



International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)



International
Labour
Office

**Towards child labour free cocoa
growing communities in Côte d'Ivoire
and Ghana through an Integrated Area
Based Approach
P.250.07.100.054 – RAF/10/54/USA**

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW

Original version

February-March 2013

This document has not been professionally edited.

NOTE ON THE REVIEW PROCESS AND REPORT

This Project Implementation Review was managed by ILO-IPEC's Evaluation and Impact Assessment section (EIA) following a consultative and participatory approach. EIA has ensured that all major stakeholders were involved throughout the review and that the review was carried out to highest degree of credibility, methodological soundness and independence and in line with established standards for such reviews..

The review was facilitated out by an external consultant¹. The review took place in February-March 2013. The opinions and recommendations included in this report are those systematized by the facilitator based on the views and perspectives of the stakeholders who participated in the review and as such serve as an important contribution to learning and planning without necessarily constituting the official perspective of the ILO or any other organization involved in the project.

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

¹ Sue Upton

Table of contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	iv
Executive Summary	vi
1. Key findings.....	vi
2. Conclusions.....	vii
3. Recommendations.....	viii
A. Background and Context	1
B. Project Description	2
C. PIR objectives and methodology	4
D. Results and Findings	6
D.1 Design	6
D.2 Implementation	7
D.3. Relevance.....	15
D.4. Sustainability	16
D.5. Comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system	17
E. Conclusions	18
F. Lessons learned	19
G. Recommendations	20
Annexes	
Annex 1- Terms of Reference.....	21
Annex 2 – List of documents reviewed	38
Annex 3 - Schedule of interviews and workshops.....	39
Annex 4 – Preliminary interviews	40
Annex 5 – Participants in stakeholder workshops	41
Annex 6 – Implementation status by objective.....	43

Tables

Table 1: Relationship between causes of child labour identified in CCP theory of change and project objectives. (source: CCP theory of change documentation)	2
Table2: AP implementing agencies and their zones of intervention (Source: CCP AP documents)	3
Table3: Experiences, hopes and expectations from the PIR stakeholder workshop participants (source PIR workshop notes) Design	6
Table 4: Alignment of CCP with national policies, programmes and institutional objectives (source: identified by PIR stakeholders during the PIR workshops)	12

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AP	Action Programme
CAP	Community Action Plan
CAYDNET	Child Aid and Youth Development Network
CCP	Cocoa Communities Project
CCPC	Community Child Protection Committee
CGECI	Confédération Générale des Entreprises de Cote d'Ivoire
CIM	Comité Interministériel de Lutte contre la Traite, l'Exploitation et le Travail des Enfants
CLMS	Child Labour Monitoring System
CLU	Child Labour Unit
CNS	Comité National de Surveillance du travail des enfants
COCOBOD	Ghana Cocoa Board
CSSVDCU	Cocoa Swollen Shoot Virus Disease Control Unit
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DCPC	District Child Protection Committee
DLTE	Direction de la Lutte contre le Travail Enfant
DRFFE	Direction Régionale de la Famille, de la Femme et de l'Enfant
EIA	Evaluation and Impact Assessment section-IPEC
EIB	Employment Information Branch
GAWU	General Agricultural Workers Union
GCLMS	Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System
GEA	Ghana Employers' Association
GES	Ghana Education Service
GLORI	Global Response Initiative
ICI	International Cocoa Initiative
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IPEC	International Programme to Eliminate Child Labour
IPM	International Project Manager
MESW	Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare
MFA	Ministry of Food and Agriculture
NCCE	National Commission for Civic Education
NDPC	National Development Planning Commission
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NPECLC	National Programme for the Elimination of Worst Forms of Child Labour in Cocoa

NSCCL	National Steering Committee on Child Labour
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PPP	Public Private Partnership
SAAENF	Service Autonome de l'Alphabétisation et de l'Éducation Non Formelle
SCREAM	Supporting Children's Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media
SDEF	Services Droits de l'Enfant et de la Famille
SOSTECI	Système d'Observation et Suivi du Travail des Enfants en Côte d'Ivoire
TUC	Trade Union Congress
TVET	Technical Vocational Education and Training
USDOL	United States department of Labour

Executive Summary

Since the signing of the Harkin-Engel Protocol in 2001, considerable resources have been invested in eliminating child labour from the cocoa supply chain through raising awareness and supporting education. The Cocoa Communities Project (CCP), aligned with several other projects, is part of IPEC's strategic programme on child labour in West Africa. The project aims *"To accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, with a focus on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana"* through using an Integrated Area-Based approach in response to a theory of change which recognises poverty and decent work deficits as among the root causes of child labour. The elimination of child labour is designed to be managed as a process embedded in wider national strategies for child labour elimination, the promotion of education and decent work and the reduction of poverty.

The CCP seeks to develop a supportive environment in which vulnerable families are empowered to improve their economic situation and make decisions that are in the best interests of their children. It plans to offer appropriate educational opportunities to 5,000 children and support for improved livelihoods to 2,000 of their families. To complement community level interventions the project is building national and local institutional capacity through a range of research and training initiatives. In addition to working with NGOs, the CCP involves government agencies and workers' and employers' organisations as implementing agencies as part of this capacity building process. The project thus seeks to encourage the consensus and ownership at community and national levels that are essential for long-term change.

The Project Implementation Review provides an opportunity for the project team and representatives of district and national level stakeholders to assess progress towards achieving project objectives. Through a process of group discussions participants were able to identify gaps and challenges and propose strategies to improve delivery and sustainability.

1. Key findings

Community based activities to raise awareness of child labour are progressing well in both Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana and the development of Community Action Plans is underway in project communities. Support for improved access to relevant quality education started with research to assess needs and available resources and some teacher training and infrastructure improvements have taken place. Activities are more advanced in Ghana than in Cote d'Ivoire and both formal and non-formal educational support to direct beneficiaries will start in both countries once direct beneficiaries are identified.

Research and mapping activities to enhance sustainable livelihoods are largely completed in Ghana but TOR's for these activities have yet to be signed in Cote d'Ivoire. 2,270 cocoa farmers have registered as Ghana Agricultural Workers Union (GAWU) members and an Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) manual has been developed, which will eventually be available in both countries. Support for families of direct beneficiaries has yet to begin but in Ghana agricultural extension agents have been assigned to project communities in preparation for enhancing agricultural productivity through practice-based field schools.

A list of project beneficiaries drawn from Ghana's initial base line study was completed in November 2012 but NPECLC, backed by the National Steering Committee on Child Labour, insisted on using Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System (GCLMS) procedures to identify CCP direct beneficiaries. After training for those concerned at community and district levels, a new listing exercise was due to be completed by March 2013. Ministry stakeholders explained how this provided an opportunity to refine the GCLMS and to highlight areas where there may be blockages to resolve. In Cote d'Ivoire further action to develop the

national CLMS is dependent on the signature of the Minister of Labour to the agreement between the project and the government.

Technical and institutional capacity building of ILO constituents and partner organizations is well advanced in Ghana through a comprehensive approach covering a broad range of local and national agencies. In Cote d'Ivoire many activities are awaiting the results of the budget review, but some training workshops have taken place.

Stakeholders in both Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire drew attention to limited understanding of ICI's Community Action Planning approach. This has resulted in Action Programmes (AP) that were implemented simultaneously in the same communities, being designed independently of each other. Hence, missing out on synergies that would have improved results. These issues occurred in spite of considerable efforts on the part of the project team to coordinate partner activities during the planning phase. Some stakeholders expressed concern about the lack of specialist input in relation to support for livelihoods. On the positive side the PIR facilitator saw the use of GAWU as an implementing agency to enable cocoa farmers to increase health and safety at work and better organize themselves through membership of unions and cooperatives as an effective approach to capacity building that reflected project design.

While the project is underway and has reported a number of encouraging results, implementation is seriously behind schedule and this poses a real threat to the achievement of project objectives. A number of activities are currently on hold awaiting approval for a budget review that was submitted to USDOL during the PIR in March 2013² and this is particularly affecting capacity building activities in Cote d'Ivoire. Work with direct beneficiaries and their families has yet to begin, so the time available for education and livelihoods interventions before the project end date is significantly less than planned.

2. Conclusions

In Ghana the CCP team can be proud of significant progress in capacity building to develop the technical and institutional environment, since stakeholders demonstrated broad based ownership and commitment to an integrated area-based approach to tackling child labour across social partner agencies and other stakeholders. In Cote d'Ivoire the project serves to remind stakeholders of the need for a functioning institutional framework to tackle child labour. There are signs of progress at local and community levels, which will no doubt bear greater fruit as the project progresses. The big issue in both countries is how to ensure that support to direct beneficiaries and their families is effective and sustainable. Among the key factors affecting this are the effective coordination and use of the expertise and time available for the delivery of livelihoods related interventions.

The CCP is a pilot project but it is too soon to know whether it provides a cost-effective, replicable and scalable model that is an effective approach to reducing child labour, and since USDOL and IPEC (Geneva) are adamant that the project extension favoured by in-country stakeholders is not a viable option, it may prove difficult to answer the question at all.

Based on stakeholder input, the overall conclusion at the end of the review process is that if the CCP is to be a useful pilot, provide meaningful results from the impact evaluation and reach its stated objectives with regard to work with direct beneficiaries and their families, then a significant extension to the planned project period would be the most desirable response. This would provide the conditions for effective implementation and ensure that commitments are respected and trust maintained. However, since the financial resources required to make this a reality are currently unavailable, there are a number of

² It should be noted that CCP activities were fully funded at the start of the project in 2010 and the budget review was required due to changes in circumstances that arose during project implementation.

measures that can be taken to support the achievement of project objectives within the time remaining, and these are indicated in the recommendations coming out of the PIR.

3. Recommendations

To IPEC and USDOL:

1. If the project cannot be significantly extended, explore and support all possibilities to enable direct action activities to be effectively implemented and the project's education and livelihoods related objectives to be met. Some such possibilities mentioned during the PIR include the speedy conclusion of the budget review process and making appropriate training resources available to the project team.

To IPEC:

2. Review project start up procedures to avoid undue delays and reduction in the time available for project implementation;
3. Include more details in project documents of how the underlying approach to eliminating child labour needs to be reflected through the implementation of clearly defined strategies;
4. Encourage greater consistency and communication between project design teams and project implementing teams;
5. Review channels of communication to avoid project delays due to multi-level decision making procedures;
6. For future projects ensure that implementing agencies working in the same communities over the same period with related objectives are required to design their Action Programmes together so that they complement each other.

To the project team and implementing agencies:

7. Review AP objectives and activities to see if they can be implemented within the time available. If not, make appropriate changes so that objectives are achievable through the proposed activities.
8. Identify any areas related to livelihoods and education initiatives where you would like more specialist advice and input, and ask the project to assist in providing this.
9. Ensure that strategies are in place for supporting any direct beneficiaries who will not complete their cycle of training before the project end date and prepare those involved for this responsibility before the project ends.
10. Ensure that post-project strategies are in place to offer appropriate support to families involved in CCP livelihood initiatives.

To social partner stakeholders:

11. Communicate regularly with the project team – do not wait for them to come to you if you have something to say! Appreciate their work, don't expect them to be perfect and let them know how best to help you build capacity to deliver services to combat child labour.

A. Background and Context

1. Since the signing of the Harkin-Engel Protocol in 2001, government, industry and other stakeholders have invested considerable resources in eliminating child labour from the cocoa supply chain in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana, where most of the world's cocoa originates. Efforts have focused on protecting children through prevention of, and withdrawal from hazardous work on cocoa farms and enrolment in appropriate educational opportunities, thus recognising both the universal right to education and the direct links between access to quality education and the elimination of child labour.
2. A number of projects contribute to IPEC's strategic programme on child labour in West Africa. This report concerns the Cocoa Communities Project (CCP) which is aligned to projects ECOWAS I and II and the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) initiative. All are funded by USDOL except the PPP which is funded by the chocolate and cocoa industry and the ILO. The 3 USDOL funded projects have similar development objectives and operate under a common management structure. All four projects work with a number of the same stakeholders and their alignment aims to encourage cross-fertilization and increased efficiency and effectiveness.

B. Project Description

3. The CCP was designed to use an Integrated Area-Based approach as an appropriate response to a theory of change which recognises poverty and decent work deficits as among the root causes of child labour. The elimination of child labour in cocoa growing communities was designed to be managed as a process embedded in wider national strategies for child labour elimination, the promotion of education and decent work and the reduction of poverty. This integrated approach addresses all forms of child labour in the selected communities and aims to increase the effectiveness and sustainability of IPEC interventions by creating a supportive environment in which vulnerable families and communities are empowered to improve their livelihood and economic situation and make decisions that are in the best interests of their children. The project works to build the consensus and ownership at community and national levels that are essential for long-term change.
4. The CCP's Development Objective is "To accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, with a focus on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana"
5. The project's five Immediate Objectives are directly related to the identified theory of change as shown in the table below. Stakeholders' developed the project's theory of change, which provides the basis for the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (CMES) that is being piloted by this and several other IPEC projects around the world. The CMES focusses on results and establishes an integrated monitoring and evaluation system to support analysis of how and why change occurs during the course of the project. A further element is an experimental impact evaluation that will use baseline and end line studies in project and control communities in Ghana.

