



International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)



International
Labour
Office

IPEC Evaluation

Social Partnership and Advocacy to tackle Child Labour

INT/08/72/IRL

**IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP
Social Dialogue and Child Labour project
part of
Irish Aid Partnership Programme (IAPP)**

An independent final evaluation by an external consultant

September 2011

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 data collection took place in July/August 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 Government of Ireland.
This report does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Government of Ireland or other stakeholders
and institutions involved in this project*

¹ Richard Longhurst

CONTENTS

Acronyms & Abbreviations	iv
Executive Summary	v
1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
2. Overall Project Description	3
2.1 Strategy and Objectives	3
2.2 Components	3
3. Evaluation Methodology	4
3.1 Desk Review	4
3.2 Interviews, consultations, telephone and Skype interviews	4
4. Assessment of the Management Arrangements of the IAPP and related projects	5
5. Project Results by Immediate Objective using Feedback from Implementers	8
5.1 The first immediate objective of the project is:	9
5.2 The second immediate objective of the project is:	11
5.3 The third immediate objective of the project is:	13
5.4 Some Concluding Comments:	14
6.....Analysing the Findings on the Basis of Questions in the Evaluation Terms of Reference	14
6.1 Design and Planning:	14
6.2 Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness)	15
7. Lessons learned	18
8. Conclusions and Recommendations	19
Annexes	21

TABLES

Table 1: Breakdown in proposed budget allocations of the IAPP (July 2008)	6
Table 2: Breakdown by Budget Line of expenditure as of 25 th August 2011	7
Table 3: Breakdown of Expenditure by Immediate Objective	14

ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

ACT/EMP	Bureau for Employers Activities
ACTRAV	Bureau for Workers Activities
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme (ILO)
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
GAP	Global Action Plan
HMS	Workers Assembly of India
IAPP	Irish Aid Partnership Programme
IBSA	India-Brazil-South Africa Forum of Dialogue
INCLUDE	Promoting Decent Work for People with Disabilities through a Disability Inclusion Support Service (ILO)
IO	Immediate Objective
IPEC	International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO)
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation
KAB	Knowledge, Awareness and Behaviour
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
NAP	National Action Plans
OECD/DAC	Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee
PEPDEL	Employment of People with Disabilities through Effective Legislation (ILO)
PPP	Public Private Partnerships
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Programme
SADC	Southern Africa Development Conference
SAP/FL	Special Action Programme of Forced Labour (ILO)
SCREAM	Supporting Child Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media (ILO)
SECTOR	Sectoral Activities Department (ILO)
SPROUT	Project Summary Outline
TPR	Technical Progress Report
WDACL	World Day Against Child Labour
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child labour
WEDGE	Women's Entrepreneurship Development and Gender Equality (ILO)
ZCTU	Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Irish Aid Partnership Programme (IAPP) is distinctive. It adds a more strategic and complementary dimension to the programme of technical cooperation which ILO-IPEC already implements. Although ILO-IPEC does work through social partners (employers and trade unions) it is recognised that the capacity of these partners needs to be strengthened, so that, to a greater extent, they are able to go ahead by working to their own strengths and implement their own activities in response to Conventions 138 and 182, *and* within the framework National Action Plans on Child labour *and* within south-south cooperation. This is expected to generate greater sustainability and national ownership to its work.

The strategy of the project was to work with social partners to implement the work of eliminating child labour through knowledge sharing, policy development with action plans and capacity development. The key evaluation question posed is: how far have social partners been strengthened to be more capable in addressing child labour issues in their own activities. The project was global in nature with over 70 countries involved in one way or another. Therefore outreach was considerable.

The evaluation used conventional methods to gather largely qualitative information, using a desk review, and interviews and consultations with staff in the field over telephone and Skype interviews. This included some interviews with beneficiaries.

In the area of design and planning, the project was innovative and filled niches not filled by other ILO-IPEC/social partners' activities. In the area of implementation and effectiveness, the project has made a significant contribution to strengthening the role of social partners in the elimination of child labour, making them feel they had ownership. In turn the various advocacy and informational products – DVDs, manuals, and advocacy materials will help social partners play a stronger role in the future. The role of ILO-IPEC, ACT/EMP and ACTRAV specialists at HQ and in the field and the coordination they achieved was fundamental to the success of the project.

In terms of relevance, the activities of the project broadened the response of social partners to the elimination of child labour, and are likely to make them more effective in that response. It strengthened the partnerships required to address child labour by placing more attention on the needs of social partners in meeting this response. Sustainability of the elements of the programme component is difficult to judge at this stage. Appropriate advocacy materials and 'how to do it' materials are in place and in some cases, were tested. They can continue to be applied without funding.

This project can be seen as complementary to other IPEC projects: it has encouraged a high degree of social dialogue, not always achieved in these other IPEC projects. This requires understanding at several levels: ACTRAV/ACTEMP in Geneva, specialists in the field, and as well as workers and employers. This project has uncovered the areas of common interest in child labour between workers and employers.

The project has contributed effectively to strengthening the capacity of trade unions and employers in the areas of child labour, and some are now able to implement some activities without involving IPEC. The trade union focal points for child labour have been re-energised, and employers' activities have found new avenues to address child labour. Many focal points have elaborated plans of action for their institutions and started campaigns (e.g. to mark World Day Against Child Labour) and awareness raising activities. All of the results have required a cohesive approach from the three ILO units of IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP

It is recommended to Irish Aid that an extension be made of the project and funded accordingly. The project was global, flexible, and targeted social partners directly and made good use of materials produced elsewhere. Some recommendations have also been made about how IPEC can more effectively incorporate social partners into its existing national programming. In particular, the project made contributions to bipartite activities. (i.e. trade unions and employers), partners allowing them to strengthen capacity in addressing child labour.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. Child labour is a problem worldwide but is particularly severe in sub Saharan Africa and Asia. There are about 170 million child labourers in these two regions of the world. While the causes of child labour are several and complex, weaknesses in coverage of education systems, in addition to poverty, is a fundamental factor.
2. The current work of ILO's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) focuses at two levels. The first is at the level of the policy and enabling environment, working with partners to identify and promote legislative and policy reforms to reduce child labour. The second level is to work with partners to implement programmes aimed at providing services to vulnerable children and communities, such as access for children to education and skills, and support for families. ILO is pursuing a Global Action Plan to tackle child labour, on the basis that effective elimination of child labour can only be achieved at the country level with member States at the forefront of these efforts. Future activities will be to take an integrated area and livelihoods approach to child labour, aiming to change the working lives of children and their parents.
3. The international campaign to eliminate child labour is centred around ILO Conventions 138 (that the minimum age of to employment shall not be less than the age of completion of compulsory schooling) and more recently, Convention 182 which urges Governments to immediate action to stop the worst forms of child labour and to ensure these children have access to free basic education.
4. The work of ILO-IPEC and its partners is also directly linked to the Millennium Development Goals, most strongly to MDG 2 (Universal Primary Education); an objective both direct and indirect of the IPEC-supported work is to ensure children are placed into school. But the work also makes contributions to attaining MDG 1 (poverty), MDG 3 (Gender) and MDG 4 (Child Health).
5. ILO and its partners are pursuing a Global Action Plan (GAP) ² to reinforce actions to eliminate worst forms of child labour by 2016: this includes the Roadmap for Achieving the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) by 2016, which is the outcome document of the Hague Global Child Labour Conference, 2010. As the GAP focuses on the strengthening the role of social partners – governments, employers, workers – in this global campaign, their organisational structures and capacity to influence national policy ensures their potentially strategic role in efforts to tackle child labour and its underlying causes. Therefore involving the social partners more intensely and strategically in the fight against child labour is a clear priority for ILO and the project under review has, as its core focus, the strengthening of social partner (employer and workers organisations primarily in this IAPP component) capacity on child labour at local, national and international levels.
6. Key tools in the GAP are National Action Plans (NAPs). The NAPs are a grouping of specific actions (legislative, policy and programme responses) designed to implement a national child labour policy, which in turn is a statement of a country's course or means of dealing with the problem of child labour. IPEC actions have long supported policy change, embedded within the core objective and activity of ILO to contribute to social justice by the adoption and implementation of labour standards: therefore NAPs become the practical instrument for fulfilling a country's obligations in relation to the two ILO Conventions of 138 and 182, as well as other international instruments such as the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.
7. Within delivery of the GAP, the three ILO departments of IPEC, ACTRAV (workers activities) and ACT/EMP (employers activities) need to work closely together to encourage social dialogue as part of the GAP at national levels; and to encourage workers and employers to combine with governments to deliver and implement a national plan.

² Proposed in the Global Report on Child Labour (2006): The End of Child Labour: Within Reach, ILO, Geneva (para 368).

8. NAPs are not a recent phenomenon, but they are under a stronger focus of late. Their state of implementation is very variable. Some just exist on paper while others are being vigorously implemented. Many require more cohesive input from social partners. Some, especially in South America, have been in existence since 2000. Through the 2000s, IPEC supported a number of national Time Bound Programmes (TBPs), using Programmes of Support (PoS) which were a nationally owned initiative comprising a framework of integrated and coordinated policies at different levels to eliminate WFCL.
9. From the viewpoint of ILO, the elimination of child labour (as well as being linked to the MDGs as a development perspective) is part of its work on standards and fundamental principles and rights at work. The fulfilment of labour standards should guarantee decent work for all, under the umbrella of ILO's Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP). The major mechanism for implementing these standards is through technical assistance to its three key constituents: government, workers and employers. This tripartite structure is the defining characteristics of ILO operations and cooperation and it is within this framework that the activities supported by this project should be analysed.

The Irish Aid Partnership Programme

10. The purpose of the *Irish Aid Partnership Programme* (IAPP) - project number INT/08/272/IRL - is distinctive. It aims to enhance a more strategic and complementary dimension to the large programme of technical cooperation which ILO-IPEC already implements. Although ILO-IPEC does work through social partners (employers and trade unions) in its existing programmes, it is recognised that the capacity of these partners needs to be strengthened, so that, to a greater extent, they are able to work to their own strengths and implement their own activities in response to Conventions 138 and 182, *and* within the framework of NAPs (where they exist) *and* within south-south cooperation. This is expected to generate greater sustainability and national ownership to its work.
11. The IPEC project component is one of five technical areas funded by the IAPP in ILO, now in its Third Phase. This third phase aims to emphasise the sustainability of interventions, organisational capacity building, greater involvement of social partners in project implementation, and assistance to partner organisations in developing plans to mobilise and diversify funding sources.
12. The resources provided by the ILO-IAPP were US\$12.9m. divided between the five programmes: Women's Entrepreneurship Development and Gender Equality (WEDGE), Promoting the Employability and Employment of People with Disabilities through Effective Legislation (PEPDEL), Promoting Decent Work for People with Disabilities through a Disability Inclusion Support Service (INCLUDE), Special Action on Forced Labour (SAP-FL) and the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC). The IPEC portion of the funds was US\$1.57m.
13. In the similarly structured Norway Government-funded project, called *Advancing Tripartite Action to Tackle Child labour* (INT/09/50/NOR), started in March 2009 and finished in December 2010 (and hereafter called the 'Norwegian project'), IPEC had worked closely with ACT/EMP and ACTRAV on the implementation of the project with the three units having direct but separate funding allocations. ACT/EMP is ILO's Bureau for Employers' Activities and is responsible for supporting employers' organisations to help create the conditions for enterprise success by influencing the environment in which they do business and by providing services that improve their performance. ACTRAV is the Bureau for Workers Activities in ILO: its mandate is to strengthen representative, independent and democratic trade unions in all countries to support them to play their role in effectively in protecting workers rights and interests in providing effective services to their members at national and international levels, and to promote the ratification and implementation of ILO conventions.

2. OVERALL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Strategy and Objectives

14. The strategy of the project is to work with social partners to implement the work of eliminating child labour through knowledge sharing, policy development with action plans and capacity development. Two versions of the development objective were found in the documentation. The first relates more to outputs (e.g. improve knowledge base) and outcomes (improve linkages) while the second is more impact, longer term oriented. An amalgam of the two would have been more satisfactory.

Improve the knowledge base and linkages between the work of ILO-IPEC and social partners, training for development of social partner capacity, and policy development and coordination;

and

The project will contribute to the objective of the ILO Global Action Plan, the elimination of the worst forms of child labour by 2016, through strengthened involvement of social partners in tackling child labour.

15. The immediate objectives of the project are:

- To enhance the knowledge base on workers and employers activities on child labour to lead to greater union and employer action on child labour;
- To develop and promote policies, strategies and action plans on combating child labour for employers' organisations and trade unions; and
- To enhance the capacity of key national and regional workers and employers institutions to be involved in designing policy and programmes to tackle child labour, as a result of a targeted training programme.

16. The key evaluation question to review is: how far, through the actions carried out, social partners have been strengthened to be more capable in addressing child labour issues in their activities.

2.2 Components

17. The project was global in nature with, according to project reports, 76 countries involved in one way or another. Therefore outreach was considerable.
18. The project has three main components:
19. The first component of the project involved the collection and systematisation of good practices which were expected to be used both to promote replication and to support the training programmes and sessions funded by the project (second component). The knowledge base generated was also expected to ensure that ILO-IPEC staff at all levels were aware of the opportunities and advantages of fully integrating social partners in national efforts to tackle child labour and to be a catalyst for increasing collaboration among ILO specialists in the field. Two main activities were envisaged: the publication of the good practices of employer/union involvement to tackle child labour, and publication of a guide for IPEC, ACT/EMP and ACTRAV on child labour and the role of social partners.

