NAP. Analyze the level of private sector / employers' organizations support to the NAP, paying specific attention to how these groups participate in programme activities.

Specific Aspects to be addressed:

- Analyze interactions of the project staff with three Governments' Departments and other key stakeholders. So far, assess these interactions in terms of being conducive to sustainable CL Action Plan. How can the roles of the government, the ILO-IPEC and other stakeholders be more effective within the framework of the programme?
- How can each stakeholder have a better contribution (based on its own resources and capacities) in favouring replication of the good practices or experiences by other stakeholders?
- Has the project being able to create alliances with key strategic partners who are not yet involved in the CL fight in each country - for example the national agencies in charge of HIV/AIDS issues in each country, the Ministry of Agriculture, and any other relevant partners.
- To what extent are local/community level stakeholders aware of the negative consequences of the WFCL and mobilized to combat it?

- Has the project been able to facilitate that the experience of South Africa policy on CL (as supported by the project) contributed to Botswana and Namibia CL policy developments?
- How the program is particularly addressed HIV/AIDS issues linked to CL and how could be increased support in this area (i.e. ILO IPEC and other stakeholders)?
- What is/has been the degree of involvement/participation of children in project activities?
- Has child labour been fully integrated in the DWCP for the three countries? How does the TECL II project partner with the DCWP teams in the countries especially the social partners?
- Were there any lessons learned from the TECL I project that are being applied in the current TECL II project?

ANNEX II: Recommendations of the final evaluation of TECL I¹⁵

A future design programme must include:

- Be more realistic and focused – distinction between ‘must-have’ and ‘nice-to-have’
- Apart from working with government, support should be provided to Workers and Employers Organisations. The possibility of working with a trade union federation and providing resources and technical assistance to them to develop a policy on child labour so that it is placed on their agenda, and mainstreamed into their operations, would be quite an achievement
- Attribution must be clearly defined, what is TECL responsible for and that is within their control
- The design of Action programmes must ensure the active participation of the Implementing Agents, so that there is buy-in and ownership.
- TECL must incorporate a gender analysis in the design phase and plan for gender mainstreaming
- The next 5 years is crucial especially in South Africa as it enters the second 5year phase of implementation, hence sustainability must be built into the design phase so it remains a conscious focus for the next period. If there was a TECL III South Africa should be in a position to assist other countries in consolidating the implementation of their country programmes and not be a recipient of direct TECL support. That would be proof of real progress and sustainable action.
- If the budget allows some sub-regional activities in terms of sharing and learning should be built into the design. This is the face-to-face forums where key stakeholders from each country can participate in an annual or bi-annual (2year) event that brings them together at a sub-regional level to share learning.

TECL must:

- Increase their staff compliment including employing a coordinator in Botswana and Namibia. Measures must be taken to find the right person for the job because this is a critical challenge but it must be a permanent employee and not a consultant. If the correct skills base is developed, this person could potentially become the focal person appointed by the Ministry.
- In appointment of staff and consultants TECL must carefully consider transformation, representation and diversity, and there is no contradiction in this and the point above.
- Continue to explore with ILO-IPEC possibilities for a more efficient and simplified reporting and procurement process. The CTA would usually be a very senior person (and should be) and able to sign off on more than is currently possible. ILO-IPEC should put mechanisms for accountability in place and ensure that appropriate systems are upheld.

TECL must continue to support the implementation of TECL II in the identified countries and:

- Ensure that its role is spelt out clearly (whether it is facilitator, implementer or both)
- In South Africa, costing of the NAP must be completed with Cabinet giving a clear time frame for this to be concluded
- TECL should continue to support interventions with targeted departments

¹⁵ IPEC Evaluation “Supporting the Time-bound programme for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in South Africa and laying the basis for concerted action in Botswana, Lesotho, Namibia and Swaziland TECL I RAF/03/50/USA An independent final evaluation by a team of external consultants”. Geneva, September 2008

- In BLNS countries, the lessons learnt from South Africa should be used when supporting implementation of the NAPs
- A country coordinator must be appointed in Botswana and Namibia accountable to TECL and have a reporting function to the PACC

The SADOL must have a dedicated focal person for child labour to lead the next phase of implementation of the NAP. The role of this person should be amongst others to:

- Drive the implementation of the NAP in government
- Chair the IC
- Coordinate and facilitate processes in departments
- Work closely with TECL who should provide the technical assistance

The IC and PACC's must be reviewed, and restructured if necessary and include:

- A dedicated and mandated representative that must have this included in their KPA's, thereby ensuring accountability. A second person must be identified in case the first mandated representative is not available but this has to be at the same level.
- The role of the IC in terms of ensuring compliance to actions in the NAP must be clarified as well as whether they are only a coordinating structure or whether they have the mandate to ensure compliance. If not, there should be clarity on where this authority is vested and how does one ensure action from a higher structure (DDG forum).

Some mediation must take place between the Area Office in Pretoria and TECL where:

- Roles, parameters and expectations are clarified
- Where existing tensions are addressed and resolved

Child labour monitoring systems must be put in place, synergised with existing departmental systems but able to act as a stand-alone system for providing the necessary information required for monitoring child labour.