Table 1: Relationship between causes of child labour identified in CCP theory of change and project objectives

Causes of CL as defined by the CCP Theory of Change	CCP's 5 Immediate Objectives
A lack of community awareness on the negative effects of Child Labour	IO.1: By the end of the project target communities will use increased understanding of child labour to develop and implement action plans to eliminate child labour in their communities.
Limited access of children to education	IO.2. By the end of the project boys and girls in cocoa growing communities will have improved access to relevant quality education, including appropriate complementary or alternative opportunities for boys and girls who are out of school
Poverty	IO.3. By the end of the project targeted households in cocoa growing communities will have enhanced sustainable livelihoods
Reduced social surveillance of the issue of child labour	IO.4. By the end of the project national capacity to deploy an appropriate CLMS framework to measure progress towards the elimination of child labour through an IAB approach will be improved.
Insufficient technical, operational and institutional capacity of ILO social partners and other local institutions to address CL issues	IO.5. By the end of the project the technical and institutional capacity of ILO constituents and partner organizations to contribute to the implementation of National Action Plans and interventions to combat child labour in cocoa-growing communities will be enhanced

Source: CCP theory of change documentation

6. The CCP is structurally complex due to its alignment with three other child labour projects and a common management structure across projects, its implementation in two languages in two countries with significant historical, cultural and political differences and the piloting of the

Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (CMES), including the planned impact evaluation in Ghana.

7. Following base line studies, the CCP started working in selected communities in 4 administrative districts in each country through a series of Action Programmes implemented by NGOs or local government departments. These Action Programmes aim to develop awareness of the dangers of child labour, build local capacity to design and implement Community Action Plans (CAPs) to protect children and improve access to appropriate educational opportunities. The project aims to withdraw 1,000 children from child labour and prevent a further 1,500 children from exposure to child labour in each country and will thus offer appropriate educational opportunities to a total of 5,000 direct beneficiaries. The project also plans to support access to a range of services to improve the livelihoods of families of children withdrawn from child labour, including training to diversify and manage income generating activities, improved access to credit and opportunities to increase cocoa production through attending practise-based field schools run by state agricultural extension services. The CCP is also supporting farmers to better organise themselves through dissemination of information concerning unions and cooperatives.
8. To complement its community level interventions the project is building national and local institutional capacity through
 1. Researching needs and mapping resources related to education, training and livelihoods;
 2. Training for relevant government officers, including education and labour inspectors, magistrates, teachers and other social partners;
 3. Support for the development and implementation of National Child Labour Monitoring Systems
9. The project exploits the ILO's tripartite structure through the involvement of government, workers' and employers' organisations as implementing agencies or through service contracts and consultancies. Implementing agencies also include locally based NGOs. The following table offers an overview of the CCP community level implementing agencies and their zones of intervention in the two countries. In Ghana the situation has been somewhat complicated by the creation of new Districts, so the original four Districts have now become seven Districts.

Table 2: AP implementing agencies and their zones of intervention

AP implementing agencies and zones of intervention in Ghana	AP implementing agencies and zones of intervention in Cote d'Ivoire
Global Response Initiative, Wassa Amenfi West District	ANADER, Zone de Soubré
Development Fortress Association, Twifo Hemang Lower Denkyira District	Direction Régionale de la Famille, de la Femme et de l'Enfant de Dimbokro, Département de Daoukro
Child Aid and Youth Development Network, Birim South District	Service Autonome de l'Alphabétisation et de l'ENF, Département de Bouaflé
Child Rights International, Suhum Kraboa Coaltar District	SDEF-Afrique Département d'Issia
International Cocoa Initiative – all Districts	ICI, all Departments
General Agricultural Workers Union – all Districts	
National Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour in Cocoa (NPECLC) – implementation of national CLMS (GCLMS) (joint AP with ECOWAS II)	Direction de la Lutte contre le Travail Enfant (DLTE), implementation of national CLMS (SOSTECI) (joint AP with ECOWAS I and PPP)
NB : A service contract with the National Council for Civic Education supports awareness raising and social mobilisation in all Districts	

Source: CCP AP documents)

C. PIR objectives and methodology

10. This Project Implementation Review provides an opportunity for the project team and representatives of district and national level stakeholders to assess progress towards achieving project objectives. It does not include community level stakeholders. Facilitated by an external facilitator with the assistance of a rapporteur, the process enables a review of project design, implementation, outputs and sustainability and makes recommendations to improve delivery and sustainability.
11. The PIR covers:
 - Analysis of implementation strategies for their appropriateness and potential effectiveness in achieving the project objectives;
 - Review of the institutional arrangements, capacity for project implementation, coordination mechanisms and the use and usefulness of management tools;
 - Assessment of project implementation, including the delivery rate of funds and project outputs to date; the identification of positive and negative factors affecting project implementation and discussion of strategies to maximise project results and impact;
 - Examination of the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and if necessary proposed revisions to the expected level of achievement of the objectives;
 - Review of strategies for sustainability, replication and scaling up.
12. Following a preliminary desk review of project related documents, the facilitator spoke to key stakeholders based in Geneva and Washington before spending one week in Accra and a second week in Abidjan. Each week started with two days of preparatory meetings with national project teams and various groups of stakeholders. This enabled stakeholders to outline their roles and responsibilities in project implementation and the current status of their planned activities and to raise and discuss issues of concern, thus enabling the facilitator to develop a more in depth understanding of the project and sharing of information between stakeholders. These meetings were followed by a two-day stakeholder workshop in each country which focussed on:
 1. A review of the progress towards achieving the five project objectives;
 2. Identification of specific delays and any resulting gaps and challenges to meeting the project objectives within the allotted period; and
 3. Suggested strategies for overcoming the principal gaps and challenges that emerged.
13. In each national workshop participants worked in five heterogeneous groups. Each group brought together local and national level stakeholders to discuss and analyse activities and outputs for one of the five project objectives. Representatives from ILO-IPEC /Geneva and from USDOL were able to move between groups, as were the CTA and the IPM. Each group was facilitated by a member of the national project team and group facilitators were asked to ensure that participants had the necessary space to express themselves. At the end of each session the groups shared the content of their discussions and there was an opportunity for debate and further input from the wider group.
14. On the final day of the process the facilitator held a short debriefing with the project teams in each country in order to outline and discuss issues arising and proposed recommendations. This draft

report has been prepared on the basis of inputs from the above process and will be circulated to enable stakeholders to comment and suggest amendments.

C.1. Methodological limitations of the PIR exercise

15. From the facilitator's perspective the most serious limitation of the PIR methodology is the lack of community level stakeholder participation, thus the people most affected by subsequent decisions have had no opportunity to contribute their experiences, ideas and points of view.
16. In addition, the TOR do not make it entirely clear to what degree the facilitator is required to analyse and draw conclusions based on prior knowledge of the project and the information provided by stakeholders, as opposed to simply reporting what is said during the PIR process. This limitation had been overcome in interaction with EIA evaluation manager.

D. Results and Findings

17. This section examines aspects of project design and its implementation and achievement, with particular reference to capacity building and direct action. It also considers issues related to relevance and sustainability and discusses the CMES.
18. At the beginning of the stakeholder workshops participants were asked to share their experiences and hopes for the CCP and their expectations for the PIR. The following table offers a broad analysis of their responses and serves to indicate the focus of the project in each country and the overall context of the PIR.

Table 3: Experiences, hopes and expectations from the PIR stakeholder workshop participants

Question	Types of responses	Ghana	RCI
Best CCP Experience	Experiences of broad stakeholder collaboration, commitment, ownership and capacity building	28	7
	Community level experiences of ownership, commitment and positive change	13	9
	Appreciation for project approach and processes	6	4
	Experiences of good support from project team	3	1
Greatest hope for CCP	Hopes concerning community empowerment	18	8
	Hopes for project objectives achieved	13	4
	Hopes concerning sharing benefits and scaling up	8	2
	Improved systems / structures to combat CL	6	1
	Hopes for sustainability	4	3
Expectations of the PIR	Resolve issues and indicate the way forward	21	18
	Improve collaboration	7	0
	Community level issues	7	1
	Know and understand current project status	5	2
	Look at best practices and project strengths	4	2
	Sustainability issues	3	0

Source: PIR workshop notes

NB: Although 34 people participated in Accra and 33 people in the Abidjan, the numbers are not entirely consistent since some people gave more than the one item requested under each category and people who participated in both workshops tended not to repeat the exercise in Abidjan.

D.1 Design

Project objectives

19. Stakeholders felt that immediate project objectives were clear and realistic and to a large degree achievable within the given period. However in the facilitator's experience, the sustainable development processes that the project supports will take longer than the 30 months allocated to action programmes to become part of the social norms of the communities concerned, so capacity building to enable local services to pick up where the project ends, is the basis for long term success.
20. Some stakeholders thought that the project was over ambitious in terms of the range of initiatives it sought to implement in relation to the financial resources available. Others suggested that there was a need for better understanding of the relevance of effective community development and capacity building of local services to the integrated area based approach that under pins project design. The project has been described as a "Christmas Tree" where a variety of initiatives to support the

elimination of child labour are on offer, without a common understanding across project stakeholders of an underlying strategy that links them together. Stakeholders drew attention to a tendency to reduce project objectives to a series of sometimes disjointed or unconnected activities and outputs, in the hope that they will all add up to the desired outcome. In the facilitator's view these issues are all linked to the interpretation of project design, which might have benefitted from increased contact between design and implementation teams.

21. From the facilitator's perspective, in a project aiming to empower communities, it is important to ensure the maximum possible community involvement in decision making so that community members can practice and develop the organisational and democratic decision making skills which contribute to healthy and thriving communities. Ideally project design builds such opportunities into its implementation strategies, but the CCP did not fully develop the potential to do this.

Assessment of problems and needs

22. Stakeholders thought that the project was based on an adequate analysis of the problems and needs of direct beneficiaries and their families, including some consideration of gender issues. However some thought that more specialist input might have been useful, particularly in relation to micro finance and livelihoods.
23. During the review process some implementing agencies in Cote d'Ivoire indicated that they were responsible for action programmes introducing activities for which they did not have either prior experience or expertise. They explained the strategies in place to ensure access to specialist advice when necessary but for the facilitator these did not seem sufficiently robust or consistent.
24. It also occurred to the facilitator that successful innovations related to livelihoods, income generation, micro-finance and literacy might have been incorporated into the design and delivery of activities. The project has carried out considerable mapping of needs and local resources but there has been more limited accompanying research to look at successful innovatory approaches that might be used. The project has however produced and disseminated a research report on practical measures for improving cocoa productivity, which will ideally be used to support families of direct beneficiaries to improve their livelihoods.

Designing for sustainability

25. Stakeholders were clear that the project was designed to be sustainable since it focusses on community empowerment to protect vulnerable children and capacity building of social partners to encourage improved delivery of services. Project design envisaged that during the course of the project, communities would develop their expertise in identifying, protecting and monitoring vulnerable children, with support from improved local services that would continue after the end of the project. Some participants stressed that sustainability relies on the availability of adequate financial resources for social services to function effectively.

D.2 Implementation

Results achieved to date – see Annex 5 for details by outcome and activity

Immediate Objective 1 focusses on raising community awareness and support for the development and implementation of CAPs to eliminate child labour.

26. A wide range of awareness raising activities has taken place in both Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana and local child protection committees are being established and trained. Implementation plans seem to be progressing well, with minor modifications in response to delays and funding constraints.
27. The International Cocoa Initiative acts as a guide and catalyst in facilitating the Community Action Plan development process, alongside the other community level implementing agencies. This process is underway in Ghana, where a number of communities have developed their visions and the goals to be achieved as a preliminary to detailed planning. In Cote d'Ivoire eight out of the planned 40 CAPs have been completed.
28. During the PIR in both countries ICI personnel drew attention to inconsistencies in the time lines of the CAP development process and the implementation of other APs in the communities concerned. This is principally a result of community based APs being elaborated without taking account of the CAP process. In Ghana this has led to AP support for improved community infrastructure running alongside rather than being part of the CAP process. In Cote d'Ivoire there was discussion about the need to establish local child protection committees before the CAP process was far enough advanced for the population to have a clear idea of the roles that their representatives would be expected to play. Implementing agencies have sometimes found themselves in a position where they have to choose between respecting ICI's advice on the CAP process or carrying out their AP activities within the planned time period, as expected by the IPEC project team. The project team has explained that the roles of the partners concerned were agreed at the planning stage and information about partner interventions was shared to aid coordination, but in spite of this the issues highlighted during the PIR still arose.
29. This situation serves to highlight that rather than the CAPs providing an integrated process and framework within which communities can work for change, there is a tendency for them to run alongside other aspects of the project and thus some of the benefits and synergy of the approach are lost. However ICI and the other implementing agencies concerned are working together to develop the compromises needed to allow the project to move forward.
30. **Summary:** Overall community based activities to raise awareness of child labour are progressing well in both Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana and the development of Community Action Plans is underway in project communities.

Immediate Objective 2 focusses on improved access to relevant quality education, including appropriate complementary or alternative opportunities for boys and girls who are out of school.

31. In Ghana the project has carried out assessments of educational needs and resources in project communities. Classrooms have been built in several CCP communities³ by a number of District Assemblies and project advocacy has also resulted in the provision of school equipment such as desks and solar lights. A number of CCP communities in Birim South District have benefited from new boreholes drilled by the District Assembly and school rehabilitation activities are underway as part of some APs.
32. In collaboration with the Ghana National Association of Teachers 100 untrained teachers have received training in teaching methods and head teachers of schools in Twifo Atti Mokwe have also been trained by the NCCE on issues related to child labour.

³ Adinkrom, Tei Mensah and Somyamekodur

33. An assessment of school governance bodies has been carried out and training modules on school management techniques, governance and leadership have been prepared. However due to funding constraints it is not clear if training for school governance bodies will be able to go ahead.
34. In Cote d'Ivoire assessments of educational needs and available resources are on-going and advocacy is less advanced. A number of training activities are on hold awaiting the results of the budget review that was submitted to USDOL on March 11th 2013..
35. The programme of educational support to direct beneficiaries will start in both countries once beneficiaries are identified.
36. **Summary:** Project activities are largely based on project research to assess needs and available resources. Activities are more advanced in Ghana than in Cote d'Ivoire but educational support to direct beneficiaries has yet to start in either country. The activities that have taken place so far are principally improvements to school governance and infrastructure in the formal sector however once work with direct beneficiaries gets underway non formal education initiatives are expected to be more in evidence.

