International Labour Organization

iTrack Evaluation

ILO EVALUATION

Evaluation Title:	**Moving towards a Child Labour Free Jordan**
ILO TC/SYMBOL:	**JOR/10/50/USA**
CA:	**102511**
Type of Evaluation :	**Final evaluation**
Country(ies) :	**Jordan**
Date of the evaluation:	**October 2016**
Name of consultant(s):	**Lotta Nycander**
ILO Administrative Office:	**Regional Office for the Arab States (ROAS)**

ILO Technical Backstopping Office: ILO HQs and ROAS

Other agencies involved in joint evaluation: n/a

Date project ends:	**31 August 2016**
Donor: country and budget US$	**3,962,160.05**
Evaluation Manager:	**Nathalie Bavitch**
Key Words:	**Child labour, child labour monitoring, national framework for child labour, Syrian refugees, gender, database, participation, ownership, national child labour survey**

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office

Contents

TABLES

Abbreviations and Acronyms

CECLE	Combatting Exploitation of Child Labour through Education
ICHF	Cooperative Housing Foundation (changed to Global Communications)
CL	Child Labour
CLM	Child Labour Monitoring
CLMS	Child Labour Monitoring System
CLU	Child Labour Unit (Ministry of Labour and Ministry of Social Development)
CRC	UN Convention on the Rights of Children
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DOS	Department of Statistics (Jordan)
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
GAM	Greater Amman Municipality
GFJTU	General Federation of Jordanian Trade Unions
IPEC	International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour
ILO	International Labour Organisation
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
IYF	International Youth Foundation
JCC	Jordan Chamber of Commerce
JCI	Jordan Chamber of Industry
JOHUD	Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOE	Ministry of Education (Jordan)
MOH	Ministry of Health (Jordan)
MOI	Ministry of Interior
MOJ	Ministry of Justice (Jordan)
MOL	Ministry of Labour (Jordan)
MOSD	Ministry of Social Development (Jordan)
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCFA	National Council for Family Affairs
NCLS	National Child Labour Survey (Jordan)
NCCL	National Committee on Child Labour
NFCL	National Framework to Combat Child Labour[1]
NSC	National Steering Committee
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
PDTRA	Petra Development and Tourism Regional Authority
RAS	Rapid Assessment Survey
ROAS	ILO Regional Office for Arab States
RRP	UN Inter-Agency Syria Regional Response Plan
SCI	Save the Children International
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SSC	Social Support Centre
TCCL	Technical Committee on Child Labour (replaced by the NCCL)
TA	Technical Assistance
TPR	Technical Progress Report
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children Fund
USDOL	US Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst forms of child labour

---

[1] Earlier named NFCC

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank all those who participated in the evaluation process and shared information and data, views and experiences in connection with the various aspects pertaining to the *Moving Towards a Child labour Free Jordan* and its socio-cultural and political context. Your support enabled a better understanding of the conditions and circumstances of child labourers, including refugees, and the work required to eliminate child labour in the country.

Many thanks go to the ILO Chief Technical Adviser Insaf Nizam and the project team in Amman, and all other ILO staff (and former ILO staff) in Amman, Beirut and Geneva who supported this evaluation. A very special thanks is here extended to Nathalie Bavitch, Regional M&E Officer, ILO ROAS, Beirut, who very ably acted as the Evaluation Manager and kept a close eye on the evaluation process and whose support has been invaluable.

The evaluator is also very grateful to the many persons who participated from the constituents (Government, the Employers and the Workers) as well as a number of other organisations, who have been involved in this Project and who participated in interviews and discussions.

Lotta Nycander

Independent evaluator

Executive Summary

This is the evaluation report of an independent Final Evaluation of the technical cooperation project entitled *Moving Towards a Child Labour Free Jordan*, implemented by the International Labour Organization (ILO) in close cooperation with three ministries; Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Social Development.

The overall objective (development objective) of this project is to create an "enabling environment for the elimination of residual child labour in Jordan". The evaluation is based on information gathered in a comprehensive documentation review, interviews and a three-weeks field visit to Jordan in August 2016 and the scope covers all events and activities from the start of the Project in October 2011 to its end in August 2016.

The evaluation has been carried out in accordance with ILO's Evaluation Policy Guidelines, UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, and OECD/DAC´s recommendations. The data gathering process was participatory to enable and encourage all key actors to share their experiences and information, and contribute to the findings. The evaluation has adhered to ethical norms and standards in the analysis of gathered/processed data and in the reporting and care was taken not to let conclusions in evaluation process be influenced by the views or statements of any particular party. Qualitative methods to gather both qualitative and quantitative data and information were used. The latter was drawn from secondary sources, as there was little scope/time to undertake a survey to gather quantitative data. The evaluation has applied the evaluation criteria *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability*.

The Project´s budget is USD 3,962,160.05 provided by the US Department of Labor.

The evaluation has put forward the following conclusions, lessons and recommendations:

<u>Overall, it is evident that ILO, in its cooperation with Government, clearly is the principal international agency addressing child labour in Jordan.</u> Great efforts have been placed Project and its partners to generate the satisfactory achievements found in the area of influencing policy-making pertaining to child labour elimination and building capacity, understanding and commitment required to invent new ways of working together toward common goals, through National Framework of Child Labour (NFCL). The National Committee on Child Labour (NCCL) and the Child Labour Unit, of the Ministry of Labour, have been supported. The NCCL now comprises government agencies, private institutions and NGOs. The setting up of a (first) Child Labour Unit in the Ministry of Social Development has been supported by the Project, as well as the institutional capacity of these ministries along with the Ministry of Education and also other stakeholder organisations taking part in the NFCL.

The Project has developed a database for the monitoring of child labourers to better function as a tool in the identification, referral and monitoring work among the three ministries and trained staff on its use. It has updated the hazardous list (on harmful work for young people) and prepared manuals for the inspectors and employers. A national survey on child labour, which includes the Syrian refugee population, was undertaken with its results summarised in a presentation in Amman by the Director, Centre for Strategic Studies, University of Jordan, on 16th August 2016 for the Minister of Labour, senior staff from ROAS, among others.

<u>Sixteen specific conclusions</u> have been made based on the findings of the evaluation, as follows:

ILO's use of the terms "recipients" and "beneficiaries" in technical cooperation project documents and other steering documents, actually connote passiveness – while these people/groups are expected to be actively involved in various ways and contribute to the goals of the project. A more appropriate term would be "project participants" *(Conclusion No. 1)*. The Project is built on the basis of activities undertaken and structures created prior to its take off, such as the CLU-MOL, NFCL, National Steering Committee, SSC rehabilitation centre. Thus, certain awareness among stakeholders already existed within MOL and other partners, including the nature and prevalence of child labour through earlier studies and research *(Conclusion No. 2)*.

It was concluded that the results chain of the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) of the Project design is sufficiently logical and coherent. The immediate objectives (IO) constitute the highest result-level goals of the Project (apart from the long-term development objective to which many other actors will contribute) and these have indicators, but there are no outcomes, or outcome-level indicators formulated. The four IOs have indicators but the problem is that these are not quantified, and not SMART although revised from the original indicator - thus they could not be used as intended, as measurement of progress. The next result level in the LFA are the outputs. It was also found that assumptions, risks and mitigation of risks are not SMART[2], as they seem not to be based on realistic assessment of the situation at the time of the start-up of the Project – and are also not beyond the control of the Project and its key actors.

---

[2] SMART = Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time bound.