With Direct Action:

- Organisations must be identified early in the process so that impact and sustainability are more discernable.
- A model of using bigger organisations to work with smaller organisations doing similar work and in a partnership model (see CINDI example in Kwazulu Natal) is a useful one to explore. This will improve the chances of building more sustainable organisations and interventions over a period of 3-4 years. The criteria for such a partnership is vital so that smaller organisations are not disrespected or 'colonised' in the process

For impact and sustainability it would make sense to use the same team of TECL I (although expanded). A new team would spend at least half of the time establishing relationships, getting to know government systems, becoming acquainted with departmental policies, and so forth and much time will be lost in the process. It is important to immediately build on the gains made in TECL I and address the outstanding work that must be done. This is the priority for TECL II.

Annex III: TECL II objectives and outputs

| DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE | Contribute to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour and other forms of child labour in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa by supporting the implementation of national plans of action in these countries. |
|---|---|
| IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE | OUTPUTS |
| <p>I/O 1 By the end of the project capacity of the key partners will have been strengthened to more effectively <i>mainstream</i> child labour issues into legislative and policy frameworks and take action against the worst forms of child labour, and awareness will have been raised among the general public and among key stakeholders.</p> | <p>1.1. Labour laws and other relevant legislation revised (where necessary) to better respond to the requirements in C138 and C182 and provide a better foundation for eliminating of child labour, incl. the worst forms of child labour, and incl. support to children affected by HIV/AIDS. Where legislation has been revised, tools are drafted to assist with the implementation of the revised legislation.</p> <p>1.2. Draft lists and regulations on hazardous work (where relevant) and finalize notice re legal definition of prohibited child labour based on the knowledge base available (where relevant).</p> <p>1.3. Knowledge tools (including lessons learned, guidelines and expert database) to support NPA taking action against perpetrators exploiting children in the worst forms of child labour (incl. CSEC, child trafficking and CUBAC) and other forms of child labour developed.</p> <p>1.4. Capacity building exercises for key stakeholders conducted using developed training modules, tools and manuals.</p> <p>1.5. The adoption process of the NAPs by appropriate bodies in each target country is clearly identified and supported and draft monitoring and evaluation systems for these national plans of action produced or proposed.</p> <p>1.6. Capacity of the <i>education sector</i> strengthened to combat child labour through the adaptation of the SCREAM Education Pack</p> <p>1.7. Situation analyses and rapid assessments produced and disseminated incl. studies on the worst forms of child labour and children affected by HIV/AIDS.</p> <p>1.8. National <i>awareness raising</i> campaigns on child labour, incl. the worst forms of child labour, designed and implemented in each of the target countries, and lessons learned shared within the sub-region, including with relevant stakeholders in Lesotho, Swaziland, and other countries of the sub-region</p> |
| <p>I/O 2 By the end of the project <i>models of interventions</i> (focusing on education and HIV/AIDS) for addressing selected worst forms of child labour and prioritized forms of child labour in <i>Botswana, Namibia and South Africa</i> will have been developed, tested and – in South Africa - further mainstreamed through pilot interventions involving direct action programmes.</p> | <p>2.1. 2,800 children withdrawn and 5,600 children prevented from child labour, incl. the worst forms of child labour, through direct action programmes providing services or monitoring of up-scaled government services.</p> <p>2.2. Strategies and tools for effective monitoring of the direct beneficiaries in action programmes are developed or improved and operational.</p> <p>2.3. Action programmes (APs) models documented, and strategies for dissemination, replication and mainstreaming of lessons learned and good practices deriving from the direct APs into relevant government policies and programmes developed.</p> |

Annex 2: List of Organizations/Persons interviewed

United States Department of Labour

- Ms Malaika Jeter (by telephone)

ILO Geneva

- Programme Officer (Ms Nadine Osseiran)

SOUTH AFRICA

ILO Office, South Africa:

- Director (Mr Vic van Vuuren)
- Senior Child Labour Specialist (Mr Yaw Ofosu)
- Workers Specialist (Ms Inviolata Chinyangara)
- Employers Specialist (Ms Rose Anang)
- Chief Technical Advisor TECL II (Ms Grace Banyana)
- National Programme Coordinator South Africa TECL II (Ms Francisca Velaphi)

Department of Labour:

- Executive Manager (Mr Virgil Seafield)
- Manager (Ms Mathilde Bergmann)

Department of Basic Education

- Deputy Director, Rural Education (Mr Jerry Zitha)

South African Police Services

- Chief Director, Policing of Vulnerable Children, Visible Policing Division (Lt Col. Leon du Toit)
- Victim Empowerment Coordinator, Hillbrow community, Johannesburg (Capt Magowa)

Department of Social Welfare

- Manager, Social Work & Policy (Ms Gyan Dwarika)
- Director, Social Crime Protection (Mr Steven Masclesele)
- Social Worker, Benoni (Ms Lerato Gisela Mekgwé)