Immediate Objective 3 focuses on enhanced sustainable livelihoods

37. Livelihoods related, research and mapping activities are largely completed in Ghana but the Terms of Reference for these activities have yet to be signed in Cote d'Ivoire. In Ghana GAWU has developed and tested an Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) Manual and 2,270 cocoa farmers have registered as union members. Community level union executives (including men and women members) have been elected and a cocoa farmers division has been created within the union. The manual will be translated into French and made available for use in Cote d'Ivoire.
38. Work with families of direct beneficiaries is not yet underway but in Ghana agricultural extension agents have been assigned to project communities in preparation for enhancing agricultural productivity and improving farmers' livelihoods through practice-based field schools.
39. During the PIR in Cote d'Ivoire it emerged that some implementing agencies had not realised the need to start establishing field schools at the beginning of the cocoa production cycle.
40. **Summary:** Similarly to IO2, project activities are largely based on project research to assess needs and available resources. Activities are more advanced in Ghana than in Cote d'Ivoire but support to families of direct beneficiaries has yet to start in either country.

Immediate Objective 4 focusses on National Child Labour Monitoring Systems

41. In Ghana a series of GCLMS activities are supporting the identification of direct beneficiaries:
 - GCLMS mechanisms are operating through established and functional District and Community Child Protection Committees (DCPCs and CCPCs).
 - DCPCs are developing action plans and have validated the criteria for the selection of direct beneficiaries and assigning services to children and their families.
 - All 40 CCPCs have been trained on child labour and the GCLMS framework
 - GCLMS data collection is complete and data entry is underway. The list of direct beneficiaries is expected by March 31st 2012, but this may prove to be over optimistic.

42. The use of the GCLMS in project communities is serving to refine the system and highlight areas where there may be blockages to resolve. The team responsible are looking into ways of streamlining the data collection process by combining the use of two tools into one to reduce the time and effort required. There are issues concerning the delivery of allowances for data collection and input that will need to be resolved if the system is to function effectively.
43. During the PIR the possibility of NPECLC contributing funds to facilitate CCP related activities was raised. This would be difficult for NPECLC since it is not part of the budget for their annual work plan and would thus risk affecting the delivery of other projects.

Ghana's Child Labour Unit

44. There is considerable speculation about where Ghana's Child Labour Unit will be housed in view of recent changes in ministerial mandates. It is not yet known if it will be part of the Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations or of the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection, but wherever it is situated, the choice will have implications for the National Action Plan and related activities.
45. In Cote d'Ivoire implementation of the Action Programme concerning the national CLMS has been awaiting the signature of the new Minister of Labour for several weeks at the time of writing, which suggests that there may be other issues at the heart of this delay. Unfortunately it did not prove possible to talk to the government officers concerned during the PIR process in spite of attempts to arrange this both during and after their return from a meeting in Washington.
46. **Summary:** In Ghana work towards achieving this objective is progressing in spite of tensions between the project and NPECLC due to delays in identifying direct beneficiaries. In Cote d'Ivoire activities have yet to begin.

Immediate Objective 5 focusses on technical and institutional capacity of ILO constituents and partner organizations

47. In Ghana capacity building is being carried out through all seven APs and a number of service contracts and consultancies, in a comprehensive approach covering a broad range of local and national agencies. Results include:
 - Establishing coordination mechanisms for the CCP, IPEC and the National Action Plan to combat child labour
 - Training for labour and education inspectors on child labour, occupational safety and health and the GCLMS
 - Production and dissemination of a manual for labour inspectors
 - Training on child labour and the CCP for key district stakeholders (Labour Office, Social Welfare, Ghana Education Service, COCOBOD, Agriculture, Health, Community Development, NCCE, and Information Services Department)
 - Needs assessment of Cocoa and Agricultural extension workers
 - Informed by the needs assessment, training for 54 Cocoa /Agricultural extension officers on child labour and OSH
 - Development of child labour modules for COCOBOD and Ministry of Food and Agriculture

- Transfer of an ILO/IPEC land cruiser to the Suhum Municipal Assembly for the use of the Assembly, the IPEC field coordinator and the DCPCs of three districts.
48. In Cote d'Ivoire the majority of activities related to technical and institutional capacity building have yet to begin, however a number of training workshops have taken place:
- Training for 30 magistrates from regional justice departments on the national and international legal framework to combat child labour
 - Training on child labour for Ministry of Education regional managers and primary education inspectors, including regional managers from all the cocoa departments covered by the CCP
 - Training for implementing agencies and the social partners on the SOSTECI (National CLMS).
49. **Summary:** Technical and institutional capacity building is well advanced in Ghana through a comprehensive approach covering a broad range of local and national agencies. In Cote d'Ivoire, while most activities await the results of the budget revision that was submitted to USDOL during the PIR process, some training workshops have taken place.

Choice of Implementing Agencies in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire

50. There is a strong argument for building the capacity of government and other social partner agencies through their implementation of Action Programmes that enable them to practice and develop expertise to improve delivery of their statutory roles and responsibilities.
51. CCP's incorporation of GAWU and NPECLC as implementing agencies in Ghana and the DLTE (the national child labour unit) in Cote d'Ivoire is designed to enable these bodies to develop and refine their respective roles in relation to child labour in cocoa communities and this experience will continue to inform their work after the project ends.
52. However in Cote d'Ivoire, ANADER (the national rural development agency⁴), the DRFFE (the regional office for women, children and the family) and the SAAENF (the literacy and non-formal education service) are all national or regional entities with different roles and responsibilities. They are each implementing virtually identical APs at community level in the four project districts. ANADER seems well suited to this role and is at a more advanced stage of implementation than the others. The DRFFE undoubtedly has expertise in areas related to child protection and women's economic empowerment and the SAAENF certainly has experience in literacy and non-formal education, but their personnel do not necessarily have the required community development, coordination and monitoring skills required to facilitate the development of CAPs and coordinate the various aspects of education and livelihood related interventions that make up their APs. The CCP strategy to address this is to provide support from local ICI agents and supervision by ICI field coordinators.
53. From the perspective of the facilitator it might have been more useful for the project to build the technical and institutional capacity of these agencies to deliver quality services in their specific areas of expertise across all 4 zones of intervention, in the way that GAWU is working in Ghana. This would have enabled ANADER to work in partnership with ICI at community level in all four intervention zones, thus adding the CAP process to their tool box of development approaches across several local offices. SAAENF could have worked to support quality literacy interventions across

⁴ NB: ANADER is legally a private entity)

all four intervention zones, and even been offered the opportunity to look at innovative alternatives for literacy acquisition and making literacy learning available not only to direct beneficiaries and their families but also to community leaders. Similarly DRFFE capacity building could have been linked to livelihoods and/ or child protection project components across all four project areas.

54. In addition to support from ICI, the project plans to address this issue and draw on the expertise of various agencies in each zone of intervention through the establishment of local platforms to create a space for discussion and sharing to support the elimination of child labour in project communities. This could be a good strategy for improving communication and synergy across local agencies but it is not clearly documented how it will work in practice. If there is no budget to enable specialist support for AP activities at community level the impact of such platforms may be limited.
55. It might be useful for the CCP final evaluation to look at
- the relative advantages of using NGOs or social partner agencies to implement action programmes
 - strategies leading to sustainable capacity building of local services.
56. From the facilitator’s perspective future APSO for APs implemented by government and social partner agencies might be more specific about how the agency concerned seeks to develop its capacity during the course of the project.

Advocacy, mainstreaming of child labor issues and project alignment with national policies and institutions

57. Stakeholders in both countries identified instances of CCP alignment with national policies, programmes and institutions:

Table 4: Alignment of CCP with national policies, programmes and institutional objectives (

CCP Objective	Ghana	Cote d’Ivoire
1	- Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda - National child labour Action Plan (NAP) - Sector plan of the Ministry of Gender Child and Social Protection - District Medium Term Development Plan	- Education - Health - Access to drinking water - NAP
2	- Education for all policy - Education strategic Plan 2010-2020	- Compulsory free education - Improving quality of teaching - School feeding - Child protection
3	- NAP - Ghana Youth Employment and Entrepreneurial Development Agency, - Local Enterprises & Skills Development Program - National Board for Small Scale Industries - Microfinance and Small Loans Centre	NAP
4	- National Plan of Action on child labour	NAP
5	- Ghana Shared Growth and Development Agenda - NAP - Decent Work Country Programme - District Medium Term Development Plan - Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy	NAP

Source: PIR stakeholders during the PIR workshops

58. In Ghana, the project has had some success in encouraging district assemblies to improve infrastructure and support for education in project communities and it is intended that CAPs will feed into District Medium Term Development Plans, thus providing a mechanism for CAPs to receive government funding. As far as agriculture is concerned the CCP is collaborating with a number of agencies including COCOBOD, the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and the Department of Cooperatives to encourage the extension of government services and support for occupation safety and health in CCP communities. In Cote d'Ivoire there is less evidence of the broad based capacity building seen in Ghana.

Addressing delays in order to achieve project objectives

59. The project is making progress and has reported a number of encouraging results, but implementation is seriously behind schedule and this poses a threat to the achievement of project objectives. This delay has come about due to a variety of both internal and external factors that are listed below.
- Project start-up activities effectively began in August 2011 and the vast majority of action programmes, service contracts and consultancies did not begin until December 2012.
 - In order to ensure that base line studies were not contaminated, implementing agencies were largely required to wait until these were completed before starting work at community level in Ghana. However some pre-baseline advocacy campaigns were initiated using mitigating strategies agreed with UCW.
 - During 2012 a budget review for both countries was found to be necessary. It was submitted to USDOL at the time of the PIR and is currently awaiting approval. The process requires passage through multiple levels within ILO-IPEC before arriving with the donor in Washington. A significant number of activities, particularly in Cote d'Ivoire, are on hold awaiting the results of this review.
 - The political upheaval in Cote d'Ivoire and the resulting elections have led to institutional changes at government level which are inevitably taking time to stabilise and become operational. This process is subject to influences beyond the control of the project and one of the consequences is that the AP concerning the national CLMS has yet to start.
 - Working with some government agencies as AP implementing agencies requires approval from USDOL and the opening of separate bank accounts for project funds. These procedures contributed to delays in Cote d'Ivoire and to some extent in Ghana, where NPECLC was concerned.
 - At the time of writing, definitive lists of direct beneficiaries have yet to be completed in either country. In Cote d'Ivoire this is due to delays in getting the base line study underway, and implementing agencies are now working with communities to verify and update the information they have received and identify direct beneficiaries in line with their AP objectives. In Ghana a decision by NPECLC, backed by the National Steering Committee on Child Labour, meant that the project's original base line study completed in November 2013 could not be used as the basis for the selection of direct beneficiaries since it did not follow procedures outlined in the Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System. This has resulted in considerable delay since a new base line survey had to be carried out by NPECLC.
60. The cumulative effect of these difficulties is that only fifteen months remain until the project end date. Unless the project period is extended, work with direct beneficiaries and their families

planned to take place over periods ranging from twenty to thirty months will need to be completed in less than fifteen months.

61. Some steps have been taken to address delays and funding limitations, including prioritisation and rationalisation of activities which has resulted in the proposed removal of several activities from the work plan or their incorporation into on-going action programmes. In Ghana the team is working closely with NPECLC to enable timely delivery of the list of direct beneficiaries and there is an alternative plan should it not prove possible to keep to agreed milestones. Otherwise the CCP team has been awaiting the PIR discussions and recommendations before making further decisions about how to address the delay
62. Some areas that may need to be reviewed to achieve project objectives include:
 - Activities and time lines for Action Programmes to ensure that they are achievable in the time available, with particular attention to support for livelihoods initiatives, including income generation and micro-finance;
 - Preparation of local Child Protection Committees to monitor and support project beneficiaries in education or training after the end of the project; and
 - Development of strategies for supporting families involved in livelihoods initiatives after the end of the project.
63. It is not known when the budget review will be finalised and this will also have a significant effect on the achievement of project objectives, particularly in Cote d'Ivoire where so many capacity building activities are dependent on the outcome. The project is currently short of funds to implement activities and while the approval of the budget review will lead to more efficient and effective use of the resources available, it is not certain that it will completely resolve the issue.

Project coordination and management

Coordination between the CCP, ECOWAS I and II and the PPP

64. The common management structure, while quite complex in terms of how it is funded and coordinated, seems to be working well in practice, as does the opportunity for one AP to cover the intervention zones of different projects. There is inevitably some confusion among non-IPEC stakeholders concerning which is which out of the CCP, ECOWAS I and II, and the PPP, so while this is not a major issue, it does require some clear explanations to ensure that everyone is talking about the same project.
65. It would also have been useful to look at the relative advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to selecting beneficiaries used by the various projects (e.g. with or without the use of a base line study), but this is beyond the scope of the PIR.
66. The project document does not develop opportunities for collaboration or shared learning between Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire and stakeholders made no mention of any such activities during the review process. However input from the project team to the draft of this report mentioned an activity for shared learning between Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana that was agreed at the IPEC staff meeting in West Africa in March 2012.

IPEC support for implementing agencies

67. During discussions with implementing agencies and the project team it emerged that reporting using the IPEC procedures is proving challenging for some agencies. This is not unusual during the early stages of AP implementation, but it is an additional source of delay that needs to be avoided. The IPEC teams in both countries have already provided training workshops and are committed to offering the necessary support through field visits to implementing agencies' offices to work through any specific issues. It is also important to note that stakeholders from both countries mentioned support from project teams as among their "best CCP experiences".