Further, the original division of management in the design, i.e. 2 years for a CTA and 2 years for a NPC, was unrealistic in view of the ambitious goals to be obtained. Due to changing circumstances, revisions were made to the design regarding activities, outputs and budget throughout the years. The objectives, however, remained untouched, which reportedly was an important factor in terms of continuity in particular vis-à-vis the constituents, and it is concluded that they are still reasonably valid as goal statements even though activities were added or deleted, due to the circumstances brought on by the influx of Syrian refugees after the Project had taken off *(Conclusion No. 3).*

The Project was designed for an implementation period of four years, but was extended by one extra year, from October 2011 to end of August 2016. Due to budget revisions, waiting for approvals and new management staff to be in place, there were quite long "fallow" periods during which new activities could not be implemented. Some administrative processes at USDOL did take time, and delays were caused by several factors including processes in the field and administrative procedures of the ILO. The ILO's choice here was to either close down the Project as originally intended, or continue to wait for the new funds to be available so that the next phase could take off – and it chose the latter *(Conclusion No. 4).* The project aims to increase and improve institutional and organizational capacity to handle child labour effectively and to create an environment where child labour is eliminated and prevented. **The focus is on influencing policies and develop capacity** - and not on actual services such as actively removing children from child labour and e.g. enrol them in schools or vocation technical training which has been done in so many other ILO projects around the world with the help of civil society organisations. Despite this, some key officials in the concerned ministries expressed to the evaluation that it had expected ILO to be able to show "how many children it had removed from child labour" and similar comments and noted to the evaluation that it had not managed to do this. This attitude, or mismatch of expectations, could be a sign that the stakeholders have not fully participated in the decision-making, and/or do not have full ownership of the Project *(Conclusion No. 5).*

The nine recommendations of the Project Implementation Review in 2012 are actually a fusion of conclusions and recommendations and are unnecessary long. ILO managed to act on the majority of them such as encouraging better coordination among the three ministries, requesting for a project revision and focusing on upstream activities (capacity development, database development) in favour of ensuring that the monitoring system was functioning as intended. The Project was also engaged in resource mobilisation jointly with ILO ROAS, resulting in project proposals for a small grant from Danida and the Canadian Government, and one in the pipeline for funding from the Government of Spain. This evaluation has concluded that some recommendations were quite realistic in view of the remaining time that the Project had while some were premature and overly optimistic, such as creating "dynamic hubs" in the pilot governorates in connection with the national framework (the Project CTA at the time had only one more year to manage the Project and during that year was supposed to coach the national project coordinator to be ready to take over the management during the third and last year). Several recommendations seem to be directed to the then ILO-IPEC programme *(Conclusion No. 6).*

ILO and its partners anticipated that the Project would be able to greatly reduce child labour in the country in a relatively short period of time and that Jordan would be one of the countries to have achieved the target of eliminating the worst forms of child labour by 2016. However, the situation changed drastically in 2012 with the huge influx of Syrian refugees due to the crisis in Syria. The evaluation has identified a number of activities and approaches geared to make a difference regarding Syrian refugee children, such as piloting NFCL in areas with high incidence of refugees, namely in Mafraq, Irbid, Amman and Zarka. Rapid assessments on child labour among Syrian refugees were conducted in the agriculture and urban informal sectors (commissioned by ILO ROAS) and ILO initiated the Child Labour Task Force within Child Protection Working Group (co-chaired by Save the Children) and mobilised for new Projects focusing on Syrian refugees. ILO also invited UNHCR to be a member of the NCLC. Furthermore, child labour incidences among Syrian refugees were monitored in the pilot implementation areas in dialogue with the humanitarian organisations. New funds were used to conduct the National Child Labour Survey in which Syrian refugee children and families participated and one refugee camp could be included, with assistance of Ministry of Interior. Project staff have also contributed to development of the ILO project on child labour project with focus on Syrian children, funded by Danida and the Government of Canada - an 18 month project ending in 2018 with a small budget (€ 347,000) *(Conclusion No. 7).*

The Project´s effectiveness in producing outputs and reaching objectives is mainly found in the formulation of policies and the supporting of the national framework, and building the capacities of main stakeholders, on advocacy and raising awareness. The ILO is, together with the Government, clearly the lead international agency addressing child labour in Jordan. The evaluation has identified good achievements regarding the Project´s work in relation to policy including mainstreaming the issue into national development policy frameworks and UN frameworks such as the UNDAF for Jordan. Achievements have also been made to encourage and build capacity, understanding and commitment for the need to work together in a new way to reach the common goal of implementing the NFCL. Systems to combat child labour and models on youth employment have been developed. The National Committee on Child

Labour (NCCL) and the Child Labour Unit, of the MOL have been activated. The NCCL now comprises government agencies, private institutions and NGOs. Support has been provided in the setting up of the Child Labour Unit, in the MOSD and in enhancing institutional capacity of both these two ministries, as well as to the MOE and of other stakeholder organisations participating in the NFCL. The Project has also clearly made efforts to assist the government in creating the initial structures, and a mechanism, for the coordinating of action to combat child labour and to link child labourers and their families to improved educational provision and social protection.

However, developing the structures, creating mechanisms and providing training are not sufficient to ensure impact of the Project. It was found that coordination and cooperation among main stakeholders was not systemized and was kept at management levels that were not high enough. It was found that the commitment from the MoL and CLU management was, on the whole, not adequate for the system to work as intended and for the child labourers (the ultimate beneficiaries) to be given the protection and education that was intended. Regarding effectiveness of the Project management and staff, the evaluation has concluded that they have been capable and effective in handling the Project, including the monitoring and reporting. Not surprisingly though, the changes of staff over the years disrupted the implementation, with three changes in management and an almost 8-month period with only a consultant to follow up on the project activities and to keep in contact with MOL (mainly), while awaiting endorsement and new funds. The three changes of administrators have also posed a challenge in running the Project smoothly, although they too have been capable to perform the duties *(The two above paragraphs belong to Conclusion No. 8)*.

The most important challenge in the pilot application of the NFCL was the high staff turnover of those working on the implementation of this framework, and a clear weakness in the application of the computerized follow-up system, lack of funding and increased workload for the employees. When "rolling out" the NFCL to the remaining Governorates in 2015-16, and re-training staff in the "old" pilot Governorates there was a lack of awareness about the very existence of the framework among many government officials participating in the training, and a lack of knowledge about the reasons for it having been put in place, adding to their existing work load. The evaluation has concluded that at central level it is evident that the Ministry officials involved in child labour issues, have an enhanced understanding and knowledge about how it should work but have not been able to convince this Evaluation (through documentation, demonstration or any other evidence based information) that it works *in practice*, namely that the cooperation framework of the three ministries as such is actively used. On the contrary, government officials have stated that it does not work because the Database cannot be operated, and "is not working" and that this is the fault of the Project. *(Conclusion No. 9)*.

A database for the monitoring of child labourers has been developed to function as a tool in the identification, referral and monitoring work among the three ministries. The earlier database was revised in 2016 and the staff trained at the time were re-trained at central and Governorate levels. This evaluation found that it is too early to expect that the revised database will function smoothly already at this stage and that it will need further nurturing, trials and maintenance *(Conclusion No. 10)*. Capacity development and awareness raising are viewed as very important elements in any ILO technical cooperation Project and in this Project it has been clearly been a cornerstone. It was concluded that more efforts could have been made to find more effective ways of involving the Employers and the Workers Associations for example in awareness-raising campaigns and as spokespersons against child labour *(Conclusion No. 11)*.

Regarding the concept of linkages between child labour and youth employment, this element has not come out as a strong feature of the Project but the mini projects ("action programmes") implemented by GAM and IYF were successfully carried out by dedicated staff in these agencies. The concept should be further developed *(Conclusion No. 12)*. A comprehensive national survey on child labour, which includes Syrian refugee population, was undertaken under the umbrella of this Project. The summary results were presented in Amman on 16th August 2016. It is assessed that the report will be an important and very useful reference document in the future work against child labour *(Conclusion No. 13)*.