Consultant and former CTA of ILO Human Trafficking Project

- Ms Astrid Coyne-Jensen

National Council of Trade Unions

- Ms Pauline Nkosi

South Africa Human Rights Commission

- Manager Public Participation & Dialogue (Mr Twadi Komane)

Fair Trade in Tourism:

- Project Coordinator (Ms Julia Kandzia)
- Executive Assistant (Ms Netsai Sibanda)

New Life Centre

- Operational Manager and Co-Founder (Ms Babalwa Makawula)
- Focus group discussion with 15 prevention beneficiaries
- Individual interviews with 4 withdrawal beneficiary girls (CSEC)

Kids Haven

- Assistant Director, Programme Manager (Mr Sam Mokgopha)
- Community Development Worker/DBMR Administrator (Mr Kgadi Maphoto)
- Individual interviews with 5 beneficiary boys (CUBAC)

BOTSWANA

United States Embassy

- Political Officer (Mr Jacob Johnson) (telephone consultation)

ILO-IPEC TECL

- National Programme Coordinator (Ms Marianyana Selelo)

Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs:

- Permanent Secretary (Ms Segakweng Tsiane)
- Deputy Permanent Secretary (Mr Lucky Moahi)
- Labour Commissioner (Ms Rose Sennanyana)

Ministry of Education:

- Principal Education Officer II, Dept.of Primary Education (Ms Bineo Bosa Modimakwane)

Ministry of Local Government and Social Services

- Senior Social Worker, Child Protection Division (Ms G.N. Manne)

APEC Monitoring & Evaluation Consultant

- Mr Joe Ssegawa

Botswana Federation of Trade Unions:

- Administrative Officer (Mr Handy Motiki)

Botswana Confederation of Commerce Industry & Manpower:

- Membership Services Manager (Mr Lefeletse Ketlaaleka)
- Member of Business Council, Palapye (Ms Maitumelo Maforaga)

Humana People to People Botswana:

- Country Director (Mr Moses Zulu)
- Programme Manager (Mr Segametsi Mashumba)
- Project Leader (Ms Precious Balone)
- Outreach Officers (Ms Bigani Dan; Mr Tikelo Mmusi; Ms Khutsafalo; Ms Matshidiso Keabetswe; Ms Mpho Ramasoto; Boitumelo Lekgobo)
- Programme Officer (Mr Leburu Garpongwe)
- Project Counsellor (Ms Virginia Loaneka)

Childline Botswana:

- Programme Officer (Mr Olebile Machete)
- Field Supervisor (Mrs Malikongwa)
- Outreach Officer (Ms Gaolebe Sentsho)

Tsamaye (North East District) Child Labour Committee members:

- Chief, and Chair of CLC (Mr Fordson Sigwele)
- Area Social Worker (Mr Thomas Mpenya)
- School Head (Ms Annah Pelaelo)

UNICEF

- (Mr Peter Ross)

NAMIBIA

U.S. Embassy:

- Political Officer (Ms Emily Plumb)

ILO

- TECL II National Programme Coordinator (Ms Simonee Shihepo)
- TECL II Namibia Administrative Assistant (Ms Stella)

Ministry of Labour & Social Welfare:

- Deputy Director International Affairs (Mr Chris Horne)
- Deputy Director Labour Inspectorate (Mr Felix Musukumbili)

Ministry of Education

- Chief Inspector of Education Audit & Standards (Ms Albertina Nangolo)

Ministry of Gender Equaity and Child Welfare

- Chief Social Worker (Ms Loide Nekundi)

Ministry of Safety & Security

- Women and Child Protection Division (Inspector Cronje)

Ministry of Youth, National Service, Sports and Culture

- Child Justice Officer, Child Justice Unit (Ms Hilya Imene)

Namibia Employers Federation:

- Secretary General (Mr Tim Parkhouse)
- Occupational Safety & Health Officer (Mr Antonio Kakoro)

Legal Assistance Centre (LAC)

- Project Officer for TECL/AP (Mr William Magenya)
- M&E Officer (Mr Toino Hanhapo)
- Project Coordinator, Aids Law Unit (Mr Amon Ngavetene)

Tsumeb Councillor

- Honourable Lebbius Tobias

LAC field project

- Legal Educator (Mr Immanuel Iita)
- Rights Monitors (Hileni Kandingula, Ndali Nakwafila, Hofni Haunyela)
- Interviews with 5 beneficiary children

Annex 3: Documents reviewed or consulted

TECL II

- Prodoc for TECL II
- Technical Progress Reports: September 2009; March 2010; September 2010
- Newsletter
- TECL I Final Evaluation Report

South Africa

- Guidelines for the prevention and response to child exploitation, 2nd draft DSD
- Draft strategy on Child exploitation DSD Feb 2011
- Website 12 June 2010 Go for the Goal
- Manual: Addressing CL in South Africa 2008 IC/CLPA (excellent)
- Fair Trade in Tourism
- CLPA for South Africa Phase 2 2008-2012
- ILO Decent Work Country Programme 2010-2014
- Presentation: Rural Education Directorate Education for All and CL elimination for workshop February 2011 (Turin)