D.3. Relevance

Relevance of the project approach

68. Stakeholders in both countries were in no doubt that the project approach, strategy and objectives remain relevant, although participants in Ghana seemed to be more familiar with the concept of the Area Based Approach than those in Cote d'Ivoire, who did not recognise the term when asked.

Relevance of the project in the different national contexts

69. Ghana's National Child Labour Steering Committee is increasingly active in bringing its influence to bear on project initiatives. This is an indication of growing national ownership, even if it does not always make the work of the project team easier. Made up of committed and competent individuals and agencies, the NCLSC is attempting to define a realistic role for itself based on access to the information required to make effective decisions. The CCP's emphasis on institutional and technical capacity building and its alignment with national policies and programmes is particularly relevant in this context and the project is well placed to support and encourage the effective operation of the NCLSC by regular consultation and sharing of information.
70. Participants at the Abidjan stakeholders' meeting expressed their concern about the lack of clarity concerning the relationship between Cote d'Ivoire's two bodies with responsibility for overseeing the elimination of child labour, the CIM and the CNS⁵. Since the country does not yet have a functioning institutional framework to address child labour issues, the project is being implemented in a very different environment from that of neighbouring Ghana. This does not make it any less relevant but suggests that results may be more limited. The PIR provided a forum for stakeholders to voice their suggestions, which included a clear redefinition of the roles and responsibilities of the CIM and the CNS and the establishment of a fixed focal point within the Ministries concerned by child labour. Employers' organisations also expressed their frustration at their lack of representation within either the CIM or the CNS, seeing this as failing to respect the tripartite agreement that is at the heart of ILO membership, and as an abuse of their prerogatives. While it is beyond the scope of the CCP to resolve these issues, the project team can offer support and encouragement to government and other national stakeholders and perhaps open up channels of communication to help the process.

Effect of delays on the relevance of project objectives

71. In Ghana the CCP team explained that the project was designed to offer direct beneficiary children two years of education or training, and even though the project is due to end before this, children will still be able to finish their cycle of education or training, since costs will be prepaid (for example for tuition and start-up kits after vocational training courses). Community Child Protection

⁵ Comité Interministériel de Lutte contre la Traite, l'Exploitation et le Travail des Enfants et le Comité National de Surveillance du travail des enfants

Committees can continue to monitor and support children's progress after the end of the project, until they complete their education or training cycle, and perhaps for even longer.

72. At the time of the PIR stakeholders in Cote d'Ivoire did not appear to have developed strategies for ensuring that direct beneficiaries would benefit from the full two year cycle of education as planned in the light of the new context of the reduced period available for project implementation.
73. It will be necessary to build a similar post-project support strategy for families working to improve their livelihoods through income generating activities initiated during the project. In addition it would be advisable to focus on activities with a relatively short cycle so that they can be well underway and through any teething problems before the end of the project.
74. From the facilitator's perspective, some components of project objectives concerning support for education and livelihoods may require modification as a result of the delays in implementation, in order to remain relevant. These interventions are extremely important to the individuals and families concerned but if the period of support is significantly reduced there is a risk that promises made cannot be delivered. The project must avoid asking already vulnerable people to take a risk in committing their resources to a new initiative without being able to follow through on commitment to offer the required support. The worst case scenario is that "beneficiaries" may end up worse off than they were to start with, having invested valuable time and energy with no results except having lost confidence in themselves to improve their situation.

D.4. Sustainability

75. As previously described the CCP is focused on empowering communities to act in the best interests of their children, while building the capacity of local services to deliver the required support. The degree of sustainability of the project is directly linked to the degree to which the project meets these objectives.
76. The overall impression as a result of the PIR is that things are looking good in Ghana. There is a sense of broad national ownership of the issues, of the commitment of key agencies working to reduce child labour and linkages to broader sectorial and national action. A number of successful advocacy initiatives suggest that this ownership and commitment is reflected at district levels. Reports of activities at district and community levels, including moves towards the mainstreaming of child labour issues into District Medium Term Development Plans, suggest that implementing agencies are experienced and capable. They are building links between appropriate bodies and are strongly encouraged to pass on their strategies for success by ensuring the involvement of community leaders in all advocacy activities.
77. Due to their experience of working in communities, NGO implementing agencies are able to respond to the challenges inherent in a project of this nature, such as the difficulties resulting from the division of responsibilities linked to CAP development. It is very encouraging to see GAWU reaching out into cocoa communities as a CCP implementing agency and this is a particularly important process in enabling cocoa farmers to move towards advocating and acting collectively to ensure fair and equitable treatment within the cocoa supply chain.
78. In Cote d'Ivoire the picture is less rosy. There is less sense of national ownership and commitment and the project team faces significantly greater challenges in driving the project forward since the political environment is more difficult and the project is less advanced, due to a large extent to financial constraints. The PIR suggested much greater variability in the experience of implementing agencies in working at community level, which is a cause of some concern.

79. In the remaining months of the project both countries must focus on the sustainability of the positive changes that it is anticipated will result from support to direct beneficiaries and their families. The importance of putting in place all possible strategies to ensure the sustainability of these changes cannot be over emphasised.

D.5. Comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system

80. The CCP theory of change is seen as valid and is well understood by the majority of stakeholders at both national and local levels and, led by the monitoring and evaluation officer, project staff and partners are using the theory of change to guide project implementation, since it is directly aligned to the five project objectives
81. Implementing agencies and key national stakeholders have attended CMES training workshops in both countries and subsequent meetings with implementing agencies were used to identify any on-going learning needs. However, outside the project team there is little evidence of a developed understanding of project indicators, with a number of people expressing the view that the project was not yet far enough advanced to discuss this. Similarly PIR participants showed varied understanding of the CMES focus on outcomes and impacts rather than on an output- based monitoring system. One group stated that *“The CMES is concerned with the measuring of actual results on ground, thus evidence of the outputs”* and only one group out of ten volunteered any direct mention of the CMES when asked about how the project results were being tracked and monitored. A group in Cote d’Ivoire said that project monitoring documentation was not yet available. While it is true that the full CMES guidelines have yet to be translated into French, it should be noted that the impact measurement framework has been translated and was distributed during the CMES training in Abidjan.
82. Since the CMES has yet to be fully implemented , it seems too soon to discuss its feasibility or any adjustments to tools and methodology for data collection, processing, reporting and use of information, as suggested in the PIR terms of reference.

Impact evaluation

83. Stakeholders in Ghana are mostly aware of the planned impact evaluation but this is not the case in Cote d’Ivoire, due to the fact that communities there will not be involved.
84. Some stakeholders in Ghana suggested that it may have been over ambitious to attempt this type of impact evaluation within a project that is already trying to implement the relatively new integrated area based approach *and* work in alignment with several other projects *and* that is experiencing financial and time constraints. The more complex the project becomes, the more difficult it is to manage.
85. The requirement for uncontaminated baseline studies has already contributed to some delay in implementation. If there is no project extension and the impact evaluation follow-up survey takes place as initially planned in early 2014, there will have been less than a year’s work with direct beneficiaries and their families, and less than 18 months’ work in each CCP community. The evaluation will then seek to assess *“To what extent the package of interventions implemented as part of the Cocoa Community Project reduces children’s work and improves school participation?”* If the results are not particularly encouraging, will it be because the project intervention package is not valid or because the time period was too short?

E. Conclusions

86. Overall, on the plus side:

1. The CAP process is underway, with indications of support for CAP implementation in both countries.
2. **In Ghana** the CCP can be proud of significant progress in capacity building to develop the technical and institutional environment, with broad based ownership and commitment to an integrated area based approach to tackling child labour from social partner institutions and other stakeholders.
3. **In Cote d'Ivoire** the project is serving to remind stakeholders of the need for a functioning institutional framework, with the hope that that funds will soon become available to enable capacity building activities to move forward faster.
4. There are also signs of progress at local and community levels, which will no doubt bear fruit as the project progresses.

87. Aspects of concern:

5. The big issue is how to ensure that support to direct beneficiaries and their families is effective and sustainable. Among the key factors affecting this are the time and expertise available for the delivery of livelihoods related interventions.
6. The CCP is a pilot project but it is too soon to know whether it provides a cost-effective, replicable and scalable model that is an effective approach to reducing child labour, and without an extension to the project period it might be difficult to answer the question at all.

88. Use of additional resources:

7. During the stakeholders' workshop in Ghana stakeholders suggested drawing on ILO-IPEC training resources linked to small enterprise development and income generation and the ILO's social finance web page⁶ which offers a wealth of information, including a 2 hour webinar.

89. This is the broad context of the project situation that is understandably preoccupying the project team and other stakeholders. Clearly the recommendations of the PIR need to suggest a response to the challenges that the project faces.

90. The overall conclusion at the end of the review process is that if the CCP is to be a useful pilot, provide meaningful results from the impact evaluation and reach its stated objectives with regard to work with direct beneficiaries and their families, then a significant extension to the planned project period would be the most desirable response. It would provide space for effective implementation and ensure that commitments are respected and trust maintained. However, since the financial resources required to make this a reality are currently unavailable, there are a number of measures that can be taken to support the achievement of project objectives within the time remaining, and these are indicated in the recommendations coming out of the PIR.

⁶ <http://www.ilo.org/employment/areas/social-finance/lang--en/index.htm>

F. Lessons learned

1. **Good communication between stakeholders and coherence between project design and project implementation are key to the achievement of project objectives:** The CCP experience in using CAPs highlights the importance of ensuring that implementation strategies are not only in line with the approach that underpins project design, but are also fully understood by implementing stakeholders. This means giving more attention to defining implementation strategies in the project document and to communication and consistency between the design and implementation teams.
2. **Long project start up periods and multi-tiered decision making processes reduce the time available for effective project implementation:** While the degree of delay experienced by the CCP is unusual, IPEC projects do tend towards long start-up periods and it is important to look at how to avoid projects continually being implemented in less time than planned. Internal channels of communication between IPEC projects and Geneva are multi-tiered and time-consuming and need to be reviewed. Communications between the field and USDOL are obliged to pass through similar channels, which can also be inefficient and ineffective, as demonstrated by the length of time taken by the budget review process that was initiated in 2012 and only reached USDOL during the PIR in March 2013. Procedures are not set in stone and sometimes they need to change.

G. Recommendations

91. As a result of the CCP project implementation review by stakeholders in Accra and Abidjan, the following recommenders are made:

To IPEC and USDOL:

1. If the project cannot be significantly extended, explore and support all possibilities to enable direct action activities to be effectively implemented and the project's education and livelihoods related objectives to be met. Some such possibilities mentioned during the PIR include the speedy conclusion of the budget review process and making appropriate IPEC training resources available to the project team.

To IPEC:

2. Review project start up procedures to avoid undue delays and reduction in the time available for project implementation
3. Include more details in project documents of how the underlying approach to eliminating child labour needs to be reflected through the implementation of clearly defined strategies
4. Encourage greater consistency and communication between project design teams and project implementing teams.
5. Review channels of communication to avoid project delays due to multi-level decision making procedures
6. For future projects ensure that implementing agencies that will be working in the same communities over the same period with related objectives design their Action Programmes together so that they complement each other.

To the project team and implementing agencies:

7. Review AP objectives and activities to see if they can be implemented within the time available. If not, make appropriate changes so that objectives are achievable through the proposed activities.
8. Identify any areas related to livelihoods and education initiatives where you would like more specialist advice and input, and ask the project to assist in providing this as necessary.
9. Ensure that strategies are in place for supporting any direct beneficiaries who will not complete their cycle of training before the project end date and prepare those involved for this responsibility before the project ends.
10. Ensure that post-project strategies are in place to offer appropriate support to families involved in CCP livelihood initiatives.

To social partner stakeholders:

11. Communicate regularly with the project team – do not wait for them to come to you if you have something to say! Appreciate their work, don't expect them to be perfect and let them know how best to help you build capacity to deliver services to combat child labour.