20. The second component of the project was focussed on training activities for workers and employers organisations, and support for both bipartite and some tripartite meetings. The two main activities as part of this component were expected to be the strengthening of employer/trade union networks of focal points on child labour, and the production of a DVD on the role of social partners in tackling child labour.
21. The third component covered policy development and coordination. This was expected to follow from the activities of the first two components: for social partners to be more effectively involved in the design of policy and programmes to tackle child labour. The two main activities were expected to be the production of campaign materials for use by social partners *inter alia* on the World Day of Action against Child Labour (WDACL), and more effective action by social partners in National Tripartite Commissions and in other policy structures dealing with child labour.
22. Therefore the design logic is to generate the knowledge base using existing or new products, use these for training (principally) and then to use this capacity development to advocate and influence policy at national level, principally.

3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

23. The evaluation used conventional methods to gather largely qualitative information. As far as possible methods were used that facilitated a triangulation of key findings, which should make the findings more reliable. The evaluation was undertaken in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework, Strategy and Guidelines, specific ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. In addition, proper note was also taken of a draft guidelines note provided by the Evaluation and Audit Unit of Irish Aid, which also followed the DAC Guidelines³.

3.1 Desk Review

24. The desk review comprised the documents required for an ILO Project, being the Project Summary Project Outline (SPROUT), Technical Progress Reports (TPRs – (annual), and also a Mid Term Self Evaluation Report (February 2010). However, no project monitoring plan was carried out for this project, as per ILO-IPEC requirements. The latest available TPR recorded project progress up to February 2011, but an updated progress sheet was provided for the evaluation. The first draft of the final independent of the evaluation of the Norwegian project also proved a useful document. Project accounts were examined to obtain information on expenditures. Some of the IAPP component outputs, e.g. employers' guides were also reviewed, plus one of the videos from Moldova was viewed: a second video on India was available but could not be accessed.

3.2 Interviews, consultations, telephone and Skype interviews

25. Interviews were held in ILO headquarters in Geneva, with staff connected to the project, within IPEC, ACTRAV, ACT/EMP and SECTOR. Fourteen Skype and telephone interviews were held with respondents in Argentina, Chile, Hungary, India, Peru, Moldova, South Africa and Zimbabwe. This also included some interviews with beneficiaries.
26. Evaluation questionnaires were not sent out because of the time constraints involved. But, in addition, the experiences gained during the independent evaluation of the Norwegian project, also a global project, showed that response rates can be very low, and it was better to try and contact as many people as possible over Skype or phone. There are specific limitations inherent in a global evaluation, where although there are very interesting things to be seen and heard on visits at country

³ Possible Questions for Inclusion in the ILO Review for Irish Aid Staff, draft, Evaluation and Audit Unit, Irish Aid, July 2011

level, what is more important is to assess the impact at regional and sub-regional level where national stakeholders have had a chance to share experiences and act collectively. Other limitations concerned the fact that time constraints for the evaluation were even more acute than normal.

4. ASSESSMENT OF THE MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS OF THE IAPP AND RELATED PROJECTS

27. The IAPP funds were often used for activities in conjunction with other funds, and it would be a difficult task for some components to separate out exactly which component of the project was funded by the IAPP and part-funded with others. In particular IAPP activities were co-funded (up to December 2010) with the Norwegian project, similar in structure⁴. The Norwegian project was developed by IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP and was also global, addressing actions to be taken by ILO social partners: employers, trade unions and governments to tackle child labour. Some of the positives for this project were based on the fact that the ground for activities with social partners had been prepared by projects previously financed by other donors.
28. The funding of the Norwegian project had been divided between the three technical units, each with direct control over their allocated funds. The three immediate objectives were under the responsibility of IPEC, ACT/EMP and ACTRAV respectively. The activities to be undertaken by IPEC in the Norwegian project included promoting the GAP: knowledge sharing of good practices, capacity building with social partners, awareness raising (WDACL, the SCREAM (Supporting Child Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media) project); education, 12-to-12 portal, south-south initiatives and training on occupational safety and health. Efforts were made to increase the role of employers and trade unions in promoting the WDACL in June.
29. As noted in the evaluation of the Norwegian funded project, no joint work plan was developed for joint activities and outputs at national, regional and international level as originally envisaged in the SPROUT. However, for the IAPP, the project documents did not mention any portion of the funds to be allocated to ACTRAV and ACT/EMP, stating (para 2.1 of Prodoc):

In developing the work of the project account will be taken of the priorities identified through liaison with ACTRAV and ACT/EMP, and identifying ways to use the comparative advantage which working with employers and workers organisations offers.

30. Therefore this principle was the basis for funding, and being somewhat innovative, *inter alia* the idea that technical cooperation funds would take the lead in social dialogue projects working with social partners in a technical or sectoral area, the development of a work plan took a few months and so delayed the initiation of the project. This led to rushed implementation.
31. The IAPP also had 3 separate components, namely ACTRAV, ACTEMP and IPEC components. While all three departments discussed possible synergies, the management and the concrete action plans of each component was the responsibility of each of the three departments. A difference to the Norwegian project was that IPEC had the responsibility for administrative management of the overall

⁴ For reference the objectives of the Norwegian project are:

At the end of the programme,

1. the knowledge base on child labour and linkages between the work of IPEC and the social partners at international, regional and national level has been enhanced (responsibility of IPEC),
2. the technical capacity of employers' organisations will have been strengthened enabling them to develop child labour policies and strategies; providing advice and services to their members and taking active part in national and international policy debates on child labour (responsibility of ACT/EMP); and
3. the capacity of key national and relational workers to be involved in designing regional policy and programmes to tackle child labour will be enhanced as a result of a targeted training programme (responsibility of ACTRAV).

project, (i.e. preparing integrated reports to the donor and issuing EPA upon the request of the managers of the ACTRAV and ACTEMP components). However, the IPEC manager was not responsible for the actual work carried out by ACTEMP and ACTRAV.

32. The initial budget (below, Table 1) shows that, over half of the funds (52.5%) were devoted to project personnel and support costs, which could be regarded as uncomfortably high. However, there was adequate justification for this.
33. First, the budget shows there is the standard 13% for support costs assessed on all UN technical assistance funds. Second, the 13.7% (\$216.0k) that covered the inputs of the CTA manager was for 12 months with the balance rest paid for by the Norwegian project, and third, the role of the CTA and the ACTRAV and ACT/EMP managers and specialists is to act not only to act as manager and administrators, but also to provide direct technical assistance and expertise.

Table 1: Breakdown in proposed budget allocations of the IAPP (July 2008)

Budget Item	US\$ ('000)	% of Budget
Technical Management (IPEC)	216.0	13.7
International experts ACTRAV	54.0	3.4
International consultants ACTEMP	54.0	3.4
International Consultants	162.0	10.3
Total Mission Costs	165.5	10.5
Total Project Personnel	651.5	41.4
Total sub contracts	354.7	22.6
Total Training	339.8	21.6
Project Sub Total	1,337.0	85.0
Total Support Cost (13%)	173.8	11.1
Sub Total	1,510.8	96.1
Provision for Cost Increases	61.5	3.9
Project Grand Total	US\$1,572.3	

34. There is strong consensus in international development agency programmes of this nature that 'coordination', 'partnerships', 'empowerment' and 'advocacy to change behaviour towards an agreed social cause' are highly desirable components of what is to be achieved in a sustainable manner. But achieving these attributes of a programme can only come at what appears to be a high price of

management/transaction costs within implementing institutions. Social dialogue requires networking and is labour intensive.

35. Also, it should be noted that what appears in Table 1 are allocations only, and are not the final expenditures of the project, some provisional figures of which are shown in Tables 2 and 3. It should be noted that both ACTRAV and ACTEMP were given 25% of the IAPP funds each. The remaining 50% of the funding remained with IPEC
36. ACTRAV took the decision to spend almost all its resources on field work with unions and so requested that its allocation of personnel funds be re-allocated into programmes. This meant that management of the ACTRAV component was an additional work load borne by the ACTRAV manager which could have been paid for under the project amounting to several work months (but is not reflected here). ACT/EMP also reports taking on a similar management load (of about 2-3 months), also not reflected in the 'accounts'. This decision to re-allocate personnel funds into programmes allowed the ACTRAV component to carry out more activities with trade unions in the field. Hence the proportion of funds used on personnel as a percentage of the project has actually got to be analysed in relation to each of the 3 components. This was a strategic choice made by each project component.
37. The reason why expenditure is being examined in this evaluation is not with the intention of this evaluation taking on some kind of audit function. The point of an evaluation is to learn lessons and look ahead. However, examining expenditure data does give some pause for reflection. There are two other reasons. First, cost data allow some comparisons and benchmarking with similar projects and second, in time of severe financial constraints, funding should be transparent and come under examination.
38. However, it is acknowledged that in this evaluation the difficulty of sorting out the management arrangements and for example, the fact that there was some contribution made to the project by staff which is not reflected here does not allow clear conclusions to be drawn. The examination of Table 2 (up to date expenditure) shows that the management and administrative element (budget lines 11 and 68) amounted to 39.4 %, less than the figures suggested above.

Table 2: Breakdown by Budget Line of expenditure as of 25th August 2011

Budget Line Number and category	Expenditure 2008-2011 (US\$)	% of expenditure
11. International Experts & Consultants	331,879	27.8
15. Official Travel	19,908	1.7
16. Evaluation Missions	17,977	1.5
17. National Professional Staff	59,382	5.0
21. Sub Contracts	206,363	17.3
31. Fellowships	3,447	0.3
32. Group Training and Seminars	368,741	31.0
53. Miscellaneous	45,259	3.8
68. Support Costs	136,884	11.5
Totals	1,189,840	99.9

Note: as of 25th August 2011, total expenditure was \$1,189,840 against an allocation of \$1,386,882, or 86% of allocation.

39. As the findings of this evaluation will show, there has been a strong positive response from respondents involved in the field activities: many employers and workers institutions believe that the IAPP (and the Norwegian project before it) introduced them to child labour issues for the first time and empowered them because it gave them ownership and addressed their direct needs and interests rather than a more peripheral involvement (e.g. as suggested as part of Government steering committees). In this sense this project was highly complementary to other, larger IPEC projects involving the tripartite partners, filling in the gaps that these larger (mostly country level Programmes of Support) were not able to fill, or were not designed to fill.
40. However, managing such a project and in particular getting so many different actors to achieve consensus and work together, required numerous communications and the administration of many small contracts, is labour intensive. As a *global* project, it covered all the regions of the ILO, this would have added to management input. The integration is both at field level with IPIC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP specialists (e.g. as shown by activities in Argentina, Chile, Colombia and in some countries of the SADC region) combining over the area of child labour, and by HQ staff (development of handbooks and guidebooks, DVDs and workshop planning).
41. ACT/EMP and ACTRAV preferred the alternative management structure of separate allocations because *inter alia* they believe they can disburse funds quicker and more efficiently and get things done quicker and better, as they are the specialists in workers and employers organisations, knowing what was the added value of these organisations in eliminating child labour. There were several reasons for the extended time taken at the beginning of the project for the three ILO-Geneva based units to agree on what would be an acceptable means of operation. First there were changes in project management (with feedback from the field) that the period of implementation was therefore rushed for some IAPP activities. Second there were some changes in resource allocation. Third, there were communication difficulties. In the initial Sprout, both management and resources were to be equally shared between the three departments. This changed after the project was approved and though management of each component remained separate (though linked), resource allocation changed from a third each to 50% for IPEC and 25% each for ACTEMP and ACTRAV.
42. However, building on the comments above, projects that advance ‘coordination’, ‘partnerships’ and ‘advocacy’ are important elements of institution building but difficult to measure. Also, given that the project is only completed by end of September 2011, little evidence of longer term impact could be expected in an end of project evaluation of this nature. In addition there are problems of attribution, the complexity of public policy making, the role of external forces and conditions, and changing strategies and milestones, that are integral to such projects.
43. As such, the choice of indicators for this evaluation is also difficult, and the evaluation looks to how existing mechanism were strengthened, e.g. child labour focal points, NAPs or convention ratification.

5. PROJECT RESULTS BY IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE USING FEEDBACK FROM IMPLEMENTERS

44. The IAPP results are laid out here, categorised by immediate objective. To a degree this is a rather arbitrary as activities overlapped more than one objective and this should become obvious. To avoid repetition, the results of activities are mentioned only once but in the following section (Analysing the Findings using Questions in the Evaluation Terms of Reference) some of the inter-linkages are explored. The project funds are still being disbursed with activities continuing to be implemented and so further achievements might be expected. A detailed list of each output from the activities is given in Annex 5, with the dollar costs of that activity. As noted above, the IPEC element of the IAPP was slow to get to the implementation of activities in terms of disbursement of funds because of the need to resolve responsibilities for implementation. However, this appears to have led to a strong foundation and ownership with partners, specifically in terms of development of the networks of

employer and trade union focal points. The Programme was complementary to other projects in IPEC.

45. This has also led to valuable *bipartite* activities (i.e. employers and trade unions) able to strengthen capacity in advocacy, knowledge sharing and campaigning, and using south-south modalities as appropriate. Some of the pluses of this are described in later sections. It is difficult to do bipartite activities in other formats of programmes.