Botswana

- Review of National Legislation that impacts on CL Botswana TECL II April 2010
- Children Speak newsletter "Child Labour Day , Issue 1 Vol 4 2010 Min Labour & Home Affairs
- Final Report for the Rapid Assessment of CL in agricultural sector Dec 2010 TECL/Institute for Development in Southern Africa
- APEC 2008-1012
- Final Report on Hazardous List submitted to NPC TECL2/Min of Labour & Home Affairs, Dep of Labour and Social Security (Kalusopa May 2010)

Namibia

- Review of national legislation that impacts on CL Namibia TECL II April 2010
- APEC 2008-2012
- Final Draft Report on Study of Impact of HIV Aids on CL in Namibia undated
- Study on impact of HIV/AIDS on Child Labour
- Namibia Child Activity Survey 2005 Report of Analysis
- Government of Namibia: Education For All National Plan of Action 2001-2015
- Children and Adolescents in Namibia 2010
- Public Participation in Law Reform: Revision of Namibia's Draft Child Care and Protection Bill
- Education Sector Policy for OVCs. Ministry of Education

Annex 4: Transcripts of Interviews with Beneficiaries

I'm Immanuel*, aged 11 years. We are seven in my family and my parents are divorced. My father remarried and has five children. Before coming to Hope Centre, I was staying with my mother. My mother does not work.

I am currently not going to school and even my other siblings are also not going to school. I would want to go school but I can't as I don't have the required papers. I want to go to school to have a better life, to learn and know things. I cannot read and write because I have never been to school.

I came to the centre on my own as there was no food at home. We would sleep without eating anything and sometimes got food from neighbours and Good Samaritans. Even now, my siblings sometimes sleep without food. My father never visits us. One of my sisters is living with my elder brother. I don't know where they live and just like my father he never comes home to visit.

I would want the government to give me a chance to go to school, buy me school uniforms and pay my school fees.

My name is Anthony* and am 11 years old. I am in Grade one at Undundu school. My mother passed away and my father stays at the farm. I used to stay with my father and grandmother at the farm. When I was at the farm I was not going to school, I used to sweep other people's houses and they would give me money or food.

I was brought at Hope Centre by my father and grandmother. I came at the Centre in 2008 and started going to school this year (2011). I didn't have the papers which the school needed. I now have the papers and that is why I'm going to school. I like going to school as I enjoy drawing. When I finish school I want to be a security officer.

At the centre we have enough food and I like it here. My father sometimes visits me. The last time he came, he brought me clothes and school shoes. I don't want to go back at the farm as older boys used to beat me all the time and cannot attend school when I'm there.

**Names in the stories are fictional*

Child R

- Approximate age: 15- 16 years of age
- Dream: To become a Traffic Cop
- Life before Kids Haven: Street child. Lived in Josie (Johannesburg) since the age of 11. His mother has met another man and he was placed with his uncle that is disabled and he had to beg for food or do garden work to be able to buy some food. He was not happy and left his uncle and went to Josie
- Kids Haven: Got here via the train.
- Note: Not clear how he was referred or brought into Kids Haven. Difficulty in articulating
- Education: Is attending school though not in a public school but in the bridging school and is not sure when or if he will be going to the other school. He would like to!
- Life at Kids Haven: "This is my home". He is very happy here as they provide him with clothing and feels safe and he is not hungry anymore. However he was sodomised and reported it to the police with the assistance of Kids Haven by a gentlemen driving around in a bakkie

(small pick-up truck) but nothing has happened yet. He is afraid and do not go to town with the other children as he knows that man still wants him.

- General: “I’ve got talent”. Gumboot dancing and is training the other children but Kids Haven does not what to buy them any gumboots. He also plays soccer in the park with the other children
- Past: He robbed one shop with older boys and also broke into cars.
- Josie: “I cry for my friend in Josie” and is sometimes tempted by others to return to the street but then “I think and stays”
- Needs: Would like to get some proper shoes and music with earphones he can listen and sleep with as he some of the other children have this and they seem to be very happy when listening to music

Child W

- Approximate age: 13- 14 years of age
- Dream: Want to become a lawyer
- Life before Kids Haven: Stayed in Katlahong with his parents but he was very naughty as he wanted to impress his peers and was threatened to be killed by the community. His mother with the assistance of a Social Worker referred him to Kids Haven as a place of safety. He came to Kids Haven in April 2010 but is visiting his parents – been home twice since his placement at Kids Haven
- Life at Kids Haven: Happy but
 - He was suspended from school for a week without any reason: when he inquired it was indicated to him that he was naughty but he does not know what he’s done wrong
 - After the week he wanted to return to the school but his school books were stolen. He is now attending bridging school but wants to go back to his previous school
- Engagement with staff / Talk to staff when feeling sad or need assistance
 - Reported that he was slapped by one staff member (Uncle) but the two ladies he reported it to is protecting the gentleman.
 - One of the Uncles is also following him if he goes to the bathroom and he does not why. This made him cross and he hit the Uncle with a chair. It was reported and recorded that he is the trouble maker!

BENEFICIARIES

Before...