Annexes

Annex 1- Terms of Reference

<p style="text-align: center;">Final February 2013</p>
--

Project Implementation Review of

**“Towards child labour free cocoa growing communities
in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana through an integrated
area based approach”**

ILO Project Code	RAF/10/54/USA
ILO Iris Code	102510
Country	Cote D’Ivoire-Ghana
Duration	48 months
Starting Date	31 December 2010
Ending Date	30 August 2014
Project Language	English/French
Executing Agency	ILO-IPEC
Financing Agency	United States Department of Labor (USDOL)
Donor contribution	USDOL: US\$ 10,000,000

List of Abbreviations

AP	Action Programme
CCP	Towards child labour free cocoa growing communities in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana through an integrated area based approach Project CL Child Labour
CLMS	Child Labour Monitoring System
CMES	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy
DBMR	Direct Beneficiaries Monitoring and Reporting
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programmes
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West Africa States
EIA	ILO/IPEC Evaluation and Impact Assessment section (former DED)
HQ	Headquarters
ILO	International Labour Organization
IO	Immediate Objective
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
NAP	National Action Plan
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
PIR	Project Implementation review
TBP	Time Bound Programme
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
USDOL	United States Department of Labour
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labour

I. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

1. The International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) is a technical cooperation programme of the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The aim of IPEC is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially its worst forms. The political will and commitment of individual governments to address child labour - in cooperation with employers' and workers' organizations, non-governmental organizations and other relevant parties in society - is the basis for IPEC action. IPEC support at the country level is based on a phased, multi-sector strategy. This strategy includes strengthening national capacities to deal with this issue, legislation harmonization, improvement of the knowledge base, raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour, promoting social mobilization against it, and implementing demonstrative direct action programmes (AP) to prevent children from child labour, to remove child workers from hazardous work, and to provide them and their families with appropriate alternatives.
2. The operational strategy of IPEC has over the years focused on providing support to national and local constituents and partners through their projects and activities. Such support has to the extent possible been provided in the context of national frameworks, institutions and processes that have facilitated the building of capacities and mobilisation for further action. It has emphasized various degrees of a comprehensive approach, providing linkages between action and partners in sectors and areas of work relevant for child labour. Whenever possible specific national frameworks or programmes, such as national plans, strategic frameworks, have provided such focus.
3. Starting in 2001, IPEC has promoted the implementation of such national frameworks through the national Time Bound Programme (TBP) approach which has evolved into the current NAPs. The NAP is the framework to operationalize the national CL labour policy as a statement of a country's course or approach to dealing with the problem of CL. It is intended to be a set of coherent and complementary policies, strategies and interventions with the long-term purpose of reducing and eventually eliminating CL.
4. The Global Action Plan (GAP), proposed in the 2006 Global Report on Child Labour and endorsed by the Governing Body at its November 2006 sitting, reinforced this emphasis by calling on all ILO member States to put appropriate time-bound measures using National Action Plans (NAP), in place by 2008 with a view to eliminating the WFCL by 2016.
5. The NAPs incorporate lessons learned from the earlier TBPs, especially in terms of process, the importance of institutions, and the role IPEC and other ILO units can play to ensure broad mobilization and sustainability. The recent experience has emphasized the facilitation and enhancement of national ownership, using a participatory approach involving government departments, the social partners and other key stakeholders at national, sub-national and sectorial levels.
6. NAPs are designed to be based on existing and planned interventions in all relevant social and economic sectors, with linkages to UNDAF and other UN programmes. They represent a programme framework, not a standalone project. The NAP formulation and implementation is a national responsibility, requiring national leadership and ownership, as well as national resource mobilization.

7. 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 analysed.
8. 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, as well as partners within a broader UN and International development context. For further information please see <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/decent.htm>
9. The DWCP defines a corporate focus on priorities, operational strategies as well as a resource and an implementation plan that complements and supports partner plans for national decent work priorities. As such DWCP are broader frameworks to which the individual ILO project is linked and contributes to. DWCP are beginning to gradually be introduced in various countries. The DWCP document for both country can be found at:

Cote D'Ivoire:

<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/dwcp/countries/index.htm>

Ghana:

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

Project background

10. The CCP Project has been designed taking in consideration previous experiences of IPEC projects (i.e. USDOL funded ones) in both countries and the West Africa region Regarding previous experiences, IPEC has implemented 8 projects in Cote d'Ivoire and 11 in Ghana, since 2002 with funds from USDOL, Canada, France, Denmark, the Netherlands and Norway.
11. Regarding current projects, this project is under the IPEC strategic programme on child labour in West Africa/ECOWAS region. It is particularly aligned to the projects "ECOWAS I and II"⁷ and Public-Private partnership⁸ (PPP). All, but PPP, are funded by USDOL. The PPP is funded by the private sector (see footnote 2). The 3 USDOL funded projects are under a common management structure (with clear responsibilities specified by project), aiming at the same development objective and working in some cases with the same stakeholders. The common structure and alignment allow for cross-fertilization among projects and increase efficiency and effectiveness.
12. ECOWAS I and II projects have gone through an integrated Midterm Evaluation in 2012. PPP will go through PIR in due time, not earlier than June 2013.
13. The Development Objective of the project is "To accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, with a focus on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana"

⁷ Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in West Africa and Strengthening Sub-Regional Cooperation ECOWAS I (RAF/09/51/USA) and ECOWAS II (RAF/10/53/USA)

⁸ Public-Private partnership between the Chocolate and Cocoa Industry, (funding source), and the ILO to Combat Child Labour in Cocoa Growing Communities in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire.

14. The project has the following five immediate objectives:

- IO.1. By the end of the project target communities will use increased understanding of child labour to develop and implement action plans to eliminate child labour in their communities.
- IO.2. By the end of the project boys and girls in cocoa growing communities will have improved access to relevant quality education, including appropriate complementary or alternative opportunities for boys and girls who are out of school
- IO.3. By the end of the project targeted households in cocoa growing communities will have enhanced sustainable livelihoods
- IO.4. By the end of the project national capacity to deploy an appropriate CLMS framework to measure progress towards the elimination of child labour through an IAB approach will be improved.
- IO.5. By the end of the project the technical and institutional capacity of ILO constituents and partner organizations to contribute to the implementation of NPAs and interventions to combat child labour in cocoa-growing communities will be enhanced

15. The project is developing the following strategic intervention to achieve the 5 objectives:

- An integrated area-based approach in cocoa-growing communities targeting all worst forms of child labour with emphasis on WFCL in the agricultural/cocoa sector and the provision of direct educational services;
- A “child labour model” linked with the Decent Work Country Programme promoting improved and/or diversified livelihoods strategies that may include supporting improved working conditions, productivity and agricultural practices;
- Broad-based advocacy for improved services and infrastructure, access to quality education and knowledge of child labour;
- Improved coordination across all key stakeholders through improved social dialogue and coalition building, including government institutions, social partners, implementing entities, and donors, with linkages to national plans to promote accountability and transparency;
- Sustainable efforts based on the development of actionable community plans and empowering communities; and
- Expanding CLMS and promoting community based platforms and better linkages with national statistical services; and
- Support to ministries of agriculture and other relevant government institutions in implementing policy development or review of sector policies necessary to address the structural causes of child labour (i.e. working children households’ livelihoods).

16. This project, together with the USDOL-IPEC projects in El Salvador and Thailand initiated in 2010, is piloting new approaches in CL labour projects. In particular the three of them are applying a new Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (CMES) that has developed its Theory of change (with participation of key stakeholders) as a starting point. The CMES focusses on results including outputs, project direct outcomes, broader or higher outcomes and impacts, monitoring of context, articulating monitoring and evaluation components apply, including a quasi- experimental impact evaluation for Ghana.

17. As of December 2012 the project has reported the following results:

Ghana

- Research reports and mapping studies in the areas of coordination and capacity building, cocoa productivity, education and other social services.
- Strengthened capacity of key stakeholders, such as the National Steering Committee on Child Labour, the Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare's Child Labour Unit, NPECLC, social partners, labour inspectors, agricultural extension officers and direct action implementing agencies
- District assemblies supported in collaboration with development partners for constructing new schools, provision of school furniture, community street lights and portable water in selected communities.
- 6 extension Agents assigned to project communities. towards enhancing agricultural productivity and improving livelihood of farmers
- Organization or re-constitution and strengthen of District Child Protection Committee (DCPCs) and Community Child Protection Committee (CCPCs), including the implementation of the Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System (GCLMS).
- In-service training on modern teaching methods to 100 untrained teachers
- Implementing agencies and key stakeholders trained on the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy
- Mainstream child labour, leadership and governance issues into the Ghana's Education Service, School Management Committee training manual and handbook.
- Occupational and Safety Health Manual, labor inspectors training manual and a CAPS development manual has been developed for multiple stakeholders.
- Baseline survey of target (and control) communities completed.

Cote D'Ivoire

- Strengthened capacity of key stakeholders, such as the Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Education, magistrates, prefects of the four CCP departments and social partners regarding child labour and improving education and livelihoods.
- Capacity of implementing agencies and other partners including the national statistical office have been built towards strengthening national M&E system as well as effective monitoring of project interventions.
- Baseline survey in project districts completed and a first draft of potential beneficiaries has been submitted.
- Two research reports have been produced

Background to the project implementation review

18. ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. Provisions are made in all projects in accordance with ILO evaluation policy and based on the nature of the project and the specific requirements agreed upon at the time of the project design and during the project as per established procedures. The Evaluation and Impact Assessment (EIA) section of ILO/IPEC provides an independent evaluation function for all ILO/IPEC projects.
19. The project document states that there will be an implementation review and an independent final evaluation of the project. Following ILO/IPEC evaluation procedures a consultation process on the timing, scope and aspects to be addressed in the project implementation review (PIR) was started in August 2012 by IPEC-EIA. Responses to the consultation process by key stakeholders justified holding a project implementation review with key stakeholders in early 2013.

20. The present Terms of Reference are based on inputs from key stakeholders received by IPEC-EIA in the consultation process and on standard issues to be covered by a project review facilitated by an external facilitator.
21. In October 2012 ILO-IPEC, project staff and USDOL had an extensive management review of the project in Accra. Results of that activity have been considered in preparation of this PIR.

II. SCOPE AND PURPOSE

22. The scope of the review will be the ILO/IPEC CCP Project in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana as a whole. The Implementation Review (PIR) will consist of a thorough assessment by the stakeholders, facilitated by the external facilitator, focusing on progress to date in the implementation of project activities. The review will use monitoring information already available.
23. The PIR will review the following areas of project design, implementation, outputs and sustainability and make recommendations for the remaining period of the project that will improve delivery and sustainability of outputs and objectives:
 - Analyse implementation strategies for their appropriateness and potential effectiveness in achieving the project objectives;
 - Review the institutional set-up, capacity for project implementation, coordination mechanisms and the use and usefulness of management tools including the project monitoring tools, work plans and planned impact evaluation
 - Assess the implementation of the project so far including the delivery rate of funds and project outputs to date. Identify factors affecting project implementation (positively and negatively) and discuss how project results and impact can be maximised
 - Examine the likelihood of the project achieving its objectives and if necessary propose revisions to the expected level of achievement of the objectives;
 - Review the strategies for sustainability and replication and scaling up
24. The PIR brings the main stakeholders together to examine and assess the areas identified above. If it is agreed that changes are required to the strategy or to the implementation process and timetable based on the review of experience to date, these revised strategies and schedules should be based on a common understanding among the stakeholders of the way forwards.
25. The role of the external facilitator is, based on the desk review of existing documents and preparatory consultations, to identify areas where discussion is needed in the stakeholders' meeting and to facilitate the discussion to reach a consensus on the way forwards. The external facilitator will also provide input and further analysis based on their perspective and their overall findings.
26. The results will be used by national stakeholders, IPEC HQ, USDOL and field staff to adjust strategies of the project.

III. SUGGESTED ASPECTS TO BE ADDRESSED

27. Through the consultation process with key stakeholders and based on prior analysis by the Evaluation and Impact Assessment (EIA) section, suggested aspects for the review to consider have been identified. These are presented in Annex 1. Other aspects can be added as identified by the review consultant in accordance with given purpose and in consultation with EIA.
28. One of the tasks for the PIR facilitator, as presented in more detail in the methodology section, is to decide which ones, based on the information available and the current status of the project, are the most important aspects for the stakeholders to address in order to achieve the purpose of the review. The selected aspects will need to be formulated into appropriate questions to facilitate discussion in order to clarify current status, discuss critical issues and reach consensus on the way forwards.

IV. EXPECTED OUTPUTS OF REVIEW

29. The facilitator will produce a background report based on initial desk review to serve as the basis for the discussions in the project review meeting. It will include a programme for the two country project review meetings.
30. At the end of the field work phase a project review report prepared by the facilitator based on the outcome of the stakeholder discussions and agreement.
31. The draft report produced in English, and translated in French by the facilitator, should be presented to IPEC EIA two weeks after the project review meetings. After a methodological review by EIA, the report will be circulated to all relevant stakeholders for their comments. The comments will be consolidated by EIA and forwarded to the consultant. The review consultant should consider the comments in the final version of the report.
32. The review report should not exceed 25 pages in length (excluding annexes). The structure of the report could follow the following outline:
 - Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
 - Background (including description of the project and review methodology)
 - Results from discussions on key issues associated with key questions
 - Conclusions/key lessons learned
 - Recommendations
 - Lessons learned
 - Appropriate annexes including TOR, schedule of interviews and workshops and list of people interviewed
33. The report should also, as appropriate, include specific and detailed recommendations by the external facilitator based on the analysis of project review responses. All recommendations should be addressed specifically to the organization/institution responsible for implementing it.
34. The report should also include a specific section on lessons learned from this project, either potential practices that could be replicated or those that should be avoided.
35. Ownership of data from the review rests jointly with ILO-IPEC and the consultants. The copyright of the review 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 review report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

V. PROPOSED REVIEW METHODOLOGY

36. The following is the suggested methodology for the project review. The methodology can be adjusted by the facilitator team if considered necessary for the review process and in accordance with the scope and purpose of the review. This should be done in consultation with the EIA section of ILO/IPEC. An external consultant will serve as facilitator to guide the project review participants through a discussion of their experiences.

37. The review should be carried out in adherence with the relevant parts of the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy; the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluations 2012

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_168289/lang--en/index.htm

the specific ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes; the UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards, Ethical Guidelines, Code of Conduct; and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.

38. Gender concerns should be addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: “Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects”⁹. All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the review process.

39. The field work will be done in two phases: one in Ghana and a second one in Cote d’Ivoire. In methodological terms the project will be considered as one. When appropriate separate sub-sections per country will be developed.

The following elements are the proposed methodology:

I. Document Review and internal scoping

40. The facilitator will review the project document, work plans, project monitoring plans, progress reports, and other documents that were produced through the project. In addition, the facilitator will conduct electronic or telephone interviews with selected stakeholders. He/She will receive a briefing by the project team and conduct an internal scoping exercise.

41. Based on the areas listed under the purpose, the list of suggested aspects above, the document review, the briefings and interviews, the facilitator will identify key issues for discussion during the project review.

II. Background Report and Project Review Meeting Programme

42. A background report will be prepared by the review consultant. The content of the Background Report will include:

- Achievements so far of the IPEC Project as documented and assessed by the facilitator

⁹ http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

- Summary of the key findings based on the purpose of the review, the suggested aspects to address and the initial scoping by the external facilitator
 - Questions and issues identified for discussion at the review meeting
43. The facilitator will present the Background Report to the Stakeholder Review Meetings in Accra and Abidjan and will also develop a tentative proposed agenda for the stakeholder review meeting.