5.1 The first immediate objective of the project is:

- To enhance the knowledge base on workers and employers activities on child labour to lead to greater union and employer action on child labour

46. Outputs and activities for this IO were:

Output 1.1: Publication of good practices of employer/union involvement to tackle child labour;

47. This involved information collection on good practices involving social partners and publication; activities to promote good practices, and establishment of an information mechanism to organise data collected under the project. Five manuals/handbooks were produced together with three DVDs. Total expenditure for this output was \$243,550 (see Annex 5).

Results

48. Eight studies have been developed to document successful corporate social responsibility practices in tackling child labour by engaging business, primarily in the cash crop/plantation sectors. This information was based on two surveys: The first was on Public Private Partnerships (PPP), identifying successful activities in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, China, India, Mexico and South Africa. The second survey gauged the involvement of social partners in implementation of child labour projects in the context of DWCPs. This and related work led to the Social Partners Supplementary Report to the IPEC Implementation Report of 2010, and Social Dialogue Country profiles for ten African countries, starting with the Francophone countries, with intentions to add Anglophone countries later.
49. In partnership with ILO's SECTOR Department, a further study was completed to document good business practices to tackle child labour in the food, drink and tobacco sector in Latin America, which identified cases in Argentina (ARCOR in the food retailing sector, and the tobacco sector) and Brazil (Unilever, a food and hygiene brands company and Cargill, an international food producer and marketer of agricultural products). Feedback indicated that these were innovative studies in terms of how IPEC was now starting to address sectors (rather than national entities) in actions against child labour. Multinationals were chosen because of the long value chain. But all four cases were different. However, in common, all four companies have spent a long time in piloting child labour-related activities and have learned a great deal as a result. In Argentina, the private sector and the affiliates of the Confederation of Industry have created a network of business to combat child labour. These ideas can be channelled into the IPEC Corporate Social Responsibility approach, including public-private partnerships and codes of conduct.
50. Feedback from the SECTOR-supported project emphasised the importance of encouraging the social partners (in this case employers) to spell out the issues of child labour from their perspectives and so encourage them to pass on good practices to their colleagues in other companies, and encourage these larger companies to take action further down the supply chain where child labour may be more prevalent. A respondent said that companies were keen to identify which parts of the supply chain had problems, and to work in PPP mode. They were especially interested in obtaining tools to assess the impact of their actions.

51. An existing study on small-scale mining and quarrying ('Keep Minors out of Mining') has been expanded and information collected on good practices involving social partners. However, the final output is pending.
52. An employer's manual has been produced from activities in South India, Moldova and in Chile, where, in cooperation with the Chilean Safety Association (CSA) - ('Growing up Protected' – Crescendo Protegido) for adolescents, in both print and web versions. This guide drew on existing employers guides in English and French, was translated into Spanish, and launched at a regional workshop in Buenos Aires, and then followed by national workshops in Chile, Uruguay and Paraguay. In Chile there was a bipartite relationship between employers and government. According to respondents' comments, the Chilean guide has been enthusiastically adopted by the CSA which covers 37,000 enterprises and 2 million workers. Their work was recognised by the US Department of Labour at a meeting in June 2011 in Washington on safety and working conditions.
53. DVDs were produced with both employers (from Argentina, India, Ghana and Moldova) and workers components (India, Ghana) and also, a video is in process by the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC). In Moldova, again following on from Norwegian funding initiated in 2005, the activities have encouraged a change in perceptions about child labour in the agricultural sector, starting with a code of conduct developed in 2009, and most recently a documentary which tells a story about how the agricultural industry employers have lead a change in the role of children in agriculture. The overall approach is to try and 'formalise' the informal sector as this enables more of the child labour problem to be addressed. The workers organisations have worked as equal partners in developing codes of conduct for occupational safety. Moldova also has a very committed government and has an effective NAP in place. Moldova is seeking recognition from international economic trading partners and freeing their industries of child labour is one element.
54. This output also included a consolidated workers guide for South African sub region, and a domestic workers manual.
55. Within this, and other immediate objectives, the programme activities made contributions to preparation and content of the ILO Global Report (2010) which had good information on social partners, corporations and south-south cooperation. This is one example of the direct technical contribution made by the CTA. Some progress has been made to prepare the draft publication and organise activities to promote good practices. Because of some difficulties a less ambitious event on CSR than that envisaged was organised in December 2010, and good practices were disseminated.
56. The (12-to-12 portal) portal developed by IPEC and receiving Norwegian funding, continued to receive funding under the IAPP: it derives its name from June 12th, the WDACL. It is essentially a web-based social networking platform aiming at bringing together the experiences and achievements of different actors in the global community in the fight against child labour. It was originally set up by IPEC in 2006 with Italian funds. The objective was to collate and share information about good practices and to encourage cooperation and commitment among partners involved in the fight against child labour. About \$16,000 has been expended in a review of its structure, and \$9,800 on uploading materials.

Output 1.2: Guide for IPEC, ACT/EMP and ACTRAV on child labour and social partners role (good practices for replication);

57. This involved establishing, testing and validating indicators for assessing impact in employers and workers participation in child labour activities, developing the guide, and implementing a system to ensure the guide is being used by ILO staff through a distance learning platform.

Results:

58. Activities in relation to the guide have not been fully implemented: the guide on social dialogue based on Argentina's experience in local development has not been completed and so it could not be tested systematically. There has been some assessment (in eleven African countries) on the national tripartite consultations process functions.

5.2 The second immediate objective of the project is:

- To develop and promote policies, strategies and action plans on combating child labour for employers' organisations and trade unions;

59. Outputs and Activities for this IO are:

Output 2.1: Strengthening of employer/trade union networks of focal points on child labour

60. This involved developing training resources and planning and implementing training and workshops, conducting research, and promoting the replication and dissemination of good practices across different contexts within south-south dialogue.

Results:

61. The translation into several languages of the trade union resource kit for training on the worst forms of child labour is still in progress, awaiting ITUC approval of the manual.
62. One hundred new Trade Union Focal Points were trained on child labour and social dialogue, spread evenly between the four sub regions of Caribbean (in Port of Spain Barbados), South Asia (in Colombo), South-East Asia (in Bangkok) and Pacific (in Suva, Fiji). This covered about 40 countries. An existing Guide for Employers on Child Labour (produced in 2007) ⁵ was rolled out in training programmes in the Latin American region, in India, and South African sub region. Intended activities in the Maghreb and Arab countries were postponed because of the political situation in those countries. A training event was organised earlier in Syria for trade unionists and employers.
63. In addition, a major event was organised: a bipartite event for representatives from workers and employers organisations from thirteen Africa countries in Johannesburg ⁶.
64. Feedback from the SADC meeting of nine countries indicated that this was the first time that a majority of these social partners had met to discuss child labour. They appreciated it was bipartite as it allowed them to speak more openly and directly. The social partners sometimes regard themselves as being sidelined by both government and ILO-IPEC, being regarded as needed for national stakeholder governance set-ups but sometimes having to act as passive participants. Social partners see they have some ownership for eliminating child labour, rather than NGOs who frequently act as the service deliverers in IPEC's country programmes. All of these national entities produced action plans for on return activities, with funds for follow up provided by the IAPP, including taking on advocacy activities for the WDACL (producing posters etc), and three national groups worked up employers organisations' guides. However funds would be needed to disseminate the guide more widely.

⁵ ACT/EMP, ILO and International Organisation of Employers, Eliminating Child labour: Guide for Employers, written by Paul Vandenberg, developed by Anne-Brit Nippierd, Sandy Gros-Louis; ILO, Bureau for Employers Activities; International Organisation of Employers, Geneva, 2007

⁶ All National Centres that participated in the training sessions are in the 12-to-12 portal under a special page for the focal points.

65. Social partners in the countries of Lesotho, Swaziland, Mozambique, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe all took action using IAPP funds while Botswana, Namibia and RSA were able to use funds from the Norwegian funded project. Another feature of the IAPP funding is shown here by the involvement of Zimbabwe. This shows it is possible to use IAPP funds to intervene in countries where there is no existing intervention (such as Zimbabwe, see below) where the campaign for the World Day of Action was supported. Action plans would also have included components to work more effectively with the ILO-IPEC's supported government's National Action Plan (NAP) on child labour.
66. In Zimbabwe, a campaign materials development workshop was in July 2011 on the role of trade unions in child labour under the auspices of the Zimbabwe Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU). This workshop came up with a framework for a draft handbook on children's rights in relation to freedom from exploitation and to inform workers on national, regional and international laws (including ILO standards) on child labour. The printing and dissemination of advocacy materials will be followed by national campaigns.
67. Other workshops were held using part IAPP funding: a tripartite national workshop was held in Tanzania, cost shared with funds from Brazil. The IAPP funded the south-south tour of the Tanzanian social partners to Brazil in May 2010. They met with Brazilian institutions and together developed a work plan that at the end of 2010 became a project that the Brazilian donor agency accepted to fund in part. This project had a number of activities aimed at the social partners in the implementation of the NAP. The other donors were the IAPP and the Norwegian project. It was the first south-south triangular cooperation project that brought these three donors together.
68. In Tanzania, after the ILO-IPEC Programme of Support (ended in 2010) to the national TBP (which continues under the umbrella of the PRSP and the DWCP), trade unions were funded to develop their capacity to support the implementation of the NAP. There were resources from the South-South project funded by Brazil and the Norwegian project to support and IAPP funds allowed the support to trade union focal points in 15-20 districts. (see Annex 5 for specific details). The IAPP funds allowed a bridging of past with present activities. The mainstreaming of child labour issues at District level was developed and so IAPP allowed building on what is being done elsewhere, build some capacity and allow social partners to work more to their own priorities.
69. Also there was an inter-regional tripartite session for focal points from eight Portuguese speaking countries. Members of employers' organisations in four other countries have also participated in training. All of the above activities were strengthened by a training of selected employer and child labour focal points in ITC, Turin in December 2010.
70. Other activities funded here included a year-long campaign combined with workshops by the Indian trade union Hind Mazdoor Sabha for the ratification of Conventions 87 and 98 (Freedom of association and Collective Bargaining) and 138 and 182 (Child Labour), as well as follow up to various workshops.
71. Overall the training workshops and related activities took 28% of the project resources or about \$440,000.

Output 2.2: Production of DVD on the role of social partners tackling child labour

72. This involved identifying key themes from the work on good practices and implementation of a plan to enable use of the DVD at key national and international meetings.

Results:

73. The DVD has been produced and has been used to promote issues about child labour in various national fora, in the spirit of south-south cooperation. There are various country case studies. The India and Moldova cases have been completed while those for Ghana and Argentina are in process. This DVD was used in India - and will be used for campaigns related to the WDACL, and are intended for future training programmes and activities as supporting visual materials, including the handbook produced by ACTRAV and ACT/EMP.
74. In India, employers were engaged in Chennai following on from activities funded by the Norwegian project. Awareness raising activities, some related to the WDACL, were carried out in the brick kiln, manufacturing, automobiles and textile sectors. A customised ACT/EMP guide was translated into Tamil was the basis for much activity. Not only employers, but also government, parents and drop out children were sensitised. In a second phase, two employers groups, the Employers Federation of South India (EFSI) and the South India Mills Association (SIMA) were involved to encourage them to seek out child labour problems among sub contractors. A code of conduct was developed as a platform to draft hiring guidelines. In the final phase, a video was made as an advocacy device for the WDACL.

5.3 The third immediate objective of the project is:

- To enhance the capacity of key national and regional workers and employers institutions to be involved in designing policy and programmes to tackle child labour, as a result of a targeted training programme.

75. Outputs and Activities for this IO are:

Output 3.1: Production of campaign materials for use by social partners on the WDACL.

76. This involved planning the resources needed to support action by social partners for the World Day events; providing support to field level programmes; and evaluating campaigns using Knowledge, Awareness and Behaviour (KAB) surveys to determine baseline.

Results:

77. Various campaign materials have been produced: an ITUC video on child labour is in process (see above); posters for employers' organisations from SADCC countries; materials for employers and business sector from southern India in Tamil language (see above), and materials produced by employers in Moldova, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan.

Output 3.2: Production of guide for trade union and employer representatives on National Tripartite Commissions and other policy structures dealing with child labour

78. This involved collection of data on employer and trade union members on NTCs, and preparation, testing, publication of guide and its use for training.

Results:

79. The production of the guide has proved to be too ambitious and may not be done at this stage. So far the focus has been on getting union focal points more engaged in developing National Action Plans. The development of country profiles on social dialogue were meant to give a picture on the consultation mechanisms, without which it is difficult to develop the NAP

5.4 Some Concluding Comments:

80. Data on direct costs expenditure by shows the current situation on expenditure by immediate objective. The components below amount to about \$929,700 or 59% of the allocated budget; breakdown by immediate objective is: No 1: \$247,540; No 2: \$642, 260, and No 3: \$39, 890.

Table 3: Breakdown of Expenditure by Immediate Objective

Output No.	Output Narrative	Expenditure (\$ in direct costs	% of Expenditure
1.1	Publication of good practices of employer/trade union involvement to tackle child labour	243,550	26.2
1.2	Guide for IPEC, ACT/EMP and ACTRAV on child labour and social partners role (good practices for replication)	3,994	0.4
2.1	Strengthen employer/trade union networks of focal points on child labour	589,213	63.4
2.2	Production of DVD on the role of social partners in tackling child labour	53,050	5.7
3.1	Production of campaign materials for use by social partners on the WDACL	39,886	4.3
3.2	Guide for trade union and employer representatives on child labour national tripartite commissions and in other policy structures dealing with child labour	0	0

81. As would be expected the bulk of this expenditure was devoted to training (2.1), a finding supported by the Scan Team evaluation of the ACT/EMP activities for the Norwegian project.