This is story of an 11 year old boy who dropped out school at Standard 3. The boy lives with a family of five headed by the mother. The father had been imprisoned for car theft. Apart from financial reasons, the child was said to be influenced by his two sister that were drop out at Form 2 and were involved in CSEC. The child was therefore in a broken home and needed assistance to be re-integrated into school.

After...

Through Humana under the CL project, the child has been assisted with the school requisites and been able to be integrated into school once again. The monitoring reports are that the child is attending school regularly, has made friends and looks forward to school. The books were checked to see if the child was fairing well. True to the word, the scores by the child were on average very encouraging. The Humana outreach field is also on hand and does assist with the child’s home work! Currently the child has been linked on a government programme and does receive a food basket for the vulnerable, although the whole family shares this. The child is also benefiting from the school feeding programme.

Sustainability after the project

It is envisaged that for sustainability:

- The mother will be involved in the backyard garden project to grow vegetable for sale and food
- The mother will be involved in public work programme (Ipeleheng) to earn some money
- Encourage the sisters to enter existing vocational training programmes

Annex 5: Some reflections on how to monitor withdrawal from excessive hours of work

A: Monitoring the impact of government policies and programmes

TECL II Prodoc states that in South Africa the government will implement direct interventions and TECL will monitor. During the mid-term evaluation it became clear that stakeholders had varying interpretations of the intention behind this proposal. In the event this did not take place in the manner envisaged, but how might the target - 2400 children to be withdrawn and prevented from excessive household chores in South Africa - have been achieved by TECL in a collaborative effort with the government, given that the government's role is not to implement 'projects' in the manner of NGOs?

The scenario below may not reflect the intentions of the original TECL II design team, but it outlines one model that could be operationalized through government/ILO collaboration:-

Water chores model:-

- During TECL I a water service delivery prioritisation tool was developed whose purpose was to guide the Water Department (DWAF) in prioritizing the construction of water systems in localities where water carrying consumed a high proportion of children's working hours. Using the tool DWAF identifies its priority locations for new drinking water projects (one criteria being excessive hours of children's work in water carrying).
- TECL selects 1- 2 locations from these (in consultation with DWAF and IC). Preliminary studies are carried out together with sensitisation of schools and community leaders.
- Construction begins in these locations (DWAF)
- During construction (or earlier) TECL commissions a detailed baseline survey to identify the number of children working excessive hours and the average hours which they are spending each day on water carrying. If desired these children could be registered on the DBMR (not advisable if the aim is to set up a model which could be easily replicated by the government acting alone in future). At this time school enrolment and attendance records are analysed and documented carefully; if desired, systems are set in place to track the school performance and attendance of the identified beneficiaries.
- The construction of the drinking water system is completed
- During the following year, TECL carries out impact studies to measure (monitor) the number of hours which children are now spending in water carrying. It collates and analyses school enrolment and attendance to compare changes before and after. Hopefully there should be a reduction in work hours and an improvement in school attendance and performance - children less tired, better concentration and application.

Strengths and challenges of this approach

The strengths are:

- No additional government funds are required for the intervention i.e. it is an example of the advantages of mainstreaming CL into standard government policies and plans
- TECL does not fund the intervention - merely the cost of baseline survey/monitoring/impact assessment
- It is replicable
- It is directly relevant to measuring progress and impact of NAP.

Challenges and limitations:-

- The correct sequencing of activities may not be straightforward to achieve.

- The government programme may not fit the timescale of a donor-funded project.
- This model could work for CL sectors such as water (household chores) and agriculture, but would be challenging to apply to other sectors e.g. CSEC and CUBAC

B: How to define withdrawal if a child is already enrolled in school

The question arose for Implementing Agencies whether they could technically 'withdraw' children from CL if those children are already enrolled in school - and if so, how to monitor their withdrawal. The typical procedure - in the past or elsewhere - has been to provide counselling and enrol them in full-time education or training. Monitoring has basically consisted of checking that they are regularly attending school or vocational training.

The reality is that even though children may be enrolled in school, they may still be involved in hazardous CL (e.g. CSEC) or their attendance, transition rate, and general academic performance can suffer as a result of excessive work hours. Such children are therefore legitimate beneficiaries for withdrawal interventions which might take the form of counselling, welfare grants, or scholarships.

For monitoring such cases any one or all of the following measures could be adopted:-

- *Periodic spot-check observations of the number of hours a child is working.* This is time-consuming, and reactivity has to manage. Reactivity is the potential bias in the data which results from the subject's awareness of being monitored.
- *Interviews to record the number of hours the child reports s/he is working.* Reactivity is again the main problem. Bias could be reduced by cross-checking what the child reports with what other family members or neighbours report.
- *School attendance records.* These are more objective (less reactivity), and should be readily available. Low-cost and time-efficient, but based on assumption that increased attendance indicates reduced hours of CL.
- *Academic performance/attainment.* These might include teachers' end of term reports, and examination/test results and transition to next grade. The former would be more useful although more subjective. Test results are objective but they should not be measured against the class standard, but against that individual child's previous test results to see if there is progress. The assumption again is that improved performance reflects greater concentration in school and homework, that the child is less tired because she has reduced working hours.