III. Stakeholder Project Review Meeting

44. The project review will be conducted with internal and external participation. Potential participants include the project management including the CTA, implementing partners, IPEC desk officers and technical specialists, donor representatives, representatives from worker and employer organizations, government officials, representatives from implementing agencies/partners. The facilitator will work together with project management and EIA to ensure that the participants who can provide information to answer the review questions are invited to the project review meeting.
45. A rapporteur, not associated with the project, will take notes. Notes should be extensive and reflect the content of the discussion. Shortly after each activity, the team (facilitator and rapporteur) should summarize the information, the team's impressions, and implications of the information for the study. This will help ensure that the record is a valid representation of the discussion.
46. The project review will consist of a two-day meeting of the expanded management team, which will include representatives from Senior Child Labour Specialist SRO-Abuja, ILO-IPEC HQ, the donor and the government, as well as from employers' and workers' organizations, and other stakeholders including executive and staff members of the implementing agencies who will be present in the relevant sections of the meeting. The project will identify the stakeholders and provide a list of participants for this meeting.

IV. Follow-up Meeting with Internal Key Stakeholders

47. Half day follow-up meeting with internal key stakeholders with decision-making authority regarding budgets, work plan and changes that has been suggested by the review meeting. This will focus on the implication of the proposed adjustment in strategy and establish the possible changes in project components, work plans, project monitoring plans, and other documents as appropriate. The participants of this meeting will be:
- ILO/IPEC Headquarters
 - Senior Child Labour Specialist
 - Project staff
 - Others as appropriate
48. A more detailed list of participants for the review meeting as well as for the follow-up meeting will be finalized with consultation between EIA and the project.

V. Review Report

49. Based on the background report and the inputs from the key stakeholders' discussions during the review and follow-up meetings, the facilitator will draft the review report. The draft report will be sent to IPEC-EIA directly by the consultant. IPEC-EIA will forward the review report to stakeholders for their inputs/comments to the report. IPEC EIA will consolidate the comments including methodological comments from EIA and forward them to the consultant for consideration in finalizing the draft report.

50. The consultant will finalize the report, taking into consideration the stakeholder comments.

Profile of the PIR facilitator

51. The project review will be carried out by a consultant with extensive experience in the evaluation of development or social interventions, preferably including practical experience in assessing comprehensive policy/program frameworks or national plans in West Africa (i.e. Cote d’Ivoire and Ghana).. Working experience on issues related to child labour, education and children’s welfare will be essential. Full command of English and French as working languages will be required. The profile and responsibilities for the review consultant are found in the table below.

Project Review Facilitator	
Responsibility	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the project documents • Conduct interviews • Prepare a background report for discussion at the stakeholder meeting • Facilitate project review meetings • Draft the review report • Finalize the review report taking into consideration the comments of stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive experience of facilitating stakeholder meetings • Good workshop process and consensus building skills • Development experience • Ability to write concisely in English and French • Experience and knowledge of evaluation, programme and project management • Experience with work at policy level and in multi-sectoral and multi-partner environment, including networking

52. The facilitator will be supported by national rapporteur, independent from the project, during the filed visit.

53. The following is the timetable for the review exercise:

Activity	Dates	Duration	Responsible
Briefing, desk review, internal briefings, development of draft background paper and agenda for the meeting	18 th -22 nd February	5 work days (home)	Consultant with project & EIA support
Meetings with key stakeholders, finalise background paper, facilitate stakeholder review meeting, debriefing.	25 th February – March 1 st (Accra) and March 11 th -15 th (Abidjan)	10 days (Accra and Abidjan)	Consultant
Prepare draft review report	March 18 th -29 th	10 days (home)	Consultant
Circulate draft report to stakeholders & consolidate comments	April 1 st -12 th	10 days	IPEC-EIA
Finalize review report taking into views the consolidated comments	April 15 th -16 th	2 days	Consultant

Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings:

54. Sources of Information

Available at HQ and to be supplied by EIA	Project document EIA, ILO and UNEG guidelines
Available in project office and to be supplied by project management	Technical progress reports/status reports Baseline reports and studies Project monitoring plan Technical and financial reports of partner agencies Other studies and research undertaken Action Programme Summary Outlines Project files National Action Plans

55. Consultations/meetings will be held with:

- Project management and staff
- ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials
- Implementing partner agencies
- Government stakeholders at local and national levels (e.g. representatives from Department of Labour, Social Development etc.)
- Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups
- NGO representatives
- USDOL (by telephone if not attending personally)
- US Embassy staff

56. Final Report Submission Procedure

- The review consultant will submit a draft review report to IPEC EIA in Geneva
- IPEC EIA will forward a copy to key stakeholders for comments on factual issues and for clarifications
- IPEC EIA will consolidate the comments and send these to the review consultant by date agreed between EIA and the review
- The final report is submitted to IPEC EIA who will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including the donor.

I. RESOURCES AND MANAGEMENT

Resources

57. The following resources are required:

- Consultant fees for 27 work days
- Travel to Abidjan and Accra and DSA as per ILO rules and regulations if applicable
- Costs associated with the project review meetings
- Local rapporteur for 10 days of work to record the meeting and to prepare a report of the meetings

58. A detailed budget is available separately.

Management

59. The review consultant will report to IPEC EIA in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with EIA should issues arise. IPEC project officials and the ILO regional office in Bangkok will provide administrative and logistical support during the review process.

Annex 1: Suggested aspects for the review to consider

Design

- Assess if it took into account the institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders.
- To what extent were external factors and assumptions identified at the time of design? Have these underlying assumptions on which the project has been based proven to be true?
- Assess whether the problems and needs were adequately analysed and determine whether the needs, constraints, resources and access to project services of the different beneficiaries were clearly identified, taking gender issues into concern.
- Are the time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities logical and realistic?
- Is the strategy for sustainability of project results defined clearly at the design stage of the project?
- Were the objectives of the project clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)?

Implementation and Achievement

Common

- What are the results achieved to date within each immediate objective?
- What are the possible changes in project strategy or implementation that are needed in order to achieve the project objectives;
- What groundwork has been laid to prepare communities for service provision and other project activities? How have communities responded? Have there been any unforeseen results that may require adjustments to project strategies?
- Are project partners (government, industry, service providers (NGOs)) able to fulfil the roles expected in the project strategy? Are there any capacity challenges?
- Is the appropriate training and guidance provided to implementing organizations by IPEC? Other areas that needs to be covered?
- How did positive and negative factors outside of the control of the project affect project implementation and project objectives and how did the project deal with these external factors?
- What is the possible effect of any significant delays in implementation and to the sequencing of events? How could any such delays be avoided in the future?
- Have measures been adopted by the Project Management to overcome any constraints to implementation?
- Which linkages have been made with ILO projects and with other projects linked to the thematic in both countries?
- Is there a need to reallocate resources or adjust activities in order to achieve its immediate objectives? Are resources sufficient for the remaining project period?
- What are the current challenges that the Project is facing in the implementation of the project and what efforts are made to overcome these challenges?
- How effective is the coordination between the CCP and ECOWAS I and II projects under the common management structure, and in the alignment with the PPP, is there any overlapping between the projects?

Enabling environment (Capacity Building)

- How effective has the project been at stimulating interest and participation in the project at the local, meso and national level?
- How effectively has the project leveraged resources (e.g., by collaborating with non-IPEC initiatives and other projects)?

- How successful has the project been in mainstreaming the issue of child labour into on-going efforts in areas such as education, alternative employment promotion and poverty reduction?
- Examine how the ILO/IPEC project interacted and possibly influenced national level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.

Direct Targeted Action

- Has the capacity of community level agencies and organizations been strengthened to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate actions to prevent and eliminate child labour?
- What kinds of benefits have the target beneficiaries gained as a result of the project work so far?
- Assess the criteria for selecting beneficiaries and implementing agencies for the project applied.

Relevance

- Is the strategy and approach of the project still relevant? How is the strategy being implemented and coordinated? Have there been any changes in strategies?
- Are the project's original assumptions related to each of its Immediate Objectives (IO) still valid?
- Are the project's Indicators and Means of Verification still appropriate?
- Does the "theory of change" still hold? What is the level of understanding of different stakeholders?

Sustainability

- How can the outputs and outcomes of the project be sustained and further used? What is the current effort towards that? What are the measures and processes adopted?
- Is local ownership been promoted? Are the linkages to broader sectoral and national action been made?
- Is the phase-out strategy for the project in place and under implementation? Is sufficiently clearly articulated and progress made towards this goal?

Special concerns

- Is the project supporting activities aimed at building up collaboration between Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire?
- Given that the project is a pilot, do the project's activities provide a replicable, scalable model that is both an effective approach to significantly reduce the worst forms of child labor in the cocoa-growing areas of each country and is also cost-effective? If not, please indicate the reasons why and provide recommendations on how to make the model (or select portions) replicable and scalable.

CMES

- Are project staff and partners applying the agreed Theory of change to guide the project implementation and how is it used as a learning tool during implementation?
- Discuss the feasibility of the project CMES implementation under the current resources and capacities and discuss any adjustment that should be considered (ie. tools and methodology for data collection, processing, reporting and use of information)
- What is the stakeholders' current level of understanding and ownership of the CMES?
- What is the stakeholders' level of awareness of the Impact evaluation by stakeholders?
- Discuss the capacities and understanding of project staff and key stakeholders of the CMES focus on outcomes and impacts rather than on an output-based monitoring system

Annex 2. Project Objectives and outputs

Development objective: To accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, with a focus on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana
Immediate Objective 1: By the end of the project target communities will use increased understanding of child labour to develop and implement action plans to eliminate child labour in their communities.
Output 1.1: Target communities sensitized through information, dialogue and analysis concerning children's work and education
Output 1.2: Support for the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of Community Action Plans (CAPs)
Output 1.3: Support for advocacy: (i) for the implementation of CAPs (ii) for the implementation of national policies and programmes supporting child rights and child protection
Immediate objective 2: By the end of the project boys and girls in cocoa growing communities will have improved access to relevant quality education, including appropriate complementary or alternative opportunities for boys and girls who are out of school
Output 2.1: Withdrawal and prevention of children, including children of migrants and share-croppers, from child labour through expanded alternative/ accelerated/ transitional/supplementary/ formal/non-formal/vocational/ direct educational services
Output 2.2: Coordination to promote improved school infrastructure (including access to potable water) and more school feeding programmes.
Output 2.3: Implementation of appropriate strategies to increase numbers of trained male and female primary school teachers working in cocoa growing communities
Output 2.4: Training for appropriate school governance structures, including SMCs and CGSs, to enhance local governance and community input to and oversight of primary school management.
Output 2.5: Research, support for and promotion of TVET opportunities, including model farm schools/Junior FFS
Output 2.6: Implementation of strategies to encourage a more positive image of agriculture through understanding of its potential as a career choice
Immediate objective 3: By the end of the project targeted households in cocoa growing communities will have enhanced sustainable livelihoods
Output 3.1: Research and implementation of strategies for improved cocoa productivity among target households, including FFS
Output 3.2: Research and implementation of strategies to promote youth and adult literacy and numeracy among target households
Output 3.3: Strategies for increased workplace safety including worksite protection, particularly for children above the minimum age for work
Output 3.4: Research and implementation of appropriate micro-finance, savings, skills training and entrepreneurship strategies for target households
Output 3.5: Support for community –based cooperative /local trade unions support organizations to enable farmers and migrant and other labourers to become organised and act through trade unions and cooperatives to tackle poverty, decent work deficits and other root causes of child labour
Immediate objective 4: By the end of the project national capacity to deploy an appropriate CLMS framework to measure progress towards the elimination of child labour through an IAB approach will be improved.
Output 4.1: Assessment of strengths and weakness of the current operation of the CLMS
Output 4.2: Strengthened pilot CLMS in operation
Immediate objective 5: By the end of the project the technical and institutional capacity of ILO constituents and partner organizations to contribute to the implementation of NPAs and interventions to combat child labour in cocoa-growing communities will be enhanced.
Output 5.1: Employers' and workers' organizations identify and implement strategies to promote major stakeholder (including government and industry) adherence, application and implementation of rights-based approaches and commitments to eliminating child

Development objective: To accelerate progress in the elimination of child labour, with a focus on its worst forms, in cocoa growing communities in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana
labour.
Output 5.2: Systematic skills/needs assessment of ILO constituents as potential implementers and/or implementing partners for interventions
Output 5.3: Capacity building of employers' and workers' organizations to plan, coordinate and deliver appropriate support to interventions
Output 5.4: Capacity building (Labour Ministries and education and agriculture public services) so that the Governments of Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire are better able to fulfil commitments to eliminating child labour at national and local levels.