Regarding gender issues, sex disaggregated data has been collected regarding participation in training events and workshops, and gender has been addressed to some extent in, for example, training events to increase understanding and awareness on the issues in relation to child labour and youth employment. The evaluation has, however, not found that any particular gender analysis or piece of research/case study has been carried out, specifically addressing gender - or any strategy developed on how to address gender issues, and integrate gender into the Project to guide the policy-oriented dialogues with the decision-makers and collaboration with the partners. This seems to be both an issue of lack of clear direction in the design, as well implementation – as the Project well could have found innovative ways and activities to bring gender to the forefront without specific instructions in the design. It is expected that (based on the recent initial survey results of the NCLS) ILO and the Jordanian government will dedicate resources and activities to

the issue of gender - relating to both girls and boys, to acquire more knowledge and design activities to meet their respective and (most likely) different needs *(Conclusion No. 14)*.

The assessment is that on the whole, the Project has been sufficiently efficient, but the following should be noted: a) The total costs incurred would have been more justified if gender concerns in relation to working boys and girls had been the topic of at least one study/survey dedicated to the topic. This could easily have been done under output 3.3 which specifically mentions the needs of boys and girls; and b) The results obtained from incurring the cost of undertaking a Study Tour ($16,850.00) to Brazil is questioned by this evaluation. The reasons are: a) No report seems to exist from MOL on how the learning and experience from the tour was to be used to work towards the Project´s objectives, and since the time of the study tour (according to the Project´s latest progress report in April 2016) there have been no further steps taken by MOL (CLU) to support the expansion of its child labour unit *(Conclusion No. 15)*.

The anticipated impact of the Project has been affected by delays in approvals by both ILO and the donor agency, that were linked to the Project´s access to funds, and resulting in delayed start-up of planned activities – among some of the challenges faced. The evaluation is in no doubt that impact can be found in the ILO's influence in policy work and capacity development of key actors. The likelihood of sustainability and nurturing what has been accomplished to far, however, is entirely dependent on internal investments of human resources, home grown systems and influences and commitment - not external *(Conclusion No. 16)*.

Good practices and lessons learnt

In 2015-16, the Project identified and documented nine good practices and many lessons that had emanated from the Project implementation. The document, which was presented in a regional workshop in 2016, is a good quality document and could be very useful not only for ILO and its counterparts also in other countries, but also for any serious international and national organisation working to eliminate the worst forms of child labour. These are some of the most important ones: Setting up a national framework; effective tools for child labour inspections; Responding to emerging crises; Database on child labour; Linkages between child labour and youth employment; and letting children participate in the advocacy of combatting child labour (they are described in detail in Annex V).

There are nine recommendations based on the above-mentioned conclusions (not all conclusions warranted recommendations as such):

1. Commit to setting targets, sustaining the impact and move forward to eliminate child labour (MOL, MOE, MOSD)

a) The Jordanian Government should, after so many years of technical cooperation with the ILO, make even more commitments in the area of child labour elimination, including setting targets, allocating more human resources and funds to reach national goals and to what has already been accomplished so far, such as the National Framework on Child Labour. This evaluation has assessed that MoSD could be more suitable to lead the work on the NFCL, than MOL. This Ministry has set up its own Child Labour Unit, run by a Focal Point. **b)** In any continued support to increase the effectiveness of the NFCL, the CLM referral system must be broadened to include Employers and Workers organisations, as well as the private sector and NGOs.

2. Follow up, improve and maintain the Database on child labour (ILO, MOL, MOE, MOSD)

a) ILO should follow up (and later monitor the actions in the governorates) to ensure that the instructions given to CLU-MOL staff are followed, namely 1) activate the database immediately; and 2) provide access to the ministries of Education and Social Development, in addition to their field offices and 3) in order to give external access, to obtain a new IP address from the Ministry of Information Technology. **b)** To make it work, full support from the top management of the involved ministries is required and further support on maintenance and nurturing by the ILO e.g. through the Syrian child labour project (Danida, Government of Canada).

3. Follow up closely on the reporting on the National Survey on Child (ILO, MOL, MOE, MOSD)

The ILO and the Jordanian government should follow up closely on the reporting on the national survey on child labour and ensure that all the relevant data collected is actually processed in the final report - including ensuring that all relevant data is sex disaggregated in the final analysis and that relevant data on refugees are accounted for. The ILO could follow up on the survey results with qualitative studies, including case studies to "dig deeper" and gain more knowledge about these specific areas.

4. Discuss interest for new technical cooperation on child labour and youth employment linkages addressing Syrian refugees in particular (ILO to initiate, and involve MOL, MOE, MOSD, Employers and Workers Organisations, UNICEF, UNHCR, Red Cross, NCFA, IYF)

a) Regarding potential future technical cooperation, ILO should explore the interest within the Jordan Government, and other constituents/actors and development partners/donors for developing the linkages between child labour and youth employment among Syrian refugees, in particular, including entrepreneurship for young people (some guarantees should be received from the Government that earlier systems invested on regarding child labour will be sustained, see recommendation 1. above). **b)** ILO Jordan and ROAS should here capitalise more on the knowledge and experience that now exists in its office in Amman (office of the ILO Coordinator) and draw lessons from earlier ILO work in other countries, in particular from ILO-IPEC´s previous research and project implementation. Such discussions could be commenced in parallel with the on-going implementation of the small project on Syrian refugee children mentioned here (planned to end in 2017). **c)** The background work for such a project should very clearly define at the outset that exactly the ultimate project participants are (child labourers, youth and their families) are and under what conditions they live – even if the Project is to be policy oriented. The ILO and Jordanian Government (as well as other organisations) now have a much better prospect to do exactly this, in terms of Syrian refugee children as much more data is available thanks to the national child labour survey.

5. Enhance relevance and validity in design and set attainable and realistic goals to ensuring ownership of the Project (ILO, USDOL and Jordan Government)

a) ILO and USDOL should set goals for its projects that are attainable and realistic and should develop the projects in close participation with the Jordan counterparts in order to avoid misunderstanding of what the project´s objectives are, and avoid mismatch of expectations (and ensure that the Jordanian constituents have a translated copy of the project document for the sake of ownership and easy reference from day one). **b)** Attention to language: ILO should as much as possible refrain from using terms such as "recipients" and "beneficiaries" (in design and implementation) of technical cooperation projects as they indicate passiveness. They should be treated as active project participants contributing to reaching the Project objectives.

6. Look for innovative ways to more actively include Employers and Workers organisations (ILO, JCC, JCI, GFJTU and any other union federation if feasible)

ILO should in any future technical cooperation find some ways to more actively involve all its constituents, namely to also include the Workers' Organizations (e.g. the General Federation of Jordanian Trade Unions) and the Employers (e.g. the Chamber of Commerce) in awareness-raising campaigns and as spokespersons against child labour and promoting youth employment.

7. Integrate gender fully in Project design and implementation (ILO, Jordanian Government)

ILO should ensure that gender analysis is part of the preparations for new technical cooperation projects, and that gender planning is part of Project Documents/proposals, and fully integrated in designs and implementation. Thus, in its recruitment of project staff, ILO must look for knowledge and experience (apart from management and technical skills) on how to integrate/mainstream gender issues in the implementation of a Project. Project practitioners must be able to move beyond inviting (and counting) women to participate in the project´s training and events - to appreciating that specific research and actions may be required to reach full and effective participation and equal opportunities. It should also be understood that "gender" also means that the needs and roles of men and boys should be analysed to guide activities in reaching the goals.