If hours of work are measured, then to qualify as a withdrawal these should be less than 20 hours per week (recognized by ILO/IPEC and UNICEF and a variety of studies as being the level above which academic performance suffers) - but could be placed lower than this.

School attendance and teachers' reports are the most feasible method, but these could be coupled with interviews and/or spot-check observations. A child should attend school on at least 80% of days (specific measure can be selected) to qualify as withdrawn.

Annex 6: Mid-term term evaluation itinerary

7-11 MARCH 2011

| Day 1: 07 March 2011 | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Time | Activity | Contact Person | Designation | Contact Details |
| 8h30 – 9h30 | Introduction to the project staff | Ms Grace Banya Ms Francisca Velaphi | CTA NPC | Tel: 012-818 8000 Cell:073 941 5970 Email: banya@ilo.org |
| 9h45 -11h20 | TECLII | Ms Grace Banya | CTA | |
| 11h30 – 12h00 <i>Interview conducted by JS & EH</i> | Meet with the ILO Director | Mr. Vic Van Vuuren | Director: i) Decent Work Team for Southern and Eastern Africa ii) Country Office for BLNS and SA Countries | Tel: 012 818 8055 Cell: 082 882 1759 Email: vanvuuren@ilo.org |
| Lunch | | | | |
| 14h30-16h45 <i>Interview conducted by JS</i> | CTA/NPC | Ms Grace Banya | CTA | NPC: Tel: 012-818 8000 Cell:082 253 0585 Email: velaphi@ilo.org |
| 17h00-18h00 <i>Interview conducted by JS</i> | ILO: Child Labour Specialist | Mr. Yaw Ofuso | Snr Child Labour Specialist | Tel: 012 818 8008 Cell: 076 467 5314 Email: ofuso@ilo.org |
| Day 2: 08 March 2011 | | | | |
| Time | Activity | Contact Person | Designation | Contact Details |
| 08h00-9h30 <i>Interview conducted by JS & EH</i> | Department of Labour (Pta) | Mr. Virgil Seafield and Ms Mathilda Bergmann | Director: Employment Standards & CLPA IC Chair Deputy Director: Employment Standards: BCEA Admin & CLPA IC Secretariat | Tel: 012 309 4199 Cell: 082 805 0169 Email: Virgil.Seafieldd@labour.gov.za Tel: 012 309 4140 Cell: Email: mathilda.bergmann@labour.gov.za |

| 11h00 – 12h30 <i>Confirm receipt of: IC Report, Presentation and Social Survey report</i> | Department Basic Education (Pta) | Mr. Jerry Zitha | Deputy Director: Rural Education & CLPA IC Member for DBE | Tel: 012 357 5911 Cell: Email: zitha.j@dbe.gov.za |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| 11h45-13h30 <i>Postponed</i> | Fair Trade Tourism SA(Pta) | Ms Jennifer Seif <i>(Out of Office)</i> Ms Katarina Mancama | | Tel: 012 342 2945 Cell: 076 481 7965 Email: Address: 34 Hatfield corner, Church Street N#1270 |
| Lunch and Travel to JHB | | | | |
| Day 2: 08 March 2011 | | | | |
| Time | Activity | Contact Person | Designation | Contact Details |
| 15h00- <i>Interviews conducted by JS</i> | New Life Centre: Drop-in Centre (Berea) & Shelter (Lombardy East) in Jhb | Ms Khopotso Nakin Ms Babalwa Makawula | APSO Implementing Partner | Tel: 011 484 3267 Tel: 011 024 4128 Cell: 078 167 3128 Email: newlifecentreforgirls@yahoo.com Address in Berea: 39 Alexandra Street Plumridge Bldg Berea |
| 15h00-16h00 <i>Interview conducted by EH</i> | SAPS: Hillbrow (Jhb) | Capt Magowa | Victim Empowerment Coordinator | Cell: 076 495 9291 Hillbrow SAPS Office |
| 16h30 – 17h15 <i>Interview conducted by EH</i> <i>Scan and email docs to JS</i> | NACTU (Jhb) | Ms Pauline Nkosi | Council Committee Member of NACTU President of NUFBWSAW | Tel: 011 833 1140 Cell: 079 048 0580 Email: pnkosi@distell.co.za info@nacto.org.za Address: Eloff Street 53 His Majesty's Building 9 th Floor |