6. ANALYSING THE FINDINGS ON THE BASIS OF QUESTIONS IN THE EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

82. The Terms of Reference (see Annex) for the Evaluation follow the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy and Guidelines, specific ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality standards. There is considerable overlap between all of these norms and standards, and the key issue is to address the overarching evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability to the extent possible.
83. In each subsection below, the suggested aspects to address in the Evaluation TORs are first summarised (in *italics*), without loss of content from the TORs. These are suggested aspects and not all could be addressed in the very short time frame allotted for the evaluation.

6.1 Design and Planning:

How well were the strategic focus, objectives and components carried through in the activities?

84. The programme was innovative, establishing a much stronger basis for coordination between ILO units. The programme filled niches not usually filled by other IPEC activities with which social partners are involved. Innovative actions involved joint actions by ACTRAV and ACT/EMP. Despite some policy differences between employers and workers, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP were able to work together and help employers and workers engage in social dialogue to eradicate child

labour: both ACTRAV and ACT/EMP specialise in workers' and employers' activities and know best how to work with these organisations. This is of great relevance in an institution such as ILO where developing effective coordination and joint implementation mechanisms around several topics, remain an important challenge.

85. A few of the components were not fulfilled because of the ambitious nature of its objectives and the management costs and communication difficulties involved in developing working relationships, agreeing a common work plan and breaking down silo-styles of working; often harder to achieve at headquarters than in the field (but a general feature of UN agencies). This meant that the project components were slow to take off the ground and placed implementation under some pressure. Take off was also slow because of the decentralised nature of IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP, as well as the projects. As evidence of slow take-off, the Mid Term Self Evaluation Report of February 2010, halfway through the project) showed that the financial disbursement at mid-term of was 8.7% of total expenditure. However, as also predicted in the Mid Term, expenditure would quickly gain pace when the coordination and implementation mechanism were established. Hence the importance of the discussions in the design phase.
86. There is logic to the design of the project: to develop the knowledge base and develop knowledge products. Then to take these products through to support training and then (third phase) for advocacy and policy influence. Some of these products are still in process, despite the contribution of the earlier Norwegian funds. Direct policy influence has been partial at this stage, but would be carried forward in any future phases
87. A heavy management load was also imposed because of the many of the activities of the project were funded from different sources (IAPP, Norwegian, South-South fund from Brazil). In addition there was the proper desire to implement the projects in the different regions that ILO serves, placing pressure on understanding different cultural and linguistic contexts. This improved communication with IPEC field and HQ staff, and was better integrated into strategic efforts by IPEC to tackle child labour, allowing it to be incorporated into its system of monitoring and evaluation.
88. IPEC appears to be a unit that usually works with NGOs, and that is required for many of the large country programmes it has implemented. This is because these country programmes have service components with reaching target groups at the household and community level as part of the strategy, and workers and employers organisations are not best suited to this. But feedback from this evaluation showed that social partners believe they have a more important role to play in the elimination of child labour in the longer term. For example, spinoffs should be a strengthening of Child Labour Monitoring activities to make it more sustainable, promoting advocacy activities both with their own colleagues and others, and reaching more deeply into the informal sector.

6.2 Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness)

What were the key achievements across countries and at global level? Were the management and implementation arrangements supportive of the strategy? How did the programme components influence the work of IPEC, ACTRAV, ACT/EMP (and other units in ILO) and how did the tripartite nature enhance the components and create synergies? How did the programme contribute to the ILO Programme and Budget outcome relevant for child labour? How did the global and country context influence achievements?

89. In terms of a strategic approach the project has made a strong contribution to strengthening the role of social partners in the elimination of child labour, giving them ownership and a more important role in this work than hitherto. In turn the various advocacy and informational products – DVDs, manuals, advocacy materials (those that were produced) will help support social partners in this stronger role in the future. Employers' organisations working mostly in the formal sector believed that the many of the worst forms of child labour (commercial sexual exploitation, for example) are a criminal activity, and also they within their industries did not face child labour as a problem. But they could bring

influence to bear further down their supply chains. Similarly, trade unions, also mostly operating in the formal sector, were able to identify areas where they could address child labour through advocacy and influence of others and by recognising how worker collective action and the right to organise could reduce poverty and drive out child labour.

90. A further important achievement of the project was its involvement in the agricultural sector. Child labour in this sector is hard to reach because of its size and dispersed nature, and some ambiguity in what are the harmful effects of child labour. However the involvement of rural industries and examination of their supply chain has uncovered some useful lessons (in India and Moldova) for how to reach children in rural areas. It is not clear if the ILO-FAO Agricultural Partnership Project provided any input for these activities, except in Ghana, where it was reported that the Programme has enhanced the synergy with IPEC work in the cocoa sector, and generally developed better relationships with ACTRAV and unions, which have been able to complement ongoing ILO-IPEC supported work with their own efforts.
91. The use of campaign materials by the social partners for the WDACL is a 'quick win'. Social partners can buy in quickly in a high profile manner with awareness raising and advocacy, and add value to tripartite consultation mechanisms and NAPs, and get them involved in ongoing IPEC field activities, including policy development.
92. Through the project with HMS in India, all the trade unions were able to work together to lobby the government and get movement on the ratification of the outstanding fundamental conventions. As a result of this trade union work, the government is committed to submit an instrument for the ratification of Convention 182 by June 2012 and discussions on convention 98 have also advanced. Considering the scale of the worst forms of child labour in India, the fact that the government is committed to ratification of C182 is a significant achievement of this project. This is an example of how the IAPP had a direct impact on the progression of labour standards.
93. As noted in the evaluation inception report, the limited time allowed for this evaluation meant that proper attention could not be given to the issues of how far IAPP components influenced the work of ACTRAV, ACT/EMP and other units in ILO. However, it is likely that the greatest achievement of the project was to re-orientate the views of IPEC and social partners as to where the role of the partners could be more effectively applied in the elimination of child labour. Integral to this was the occasional operation of bipartite activities, probably giving more formal weight to some ongoing informal activities. The chance for workers and employers to meet and discuss common issues and take on joint action programmes with their ownership was reported by some respondents as a very positive experience.
94. With the ACTRAV-ACTEMP campaign on hazardous child labour, both departments launched a historic joint campaign against hazardous child labour. It offers real potential for long term collaboration at the national level between trade unions and employers' organisations on child labour. The official handbook for the campaign is unique in providing the basis for this work to be carried out with the specialists in the field.
95. The IAPP components made a significant contribution to the promotion of elimination of child labour in Africa at a policy level. As noted earlier, African countries are a special focus of the GAP. Contributions include a revitalisation of the focal point system in Africa, also bringing them together for a strategic planning meeting in Turin, greater engagement of social partners at the regional and sub regional level (and supported by additional extra budgetary funding and strong activities for replication in the SADC countries and in Ghana codes of conduct for contractors and out growers that might be applied elsewhere in similar agriculture-based economies. Generally this is leading to much policy oriented debate at national level on issues such as vocational education and training, livelihoods, rural development and policy eradication. Some of the activities have reached down to district level (e.g. Tanzania), and some have firmed up child, labour in the DWCPs (e.g. Zimbabwe)

Relevance

How did the components address issues, needs and opportunities as defined in the planning documents? How did the activities and components line up with other activities in the IAPP, other IPEC activities and ILO-wide work on social dialogue and tripartite activity on child labour?

96. The activities of the project were relevant in broadening the response of social partners to the elimination of child labour, and are likely to make them more effective in that response. It has strengthened the partnerships required to address child labour by placing more attention on the needs of social partners in meeting this response. It is not clear whether the activities went beyond strengthening partnerships in other areas, such as CSR approaches in IPEC.
97. As noted in the evaluation induction report, it was not possible to research the linkage of the IPEC component of the IAPP with other components. However, in the investigations, no connections with WEDGE, PEPDEL, INCLUDE or SAP-FL were mentioned.

Sustainability

What are the key elements of sustainability of the programme components? How is it linked to sustainability of other IPEC and ILO activities? How can ILO build on achievements so far? How did the components contribute to ILO strategic objectives? How did the project contribute to knowledge and capacity in ILO-IPEC?

98. Sustainability of the elements of the programme component is difficult to judge at this stage. The activities of the component are just closing, and its inception was late. Appropriate advocacy materials and 'how to do it' materials are in place and in some cases, were tested. They can continue to be applied without funding. But follow-up would suffer without further funding to meet the expenses of expanding the target group for influence. Although context is important, the existence of one set of national guidelines can, for example, in some circumstances, encourage other national organisations to see what they can do. But the holding of workshops, printing and follow up will all require funds, however modest.
99. The flow of knowledge about child labour has been in both directions: IPEC staff have gained from the new perspectives generated by the IAPP. It has helped them see how social partners can have a stronger role in national programmes. As activities have been held in all regions, then all of the IPEC HQ programme staff as well as regional child labour advisers have learned something new and gained new ideas for implementation in other parts of their programme.

Special Concerns

How did the components support the International Core Labour Standards? What are the issues regarding follow-up? How has the project contributed to enhancing the role of workers and employers organisations in advocating for action against child labour at regional and national levels? To strengthening the collaborative work of IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP specialists? To strengthening the issue of child labour as a priority for workers and employers, and to ensuring that social partners acquire a stronger role in implementation of recent IPEC projects? How far have ACTRAV and IPEC been able to mainstream child labour in their priorities? What was the involvement of social partners in the four project stage areas of design, before project launch, implementation and monitoring and evaluation? How did the project enhance the capacity of employer's organisations and their understanding of child labour? How has the programme contributed to showing how social dialogue as a modality to eliminate child labour? How have bipartite activities contributed to eliminating child labour? How has the capacity building component strengthened focal points? How have the management arrangements at HQ helped achieve the outcomes of the project, including financial allocations? How has further bipartite collaboration between ACT/EMP and ACTRAV furthered the goal of the project?

100. The 'special concerns' section of the TOR questions cover the a mix of issues that overlap with other aspects: achievements, design, relevance and sustainability, such as: how the project has strengthened workers and employer institutions in working in the area of child labour; the mainstreaming of child labour into the activities of ACT/EMP and ACTRAV; the management structure concerning the role of IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP, including financial allocations; strengthening of tripartite and bipartite actions on child labour; use of social dialogue as a modality and the degree of capacity building.
101. By and large these special concerns have been addressed in previous sections of this report, in particular the nature of the management structure, but the following points are relevant. First several respondents noted how in their country situation their advocacy work pushed for legislation and in one country (India) the ratification of C182. Second, involvement of social partners in the early stages of the project appears to have been minimal, but many activities are following similar work funded under the Norwegian project. Needs of social partners may have been expressed then. Third, as noted in the induction report (and above in this report) it was not possible to carry out investigations of how the IAPP influenced additional activities of ACTRAV and ACT/EMP. This may well have happened, but it was not investigated.

7. LESSONS LEARNED

102. A lesson drawn from the mid-term assessment should be reinforced; that for future similar projects some preparatory phase with needs assessment should be planned to make consultation sessions in the field for setting priorities and adding time for the elaboration of the project work plan. It was reported that implementing social dialogue projects through technical assistance funding was unusual for ILO, and this may require different approaches.
103. In addition, all future components should be thoroughly discussed with social partners as well as the implementing units, and be based on a thorough need assessment.
104. The approaches made by IPEC have been more social partners- needs based than previous activities. This means there has been a lot of learning between social partners and ILO-IPEC staff: the former can see how child labour is a concern of their constituents (despite its prevalence in informal sector, in some cases bordering on criminal activity) reinforcing existing ethical perspectives, and they can do something concrete about it; the latter have seen how social partner responses will be a foundation for longer term solutions through decent work.
105. Extending child labour programmes to the agricultural sector (as well as other programmes) has always been a challenge for ILO. In this project some inroads were made to semi-formalising the agricultural sector through penetrating the supply chain. Although the micro evidence is not available, it is possible that these processes touched other small agricultural enterprises.
106. Lessons have been learned upwards to social partner national institutions and downwards (in some countries) to district level.