8. Ensure that results of eventual new study tours clearly relate to the Project´s goals and make follow up of how these have had an impact or contributed to improvements (ILO – relating all TA implementation)

ILO and involved constituents should ensure that if undertaking study tours, e.g. to other countries under ILO project budgets, their purposes must explicitly be related to furthering the Project´s objectives prior to undertaking such visits, and be accompanied by a follow-up report by the constituents/stakeholders explaining how new learning, knowledge and/or lessons and good practices will be transformed into action in relation to the Project´s goals. ILO should not endorse such visits if the above-mentioned requirements cannot be met.

9. Learn from, and share the Good Practices and lessons learned document (ILO, MOL, MOE, MOSD)

ILO and the ministries who have been involved in the project should ensure that the Good Practices and Lessons Learned document should be shared and learned from in particular in discussions on new technical cooperation in Jordan and possible in the region if adapted to other countries/cultures. It could also be very useful for organisations outside of the constituents, e.g. UNICEF, Save the Children, other NGOs working on child labour issues in particular.

1   Introduction

This report is the second draft of the final evaluation of the technical cooperation project entitled Moving Towards a Child Labour free Jordan. The Project has been implemented by the International Labour Organization (ILO) in close cooperation with the Ministry of Labour in Jordan and has been funded by the United States Department of Labour.

1.1   Context

The total population of Jordan is about 9.53 million, with by and large evenly balanced shares of female and male populations of about 50.7 and 49.3 per cent respectively[3]. The recent National Child Labour Survey (August 2016) found that there are 75,982 working children, –which includes 69,661 child labourers – out of which **44,917 children work in hazardous conditions**[4].

In the Jordan Decent Work Country Programme framework, effective progress by the Jordan national programme to eliminate child labour falls under "Outcome 1.1: An enabling environment for the elimination of residual child labour is created." This fits within Priority 1: "Decent work opportunities for young Jordanian men and women are expanded through the promotion of better work conditions, non-discrimination and equal rights at work".

The SDG Target 8.7 calls on all to take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of all forms of child labour as an essential step to achieving decent work for all, full and productive employment and inclusive and sustained economic growth.

1.2   Structure of this report

This first draft report has **five chapters**: Introduction, including context, purpose, scope clients and outputs (Chapter 1); Evaluation framework, consisting of evaluation criteria, instrument, approach, evaluation standards, methods applied and steps taken as well as the perceived limitations in the process (Chapter 2); Project Description addressing design and results framework (Logical Framework Analysis/LFA) (Chapter 3); Key findings, which includes a background and time line of major relevant events; an account of the project staff and consultants recruited between 2011 and now; Relevance and validity of the Project design; Effectiveness in contributing to the objectives and management arrangements, monitoring and reporting; Gender issues; Efficiency and Impact and sustainability (Chapter 4); and Conclusions, lessons and recommendations (Chapter 5).

A file entitled Evaluation, Part II **is submitted separately but under the same cover as this report**[5]. It has eight annexes:

Annex I. Terms of Reference; Annex II. The evaluation instrument and the sources of data; Annex III. Questions sent to by e-mail; Annex IV. Summary achievements (outputs produced 2011-2016); Annex V. Lessons learned and good practices; Annex VI. Validation workshop; Annex VII. Documents consulted; Annex VIII. Persons consulted and/or interviewed; and Annex IX. Project key events: Topics, institutions and participants.

---

[3] Source: National Child Labour Survey, 2016

[4] The survey, implemented under the ILO project here evaluated included 20,000 households (plus 2 households) that include Syrian children from refugee families.

[5]

2   Project background

The "Moving towards a Child Labour Free Jordan" Project was developed in 2010 and has an official starting date of 31 December 2010 but started its actual implementation in October 2011 when the CTA was recruited and in place. It was designed to run for four years to address the child labour issues in Jordan, aiming at creating an enabling environment, strengthening policy and legislative frameworks in reducing the magnitude of child labour in Jordan. A major element has been the capacity development of the stakeholders to tackle the problems. The focus has been on supporting the Government and ILO's partners to implement the National Framework to Combat Child Labour (herein referred to as NFCL, or simply the framework). The Project was set to contribute to the following frameworks/agreements: ILO Global Action Plan (which sets the internationally agreed goal of eliminating the worst forms of child labour by 2016); the Roadmap for achieving the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour by 2016 (adopted by the Hague Global Child Labour Conference on 10-11 May 2010); the Jordan Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP); as well as national efforts to prevent and eliminate child labour by supporting the ILO Global Jobs Pact which outlines strategies to guide recovery from the present economic crisis.

This Project has built on activities and structures created prior to its take off. These are some of such key events:

- The first child labour survey (1997);

- Jordan ratifying C182 (Worst Forms of Child Labour) (1999);

- The Child Labour Unit set up in MOL (2000) and a National Steering Committee (secretary: CLU, MOL).

- First comprehensive field sample Child Labour Survey, MOL (2001);

- Implementation of ILO-IPEC´s Action Programme and Country Programme with USDOL as the donor (2002-2007) with the Social Support Centre (SSC) set up as a model of rehabilitation[6], funded by MOL with a budget of JOD 250,00/year and JOHUD, a national organisation, provided the space for it (now located in Marka).

- A Rapid Assessment on the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Jordan was carried out (2006);

- Implementation of the "Combating Exploitative Child Labour through Education" (CECLE) project by the Community Housing Foundation International (CHF) and the National Council for Family Affairs (NCFA) and starting the conceptualisation of the NFCL (2006);

- The Child Labour Survey (2007-2008) by Department of Statistics (DOS) and SIMPOC;

- The ILO started to design the current child labour Project (2010);

- The Jordanian Government adopting the National Framework to combat Child Labour (August 2011), with CLU, MOL, as the responsible unit for implementation;

- Finally, the launch of the "Moving Towards.." project, with the CTA in place (October 2011) – two months after the launch of the NFCL.

2.1   Project design

Objectives and results based framework

The project's <u>development objective</u> is to create an "enabling environment for the elimination of residual child labour in Jordan". Four <u>immediate objectives</u> form the basis of the Project, thus by the end of the Project the following should be obtained:

1) A mechanism for coordinating action to combat child labour at national and district levels and link child labourers and their families to improved educational provision and social protection will have been established; **2)** Trends in child labour will be estimated, specific aspects of child labour in Jordan will have been researched and conclusions will have been used to inform policy decisions and guide direct action; **3)** The capacity of ILO constituents to implement the National Framework to Combat Child Labour will have been enhanced; and **4)** The elimination of child labour and the promotion of youth employment will have been mainstreamed into the national development policy frameworks.

Following the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA), and the results-based framework used by ILO, the above-mentioned immediate objectives need to be reached in order for the evaluation to determine that contributions to the

---

[6] It was noted that all MOL´s "child labour funds" are director to this Centre; however, it does not accept children below the age of 16 years.

development/overall objective have been made. The logic of the results chain also emphasises that 17 outputs (distributed under each of the four immediate objectives) need to have been "produced" in order for the evaluation to determine that the immediate objectives have been contributed to, or indeed reached. Table 1. shows a simplified results chain. The indicators at Immediate Objective level are the ones used in the last available TPR, April 2016.

Table 1. Simplified results chain

Immediate objective (IO) 1. A mechanism for coordinating action to combat child labour at national and district levels and link child labourers and their families to improved educational provision and social protection will have been established

Indicators at IO level[7]:
1. Technical committee of the NCLC is created
2. Decisions taken at NCLC and technical committee meetings are followed up
3. CLM institutional framework at local, district and governorate levels in targeted areas is established and functioning
4. CLM referral system in 3 selected governorates is functioning well
5. Web-enabled CLMS is in place.