Annex 2 – List of documents reviewed

- CCP Prodoc
- CCP technical Progress reports and status updates
- PPP Prodoc and technical progress reports
- ECOWAS I&II midterm evaluation draft report
- CMES guidelines
- Ghana Impact evaluation design

Ghana and RCI

- APSOs and Service Contracts
- Implementing agency reports
- Base line surveys TOR and technical proposals
- Field staff work plans
- Project log frame
- Operational outputs

Annex 3 - Schedule of interviews and workshops

Accra: 25th February – 1st March. 2013

Time	Activity
<i>Monday, 25th February, 2013: Interviews with Project Team and National Stakeholders</i>	
9.00-12.00:	Meeting with ILO-IPEC CTA and Project team
2.00-3.00:	MESW, Labour Department, Child Labour Unit (CLU), Employment Information Branch (EIB) and NPECLC
15.30-16.30	Ministry of Food and Agriculture, Ghana Cocoa Board , Cocoa Swollen Shoot Virus Disease Control Unit (CSSVDCU)
<i>Tuesday, 26th February, 2013</i>	
9.00-11.00	Ghana Employers' Association (GEA), Ghana Trades Union Congress (GAWU), National Steering Committee on child labour (NSCCL)
11:30 -13:30	Meeting with Direct Action IAs (GLORI, CAYDNET, DFA and CRI) and International Cocoa Initiative (ICI)
13:30 – 14:00	PPP
14:30 – 16:30	Preparation for stakeholders' meeting with project team
<i>Wednesday, 27th & Thursday, 28th February</i>	
09-16.30	Stakeholders' workshop
<i>Friday, 1st March, 2013</i>	
10:00-12:00	Debriefing with Project Team

Abidjan 11-15 mars. 2013

Heure	Activité
Jour 1 : Lundi, 11 mars 2013	
9.00-11.00	Séance de travail avec le staff IPEC et l'équipe de projet CCP
11. 30-12.30	Réunion avec le Ministre/cabinet en charge du travail, président du CIM et quelques membres du CIM (qui n'a pas eu lieu)
15.00-16.00	Réunion avec le CNS (qui n'a pas eu lieu)
Jour 2 : Mardi, 12 mars 2013	
09.00-10.00	Séance de travail avec DLTE (qui n'a pas eu lieu)
10.30-11.30	Séance de travail avec le CGECI, INTERSYNDICALE et UGTIC
11 :30 – 13 :30	Séance de travail avec ANADER, SAAENF, ONG SDEF-AFRIQUE, DR MFFE Dimbokro et ICI
15.00-17.00	Séance de préparation de l'atelier avec les parties-prenantes
Jour 3 : mercredi, 13 mars 2013 (demi-journée) et Jour 4 jeudi, 14 mars 2013	
	Atelier avec les parties-prenantes
	Appel de Washington
Jour 5 : Vendredi, 15 mars 2013	
14.00-16.00	Séance de débriefing et de synthèse avec l'équipe du projet

Annex 4 – Preliminary interviews

Preliminary interviews	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ricardo Furman, Evaluation and Impact Assessment section (ILO-IPEC Geneva) • Simon Steyne, Head of Social Dialogue and Partnership (ILO-IPEC Geneva) • Francesco D'Ovidio, original CCP CTA • Maureen Jaffe, USDOL 	
Ghana	Cote d'Ivoire
Meetings with Project team	
Stephen McClelland, CTA Honore Semien Boua Bi, IPM	Honore Semien Boua Bi, IPM Laurent Guittey Chargé de programme
Stella Dzator, National Project Manager Albert Atabila, Field Coordinator Charity Dodoo, Field Coordinator Grace Boakye Yiadom, Field Coordinator Daniel Chachu, M&E project officer	Daniel Chachu, M&E project officer Koffi Victor, Field Coordinator Daloa Adaye Raymond, Field Coordinator Soubré Sei Bi Olivier, Field Coordinator Daoukro
Meeting with national Child Labour programme staff	
Mamudu Kenneth, NPECLC Morrison Opam Adjei ILO focal person Issah Mushin Senior Labour Inspector Anthony Awotwe EIB, Principal Labour Officer Elizabeth Akanbowire, EIB, Child Labour Unit	
Meeting with COCOBOD	
Barnett Quaicoo, COCOBOD, Senior research officer	
Meeting with GEA, GTUC/GAWU and NSCCL	Séance de travail avec CGECI, INTERSYNDICALE et UGTCI
Richard Ayitey, GES Patience Quaye Police./ Chair NSCCL Andrews Tagoe, TUC/GAWU Godwin Dzukey, TUC/GAWU	Ladouyou Sibahi Edouard CGECI, Responsable des questions sociales, de la formation/ emploi et des RH Rabet Jean-Claude, INTERSYNDICALE, SG adjoint chargé de la LTE Assie Kona Ba Robert, UGTCI, Formateur
Meeting with direct action implementing agencies	Séance de travail avec les Agences d'exécution
Ebenezer Osei, GLORI Alfreda O. Gyamfi, Development Fortress, Director Janet Okyere Brako Development Fortress, Project Coordinator Justice Archer CAYDNET, Director Asare Augustus CAYDNET Project Coordinator Daniel F. Sampson, Child Rights International, Project Coordinator Patience Dappah, ICI National Coordinator David B. Mensah ICI Project Coordinator Isadore N.A. Armah, ICI Project Assistant Elvis S. Quashiga, ICI Project Assistant	Awokou Donatien, ICI, Responsable projet Kouadio Clément, ONG SDEF-AFRIQUE, Coordonnateur projet à Issia Angui Larissa Epse KONAN, SDEF-AFRIQUE Agent de projet Yao Effet Kofikan DR MFFE DIMBOKRO, Chef de projet Broni Laure, DLTE, Agent technique Missa Célestin, DLTE, Agent technique Kadjo Nanou Emile SAAENF, Chargé de projet Mme Kone Niamine Saaenf Chargée de projet
Meeting with IPEC/PPP team	
Margaret Sackey, Acting Project Coordinator Newton Obeng, Admin/ Finance Officer	

Annex 5 – Participants in stakeholder workshops

Ghana:

NO	NAME	ORGANISATION
1	Daniel Chachu	ILO/IPEC
2	Barnett Quarcoo	COCOBOD
3	Charity Dodoo	ILO
4	Lalaina Razafindrakoto	ILO/IPEC
5	STEPHEN McClelland	ILO/IPECC
6	Bouabi Simien Horore	ILO/IPEC
7	Ebenezer Osei	GLORI
8	Albert Atabila	ILO
9	Alex Soho	ILO/IPEC
10	Caleb Obipeh	CALEBO MEDIA
11	Grace Boakye Yiadom	ILO
12	C.K. Opoku	Twifo Atti Morkwa D.A
13	Janet Okyere Brako	Dev't Fortress
14	Mary Francis	USDOL
15	Mamudu Kenneth	NPECLC/MEIr
16	Micheal Akita	N.F.E.D
17	Asare Augustus	CAYDNET
18	Taminu Aboul Rashid	Birim South D.A
19	Vitau Kanewala	Amenfi West Dist Assly
20	Morrison Opam Adjei	MELR
21	Stella Dzator	ILO
22	William Minta Wiafe	CSSVDU/COCOBOD
23	Christopher Conduah	NDPC
24.	Mary Nyamekye Ankrah	NCCE
25	Thomas Musah	GNAT
26.	Richard Ayitey	GES
27	Margaret Sackey	ILO
28.	Isadore N.A. Armah	ICI
29.	Benjamin Botchway	MGLRD
30.	Daniel F. Sampson	CRI-Suhum
31	Abdul-Samad Issah	MoELR
32	Richardo Furman	ILO-IPEC/EIA
33.	Charles A sante-Bempong	GEA
34	Eric Okrah	Recorder

Cote d'Ivoire

N°	Nom des participants	Structure / Fonction
1	Francis Mary	USDOL
2	Mc Clelland Stephen	BIT CTP
3	Kone Koko Siaka	Rapporteur
4	Boua Bi Sémien	BIT/ IPM
5	Chachu Daniel	IPEC-CCP NPO (Suivi et Evaluation) CCP- Ghana/RCI
6	Guittey Laurent	BIT Chargé de programme IPEC-CCP
7	Koffi Victor	BIT Field Coordinator Daloa
8	Adaye Raymond	BIT Field Coordinator Soubré
9	Sei Bi Olivier	BIT Field Coordinator Daoukro
10	Sigui Mokié	BIT NPO ECOWAS
11	Ouattara Pegadabila Gervais	BIT Chargé de programme IPEC-PPP
12	Ladouyou Sibahi Edouard	CGECI Responsable des questions sociales, de la formation/ emploi et des RH
13	Rabet Jean-Claude	INTERSYNDICALE SG adjoint chargé de la LTE
14	Assie Kona Ba Robert	UGTCI Formateur
15	Awokou Donatien	FONDATION ICI Responsable projet
16	Kouadio Clément	ONG SDEF-AFRIQUE Coordonnateur projet à Issia
17	Yao Effet Kofikan	DR MFFE DIMBOKRO Chef de projet
18	Broni Laure	DLTE Agent technique
19	Kadjo Nanou Emile	SAAENF Chargé de projet
20	Mme KONE NIAMIEN	SAAENF Chargée de projet
21	Angui Larissa Epse Konan	SDEF-AFRIQUE Agent de projet
22	Missa Célestin	DLTE Agent technique
23	Diouro Michel	RICAE Responsable projet
24	Hili Baba	DR MFFE DIMBOKRO Coordonnateur projet
25	Kouakou Yao Marc	ANADER/SOUBRE Coordonnateur
26	Tia Zogbeu Robert	ASA Chef de projet
27	Kongo Kouadio S.	Coopérative KAVOKIVA Coordonnateur projet
28	Kouassi Pemaud Justi	DPE/MFFE Attaché administratif
29	Dr N'guessan Joseph	ONG FSL Président
30	Boni Magloire	Conseil du café cacao Conseiller du DG
31	Enoh Moïse	INS Chargé d'études
32	Hobah Christian	DLTE/CIM Sous-directeur (Suivi Evaluation P et P)
33	Devamy Irié François	ONG CAVOEQUIVA Conseiller communautaire

Annex 6 – Implementation status by objective

Objectives/outputs/activities	STATUS	
	Côte d'Ivoire 12.03.2013	Ghana 23.02.2013
Immediate objective No. 1: Target communities will use increased understanding of child labour to develop and implement action plans to eliminate child labour in their communities.		
Output 1.1: Target communities sensitized through information, dialogue and analysis concerning children's work and education		
<u>Activity 1.1.1:</u> Carry out formative research on KAB relative to child labour and education among target communities.	Not started	Removed from work plan
<u>Activity 1.1.2:</u> With key partners, develop awareness-raising strategies and materials tailored to different target groups.	Not started Service Contract with NGO FAPD; awaiting BR	On-going
<u>Activity 1.1.3:</u> Carry out awareness-raising campaigns through direct actions and through providing assistance to partners to integrate agreed strategies into their own programmes.	On-going	On-going
Output 1.2: Support for the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of Community Action Plans (CAPs)		
<u>Activity 1.2.1:</u> Using PRA and organization techniques, carry out an institutional mapping and needs assessment of local partners that can contribute to project's goals.	On-going contract signed – ICI AP;	Completed
<u>Activity 1.2.2:</u> Train relevant local partners in CAP development.	On-going ICI AP	On-going
<u>Activity 1.2.3:</u> Support local partners to develop CAPs focussing on the elimination of child labour in cocoa, using an IAB approach.	On-going contract signed – ICI AP;	On-going
<u>Activity 1.2.4:</u> Support target communities to implement and monitor their CAPs, including their educational strategies	On-going contract signed – ICI AP;	Contracts signed yet to commence
Output 1.3: Support for advocacy : (i) for the implementation of CAPs and (ii) for the implementation of national policies and programmes supporting child rights and child protection		
<u>Activity 1.3.1:</u> Advocate with local government and other organizations the mainstreaming of CAPs into relevant policy agendas.	Not started Planned through national consultancies – no funds for workshops	Planned as NDPC Service Contract but due to limited funds it has been added to ICI and Direct Action Contracts. CCP will engage NDPC in mainstreaming CAPS. at the national level
<u>Activity 1.3.2:</u> Support communities to seek adequate funding for implementation of CAPs.	On-going ICI AP	Contracts signed yet to commence
<u>Activity 1.3.3:</u> Provide on-going training as needed for implementation of CAPs.	On-going ICI AP	On-going
<u>Activity 1.3.4:</u> Advocate with government agencies the mainstreaming of child labour concerns into relevant policies and programmes.	On-going ICI AP	On-going
<u>Activity 1.3.5:</u> Advocate for the introduction or strengthening of government programmes in targeted communities (education, poverty reduction and social protection, rural development...)	On-going ICI AP	On-going
Immediate objective No. 2: Boys and girls in cocoa growing communities will have improved access to relevant quality education, including appropriate complementary or alternative opportunities for boys and girls who are out of school.		
Output 2.1: Withdrawal and prevention of children, including children of migrants and share-croppers, from child labour through expanded alternative/ accelerated/ transitional/supplementary/ formal/non-formal/vocational/ direct educational services		
<u>Activity 2.1.1:</u> Conduct an education needs assessment in target communities, including coverage of migrant children.	On-going national consultancy	Completed