8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

107. This project can be seen as complementary to other ILO-IPEC projects: it has encouraged a higher degree of social dialogue than previously. Its lessons are already informing new ILO-IPEC projects. The gap has been that other project formats in IPEC are not able to focus on workers and employers directly to build understanding of child labour. This requires understanding at several levels: ACTRAV/ACTEMP in Geneva, specialists in the field, and as well as workers and employers. This project has uncovered the areas of common interest in child labour between workers and employers.
108. Although it is early days, the project has contributed effectively to strengthening the capacity of trade unions and employers in the areas of child labour, to the point where they are able to implement some activities without involving ILO-IPEC. The trade union focal points for child labour systems have been re-energised, and many of these focal points have elaborated plans of action for their institutions and started campaigns (e.g. to mark WDACL) and awareness raising activities. All of the results have required a cohesive approach from the three ILO units of IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP
109. On the basis that a high degree of social dialogue has been achieved in the area of child labour, with common interest identified and acted upon, as evidenced by enthusiastic feedback from the field,it is recommended to Irish Aid that an extension be made of the project and funded accordingly (Recommendation 1).
110. A major feature of the IAPP is that it was global, flexible, and targeted social partners directly and made good use of materials produced elsewhere. As regards learning between HQ units, a by-product has been the opportunity to pilot some activities, learn by doing, to find entry points to put something into practice. It is recommended that ILO-IPEC reviews how the role of social partners and concerns of social partners could be better integrated into existing projects (Recommendation 2). .
111. It is recommended to the ILO implementing units that in terms of which activities to implement, for IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP, that funds could be split between following up existing projects and opening up new countries and social partners in new sectors, and in IPEC activities in an integrated area approach. The existing successes could be used to encourage these new sets of social partners (Recommendation 3). .
112. It is recommended to the implementing units that IPEC continue as lead with a needs assessment, an agreed work plan and funded accordingly. All outputs and activities should be based on a thorough needs analysis and agreed upon by all parties (Recommendation 4). .
113. The programme management, structure has worked, and the transaction costs are justified by the achievements. This depends on the level of trust and shared objectives, and it is hoped that the success of this project means that all partners are now reasonably comfortable about the structure for the allocation and disbursement of funds, and believe that the results of the project will endure. Therefore it is recommended that the current management structure continues but at the continuing level of close consultation between all implementing partners (Recommendation 5). .
114. ILO-IPEC specialists have also become better informed and effective, and have heard new views from social partners.
115. The project funds have helped ILO-IPEC in the concentration of efforts in Africa with social partners' support. Some background comments and a rationale for this observation are made in the section on Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness). It is recommended to ILO-IPEC that the lessons of this project and the level of social dialogue achieved be used to improve the role of the social partners in the development of NAPs (especially in Africa) and the more direct involvement of

social partners in these plans. From an employer's perspective, Central Asia also requires further attention (Recommendation 6). .

116. The project made contributions to *bipartite* (i.e. trade unions and employers), partners allowing them to strengthen capacity in addressing child labour in a role that is arms-length apart from ILO-IPEC and governments. These partners are better able to implement sustainable actions and initiate their own activities. The re-energising of trade union focal points for child labour has been significant.
117. As noted above, there will be lessons to learn about penetrating the informal agricultural sector. It is recommended that this could be something that the ILO-IPEC-FAO Agricultural Partnership Project could follow up (Recommendation 7). .
118. It is important to continue to focus on capacity development and strengthening the knowledge base of employers and workers organisations. There is still a need to develop and disseminate information, training and awareness raising materials
119. The project implementation has showed that ILO-IPEC needs to develop further work with the employers and trade unions to build on the activities started and may require more attention to coordinating mechanisms at ILO HQ. It is recommended to ILO-IPEC that it makes more use of the bipartite mechanism (Recommendation 8). .
120. The flexible nature of the project funds enabled synergies to be made with other activities, such as development of materials and guidelines. There have been multiplier effects in so far as social partners have been able to implement their own activities more effectively, and within the context of South-South/Triangular cooperation.
121. The project enabled social partners to take unilateral action in the area of child labour (e.g. trade union handbook on hazardous child labour); also, produced were various effective campaigning and advocacy aids: a DVD by social partners, the activity in Colombia with the employers organisations and its mining members and the transformation of the Chilean manual into a web based platform and instrument to disseminate it. It is recommended to IPEC that these materials be piloted in other countries (Recommendation 9).

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Selected Bibliography	22
Annex 2: Evaluation Inception Report.....	23
Annex 3: Evaluation Terms of Reference	28
Annex 4: List of people Interviewed.....	43
Annex 5: IAPP Output and Activity Table	44

Annex 1: Selected Bibliography

ACT/EMP, ILO and International Organisation of Employers, Eliminating Child labour: Guide for Employers, written by Paul Vandenberg, developed by Anne-Brit Nippierd, Sandy Gros-Louis; ILO, Bureau for Employers Activities; International Organisation of Employers, Geneva, 2007

Civil Society Direction, Learners, Practitioners and Teachers: handbook on monitoring, evaluating and managing knowledge for policy influence, 2010.

ILO-PARDEV, Project Document/Summary Project Outline, Social partnership and advocacy to tackle child labour, INT/08/72/IRL.

ILO-IPEC, Social partnership and advocacy to tackle child labour (INT/08/72/IRL), Progress Reports for July 2007-December 2008, January 2011-February 2011.

ILO-IPEC, The growing role of South-South Cooperation in combating child labour, 2010 edition: Good Practices, Geneva 2010

ILO, ILO/Irish Aid partnership (IAP) Third Phase 2008-2011, Mid-Term Self Evaluation Report, February 2010.

ILO-IPEC, Independent Evaluation: Advancing Tripartite Action to Tackle Child Labour, A components of the 2009/10 ILO/Norway Programme Cooperation Agreement, by Lotte Nycander, Independent Consultant, February 2011.

Scanteam, Evaluation Report on ILO Bureau for Employers Activities Child Labour Project, Geneva, 2009,

Annex 2: Evaluation Inception Report

Introduction

1. The Irish Aid Partnership Programme (IAPP - INT/08/272/IRL) aims to enhance a more strategic and complementary dimension to the large programme of technical cooperation which ILO-IPEC already implements. Although ILO-IPEC does work through social partners (employers and trade unions) it is recognised that the capacity of these partners needs to be strengthened, so that, to a greater extent, they are able to work to their own strengths and implement their own activities in response to Conventions 138 and 182, *and* within the framework of NAPs *and* within south-south cooperation. This is expected to generate greater sustainability and national ownership to its work.
2. The IPEC project component is one of five technical areas funded by the IAPP in ILO, now in its Third Phase. This third phase aims to emphasise the sustainability of interventions, organisational capacity building, greater involvement of social partners in project implementation, and assistance to partner organisations in developing plans to mobilise and diversify funding sources.
3. The resources provided by the ILO-IAPP are US\$12.9m. divided between the five programmes: Women's Entrepreneurship Development and Gender Equality, Promoting the Employability and Employment of People with Disabilities through Effective Legislation, Promoting Decent Work for People with Disabilities through a Disability Inclusion Support Service, Special Action on Forced Labour and the Child Labour (IPEC). The IPEC portion of the funds was US\$1.57m.

Programme Strategy, Objectives and Components

Strategy and Objectives

4. The strategy of the project is to work with social partners to implement the work of eliminating child labour through knowledge sharing, policy development with action plans and capacity development. For a discussion of the development objective, see end of this note.
5. The immediate objectives of the project are:
 - To enhance the knowledge base on workers and employers activities on child labour to lead to greater union and employer action on child labour;
 - To develop and promote policies, strategies and action plans on combating child labour for employers' organisations and trade unions; and
 - To enhance the capacity of key national and regional workers and employers institutions to be involved in designing policy and programmes to tackle child labour, as a result of a targeted training programme.

Components

6. The project was global in nature with, according to project reports, 76 countries involved in one way or another. Therefore outreach was considerable.
7. The project has three main components:
8. The first component of the project involves the collection and systematisation of good practices which were expected to be used both to promote replication and to support the training programmes and sessions funded by the project. The knowledge base generated was also expected to ensure that ILO-IPEC staff at all levels were aware of the opportunities and advantages of fully integrating social partners in national efforts to tackle child labour and to be a catalyst for increasing collaboration among ILO specialists in the field. Two main activities were envisaged: the publication of the good

practices of employer/union involvement to tackle child labour, and publication of a guide for IPEC, ACT/EMP and ACTRAV on child labour and the role of social partners.

9. The second component of the project was focussed on training activities for workers and employers organisations, and support for both bipartite and some tripartite meetings. The two main activities as part of this component were expected to be the strengthening of employer/trade union networks of focal points on child labour, and the production of a DVD on the role of social partners in tackling child labour.
10. The third component covered policy development and coordination. This was expected to follow from the activities of the first two components: for social partners to be more effectively involved in the design of policy and programmes to tackle child labour. The two main activities were expected to be the production of campaign materials for use by social partners on the World Day of Action against Child Labour, and more effective action by social partners in National Tripartite Commissions and in other policy structures dealing with child labour.

Evaluation Issues to address

11. The following questions were provided in the Terms of Reference dated July 2011, and have been edited for this inception report to reduce repetition, and without loss of meaning. These are *suggested* areas to investigate and within the time constraints of the evaluation it is not possible to research all in depth.

Design and Planning:

Evaluation Question	Means of Investigation	Comments
How well were the strategic focus, objectives and components carried through in the activities?	Interviews and feedback that give overview of this nature. Programme generated monitoring sheet.	Availability of IPEC monitoring plan may have helped. This is a general evaluation question and to be answered in conjunction with the design logic (ToC)

Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness)

Evaluation Question	Means of Investigation	Comments
What were the key achievements across countries and at global level?	Monitoring sheet provided for evaluation. Interviews	This is a general evaluation question. Late availability of project list with monitoring sheet may dilute the investigation here
Were the management and implementation arrangements supportive of the strategy?	Interviews with management and finance officers	
How did the programme components influence the work of IPEC, ACTRAV, ACT/EMP (and other units in ILO) and how did the tripartite nature enhance the components and create synergies?	Interviews with ACT/EMP and ACTRAV staff in particular.	Absence of HQ ACTRAV staff in the second phase of the evaluation will limit examination of this question and absence of some ACT/EMP staff.
How did the programme contribute to the ILO Programme and Budget outcome relevant for child labour?	Examination of ILO P&B outcomes.	

Evaluation Question	Means of Investigation	Comments
How did the global and country context influence achievements?	A part of all evaluation investigations	Difficult to form a sound judgement given the large number (70 plus) of countries involved. Will expect to do country case studies.

Relevance

Evaluation Question	Means of Investigation	Comments
How did the components address issues, needs and opportunities as defined in the planning documents?	Review of project documents, feedback from beneficiaries	
How did activities and components line up with other IAPP activities, other IPEC activities and ILO-wide work on social dialogue and tripartite activity on child labour?	As above	Severe time constraints for evaluation will mean that interviews with other IAPP component staff and ILO- wide social dialogue staff will be very limited

Sustainability

Evaluation Question	Means of Investigation	Comments
What are the key elements of sustainability of the programme components?	Interview with programme beneficiaries, and views of ILO regional staff.	Likely to be limited to a few cases
How is it linked to sustainability of other IPEC and ILO activities?	Interview with IPEC staff not directly involved in the IAPP	Severe time constraints for evaluation will means that interviews with IPEC and ILO staff will be very limited
How can ILO build on achievements so far? How did the components contribute to ILO strategic objectives?	Interviews with IPEC staff	
How did the project contribute to knowledge and capacity in ILO-IPEC?	Interviews with IPEC staff	

Special Concerns

Evaluation Question	Means of Investigation	Comments
How did the components support the International Core Labour Standards?	Interviews, and review of Committee of experts on application of conventions	Unfortunately Committee of Experts reports not made available.
What are the issues regarding follow-up?	Feedback from beneficiaries and ILO field specialists	
How has the project contributed to	Feedback from beneficiaries	

Evaluation Question	Means of Investigation	Comments
enhancing the role of workers and employers organisations in advocating for action against child labour at regional and national levels?	and ILO field specialists	
To strengthening the collaborative work of IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP specialists?	Interviews with staff at HQ and regions	Likely to be partial as interviews with ACTRAV staff not comprehensive
To strengthening the issue of child labour as a priority for workers and employers, and to ensuring that social partners acquire a stronger role in implementation of recent IPEC projects?	Feedback directly from workers and employers representatives.	Initial feedback suggests employers specialists more likely to respond to evaluation requests
How far have ACTRAV and ACT/EMP and IPEC been able to mainstream child labour in their priorities?	Interviews with staff at HQ and regions	Timing of evaluation in August means that may not be able to interview sufficient HQ staff
What was the involvement of social partners in the four project stage areas of design, before project launch, implementation and monitoring and evaluation?	Interviews with social partners	Unlikely to find sufficient feedback and experience to understand what happened at all of these stages.
How did the project enhance the capacity of employer's organisations and their understanding of child labour?	Feedback from employers	
How has the programme contributed to showing how social dialogue as a modality to eliminate child labour?	Interviews with ILO staff	This issue only likely to emerge after further implementation of project. Short terms reactions only
How have bipartite activities contributed to eliminating child labour?	Interviews with beneficiaries	Feedback likely to be very speculative at this stage
How has the capacity building component strengthened focal points?	Interviews with beneficiaries	As above
How have the management arrangements at HQ helped achieve the outcomes of the project, including financial allocations?	See under 'Achievements'.	
How has further bipartite collaboration between ACT/EMP and ACTRAV furthered the goal of the project?	Interviews with staff at HQ and regions	Absence of HQ ACTRAV staff in the second phase of the evaluation will limit examination of this question and absence of some ACT/EMP staff.

Conclusions: The key evaluation questions

12. The key evaluation question to review is: how far, through the actions carried out, social partners have been strengthened to be more capable in addressing child labour issues both in their own activities and in ILO-supported work, and these are embodied in two parts: how well did the project work and what has happened as a result.
13. Two versions of the development objective were found in the documentation. The first relates more to outputs (e.g. improve knowledge base) and outcomes (improve linkages) while the second is more impact, longer term oriented:

Improve the knowledge base and linkages between the work of ILO-IPEC and social partners, training for development of social partner capacity, and policy development and coordination;

and

The project will contribute to the objective of the ILO Global Action Plan, the elimination of the worst forms of child labour by 2016, through strengthened involvement of social partners in tackling child labour.