Output No.	Output content	**Changes** made after original design
Output 1.1	NCLC and Task Force expanded and linked to a national inter-ministerial body for the protection of children	
Output 1.2	CLM Institutional Framework is set up and integrated into NFCL	"and integrated into NFCL" was added to the original Log frame"
Output 1.3	CLMTs are set up at the local level in focal areas	the output *deleted* in 2012 revision
Output 1.4	CLM referral system is operational and integrated into NFCL	"and integrated into NFCL" – was added to the original Log frame"
Output	A web-enabled CLMS data base is designed and maintained	

Immediate objective 2. Trends in child labour will be estimated, specific aspects of child labour in Jordan will have been researched and conclusions will have been used to inform policy decisions and guide direct action.

Indicators at IO level:
1. Number of reports or data sets available on child labour from the module on CL and Youth Employment included in DOS Labour Force Survey.
2. Planned Rapid Assessment Surveys conducted

Output No.	Output content	**Changes** made after original design
Output 2.1	Module on child labour and Youth Employment is incorporated in the DOS Labour Force Survey	
Output 2.2	Qualitative surveys on child labour and youth employment are conducted.	
Output 2.3	In-depth data collection on specific worst forms of child labour is conducted.	This output was added to the original two outputs

Immediate objective 3. Capacity of ILO constituents to implement the National Framework to Combat Child Labour will have been enhanced.
Indicators at IO level:
1. Number of government units, employers' organisations, trade unions, that have been informed about the NFCL and its implementation
2. Assessment of the efficiency of CLU in coordinating action against child labour.

Output No.	Output content	**Changes** made after original design
Output 3.1	The capacity of the Child Labour Units at MoL and Ministry of Social Development is enhanced	"..and Ministry of Social Development is enhanced" was added when MoSD came on board
Output 3.2	The capacity of key partners including labour inspectors on Child Labour Monitoring to raise awareness on CL and youth employment is enhanced	

---

[7] All indicators mentioned here are, are the ones found in the last TPR, April 2014.

Immediate objective 3. Capacity of ILO constituents to implement the National Framework to Combat Child Labour will have been enhanced. Indicators at IO level: 1. Number of government units, employers' organisations, trade unions, that have been informed about the NFCL and its implementation 2. Assessment of the efficiency of CLU in coordinating action against child labour.		
Output 3.3	The capacity of service providers to address specific needs of girls and boys involved in child labour and their families is enhanced.	In 2012 budget revision request, the Project requested to have this output changed to: "The impact of the NFCL is assessed". However it was later decided to keep it unchanged.
Output 3.4	The capacity of employers organisations to address child labour and youth employment is enhanced	
Output 3.5	The capacity of trade unions on child labour issues is enhanced	This was revised: The capacity to address child labour and youth employment issues is enhanced
Output 3.6	The capacity of local governments to raise awareness on CL and youth employment is enhanced	

Immediate objective 4. 4. Elimination of child labour and the promotion of youth employment will have been mainstreamed into the national development policy frameworks Indicators at IO level: 1. NFCL is reviewed and strengthened through the integration of CLMS 2. Awareness of NCFL among decision makers.		
Output No.	**Output content**	**Changes made after original design**
Output 4.1	The NFCL is endorsed by Cabinet.	This was revised: "the NFCL is monitored and reviewed, including the integration of the CLMS"
Output 4.2	Hazardous child labour list of 1997 updated, approved and made known.	This was changed to: "Revised hazardous child labour list made known and disseminated"
Output 4.3	Child labour and Youth Employment issues are mainstreamed into the national development policy frameworks.	
Output 4.4	Regional cooperation on child labour and youth employment is strengthened.	
Output 4.5	Impact assessment towards institutionalization of the NFCL implementation model is conducted.	This output was added to the original 4 outputs

Beneficiaries, stakeholders and recipients

The Project is intended to develop synergies with other ILO projects and work closely with ILO ROAS Decent Work Team, the Senior Specialists in Gender, Employers' and Workers' Organizations, Skills, and Social Security; the ILO Headquarters technical departments.

According to the Project Document – the main steering document for the Project - the **indirect beneficiaries** of the Project are the child labourers who would be identified by the CLMTs and given access to education and health care through the referral system that is part of the CLMS (Paragraph 3.2). At the time of the Project's conception in 2010, the indirect beneficiaries were street children and children living in certain refugee camps, such as Zarka (with high concentration of auto repair workshops employing children); girls working in agriculture and in households in Shouneh in the Jordan Valley, and children in Petra who work in the area of tourism[8].

The evaluation will identify, and account for, any changes that have been made with regard to defining who the indirect beneficiaries of the Project are. The **recipients** of the Project are **clearly also stakeholders**, and are defined, as individuals within organizations or institutions to who services will be provided with the purpose of building their capacity to provide services to support beneficiaries. Thus, these are Government, Employers associations/organisations and Workers Unions/organisations.

Among the **Government** agencies originally mentioned as recipients are the Ministry of Labour (with its Child Labour Unit) and its directorates of labour inspectors; the Ministry of Education and the Vocational Training Corporation; Ministry of Social Development (MoSD) with its directorates in the concentration areas as well as its institutions for

---

[8] Source: Project Document, Section 3.2.

juvenile care; Ministry of Health (MoH); Ministry of Interior (MoI) and its judiciary panels in the areas where CLMTs are established; Ministry of Planning and the unit in the Prime Minister´s (PM) office responsible for the National Agenda; The Ministry of Agriculture (MoA); Department of Statistics (DOS) with the unit in charge of the Employment and Unemployment surveys and Annual Reports; Coordination Committee for Social Solidarity; National Aid Fund; Development and Employment Fund; and GAM.

Among the **Employers organisations**, the Chamber of Industry (JCI) - with its 200,000 employers in the country covering ten different sectors - is designated as recipient of the Project. Among the **Workers organisations** the General Federation of Jordanian Trade Unions (GFJTU) is mentioned as a recipient with its 120,000 members and 17 affiliated trade unions.

Organisations outside of the ILO constituent framework, originally mentioned as recipients, are UNICEF and the Maharat programme of the World Bank. Among non-governmental organisations (NGOs) mentioned as recipients at this early stage are the those social partners who had worked with the former ILO project entitled "Combatting Exploitation of Child Labour through Education" (CECLE), namely the international Global Communications (formerly Cooperative Housing Foundation-CHF); National Council for Family Affairs (NCFA); Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development (JOHUD)/SSC; Jordan River Foundation (JRF) and Questscope.

Both the terms recipients and beneficiaries indicate *passiveness* but are commonly used by many organisations working in the area of technical assistance/cooperation. However, their designated roles as partners of the ILO require active involvement and this evaluation will attempt to gauge the extent of their involvement as project participants and partners, and their contributions in reaching the Project objectives.

Strategy and approach

The strategy was to address policy level interventions, especially to ensure that issues of WFCL are integrated into Government policy frameworks and that families of child labourers become the special target group for poverty alleviation and social protection schemes. *Key words* in the Project Document are coordination and capacity building of concerned ministries, social partners and Civil Society Organisations – to set in motion the NFCL, focusing on the referral mechanism based on identifying and registering data, capturing child labour cases through labour inspection services and referrals to MOE and MOSD for solutions regarding formal/ non-formal education, social services and cash support.

The intention was that the strategy would be to remove, or address, any "residual pockets of child labour" and build on the results from earlier ILO-IPEC programmes; such as data from DOS-SIMPOC survey; results of the CECLE baseline survey; the results of the study on hazards faced by children; and studies by National Council for Family Affairs on the impact of CL on physical and psychological health[9].