Objectives/outputs/activities	STATUS	
	Côte d'Ivoire 12.03.2013	Ghana 23.02.2013
<u>Activity 2.1.2:</u> Advocate for introduction or expansion of educational programmes in target communities, including needed infrastructure and public schools.	On-going national consultancy	On-going
<u>Activity 2.1.3:</u> Review relevant existing alternative/transitional education programmes and design and implement country-specific transitional education strategies.	Not started – awaiting BR national consultancy	Removed from work plan
<u>Activity 2.1.4:</u> Support Governments to develop curricula and materials and print the materials to be used in alternative/transitional education programmes.	Not started – no funds	Not started – TOR in progress
<u>Activity 2.1.5:</u> Provide training and other support to teachers, including NFE teachers, in target communities as needed/requested, in cooperation with the relevant public institutions and education sector trade unions.	On-going APs 2-5	On-going
<u>Activity 2.1.6:</u> Provide targeted children with direct educational services such as tutoring, catch-up classes, and school supplies to withdraw/prevent children from the worst forms of child labour.	Not started due to delays in DB selection process	Not started due to delays in DB selection process
Output 2.2: Coordination to promote improved school infrastructure (including access to potable water) and more school feeding programmes.		
<u>Activity 2.2.1:</u> Carry out a needs assessment of target community schools.	On-going national consultancy	Completed
<u>Activity 2.2.2:</u> Advocate with government authorities for repair/rehabilitation/construction of schools, as identified in assessment.	On-going – APs 2-5	On-going
<u>Activity 2.2.3:</u> Undertake school rehabilitation where required on a case-by-case basis, with prior approval from donor.	On-going – APs 2-5	On-going
<u>Activity 2.2.4:</u> Advocate with governments, donor and UN agencies for the introduction of school feeding programmes if required.	On-going – APs 2-5	On-going
<u>Activity 2.2.5:</u> Create community kitchens with input from parents in selected communities.	On-going – APs 2-5	Removed from work plan
Output 2.3: Implementation of appropriate strategies to increase numbers of trained male and female primary school teachers working in cocoa growing communities		
<u>Activity 2.3.1:</u> Conduct teacher needs assessments in target communities.	On-going national consultancy	Completed
<u>Activity 2.3.2:</u> Linked to participatory CAP development, create action plans for increasing number of trained teachers.	On-going – APs 2-5	On-going
<u>Activity 2.3.3:</u> Support education systems to implement plans, including advocacy with national authorities as required.	On-going – APs 2-5	Removed from work plan
Output 2.4: Training for appropriate school governance structures, including SMCs and CGSs, to enhance local governance and community input to and oversight of primary school management.		
<u>Activity 2.4.1:</u> Conduct assessment of school governance structures in the target communities where they exist, including a KAB study to determine committee members' level of knowledge and attitudes toward child labour.	On-going national consultancy	Completed
<u>Activity 2.4.2:</u> Develop training modules on school management techniques, good governance and leadership, or adapt them from existing programmes.	Workshop - TOR drafted, awaiting BR	Completed

Objectives/outputs/activities	STATUS	
	Côte d'Ivoire 12.03.2013	Ghana 23.02.2013
<u>Activity 2.4.3:</u> Train school governance structures on school supervision and counselling.	Workshop - TOR drafted, awaiting BR	Not started – depends on availability of funds
<u>Activity 2.4.4:</u> Encourage participation of community parents in school governance structures.	Not started – awaiting BR	Not started – depends on availability of funds
Output 2.5: Research, support for and promotion of TVET opportunities, including model farm schools/Junior FFS		
<u>Activity 2.5.1:</u> Assess target families' needs and interest in TVET.	On-going national consultancy	Not started
<u>Activity 2.5.2:</u> Assess facilities and programmes, including apprenticeship opportunities and Junior FFS, accessible to target community.	On-going national consultancy	On-going
<u>Activity 2.5.3:</u> Assess general labour market demand to identify relevant TVET courses.	On-going national consultancy	Not started
<u>Activity 2.5.4:</u> Support targeted youth to receive TVET.	On-going Planned as part APs 2-5 awaiting GSM approval and BLS	Not started
<u>Activity 2.5.5:</u> Implement model farms schools/Junior FFS.	On-going AP 2 + national consultancy awaiting GSM approval and BLS	Not started
<u>Activity 2.5.6:</u> Develop proposals to improve the traditional apprenticeship systems (improvements in legal framework, stronger protections against hazardous work, expansion of apprenticeship systems etc.).	On-going	On-going
Output 2.6: Implementation of strategies to encourage a more positive image of agriculture through understanding of its potential as a career choice		
<u>Activity 2.6.1:</u> Mainstream studies on cocoa and agriculture into school curricula in cocoa districts.	Not started – awaiting BR national consultancy	On-going
<u>Activity 2.6.2:</u> Identify successful cocoa farmers and rural workers' representatives who can act as role models for the children in schools and organize role modelling sessions.	On-going national consultancy	On-going
<u>Activity 2.6.3:</u> Take school children on excursions to see large cocoa farms and invite the owners and representatives of relevant rural workers' unions to address children on the cocoa industry.	On-going national consultancy	Not started
Immediate objective No.3: Targeted households in cocoa growing communities will have enhanced sustainable livelihoods		
Output 3.1: Research and implementation of strategies for improved cocoa productivity among target households, including FFS		
<u>Activity 3.1.1:</u> Conduct research, including key informant interviews with cocoa industry stakeholders, to identify practical measures to enhance productivity.	TOR drafted for service contract planned April-June 2013	Completed
<u>Activity 3.1.2:</u> Through TOT programmes, support for FFS and other modalities, introduce productivity-enhancing and improved agronomy measures on target farms/households.	TOR drafted service contract planned April-June 2013	On-going
<u>Activity 3.1.3:</u> Document results of enhanced productivity measures on select farms for use in awareness raising campaigns.	TOR drafted service contract planned May-July 2013	Removed from work plan
Output 3.2: Research and implementation of strategies to promote youth and adult literacy and numeracy among target households		
<u>Activity 3.2.1:</u> Map existing literacy programmes: government, UN, donor agencies, national institutes, drawing from existing maps such as those done by Tulane University.	On-going national consultancy	Completed

Objectives/outputs/activities	STATUS	
	Côte d'Ivoire 12.03.2013	Ghana 23.02.2013
<u>Activity 3.2.2:</u> Assess literacy and numeracy needs among parents and adolescents in targeted households.	On-going national consultancy	Completed
<u>Activity 3.2.3:</u> Advocate for extension of these programmes to target communities.	On-going APs 2-5	Removed from work plan
<u>Activity 3.2.4:</u> Where necessary, provide support for the establishment of literacy and numeracy training programmes.	On-going APs 2-5	Not started
Output 3.3: Strategies for increased workplace safety including worksite protection, particularly for children above the minimum age for work		
<u>Activity 3.3.1:</u> Identify and promote use of productivity- and –safety-enhancing equipment and tools among target households.	On-going National consultancy + APs 2-5	Removed from work plan
<u>Activity 3.3.2:</u> Prepare occupational safety and health in cocoa training manuals, building on existing materials.	On-going National consultancy	On-going
<u>Activity 3.3.3:</u> Conduct train-the-trainers programmes in OSH in cocoa among target households.	Not started – planned for April 3013	On-going
<u>Activity 3.3.4:</u> Conduct awareness raising campaigns on the productivity and other benefits of improved workplace safety measures.	Not started	Not started
Output 3.4: Research and implementation of appropriate micro-finance, savings, skills training and entrepreneurship strategies for target households		
<u>Activity 3.4.1:</u> Map existing micro-finance and savings institutions, taking into consideration any existing maps.	TOR drafted for national consultancy in May 2013	On-going
<u>Activity 3.4.2:</u> After reviewing the existing cocoa value chain analyses, if necessary conduct cocoa value chain analyses.	TOR drafted for national consultancy in May 2013	Removed from work plan
<u>Activity 3.4.3:</u> Assess need and interest in target communities for micro-finance and savings facilities.	TOR drafted for national consultancy in May 2013	On-going
<u>Activity 3.4.4:</u> Negotiate with micro-finance, savings and micro-insurance institutions to accept target cocoa farmers/ households/ cooperatives/solidarity groups as clients, when appropriate.	On-going APs 2-5	On-going
<u>Activity 3.4.5:</u> Provide training on household budget management and school saving strategies.	Not started APs 2-5	Not started
<u>Activity 3.4.6:</u> Provide technical assistance, including training on income generating opportunities, economic empowerment, and skills development, to target households.	Not started	Not started
Output 3.5: Support for community –based cooperative /local trade unions support organizations to enable farmers and migrant and other labourers to become organised and act through trade unions and cooperatives to tackle poverty, decent work deficits and other root causes of child labour		
<u>Activity 3.5.1:</u> Raise awareness of potential benefits of association/organization among cocoa farming communities.	TOR drafted for workshop September 2013	On-going
<u>Activity 3.5.2:</u> Assess interest in establishment of associations and facilitate target households' entry into them, as requested.	TOR drafted for service contract June 2013	On-going
<u>Activity 3.5.3:</u> Facilitate the formation or strengthening of cooperatives, trade unions, solidarity groups and other associations whose membership includes members of target households.	Not started	On-going
<u>Activity 3.5.4:</u> Provide on-going technical assistance including business development services to enhance effectiveness of targeted associations.	Not started	Not started

Objectives/outputs/activities	STATUS	
	Côte d'Ivoire 12.03.2013	Ghana 23.02.2013
Immediate objective No. 4: National capacity to deploy an appropriate CLMS framework to measure progress towards the elimination of child labour through an IAB approach will be improved.		
Output 4.1: Assessment of strengths and weakness of the current operation of the CLMS		
<u>Activity 4.1.1:</u> Based on consultations with ILO constituents and civil society, and in coordination with the WAP/ECOWAS project, review current CLMSs.	Not started DLTE AP	On-going
<u>Activity 4.1.2:</u> Identify opportunities to strengthen national and local CLMS, including by promoting greater coordination between the two, with a focus on cocoa growing districts.	Not started DLTE AP	On-going
Output 4.2: Strengthened pilot CLMS in operation		
<u>Activity 4.2.1:</u> Create and validate with ILO constituents and civil society strategic plans to broaden and improve the effectiveness of CLMS.	Not started DLTE AP	On-going
<u>Activity 4.2.2:</u> Support target communities to implement/strengthen CLMS.	Not started DLTE AP	On-going
<u>Activity 4.2.3:</u> Provide training and other technical assistance to CLMS, including in a) strategies to mobilize resources to fund CLMS action and, b) promoting improved coverage of necessary social services as alternatives to child labour.	Not started DLTE AP	On-going
<u>Activity 4.2.4:</u> Promote adoption of pilot CLMS at national level, including all cocoa districts.	Not started DLTE AP	On-going
Immediate objective No. 5: Technical and institutional capacity of ILO constituents and partner organizations to contribute to the implementation of NPAs and interventions to combat child labour in cocoa-growing communities will be enhanced.		
Output 5.1: Employers' and workers' organizations identify and implement strategies to promote major stakeholder (including government and industry) adherence, application and implementation of rights-based approaches and commitments to eliminating child labour.		
<u>Activity 5.1.1:</u> Provide training and technical assistance to social partners on ILO supervisory mechanism and their role in it, particularly as regards child labour.	TOR drafted, planned service contract in March 2013	Completed
<u>Activity 5.1.2:</u> Support the creation of strategic plans against child labour among workers' and employers' organizations.	TOR drafted, planned service contract in march-April 2013	On-going
<u>Activity 5.1.3:</u> Provide technical assistance to workers and employers organizations to implement and monitor strategic plans.	TOR drafted, planned service contract in March 2013	On-going
Output 5.2: Systematic skills/needs assessment of ILO constituents as potential implementers and/or implementing partners for interventions		
<u>Activity 5.2.1:</u> Organize sectoral workshops to assess and support the capacity needs of the ILO's constituents on the WFCL in the intervention areas and their proposed sectoral strategies.	Started	Completed
<u>Activity 5.2.2:</u> Provide ongoing training and technical assistance (including on CLMS and OSH) to ILO constituents to strengthen their capacity as implementing partners.	Planned for June 2013	On-going
Output 5.3: Capacity building of employers' and workers' organizations to plan, coordinate and deliver appropriate support to interventions		
<u>Activity 5.3.1:</u> Train employers and workers organizations on the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of interventions against child labour in cocoa communities.	TOR drafted, planned service contract in March 2013	On-going
<u>Activity 5.3.2:</u> Provide on-going technical assistance to social partners to enhance effectiveness of child labour interventions.	Started	On-going
<u>Activity 5.3.3:</u> Support annual bilateral exchanges of experience between the Ghanaian and Ivorian employers' organizations and the Ghanaian and Ivorian workers' organizations about project matters	TOR drafted, planned service contract in March 2013	On-going – but dependent on availability of funds

Objectives/outputs/activities	STATUS	
	Côte d'Ivoire 12.03.2013	Ghana 23.02.2013
Output 5.4: b		
Activity 5.4.1: Identify knowledge gaps for policy support and conduct appropriate research to fill these gaps.	Completed	Removed from work plan
Activity 5.4.2: Training and support to Governments of Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire to report on the implementation of relevant ratified ILO Conventions.	Not started Planned through workshop Sept. 2013	On-going
Activity 5.4.3: Development of training manuals on child labour inspection, with a focus on agriculture, for labour inspectorates, or adaptation of existing materials.	TOR drafted for workshop in April 2013	Completed
Activity 5.4.4: Provide training to labour inspectorates.	TOR drafted for workshop in April 2013	Completed
Activity 5.4.5: Provide training to labour inspections services and the social partner organization, in joint workshops on OSH in agriculture (linked to Outputs 5.2.2 and 5.3.2).	One workshop completed, one more planned	Completed
Activity 5.4.6: If requested, provide technical assistance to labour inspectorates to conduct child labour inspections and contribute to CLM.	Not started	On-going
Activity 5.4.7: Review education sector plans and programmes.	Started	Removed from work plan
Activity 5.4.8: Provide support to integrate child labour concerns into education sector plans.	Started	Removed from work plan
Activity 5.4.9: Provide support to integrate child labour concerns into education programmes, including where possible curriculum and teacher training, including through the involvement of relevant education sector trade unions (Linked to Output 2.1.5, 5.2.2 and 5.3.2).	Not started	Removed from work plan
Activity 5.4.10: Review rural development plans and programmes.	Not started	Removed from work plan
Activity 5.4.11: Provide support to integrate child labour concerns into rural development and poverty reduction plans and programmes.	Completed	On-going
Activity 5.4.12: Create or adapt training materials on child labour for use by agriculture extension officers.	Workshop date to be decided	On going
Activity 5.4.13: Provide training on child labour and CLM to extension officers and other officials.	Workshop date to be decided	Completed

Source: PIR facilitator based on project records and interviews