14. The central evaluation question to answer lies someway between these two.

Annex 3: Evaluation Terms of Reference



International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour ILO/IPEC

Final (basis for
contract for
evaluator)

Terms of Reference For Independent Evaluation

Social partnership and advocacy to tackle child labour

(ILO/Irish Aid Partnership Programme (third phase))

July 2011

ILO Project Code	INT/08/72/IRL
ILO Project Number	
ILO Iris Code	101261
Country	Global
Starting Date	August 2008
Ending Date	31 July 2011 (extended to 31 September)
Project Duration	
Type of Evaluation	
Date of Evaluation	
Project Language	English
Executing Agency	ILO-IPEC with ILO/ACTRAV, ILO/ACTEMP)
Financing Agency	Irish Aid (Government of Ireland)
Donor contribution	USD 1,572,327

Background and Justification

Overall Project Context Description

1. Child labour is a problem worldwide but is particularly severe in sub Saharan Africa and Asia. There are about 170 million child labourers in these two regions of the world. While the causes of child labour are several and complex, weaknesses in coverage of education systems, in addition to poverty, are a fundamental factor.
2. The work of ILO's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) focuses at two levels. The first is at the level of the policy and enabling environment, working with partners to identify and promote legislative and policy reforms to reduce child labour. The second level is to work with partners to implement programmes aimed at providing services to vulnerable children and communities, such as access for children to education and skills, and support for families. ILO is pursuing a Global Action Plan to tackle child labour, on the basis that effective elimination of child labour can only be achieved at the country level with member States at the forefront of these efforts. The international campaign to eliminate child labour is centred around ILO Conventions 138 (that the minimum age of to employment shall not be less than the age of completion of compulsory schooling) and more recently, Convention 182 which urges Governments to immediate action to stop the worst forms of child labour and to ensure these children have access to free basic education.
3. The work of ILO-IPEC and its partners is directly linked to the Millennium Development Goals, most strongly to MDG 2 (Universal primary education): an objective both direct and indirect of the IPEC-supported work is to ensure children are placed into school. But the work also makes contributions to attaining MDG 1 (poverty), MDG 3 (Gender) and MDG 4 (Child Health).
4. The ILO is pursuing a Global Action Plan to tackle child labour. The plan calls for the adoption of time-bound targets to meet the goal of eliminating the worst forms of child labour by 2016 – and eventually all forms – and identifies various means by which the ILO can support this process. This target would parallel and contribute to both the Millennium Development Goals on education and poverty, and to the effective abolition of all forms of child labour, which is a fundamental goal of the ILO.
5. The Global Action Plan also focuses on the need for strengthening the role of social partners in the global campaign against child labour. Their organisational structures and their capacity to influence policy give them a potentially very strategic role in efforts to tackle child labour and the underlying causes of child labour. Therefore, this project will have as its core focus the strengthening of social partner capacity on child labour at the local, national and international levels, notably by exploiting a new momentum of IPEC technical cooperation which has been known as the “south-south initiative in combating child labour”.
6. The purpose of INT/08/272/IRL is distinctive. It adds a more strategic dimension to the large programme of technical cooperation which ILO-IPEC already implements.
7. Although ILO-IPEC does work through social partners (employers and trade unions) it is recognised that the capacity of these partners needs to be strengthened, so that, to a greater extent, they are able to go ahead and implement their own activities in response Conventions 138 and 182, *and* within the framework national Action Plans on Child labour *and* within south-south cooperation. This is expected to generate greater sustainability and national ownership to its work.
8. The project is one of five technical areas funded as part of the ILO/Irish Aid Partnership (IAP), now in its Third Phase. The resources provided are US\$12.9 divided between five programmes: Women's Entrepreneurship Development and Gender Equality (WEDGE), Promoting the Employability and Employment of People with Disabilities through Effective Legislation (PEPDEL), Promoting Decent Work for People with Disabilities through a Disability Inclusion Support Service (INCLUDE),

Special Action on Forced Labour (SAP-FL) and the Child Labour (IPEC). The IPEC portion of the funds was US\$1.4m, of which one quarter each was directed towards ACTRAV and ACT EMP.

9. The IAP funding has worked in a synergistic manner with funding from the Norwegian government in the form of INT/09/50/NOR (IPEC), Advancing Tripartite Action to Tackle Child Labour (a component of the ILO/Norway Programme Cooperation Agreement (2009-2010). Similar activities were funded by the Norwegian project, including some other components (such as the '12 to 12 Community Portal" which also benefiting the activities supported under the IAP).

Overall Project Description

10. The project has three main components, improving the knowledge base and linkages between the work of ILO-IPEC and social partners, training for development of social partner capacity, and policy development and coordination. .
11. Even though the ILO Global Action Plan on elimination of the worst forms of child labour called for a particular focus on Africa, this project also implemented activities in Latin America, Europe, Asia and the Pacific and complemented and enhanced previous experience that IPEC, ACTRAV and ACTEMP have had and were implementing in the countries covered.
12. The strengthening actions led by existing social dialogue and child labour focal points was central to the approach of this project as well as the establishment and development of new ones and for this to take place the project devoted a significant portion of its implementation action to improving the knowledge base and linkages between the work of ILO-IPEC and social partners.
13. Therefore, an important factor of the project was to increase the capacity of social partners to play an active role in efforts to tackle child labour and it gathered information on good practices and on ways in which employers and workers organizations have become involved.
14. The collection and systematization of good practices were supposed to be used both to promote replication and during the training programmes and sessions funded by the Project. Moreover, the knowledge base generated should be capable to ensure that ILO-IPEC staff at all levels were aware of the opportunities and advantages of fully involving social partners in national efforts to tackle child labour and to be a catalyst in increasing collaboration among ILO specialists in the field.
15. The second component of the Project was focused on training activities for Workers organizations, Employers organizations and Bipartite/tripartite sessions
16. At national level many IPEC projects have been cooperating with trade unions on issues of child labour law and building awareness on the need to tackle child labour. However a need has been identified to further develop the linkages between trade unions and IPEC. This recently gave rise to an initiative for a training programme, which was organised in October 2007 jointly between IPEC and the ILO Bureau for Workers Activities. Bringing together participants from Africa, Asia and the Americas, the aim was to begin a process of developing a group of trade union focal points with particular knowledge of child labour issues and the trade union role in combating child labour.
17. Under the project it would be proposed to extend cooperation with ACTRAV and ITUC in development of an international trade union network on child labour. This would be based on a network of trained trade union focal points who would work at national and regional level in cooperation with ILO-IPEC and ACTRAV and be supported in developing and implementing action plans on child labour, with aims at getting trade unions more involved in actions on the WFCL with the informal sector
18. The project would also support other training needs identified through the project steering committee based on the "Trade Union and Child Labour" training kit.

Employers' organisations

19. ACTEMP in collaboration with IOE have recently produced a set of Guide for Employers on eliminating child labour. This comprehensive material provides a good basis for development of a training programme which can help maximise employer involvement if efforts to tackle child labour. It provides practical examples for business on how to deal with child labour, as well as setting out the challenges and considerations that businesses need to take into account when addressing child labour in their workplaces or their supply chains.

Bipartite/tripartite training

20. At national level employers and trade unions are represented on IPEC National Steering Committees and National Action Committees on Child Labour. This group of trade union and employer representatives would be targeted for support through the project, with training activities and resources aimed at increasing their effectiveness and contributions within national discussions.

Advocacy, awareness raising and policy development

21. The work on training and knowledge outlined above is intended to support action by employers and unions which will help to tackle child labour. Employers and unions can play a key role to mainstream the child labour issue in countries' programmes and policies. One reason why child labour is often not high on the development agenda is that such constituencies have so far been largely lacking or weak in making representations on the issue.
22. Under the project, it is proposed to engage employers and workers organisations so that they help in promoting key messages, building awareness and supporting policy development. The aim will be for employer and union organisations and networks to
 - Initiate their own activities to raise membership awareness on the need for employers/workers responses to child labour
 - Consider the issue during major Conferences and events
 - Discuss the issue in tripartite and bipartite structures
 - Establish their own policies on child labour
 - Promote their policies within key industries, with government and with other actors
23. Efforts to develop the capacity and role of employers and trade unions would also seek to integrate them fully in support for and promotion of the World Day against Child Labour, held annually on June 12. The World Day is a major opportunity to raise public awareness and political support for the need to address child labour. In the past the World Day has attracted very significant international media coverage and has helped to raise the profile of international concern on child labour.
24. World Day activities are usually held in more than 50 countries worldwide. Much of the programme is organised through the wide network of partners which the ILO's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour has, but the World Day is also supported more widely by other international agencies and partners. Within the framework of the project support would be provided for the promotion of the World Day against Child Labour, key knowledge and awareness raising products to be produced in relation to the World Day, and activities of employers' and workers' organisations in supporting the Day.
25. There is also interest on the part of both employers and workers organisations in promoting the sharing of experience between countries, and the project would seek to identify and support strategic opportunities of this kind. Given the support of the Irish government for this project, in consultation

with ACTEMP and ACTRAV, links would be established with the Irish Congress of Trade Unions and the Irish Business and Employers Confederation to keep them informed on the development of project activity.

26. The partners for the project will be relevant employers and workers organizations and their representatives, as well as other stakeholders in the field.
27. The countries, existing initiatives and organizations to be involved under this project will be in line with IPEC's and the ILO Bureaux for Employers' and Workers' Activities and will rely on the relevance of previous activities sponsored both for up and downstream policy development, piloting experiences, sharing knowledge, advocacy and capacity building.
28. The countries, regions and organizations to be covered will be coordinated by the three technical units of the ILO. In all activities efforts will be made to promote full participation of both women and men, in line with established ILO practice.
29. IPEC staff in the field as well as project's stakeholders will also benefit from this project in the sense that their capacities to promote tripartite dialogue and better involve workers' and employers' organizations in the implementation of project's initiatives and it will not operate in isolation, but will be integrated into strategic efforts by the ILO to tackle child labour.
30. The Project has employed flexible approach as during its implementation, the Programme and the ILO-units involved should be capable of identifying those strategic opportunities and activities that are in line with the Global Action Plan.
31. The objectives of the project are:
 - At the end of the project, the knowledge base on workers and employers activities on CL has been enhanced leading to greater union and employer action on child labour
 - At the end of the project Employers organisations and trade unions will have developed and be promoting policies, strategies and action plans on combating child labour.
 - At the end of the project, the capacity of key national and regional workers and employers institutions to be involved in designing policy and programmes to tackle child labour will be enhanced as a result of a targeted training programme
32. The objectives outlined above will contribute to the impact on the ultimate beneficiaries of the project, children who as a result of strengthened policies and programmes will not enter, or be withdrawn from, child labour.
33. A detailed implementation has been developed in consultation with ACTRAV and ACTEMP

Other relevant project background

34. The project will build on the large scale programme of technical cooperation which ILO-IPEC already has in place and reinforce and support work implemented through the DWCP process.
35. For instance The ILO-Norway Framework Agreement has supported since 2004 a collaborative action between three technical units in the ILO (ACTRAV, ACTEMP and IPEC), in the implementation of activities at the national, regional and interregional level. Many lessons have been learned from these collaborative efforts and these have as such served as a basis for this project.
36. From the perspective of the 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 project should be analyzed.

37. ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) are being introduced in ILO to provide a mechanism through which to outline agreed upon priorities between the ILO and the national constituents partners within a broader UN and International development context. For further information please see <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/decent.htm>
38. The DWCP defines a corporate focus on priorities, operational strategies as well as a resource and implementation plan that complement 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 gradually be introduced in various countries
39. Within the UN family the ILO is seen as the lead agency on child labour, and can play a role in raising concern with child labour within the UN country team process and within other inter agency coordinating groups.

Background to Evaluation

40. A mid-term ILO managed self-evaluation was conducted in 2009 to evaluate the progress so far. A consultant prepared a standard review instrument that was completed by the individual departments responsible for the individual components.
41. The related ILO Norway framework from 2009-10 was subject to a final evaluation in early 2011.
42. The Irish Partnership Agreement has been undergoing an evaluation in March-July 2011, consisting of individual evaluation process and reports for the individual projects under the Partnership Agreement, with a synthesis report to be prepared in July 2011.
43. This evaluation of the Irish Aid component on social partnership and Advocacy to tackle Child Labour is considered part of this evaluation and will feed into the final work on the overall evaluation of the Partnership Agreement and the discussions on further work and funding.
44. Evaluation for the purpose of learning and planning and building knowledge is an essential part of ILO/IPEC approach. It contributes to building the knowledge base on action against child labour and the capacity for using such knowledge. This is particular so for global cross-cutting strategic programmes such as this one with a focus on the key tripartite basis for action. As per ILO evaluation policy and procedures all programmes and projects over a certain duration and funding level have to be evaluated. An evaluation focusing on the strategic achievements and experience can form the basis for discussions on further action in this area of work.
45. Annual reports have provided extensive details, including elements of self-assessment which could be completed by an external review and perspective that would allow for a credible and impartial assessment of the achievement of the programme component so far.

Purpose and Scope

Purpose

46. The purpose of the present evaluation is to
 - identify and assess current achievements of the IPEC component
 - identify relevance, effectiveness and possible sustainability of the programme component

- identify relevant linkages between the components within the project and their contribution to the achievement of the IPEC implemented component; as well as linkage with other IPEC activities related to social dialogue
 - assess broader role and contribution of this project to the process of strengthening social dialogue in work on child labour in ILO and IPEC
 - identify areas of further work and strengthening of the partnership agreement based on current achievements, lessons learned and analysis of key factors determining progress in the programme component
47. The evaluation should assess the overall achievement of the programme component at different levels such as at policy, institutional and country level in accordance with the availability and quality of existing data and information. It should analyze strategies and models of intervention used, document lessons learned and potential good practices, and provide recommendations for all stakeholders on how to integrate these into planning processes and implementation of future child labour activities within the framework agreement.
48. The main users of the evaluation are Employers and Workers organisation at different levels the ILO in particularly ACTRAV, ACTEMP and IPEC including specialists in the field; and Directors of ILO Offices in the context of the coordination role of the Decent Work Country Teams; donors and other relevant global, regional and national partners.