2.2   Project staff and consultants 2011 – 2016

Originally, the donor agency had not foreseen the recruitment of an expatriate CTA to manage the Project. However, an agreement was reached that a CTA should be in place during the first two years, followed by a national manager who would take over during the third and forth year. However, this is the situation in terms of management:

Nicholas Grisewood, CTA (12/10/2011 – 31/10/2013) worked for **24 months** and was followed by Rula Dajani, NPC (01/11/2013 – 10/04/2014) who officially was in charge of the project **5 months.** Kholoud Abu Zaid, Consultant (17/4 2014 – 30/11/2014) was then recruited to follow up on the project activities and keep contact with the Ministry and the stakeholders (as to avoid an absence of ILO presence). He was in place for **7 months**, followed by Insaf Nizam, CTA (16/04/2015 to date) who was managing the Project for **16 months.**

The Administrative Assistants who worked in the Project are Nadine Hammad (06/12/2011 - 13/09/2012), Huda Al Shabani (10/07/2012 - 30/09/ 2015), and Mohammad Sirhan (26/11 2015 –). National consultants were recruited to undertake specific tasks for the Project, within a large number of areas[10]. The evaluation noted that several of the

---

[9] Source: Project Document, ILO

[10] Mapping of laws and policies regarding child labour; Rolling out the National Framework in first 5 governorates; Identifying/developing Good Practices and conducting the regional GP workshop; Developing the 2nd phase of the Child Labour Database and training government staff; Conducing an assessment on the impact of the NFCL; Developing the MoE manual for school counsellors on preventing student drop out and training MoE staff; Developing by-laws relating to child labour for the Juvenile Law No 32 of 2014; Developing the ToR and the organisation structure for the MoSD Child Labour Unit; Providing technical support to the National Child Labour Survey; Developing the MoSD Manual for Social Workers on addressing child labour and training MOSD staff; Rolling out the NFCL and building capacity of field staff; Developing the Manual for Labour and Health Inspectors on identifying and addressing hazardous child labour; Developing Child Labour website in cooperation with the MOL; and conducting the final evaluation of the entire project.

representatives of the constituents interviewed, and also other stakeholders, perceived that the *changes in management* affected the Project outcomes, and were in some cases a source of critical comments from stakeholders.

3   Evaluation framework

This chapter provides the overall framework, including the methodology and perceived limitations to the evaluation study.

3.1   Purpose, scope, clients and outputs of the Evaluation

The Terms of Reference (ToR) has listed a number of **purposes** for the evaluation, as follows:

Establish the relevance of the project design and implementation strategy; Determine the implementation efficiency of the project; Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives at outcome and impact level and to identify the supporting factors and constraints that have led to this achievement or lack of achievements; Identify unintended changes, both positive and negative at outcome and impact levels, in addition to the expected results; Assess the relevance of the sustainability strategy, its progress and its potential for achievement, identifying the processes that are to be continued by stakeholders; Identify lessons learned and potential good practices, especially regarding models of interventions that can be applied further; Provide recommendations to project stakeholders to support the completion, expansion or further development of initiatives that were supported by the project; and Follow-up on recommendations made from the Mid-term evaluation that took place in 2012.

Regarding the **scope** of the evaluation, the ILO/IPEC programme is the focus, its achievements and its contribution to the overall national efforts to achieve the elimination of child labour, including all major activities implemented since the take off from October 2011 to the time of the evaluation in August 2016 (the Project ended 31st August).

Design issues are part of the area to be assessed, as are implementation, good practices and lessons learnt. The likelihood of sustainability has been addressed. The data collection phase took place in Amman, and Irbid in Jordan. The clients of the evaluation are the ILO Regional Office for Arab States (ROAS) including its Decent Work Team (DWT), and the ILO technical departments and EVAL at Headquarters. The USDOL representatives, the ILO constituents, counterparts and Civil Society Organisations are also among the clients. The deliverables are: an Inception report; a Stakeholder debrief, PowerPoint Presentation (PPT) of the preliminary findings; this draft evaluation report with conclusions, recommendations and annexes; to be followed by a second draft and a Final evaluation report incorporating comments received, and including an Executive Summary.

3.2   Evaluation criteria, evaluation instrument, methodology and limitations

Evaluation criteria

The evaluation has applied five relevant evaluation criteria[11] as follows:

1. <u>Relevance</u> - which here is understood as the extent to which the Project´s activities are in line with the priorities and policies of the country/stakeholders and (direct, indirect, ultimate) beneficiaries, as well as the ILO itself and the development partners (donor agency);

2. <u>Effectiveness</u> (implementation and management arrangements) - which here is understood as relating to the extent to which activity/strategies reach or contribute to meeting the stated objectives;

3. <u>Efficiency</u> – which here is understood as a measurement of the outputs (qualitative and quantitative) in relation to the inputs. It is applied to assess/determine whether the least costly resources possible were used to reach the intended results;

4. <u>Impact orientation</u>; and

5. <u>Likelihood of sustainability</u> – which here is understood as the positive and/or negative changes produced by the Project directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. This also includes the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of e.g. policy and socio-economic conditions.

Evaluation instrument

The evaluation objective and purposes (section 1.2) have been "translated" into relevant and specific evaluation key questions – the evaluation instrument - to inform the development of the methodology[12] (examples of these questions are found in Annex II). These questions were posed to ILO staff (current and former), relevant constituents/stakeholders (Government agencies, Employers and Workers Associations/Organisations), as well as UN

---

[11] As recommended by the ToR and OECD-DAC.
[12] These evaluation questions were drawn from the ToR, as well as developed by the Evaluator based on the evaluation objective and purpose.

organisations, NGOs and CSOs in Jordan. The evaluation has also attempted to assess whether the Project has been doing things "in the right way" to ensure that outcomes/objectives are met, and whether or not there could have been better ways of achieving results.

Approach

The evaluation has been carried out in accordance with ILO's Evaluation Policy Guidelines, the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards (updated in 2016), and OECD/DAC´s recommendations. A participatory process was applied to encourage all key actors to share their information, experiences and knowledge – thus contributing to the findings. The evaluator has adhered to ethical standards in the analysis of gathered/processed data and in the reporting, to ensure that the conclusions drawn were not influenced by statements or views by any particular party. Regarding gender and gender equality, the evaluation has aligned with the UNEG Norm 8 on human rights and gender equality which states that the universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation (UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation, 2016). Thus, the evaluator has identified gender-related aspects during the process of data collection, analysis and report writing, and assessed the level of gender integration (mainstreaming) in both Project design, implementation and follow-up of activities and strategies.

Norms and standards

The evaluation has complied with ILO and UN norms and standards, and the evaluator has duly considered ethical standards and code of conduct as spelled out in the UNEG's ethical guidelines for UN evaluations. The evaluator has as much as possible adhered to, for instance, protecting those involved in the evaluation process. Thus, confidentiality of the beneficiaries was respected. The evaluator has also been mindful of ethical considerations in the analysis of data collected and in the reporting. As much as possible, the evaluation has applied triangulation/cross-checking and observations - to increase the credibility and validity of the results and, to the extent possible, minimise any bias. The work is guided by the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-based Evaluation: principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations (2013) and ILO Guidance Note No.4: Integrating Gender Equality in Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects (March 2014).

Methodology and steps in the process

The evaluator has used qualitative methods to gather both qualitative and quantitative data and information. In processing and analysing the collected qualitative information, the evaluator has attempted to use elements of thematic analysis and content analysis, process tracing and mapping (and combinations of these) in arriving at evaluation conclusions. Quantitative data has been drawn from secondary sources as there is no scope to carry out a survey to gather quantitative data.