| Day 3: 9 March 2011 | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Time | Activity | Contact Person | Designation | Contact Details |
| 8h00-8h45 <i>Interview conducted by EH</i> | ILO Employers | Ms Rose Anang | Employers Specialist | Tel: 012 818 8045 Cell: 073 445 9840 Email: anag@ilo.org |
| 8h45-9h45 <i>Interview conducted by EH</i> | ILO – Workers | Ms Inviolata Chinyangara | Workers Specialist | Tel: 012 818 8046 Cell: 076 387 9893 Email: chinyangara@ilo.org |
| Travel to JHB | | | | |
| 11h00-12h00 <i>Interview conducted by JS & EH</i> | Human Trafficking Project with NPA & Drafting of TECL II Prodoc | Ms Astrid Coyne-Jensen | Former CTA of Human Trafficking Project with NPA Consultant to IPEC | Cell: 072 418 8416 Email: astrid.coynejensen@gmail.com Address: Art in Main in Jhb |
| Travel to Benoni | | | | |
| 13h00-16h00 <i>Interviews to be conducted by JS</i> <i>2 Beneficiaries interviewed by EH</i> | Kids Haven APSO Implementing Partner | Mr. Sam Mokgopha Mr. Kgadi Maphoto | Ass Director & Programme Manager DBMR Manager | Tel: 011 421 4222 Cell: 083 488 0955 Email: Samm.kidshaven@gmail.com Address: 38 Cranbourne Ave Cnr Voortrekker Street Benoni |
| Day 3: 9 March 2011 | | | | |
| Time | Activity | Contact Person | Designation | Contact Details |
| 13h30-14h45 <i>Interview conducted by EH</i> | Department of Health & Social Development – Benoni Office | Ms Lerato Gisela Mekgwe | Canalization Officer (M&E the implementation of the Children’s Act) | Tel: 011 749 5400 Cell: 072 183 5547 Email: lerato.mekgwe@gauteng.org.za |
| Travel to PTA | | | | |
| 16h00-17h00 <i>Cancelled as Ms Mtshweni was not available when called</i> | COSATU <i>Scheduled phone conference</i> | Ms Gertrude Mtshweni | | Tel: 011 339 4911 Cell: 082 829 2966 Email: Gertrude@cosato.org.za Address: |

| | | | | Braamfontein 1 Leyds Street Cnr Becket COSUTO House - 2 nd floor |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Travel to Pretoria | | | | |
| Day 4: 10 March 2010 | | | | |
| Time | Activity | Contact Person | Designation | Contact Details |
| 8h00-10h00 <i>Interview conducted by EH</i> | TECLII NPC | Ms Francisca Velaphi | NPC | Tel: 012-818 8000 Cell: 082 253 0585 Email: velaphi@ilo.org |
| Travel to Boksburg | | | | |
| 11h00-12h00 <i>Interview conducted by JS</i> | Department of Social Development (DSD) | Ms Gyan Dwarika Ms Musa Mbere <i>(Left before interview)</i> | Manager: Social Work Policy: Child Expropriation & CLPA IC Member for DSD Director: Children | Tel: 012 312 7150 Cell: 084 587 1960 Email: GyanD@dsd.gov.za Tel: 012 312 7948 Email: musa.mbere@socdev.gov.za |
| 12h00-13h30 <i>Interview conducted by JS</i> | SAPS (National) | Cornell Leon ... | ... | Tel: 012 ... Cell: 082 778 3502 Email: |
| 13h30-14h00 <i>Interview conducted by JS</i> | Department of Social Development (DSD) | Mr. Stephan ... | ... | Tel: 012 ... Cell: ... Email: ... |
| Lunch & Travel to Pretoria | | | | |
| Preparation for briefing workshop | | | | |
| Day 5: 11 March 2010 | | | | |
| Briefing meeting with Stakeholders in Pretoria | | | | |
| Time | Activity | Contact Person | Designation | Contact Details |
| 13h00-13h45 <i>Interview conducted by JS</i> | Fair Trade Tourism SA(Pta) | Ms Jennifer Seif <i>(Out of Office)</i> Ms Katarina Mancama <i>(Not present at briefing w/shop)</i> | | Tel: 012 342 2945 Cell: 076 481 7965 Email: Address: 34 Hatfield corner, Church Street N#1270 |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | Ms Julia Kandia & Ms Netsai Sibanoa | | |
| 13h00-13h45 <i>Interview conducted by EH</i> | SA Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) | Mr. Twadi Komane Ms Victoria Maloka (Not available) | Manager: Public Participation & Dialogue | Tel: 011 484 8300 Cell: ... Email: tkomane@sahrc.org.za Tel: 011 484 8300 X2084 Email: vmaloka@sahrc.org.za |

MID-TERM TERM EVALUATION

ITINERARY NAMIBIA

14 – 18 MARCH 2011

Sunday, 13 March 2011

| | |
|-------------|--------------------|
| 06h00-14h30 | Travel to Ondangwa |
|-------------|--------------------|

Day 1- Monday, 14 March 2011

| | |
|---------------|---|
| 0800- 0830 | Meeting with field Monitor(LAC- Ongwediva satellite office) |
| 09h00 -11h00 | Interview beneficiaries |
| 11h30- 14h30 | Travel to Tsumeb |
| 15h00 – 16h15 | Interview beneficiaries (FGD + Interviewers) |
| 16h30 – 17h00 | Meeting with field Monitor(LAC-Tsumeb satellite office) |

Day 2- Tuesday, 15 March 2011

| Time | Activity | Interviewer(s) |
|---------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| 06h00 – 10h00 | Travel to Windhoek | |
| 10h30 – 11h15 | ILO NPC | NC+EC |
| 11H30 – 12H30 | MoSS (Inspector Cronje) | NC+ EC |
| 12H30 – 13H45 | LUNCH | EC |
| 14h00 – 15h00 | MOYS(Hilya Imene) | NC+ EC |
| 15h00- 16h00 | MoE (Mrs Nangolo) | NC+ EC |