Scope

49. The scope of the evaluation includes
- All IPEC, ACTRAV and ACTEMP implemented component and activities under this project as outlined in the project document and as detailed further in work plans and budgets for the project
 - IPEC, ACTRAV and ACTEMP contribution to any coordinated and joint activities of the partnership agreement
50. The evaluation should focus on the specific component and its achievements and not on the mechanisms and process of establishing and managing the project within the Partnership Agreement as such.

Suggested Aspects to be Addressed
--

51. Generally, the evaluation should adhere to the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy and Guidelines, specific ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. More specifically, the evaluation should address the overarching ILO evaluation criteria of 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 issues see: ILO Guidelines for the Integration of Gender Issues into the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of ILO Programmes and Projects, 1995. Further information on the ILO's gender approach is also available at www.ilo.org/gender.
52. 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.
53. 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 analysing results through

addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the objectives of the programme component.

54. Annex 1 lists the broad suggested aspects that can be identified at this point for the evaluation to address organised in the following headings:

I. Design & Planning

II. Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness)

III. Relevance of the Project

IV. Sustainability

IV. Special Concerns

55. 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), the evaluation manager. These will be particularly developed through the initial round of interviews with key stakeholders, in particular project management and other colleagues at ILO Geneva.
56. The evaluation instrument prepared by the evaluation team will indicate further selected specific aspects to be addressed based on initial desk review. The evaluation instrument should identify the priority aspects to be addressed in the evaluation.

Expected Outputs of the Evaluation

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

- A desk review of programme component related documents
- An evaluation instrument prepared by the evaluator identifying key aspects to address as well as approach and methods to be used
- Data collection and interviews in Geneva
- Preparation of questionnaire for field based colleagues and partners
- Email and telephone interviews with staff and partners as identified
- Draft evaluation report
- Final Report including:
 - Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
 - Clearly identified findings
 - Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations
 - Lessons learned
 - Potential good practices and effective models of intervention.
 - Appropriate Annexes including the TORs for the independent evaluation

58. The report should follow the outline that is considered the most appropriate given the purpose, scope and selected suggested aspects and when the focus should be on clear documentation and analysis of outcomes, results and achievements. The outline could follow the strategic components of the programme with cross cutting elements covered as appropriate.
59. The total length of the report should be a maximum of 30 pages for main report, excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated. The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.

60. 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.
61. The final report will be circulated to key stakeholders for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the Design, Evaluation and Documentation Section (DED) of ILO/IPEC Geneva and provided to the team leader. In preparing the final report the team leader should consider these comments, incorporate as appropriate and provide a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated.

Evaluation Methodology

62. The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard
63. The following is the proposed evaluation methodology. While the evaluation team can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by DED provided that the research and analysis suggests changes and provided that the indicated range of questions is addressed, the purpose maintained and the expected outputs produced at the required quality.
64. The evaluation will be carried out through a desk review of appropriate material, including the project documents, progress reports, previous evaluation reports, outputs of the project and action programmes, results of any internal planning processes in the countries and relevant materials from secondary sources.
65. At the end of the desk review period, it is expected that the evaluation consultant prepare a brief document indicating the methodological approach to the evaluation, the evaluation instrument, to be discussed and approved by DED prior to the commencement of the field mission.
66. The evaluation team will interview key stakeholders including representatives of donors, relevant ILO and ILO/IPEC officials at ILO HQ and appropriate key other stakeholders and ILO officials at the regional level.
67. During Irish Aid Project implementation, a survey was undertaken of IPEC colleagues in the field as a base line on the perspective, experiences and understanding of IPEC collages. This could be used as reference by the evaluator. Data on the survey will be provided to the evaluator. A simpler and shorter follow up survey could be a possibility to determine any changes.
68. Country examples or mini case-studies should be incorporated to highlight specific examples. For instance Mozambique and Zambia are good examples where Employers Organisations (EO) that have developed a much bigger role nationally after capacity building and awareness raising activities funded by the project. In South America, Argentina and Chile are equally good cases to be evaluated at the policy level, including work that trade unions have done in Argentina, India, in the context of local action plan and activities and from the ratification point of view, could in principle be subject of a specific sub-study. Other examples are Ghana for their bipartite actions; and South East Asia (Bangkok) for assessing the results of the training.

69. The evaluator will be responsible for drafting the evaluation report. Upon feedback from stakeholders to the draft report, the team leader will further be responsible for finalizing the report incorporating any comments deemed appropriate.
70. The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the IPEC-DED section and with the logistical support of the relevant ILO/IPEC officials at HQ.
71. The phases of the evaluation and the time table is given in Table 1.

Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings

72. The standard documents and currently identified sources of information are given in table 2. A more detailed list of documents will be prepared by programme management as part of the preparation for the evaluation.

Table 2: Documents to Consultant and Sources of Information

To be supplied immediately to the evaluator upon signature of contract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project document • Annual Progress Reports • Briefing material on evaluations in ILO/IPEC
To be made available during desk review and during interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant documents for the ILO/Norway Framework • ILO 2009/2010 • A list of the relevant contact persons involved in the work for the component • Indicative annual work plans • Budget information • Studies, workshop reports and other documents and research undertaken • Relevant mission reports and internal reports • National workshop proceedings or summaries • Relevant country level planning documents • Report of the Committee of Experts on the application of Conventions on the countries covered by this Project • Relevant evaluation reports of related components • Others to be identified

73. It is suggested that the evaluator should read the Report of the Committee of Experts on the application of Conventions on the countries covered by this Project. The example of Angola is a good one, given that UNTA has systematically taken a qualified role in raising specific issues related to the reports submitted to the ILO concerning Conventions 138 and 182. Moreover, the Declaration baselines should also be part of the evaluator's reference reading
74. Table 3 lists the current identified stakeholders and key informants to consult during the evaluation. A further list will be prepared by ILO/IPEC as part of the preparation of the evaluation.

Table 3: List of stakeholders and other key informants for consultation and interview

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ILO/IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP staff involved in the direct management and implementation of the programme component • ILO/IPEC technical and backstopping officials at HQ and the regions as appropriate • Relevant ACTRAV and ACT/EMP officials including • Other ILO officials involved in supporting the programme component • Directors of relevant ILO offices • Representatives of donor (if appropriate) • Other partners and individuals directly involved in the activities of the programme component • Others to be identified
--	---

Final Report Submission Procedure

75. 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 evaluation team leader or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders.
- The final report is submitted to IPEC DED who will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including the donor.

Resources and Management

Composition of the evaluation team

76. The evaluation team will consist of one evaluator that previously has not been involved in the projects or other activities surrounding the framework agreement or the programme component. The evaluator will have the final responsibility during the evaluation process and the outcomes of the evaluation, including the quality of the report and compliance with deadlines. The IPEC/DED will as the evaluation manager identify and select the evaluator based on consultations and input from the key stakeholders. The evaluator should have a proven understanding of social partners and their unique operations and the role they should play in eliminating child labour.

77. The profile and responsibilities of the evaluator is as given in table 4

Table 4: Responsibilities and Required Profile

Responsibilities	Required Profile
<i>Evaluator</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Detailed conceptualization and implementation of evaluation, including methodology and data collection• Delivery of expected outputs• Implementation of evaluation as per required standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Relevant background in social and/or economic development• Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institution building and local development projects.• Experience in evaluations as team leader and from global, programme or strategic level evaluations• Familiarity and experience with framework agreements between donors and multi-lateral organisations• Experience with work in multi-lateral organisations• Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework are highly appreciated.• Experience with ILO, labour and employment issues desirable• Demonstrated understanding of multi-stakeholder programmes, with experience of tripartite work in particular• Fluency in English and demonstrated ability to analyse and write concisely at the senior and strategic level

Timetable

78. 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.
79. The evaluator will be responsible for 30 work days *of which at least 7 days will be in two visits to Geneva*
80. The proposed timetable is given in Table 1 as follows:

Table 1: Proposed time table

Phases	Tasks	Dates
I: Desk Review	Desk review of relevant programme and project documents	8 days (to be scheduled)
II. Interviews and Data Collection	Visit to Geneva for interviews plus telephone and email interviews with non-Geneva based key informants	One week in August 2011 (to be scheduled)
III. Draft Report	Further data collection and preparation of first completed draft of evaluation report	One week in August (to be scheduled)
IV. Stakeholder comments	Draft report circulated by DED to key stakeholders for their comments to the draft evaluation report. DED consolidates the comments and forwards to evaluator	One week (to be scheduled)
V. Final report	Evaluator finalizes the evaluation report taking into consideration the consolidated comments	One week (to be scheduled)

Financial Resources:

81. The resources required for this evaluation are:

For the evaluation team leader:

- Fees for a consultant for 30 working days
- Fees for travel from consultant's home to Geneva in accordance with ILO regulations and policies (if applicable)
- Fees for DSA per ILO regulations for Geneva

82. A detailed budget is available separately

Management:

83. The evaluator will report to IPEC DED in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with DED should issues arise. IPEC officials at ILO/IPEC HQ will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation with input and support from ACTRAV and ACTEMP as required.

Suggested aspect to address

Design & Planning

- How well were the strategic focus and objectives of the project and its components carried through in the specific activities?

Achievements (Implementation and Effectiveness)

- What were the key activities and outputs and what were the key strategic achievements as a result and across countries?
- What were the key achievements at the global level?
- Were the management and implementation arrangements conducive the strategic focus of the project, including the process for ensuring flexibility to address strategic opportunities?
- How did the activities of the programme components influence the work of IPEC, ACTRAV and ACTEMP and other parts of ILO?
- What is the contribution of the programme component to the ILO Programme and Budget outcome relevant for child labour
- How did the tripartite nature and links enhance the work of the programme component?
- How did the IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP collaboration create synergies?
- How did the context globally, and in various countries influence the implementation and achievement?

Relevance of the Project

- How did the activities of the programme component address issues, needs and opportunities as defined in the project document and other programming documents?
- Did the activities of the component serve to build on or create the necessary linkages and fit with relevant other activities within the Partnership Agreement or other activities in IPEC and in the ILO on social dialogue and tripartite action on child labour?

Sustainability

- What elements of the programme component are sustainable? What are the key elements in the sustainability of the programme component? How is it linked to the sustainability and approach of other IPEC and ILO activities?
- How can ILO achieve maximum impact from the programme components? How can ILO built on the achievement of the programme component so far?
- What was the key strategic contribution of the programme components to achievement of ILO strategic objective and operational outcome?
- How did the project contribute to the enhancement of knowledge and capacity in ILO and in particular ILO/IPEC?

Special Concerns

- How did the programme components promote and support the International Core Labour Standards? Were activities fully in line with these?
- What are the issues and key areas of analysis and focus that can be identified as relevant for a detailed discussion on follow-up activities in this area of work?

- How has this Project been able to contribute to enhance the role of Workers and Employers' organisation in advocating for action against child labour in the national and regional level?
- How has this Project been able to contribute to enhance the role of Workers and Employers' organisation in advocating for action against child labour in the national and regional level?
- How has the project strengthen the work that IPEC and ACTRAV and ACTEMP specialists to work together in the field, in particular through stronger coordination and linked efforts?
- Has the project helped strengthen the priority of child labour as an issue of workers and employers through strengthening the issue as a priority with ACTRAV, ACTEMP and through strengthening the awareness and capacity of IPEC desk officers to see the role of social partners and how therefore project colleagues in the field work on this matter, to ensure that social partners acquired a better place in project implementation in the field in recent IPEC's projects?
- Have ACTRAV and ACTEMP have been able to also mainstream child labour in their priorities?
- What has been role, if any of the project, in facilitating the work ACTEMP and ACTRAV in raising child labour as an ILO fundamental principle? Have other activities of ACTEMP and ACTRAV such as projects funded by other donor, helped raise this issue?
- How as the involvement of the social partners (trade unions and employers)' in terms of four areas
 - At the design stage, how were they consulted and whether were their inputs incorporated in the project document?
 - before the launching of the project, whether the project has had planning meetings - separate with individual constituents and in a tripartite manner to introduce the project and develop a detailed action plan
 - in the implementation stage, what is the percentage of budgets, allocated for each social partner
 - in the monitoring and evaluation processes, how have social partners involved in this process
- Are there any concrete examples of how the project intervention has lead to some change on child labour issues by social partners in their own area of work or at their own initiative?
- Assessing the overall objectives by trying to capture in what sense the project has been capable of enhancing the capacity of employer's organisations in national efforts
- Given that child labour is not the core "business" of employers organisations, the evaluation should assess to what extent the activities succeeded to enhance their understanding of child labour (characteristics and consequences).
- Did the project manage to strengthen tripartite and joint worker-employers action against child labour?
- Were the project results meaningful and did the meet the needs and priorities of social partners?
- Has the project contributed to demonstrating how social dialogue can be used as a modality to end child labour, as through the project's activities it was possible to undertake capacity building sessions to promote social dialogue?
- To what extent has it been possible to have bipartite actions after the project activities and in what sense it has contributed to combat child labour
- To what extent have the Capacity Building component of the project strengthened

- The level of the overall trade union's understanding of child labour issues
- Individual skill (focal points) and institutional/organisation capacity to act on child labour issues
- Concrete results of the focal point training and other capacity building activities
- Bipartite activities, if any (focus of the activities and targeted actions)
- To what extent has it been possible to have bipartite actions after the project activities and in what sense it has contributed to combat child labour
- Assess how the project management and coordination in HQ and in the field has helped achieve the outcomes of the project. This could include financial allocations of the project; the present single department management structure and joint/collaborative efforts of the three departments
- To what extent have further bi-partite collaboration between ACTEMP and ACTRAV furthered the goal of the project?