The evaluation has analysed the logic behind the design of the Project (expressed in the logical framework analysis matrix). A results-based management approach has been used when assessing achievements against what was been originally planned. Changes to the initial logical framework, the reasons and validity of these, were looked into and has been accounted for in section 3.1. Methodological triangulation was applied, involving more than one option to gather data, i.e. interviews, observations, use of brief written questions sent per e-mail to selected respondents, and documentation review – the latter throughout the duration of the process. Emphasis on triangulation was not only in order to increase the credibility and validity of the results or to crosscheck information to minimise any bias, but also to deepen the evaluator´s understanding. Qualitative content analysis was used to analyse the gathered information. Rival/contradicting explanations were, in particular, noted and analysed. Below are the sources and methods used in the data gathering (here organised under each evaluation criteria):

Table 2. Sources and methods of data collection and applying the key evaluation criteria

Key evaluation criteria	Sources of information & data	Method used
Relevance	Relevant national policy documents and strategies, DWCP, UNDAF, Project Document with LFA, action/work plans, info from staff & stakeholders, MoUs.	Doc. review, in-depth interviews & meetings with ILO staff, other UN-staff, constituent categories and partners.
Effectiveness	Technical Progress Reports (TPRs), donor response/questions to TPRs, M&E reports, reports on capacity building/training; Mid-term evaluation report (2012) info from staff & stakeholders.	Doc. review, in-depth interviews with ILO staff and Development partners (including donor) & other stakeholders; Collection of qualitative & quantitative information data, through questionnaires.
Efficiency	TPRs, work plans, budgets & expenditure statements, audit & donor reports, financial	Doc. review, interviews, e-mail correspondence.

Key evaluation criteria	Sources of information & data	Method used
	reports/documents & info from Finance/Admin project and ILO staff in ROAS office.	
Sustainability & impact orientation	TPRs, M&E reports, info from constituents and partner organisations.	Doc. review, discussions & meetings, in-depth interviews, e-mail correspondence. Group discussions with pre-prepared themes (few topics) may be used in the Stakeholder workshop to gather more information on sustainability.

Comprehensive documentation review: At the time of starting the field programme in Jordan, a number of documents had been received. The evaluator studied the overall context in which the Project is operating and the documentation review was carried out throughout the evaluation field mission, as more documents were gathered during the process of the fieldwork in Jordan and through all the interviews and meetings with the stakeholders in Amman.

Field visit to Irbid Governorate: On the evaluator´s request, a visit was made to Irbid on 30th July, for discussions with relevant focal point staff of the three Ministries to collect data, information and to make which included discussions with the IT manager regarding the Database. It also included a visit to Terres des Hommes[13] with an in-depth interview with a programme staff working with refugees in the area, among others.

Interviews/groups discussions/meetings: The evaluator conducted interviews, mostly 1-hour in-depth face-to-face interviews, and also several via Skype, with a number of ILO staff as well as former Project, and former ILO staff in the Project office in Amman, in ROAS Beirut and at HQs in Geneva. A discussion took place initially with a US Department of Labour representative in Washington, i.e. the donor representative, as well as the regional M&E officer and C/RPU for guidance and expectations at the inception stage.

Many representatives of the ILO constituents and stakeholders were interviewed in Amman, including the three ministries involved i.e. Ministries of Labour, Education and Social Development, whom the Evaluator also interviewed in Irbid Governorate. These were a mix of in-depth interviews and consultations (of approximately one hour) and group discussions/meetings.

Staff members of other Government agencies were also interviewed such as the Department of Statistics (DOS) and the Greater Amman Municipality. Staff of the Centre for Strategic Studies (CSS) of University of Jordan; the National Council for Family Affairs and JOHUD also took part – the latter being semi-independent of the Government. Among the constituents, the evaluator also interviewed officials of the Jordan Chamber of Industry, Jordan Chamber of Commerce, representing the Employers, the General Federation of Jordanian Trade Unions, representing the Workers. Interviews were carried out with international organisations (Save the Children, IYF and Terre des Hommes). The evaluator also interviewed consultants who had been recruited for specific tasks by the Project, e.g. in relation to a campaign for caring for the working children in tourism in Petra, and the consultant who had "rolled out" the NFCL and trained (selected) government staff in all Governorates during 2015-2016. A full list of interviewees is annexed (Annex VIII).

E-mail correspondence and brief questionnaire: E-mails were used to gather more information and to enrich the triangulation and validation process. A questionnaire was also used (sent to ILO Project staff, ILO ROAS, ILO HQs, UNICEF and UNHCR staff) (Annex III).

Validation Workshop: At the end of the data collection phase in Jordan, on 16th August, a Stakeholders Validation workshop was organised and attended by ILO staff and key stakeholders. The evaluator was responsible for organizing the methodology of the workshop while the identification of the number of participants of the workshops and logistics was the responsibility of the Project management, in consultation with the evaluator. This was an opportunity for the Evaluator to present the preliminary findings (PPT and discussion points/group work) and to receive feedback, and gather further information. The presentation was followed by a Q&A session, followed by group work with each group presenting their suggestions/recommendations in view of the way forward, i.e. ILO's possible continued involvement on the topic of child labour in Jordan (see the text of the PPT which includes the questions used for the Stakeholder group discussion, as well as their comments on the PPT presentation, in Annex VI).

Reporting: An Inception Report was submitted to the Evaluation Manager at the beginning of the assignment, followed written comments from ILO and stakeholders, and after incorporation of comments, a first draft report was compiled

---

[13] An international NGO.

and submitted. Consolidated comments from ILO have been received and have been addressed in this second draft report.

Limitations to the evaluation study

This evaluation has been greatly dependent on receiving information from the relevant sources (documents and people) as are most research-oriented studies. The Evaluator experienced some degree of limitations in two areas:

1) Not being able to access information from other UN agencies that had been involved with the Project. No interviews were held with them, and no replies received so far to questionnaires even after several attempts by the project CTA (Chief Technical Adviser) and evaluation manager to get access;

2) The schedule of appointments during the stay in Amman rightfully entailed interviews not only in Jordan, but Skype interviews with officials also in Beirut, Geneva and Washington. This was very useful, however, this ambitious schedule of appointments basically left little room for making more than one field visit. ILO had not planned any field visit for the evaluation, outside Amman, because of the policy-oriented and centralised nature of the Project and the fact that it is not actually responsible for implementing activities in the governorates. However, the challenges and problems faced regarding the Database warranted and justified at least one visit outside the capital.

Thus, out of the 12 governorates, the Evaluator only made one visit to Irbid and held discussions with officials of the Ministries of Labour, and Education, and held one in-depth interview with Terres des Hommes (an INGO). This provided a more accurate picture of the working environment of the child labour Focal Points, and how they perceived their work situation, as well as the refugee-related work of an NGO (Syrian refugees). The Evaluator appreciated that it was possible to fit this visit into the programme.

4 Main findings

Following the evaluation´s purposes (section 1.2) this chapter addresses the main findings of the evaluation and shows how the evaluator has applied the evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, likelihood of sustainability, and impact) to determine the achievements of the projects; its accomplishments as well as the obstacles in reaching the set objectives.

It discusses **relevance and validity** of project design and strategy, and analyses the Project´s stated risks and the intention to mitigate these. It describes the assumptions made at the onset (design stage) and the planned division of labor between the CTA and a National Project Coordinator (NPC) in relation to the duration of the Project (4.2).

This is followed by a detailed account of what the Project has accomplished in its attempts to contribute to the four objectives, i.e. the evaluation´s assessment of the Project´s **effectiveness** (4.3).

A discussion about some of the Project´s outputs follows, placed in relation to the inputs made, with the evaluation criteria **of efficiency** in mind, followed by analysis and conclusions on **impact, likelihood of sustainability** (4.4), **good practices and lessons learnt** (4.5).