Day 3 – Wednesday, 16 March 2011

| Time | Activity | Interviewer(s) |
|---------------|---|----------------|
| 08h30 – 9h30 | ILO (NPC) | EC |
| 09H45 – 10H30 | UNICEF | NC+ EC |
| 10H45 – 11H30 | Christo Horn (Ministry of Labour) | NC+ EC |
| 11h30 – 12h30 | USAID (<i>Telephone Interview</i>) | EC |
| 13h00 – 14h00 | LUNCH (LAC) | NC +EC |
| 14h15 – 15h30 | | |
| 15h45- 16h30 | MOGECW(Loide Nekundi) (<i>Telephone Interview</i>) | EC |

Day 4 - Thursday, 17 March 2011

| Time | Activity | Interviewer(s) |
|---------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 08h30 – 11h15 | Workshop Planning | NC/EC |
| 11h30 – 12h30 | NEF (Antonio Kakoro) | EC |
| 13h00 – 14h00 | LUNCH | |
| 14h15 – 17h00 | Workshop Planning | NC+EC |

Day 5 – 18, March 2011

| | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| 08h00- 12h30 | Workshop (Ministry of Labour boardroom) | |
|--------------|---|--|

**ILO/IPEC: TOWARDS THE ELIMINATION OF CHILD LABOUR (TECL II)
IN BOTSWANA**

MID TERM EVALUATION SCHEDULE, 21ST TO 25TH MARCH, 2010.

| Activity | Venue | Date | Time | Partner (s) | Remarks |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|---------------|--|--|
| MONDAY 21ST MARCH | | | | | |
| Overview of TEC II Project, Botswana | NPC's office | 21/03/11 | 0800 - 0925 | NPC National Consultant International Consultant | NPC to update the consultants about the project, progress, achievements as well as challenges |
| Documents Review | NPC's Office | 21/03/11 | | National Consultant International Consultant | NPC to avail documents such as TPR's, other reports, work in progress, finished or to start. IA's files, |
| Interviewing Partners | PS Office | 21/03/11 | 09:30 – 10:45 | Ministry of Labour, Permanent Secretary | PS to appraise the consultants about the project progress as the custodian |
| | BFTU | 21/03/11 | 11:00 - 11.45 | BOCCIM, CEO CSR Code of Conduct? | The employer's perspective would be sought |
| | BOCCIM | 21/03/11 | 11:00 – 11:45 | BFTU, Mr. Motiki mini program training? | The worker's perspective would be sought |
| | Ministry of Education | 21/03/11 | 12:00 - 1300 | Ministry of Education, Ms Modimakwane | Conducted SCREAM training |
| LUNCH 13:00 – 14:00 | | | | | |
| | Humana Offices | 21/03/11 | 14:00 – 15:00 | NGO, Humana, Director | Member of PACC, also an IA |
| | Childline | 21/03/11 | 15:15 – 16:15 | NGO, Child labour Project Manager | Member of PACC also an IA |
| DEPART FOR PALAPYE 3 hours | | | | | |
| TUESDAY 22ND MARCH | | | | | |
| Field Visits | Palapye | 22/03/11 | 0800 | Interact with field staff (Humana) | Field supervisor to give an update of the project progress, achievements, challenges etc |
| | Palapye drive to rural area | 22/03/11 | 0900 | Interact with school | Obtain insightful information from teachers as key informants and also interview |

| Activity | Venue | Date | Time | Partner (s) | Remarks |
|--|---|----------|-------|--|--|
| | | | | | beneficiaries in a school setting |
| | Palapye - | 22/03/11 | 11:00 | Interact with one of the families of the beneficiaries | Consultants would obtain insightful and corroborative information |
| LUNCH AND DEPART FOR FRANCISTOWN AT 1400HRS | | | | | |
| | Francistown | 22/03/11 | 1600 | Interact with field staff (Childline) | Field supervisor to give an update of the project progress, achievements, challenges etc |
| WEDNESDAY 23RD MARCH | | | | | |
| | Francistown | 23/03/11 | 0800 | Interact with schools | Obtain insightful information from teachers as key informants and also interview beneficiaries in a school setting |
| | Tsamaya - 20 kms from Ftown | 23/03/11 | 10:00 | Interact with one of the families of the beneficiaries | Consultants would obtain insightful and corroborative information |
| | Tsamaya | 23/03/11 | 11:00 | Interact with child labour committee | Insightful information on communities tackle child labour would be obtained |
| | UN Place | 24/03/11 | 0900 | UNICEF | Analyzed LFS as it pertains to children's work |
| LUNCH AND DEPART FOR GABORONE AT 1400HRS | | | | | |
| 25/03/11 | Gaborone, MLHA, 3 rd Floor conference room | 25/03/11 | 0900 | Debriefing workshop for PACC | The consultants will give PACC feedback on the outcome of the evaluation. |