Annex 4: List of people Interviewed

Name	Designation	Contact
Claude Akpokavie	Specialist in Workers Activities, ACTRAV	akpokavie@ilo.org
Pedro America Furtardo de Oliveira	CTA, IAPP Programme, ILO-IPEC, Geneva	oliveirap@ilo.org
Rose Anang	ACT/EMP Specialist, ILO Sub Regional Office Pretoria, South Africa	Skype roseanang
Marcus Ananth	ACT/EMP Field Project manager, Chennai, India	ananth@ilo.org
Snezhi Bedalli	Desk Officer, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, ILO-IPEC, Geneva	bedalli@ilo.org
Ariel Castro	ACTRAV Specialist, ILO Sub Regional Office Delhi	
Inviolata Chinyangarara	ACTRAV Specialist, Sub Regional office, Pretoria	
Gotabaya Dasanayaka	ACT/EMP Specialist, ILO Sub Regional office, Delhi	
Eugenia Ganea	Employers Organisations Representative, Moldova	
Jorge Illingworth	ACT/EMP Specialist, ILO Sub regional Office, Lima	
Lars Johansen	Desk Officer, Latin America, ILO-IPEC, Geneva	
Angie Keller	Finance Unit – ILO-IPEC, Geneva	keller@ilo.org
Anne Knowles	ACT/EMP Specialist, ILO Sub regional office, Budapest	
Fiona Magaya	Zimbabwe Confederation of Trade Unions	
Anne-Brit Nippierd	ACT/EMP, ILO Geneva	nippeird@ilo.org
Nadine Ossierian	Desk Officer, Eastern Africa, ILO-IPEC, Geneva	
Cecilia Rena	ARCOR company, Argentina	
Benjamin Smith	Technical Officer, Corporate Social Responsibility, ILO-IPEC, Geneva	smithb@ilo.org
Constance Thomas	Director, ILO-IPEC, Geneva	thomasc@ilo.org
Mr Venkitesvaran	Executive Director, Complazt sanmar company, Chennai	
Andres Yuren	ACT/EMP specialist, ILO Regional Office Santiago	
Peter Wichmand	DED (Evaluation Unit), ILO-IPEC	wichmand@ilo.org
Eric Zaballos	SECTOR, ILO Geneva	zeballos@ilo.org

Annex 5: IAPP Output and Activity Table ⁷

Immediate Objectives

1. At the end of the project, the knowledge base on workers and employers activities on child labour has been enhanced leading to greater union and employer action on child labour:

Output 1.1: Publication of good practices of employer/trade union involvement to tackle child labour

Activity	Activities carried out (with responsible unit)	Expenditure \$	Countries
1.1.1: In consultation with ACTEMP and ACTRAV, collect information on good practices involving social partners that have been implemented by or under IPEC, ACTRAV and ACT EMP auspices.	Employers handbook from activities in South India, Moldova, Chile (ACT/EMP)	46,404	Moldova, Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Ghana, India, South Africa and Swaziland
	Production of DVD – employer component (ACT/EMP)	25, 156	Argentina, India, Ghana, Moldova
	Production of DVD – workers component (ACTRAV)	23,192	India, Ghana
	Handbook for WDACL (ACT/EMP, ACTRAV) ITUC video (ACTRAV)	7,500 20,000	Global Global
	Consolidated Guide - South Africa sub region (ACT/EMP)	4,337	Malawi, Swaziland, Zimbabwe
Narrative: Documentation of good business practices in tackling child labour	Study to document good business practices in the food, drink, tobacco sector in Latin America (Argentina, Brazil) – SECTOR (part funded by Sector). Develops CSR indicators also (IPEC)	14,950	Argentina, Brazil
All of Activities 1.1.1. are finalised	Collection of information on good practices involving social partners involved in the small scale mining and quarrying sector. (IPEC)	4,559	
	Map out social partners representation on national tripartite commissions on child labour; profiles of selected francophone countries in Africa (IPEC)	7,500	Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo
	PPP survey of child labour in the field (IPEC)	14, 145	

⁷ Note that not all of these activities are fully funded by the project.

Activity	Activities carried out (with responsible unit)	Expenditure \$	Countries
	Good practices publication (three languages) (IPEC)	7,781	Brazil, South Africa, India, Mali, Morocco, Angola, Mozambique, Kenya, Uganda, Zambia, Timor Leste, Ethiopia, Ghana, Nepal, Zimbabwe, Bangladesh, Indonesia, Mongolia, Kosovo, Romania, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Albania, Central America
	Domestic Work manual and ACTRAV manual (ACTRAV)	18, 654	Global
	Total Expenditure for Activity 1.1.1:	\$194, 178	
1.1.2: Prepare draft publication and organise activities to promote the good practices	Develop an editorial layout and print documents: brochure in progress. (IPEC)		
	Organise meeting on CSR and CL in South Africa– IBSA (India Brazil South Africa) initiative and South South cooperation: case of Unilever, Coca Cola, AMBEV and Tobacco. – to be held later. SSC event organised in December 2010 (IPEC)	6,707	India
	Total expenditure for Activity 1.1.2	\$6,707	
1.1.3: Establish an information mechanism to enter and systematise data collected under this project All activity 1.1.3 completed	Review of the structure of the 12-12 portal. The site address is www.12to12.org/index.php . (IPEC)	15, 859	
	Upload existing information to portal and activities involving social partners (IPEC)	9, 343	Global
	Manual Chile – web (ACT/EMP)	9, 828	Chile
	Manual Crescendo Protegido – print version (ACT/EMP)	7, 635	Chile
	Total Expenditure for Activity 1.1.3	\$42, 665	
Total Expenditure for Output 1.1		\$243,550	

Output 1. 2: Guide for IPEC, ACT/EMP and ACTRAV on child labour and social partners role (good practices for replication)

Activity	Activities carried out (with responsible unit)	Expenditure (\$)	Countries
1.2.1: Establish, test and validate methodologies and indicators for assessing impact in employers and workers participation in CL activities. Activity 1.2.1 completed	Assessment of how national tripartite consultations process function in selected countries. (IPEC)	3, 944	Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Ivory Coast, DRC, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Rwanda, Senegal, Togo
1.2.2: Develop guide Activity not done	Collect and draft guidelines on social dialogue based on Argentina's experience in local development. (IPEC)		
1.2.3: Implement systematic programme to ensure the guide is available to and being used with all IPEC staff and ACTEMP, ACTRAV field staff distant learning platform Activity not done	Test this guideline in new project in selected countries (IPEC)		
Total Expenditure of Output 1.2		\$3,994	

Immediate Objectives:

2. At the end of the project, employers' organisations and trade unions will have developed and be promoting policies, strategies and action plans on combating child labour

Output 2. 1: Strengthen employer/trade union networks of focal points on child labour

Activity	Activities carried out (with responsible unit)	Expenditure (\$)	Countries
2.1.1. Develop training resources as required Not done yet, ITUC has to approve manual	Translate TU resource kit for WFCL and organise resource material for training sessions for focal points in several languages (IPEC)		
2.1.2. Plan and implement training programme	Development & roll out of training programmes for employers/ dissemination of ACTEMP CL Guides (Sp) Latin American region (ACT/EMP)	22,931	
	CL Focal Point training for the Caribbean National Centres (IPEC)	25, 416	Barbados, Belize, Dominica Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and The Grenadines', Suriname, Bahamas, Trinidad and Tobago
	Development & roll out of training programmes for employers/ dissemination of ACTEMP CL Guides, Asia (India) and Arab States (ACT/EMP) (in progress)	31, 928	India (Chennai) Moldova
	Development & roll out of training programmes for employers/dissemination of ACT/EMP CL Guides in SADAC countries (Pretoria) (ACT/EMP)	43,507	SADC
	Training of EO CL focal points on CL and project management, ITC Turin (ACT/EMP)		
	Information and training workshop for employers on development of policies & codes in South Africa (ACT/EMP)	10,884	Malawi, Zimbabwe, Swaziland, South Africa
	Sub-Regional training of trade union child labour focal points (3 days) SADC (ACTRAV)	46,567	SADC

Activity	Activities carried out (with responsible unit)	Expenditure (\$)	Countries
	Sub-Regional training of trade union child labour focal points (3 days) SADC (IPEC) (mission report)	1,586	SADC
	National workshops in SADC countries for the development of policies & action plans (ACRTAV)	30,736	Zimbabwe, Kenya, Zanzibar, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda, Ethiopia
	Training of social partners to report on CL conventions for Portuguese speaking countries in Africa and Timor Leste (IPEC)	37,126	Angola, Brazil, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau Mozambique, São Tomé and Príncipe, Timor Leste
	CL training course for focal points in South-East Asia (IPEC)	21,945	Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, China, Laos, Mongolia
	CL training course for focal points in South-East Asia (follow up as above) (ACTRAV)	5,810	
	CL training course for focal points in South Asia (IPEC)	19,737	India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Nepal, Afghanistan, Bangladesh
	CL training course for focal points in the Pacific (IPEC)	43,809	Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Samoa, Vanuatu, Kiribati, Fiji
	Tripartite Workshop in Tanzania – Cost-share with Brazilian Project (IPEC)	14,809	Tanzania
	Training social partners on CL in Syria (IPEC)	267	Syria, Lebanon
	National workshop with all national centres on Child Labour to prepare for ratification (India). (ACTRAV)	85,167	India
	Total expenditure for activity 2.1.2	\$442,225	
2.1.3: Conduct research and organize workshops	IPEC contribution to the HMS action programme (IPEC)	30,000	India
	Wrap up workshop with ITUC Africa and SATUC (SADC) countries (ACTRAV)	59,840	Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe
	Follow up to the Conference of employers in Central Asia (ACT/EMP)	33,875	Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, India (Chennai), Colombia
	Workshop with employers in Colombia (ACT/EMP)	5,500	Colombia
	Dissemination of DVD (ACT/EMP)	4,663	

Activity	Activities carried out (with responsible unit)	Expenditure (\$)	Countries
	Achieved for India		
	Total expenditure for activity 2.1.3	\$133,878	
2.1.4. Promote the replication and dissemination of good practices in projects and programs developed in other geographical and socio-economic contexts in the spirit of south-south cooperation	Organise Study tours to share good practices (report and project funded by ABC in Tanzania and USDoL). (IPEC)	13, 110	Tanzania, Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Mozambique
	Production of PSA Video/DVD on good practices (IPEC)		
	Total expenditure for activity 2.1.4	\$13,110	
Total expenditure for output 2.1		\$589,213	

Output 2.2: Production of DVD on the role of social partners in tackling child labour

Activity	Activities carried out (with responsible unit)	Expenditure (\$)	Countries involved
2.2.1. Linked to work on good practices, identify key themes. Work in conjunction with ILO DCOMM for production.	Disseminate PSA (partly done during WDACL, India) (IPEC)		
2.2.2 Implement plan for ensuring widespread use of the DVD at key national and international meetings	WDACL: awareness raising and promotional activities (ACT/EMP)	53, 050	Ghana, India (Chennai), SADAC, Moldova, Swaziland, Zimbabwe Malawi
Total Expenditure for output 2.2		\$53,050	

Immediate Objectives:

3. At the end of the project, the capacity of key national and regional workers and employers institutions to be involved in child labour policies design as well as IPEC field staff on the importance of tripartism has been strengthened.

Output 3.1: Production of campaign materials for use by social partners on the World Day Against Child Labour

Activity	Activities carried out (with responsible unit)	Expenditure (\$)	Countries involved
3.1.1. Plan resources required to support action by the social partners on and around the World Day	Development of campaign material on Education for All (ACTRAV) Not done and replaced by bi partite initiative	10, 913	
	Development of campaign material (ACT/EMP)	10, 913	
	Development of campaign material (ACT/EMP)	10, 157	India
	Pinwheel (IPEC)	6,588	
	Development and implementation of campaign materials for India. (ACTRAV)		
	Total Expenditure for Activity 3.1.1	\$38,571	
3.1.2. Provide support to field level programmes	Support of selected Plans of Action arising from CL focal points training with ACTRAV (SADC countries in 2010). Work carried out in Zambia, Malawi and Zimbabwe.(ACTRAV)		
	Map out campaigns (IPEC)		
3.1.3. Evaluate existing and previous campaigns including conducting KAB surveys to determine baseline	Collect data – partially on Francophone Africa (IPEC)	1, 315	
	Total Expenditure for Output 3.1	\$39,886	

Output 3.2: Guide for trade union and employer representatives on child labour national tripartite commissions and in other policy structures dealing with child labour

Activity	Activities carried out (with responsible unit)	Expenditure (\$)	Countries Involved
3.2.1. Collection of data on employer and trade union members on National Tripartite Commissions	Organise material – not done (IPEC)		
3.2.2. Preparation of guide and testing.	Edit and print material (IPEC)		
3.2.3. Publication and use to support training	IPEC		