4.1 Relevance and validity of project design and strategy

It was found that the results chain of the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) of the Project design is sufficiently logical and coherent. There are, however, no outcomes, or outcome-level indicators formulated, only immediate objectives and indicators to these, as well as outputs at the level of results. The latter have been revised from the original indicators but can still not be used as measurement of progress as they generally are not quantified, i.e. not SMART. Regarding the anticipation of risks and their mitigation, as well as assumptions that formed the basis of the design, some problems were found, as follows:

Risks and mitigating risks

The ILO foresaw that there were risks associated with the fact that, although the project may achieve the integration of child labour into key national policies, its effects on the elimination of child labour may be difficult to ensure. This risk was to be mitigated by a broad base of not only government departments but also "powerful NGOs that the project will work with" along with a number of international organisations[14]. Although NGOs have been part of the national high-level committee, *the absence of NGOs in activating the NFCL may have slowed down the progress.* Thus the risk that was foreseen was, in fact, *not* mitigated as stated in the Project Document. One explanation is that once the Project actually took off in November 2011, the design of the NFCL was already finalised by the NCFA in collaboration with the MOL, and in fact no NGO was involved as implementers in the design, only the three ministries.

Assumptions made at the design stage

Regarding coordination of the design of the Project is based on a number of assumptions, including that the members of CLMTs, be they "officials, NGOs, personnel or community leaders", would invest their time and energy necessary for their teams to function well without financial compensation, apart from their travel and meeting costs. There would be a change in the job descriptions of child labour focal points and members of CLMTs to include this function and the GoJ would allocate resources for the continued functioning of the CLMTs after the close of the project. Furthermore, the ministries and NGOs that already have databases related to child labour would be willing to share their data and link their databases to the CLMS – and the NCLC would need to play a role in bringing all these organisations on board. Another assumption made was that the design of the NFCL, prepared under the CECLE project by the National Council of Family Affairs, would "set clear targets on the basis of solid evidence and assign roles and responsibilities to the right partners". The assumption was that this was "highly likely".

Unrealistic original design in terms of project management

The Project was intended to be implemented for a period of four years; Two years for a CTA to manage the Project, and the remaining third and fourth year to be managed by a National Project Coordinator. To not allow for a CTA post to continue to lead the project throughout, is assessed as a design error, and it was not realistic to assume that the four objectives would be met with this division of leadership.

The Project was eventually implemented with several extensions and with several changes in management as was described in section 3.3. Waiting for approval, new management staff to be in place, and funds to be released caused quite long "fallow" periods (one such period lasted 8 months) where no new activities could be implemented. ILO's

---

[14] Source: Project Document, section 168 (the document has no page numbers).

choice here was to either close down the Project, or wait for the new funds to become available so that the new phases could take off – and it chose the latter.

Conclusion

a) The results chain of the LFA of the Project design is sufficiently logical and coherent with one exception, namely assumptions, risks and mitigation of risks. These are not SMART[15]; in particular they are not based on realistic notions of the situation, which is one of the requirements of a results-based framework. Furthermore, they are not beyond the control of the Project and its key actors.

b) The evaluation also found that the original, and intended division of management, between a CTA (2 years), and a NPC (2 years) was unrealistic in view of the ambitious goals to be obtained.

c) This evaluation have shown (section 3.2) that due to changing circumstances, several revisions were made of the design regarding activities, outputs and budget throughout the years. The objectives, however, stayed the same which reportedly was an important factor in terms of continuity, in particular vis-à-vis the constituents, and it is assessed that were still valid as goal statements even though activities were added or deleted due to the change of circumstances in the country i.e. the influx of Syrian refugees after the Project had taken off.

4.2   Effectiveness in contributing to the four objectives

This section looks at two things, 1) How did the Project respond to recommendations from earlier reviews and evaluations? and 2) What has been accomplished, and what was not achieved vis-à-vis the plan and the results based framework (LFA)? If outputs and objectives were not achieved - what were the reasons? Effectiveness is here understood as answering the overarching questions relating to the extent to which the Project´s activities and strategies have reached (or contributed to) meeting the four objectives, thus also making contributions to the development objective. If it cannot be assessed that they were met - which were the obstacles and reasons? As the scope of the final evaluation is to assess the achievements from the start in 2011, it is necessary to first clarify what ILOs response and follow-up have been to recommendations made by earlier reviews or evaluations over the years, primarily the comprehensive independent Project Implementation Review (PIR) in 2012, and the internal review in 2014 which was part of the Jordan Decent Work Country Programme Review.

ILO's response to the recommendations of Project Implementation Review (2012)

The Project Implementation Review (PIR) report, dated November 2012, identified that the main achievements were that the Project had been able to raise awareness and increase empowerment of stakeholders involved in the NFCL. Dialogue and trust had been built with the stakeholders working in a Technical Committee on Child Labour. Information about the different child labour initiatives was accessed and a mapping of sectors and regions where child labour is found e.g. agriculture, mechanics, and tourism had been accomplished. The stakeholders´ request that the Project would engage itself in exchanges, regarding the impact on child labour from the influx of the Syrian refugees, had been met and preparations for a project revision had been started[16]. There was a consensus among stakeholders that it was time to start applying the NFCL in practice in order to test it in a limited number of geographic regions and that the focus should be on specific thematic areas and reinforce the mechanisms for identification, referral and monitoring.

The recommendations are very long and entail a mix of conclusions and recommendations, thus these are only summarised below with comments added by this final evaluation:

Recommendation 1. Move from dialogue to action: This recommendation includes two specific recommendations, namely a) development of action plans of the NFCL and b) creation of dynamic hubs in the pilot regions "combining decision-making committees composed of representatives of the key ministries at governorate level with taskforces of specialists and practitioners directly involved in tackling child labour in the communities to develop contextually appropriate approaches and help establish networks of service providers and resource organisations" (PIR report, p. vii)..

ILO response: This evaluation has not come across any evidence that such action plans were made, nor that dynamic hubs in the regions were created. It is noted that the review was undertaken in October 2012 i.e. almost exactly at mid term of the first CTA´s two-year tenure- as he started his assignment in October 2011 and left in October 2013 when

---

[15] SMART = Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time bound.
[16]Source: ToR, paragraph 11.

his contract ended. Thus, the CTA had only one year to support the stakeholders in meeting this recommendation, which entail relationship building, coordination, and knowledge and capacity development.

Recommendation 2. Pursue project revision and implementation pilots: This recommendation addresses the need for stakeholders at national level to be involved in reinforcing the referral and monitoring system that connects community, governorate and national level. It supported the CTA´s decision to request a project revision and reallocation of resources e.g. *shifting the focus from child labour monitoring teams to pilots for implementation of the national framework against child labour*, in geographical areas where Save the Children operates and concentrate on specific sectors (the mechanics sector) *or populations, such as refugees outside the refugee camps.*

ILO response: The Project did adopt more upstream activities (capacity development activities, database development) in favour of ensuring that the monitoring system is functioning as intended. The evaluation has noted that at the time of the final evaluation the staff did perceive that its focus was to be "up-stream". It is also noted that the review left it to the Project to decide whether the focus should be on refugees, in piloting the framework.

Recommendation 3. Maintain staff capacity, review management roles: At the time of the PIR the (former) CTA had been working for only one year, and had one more year left on his tenure. The recommendation stated that the NPC (who would take over the management from the CTA in October 2013) should be assisted by another national – to be recruited and the CTA should use the remaining time of his tenure to coach the NPC to effectively take over.

ILO response:

Two CTAs, one national manager, and one national consultant have managed the Project during almost 5 years, assisted by three different administrative assistants and a driver. Many consultants have performed specific tasks for the Project in many different areas. The changes of CTA´s and managers, particularly, was unfortunate and have had an adverse impact on achieving what was originally foreseen in terms of reaching all objectives, although all staff in management positions have performed well in the circumstances.

Recommendation 4. Intensify resource mobilisation: The PIR recommended that, considering the limited resource base and the need to intensify implementation efforts, it was necessary for the project staff to engage proactively in resource mobilisation.

ILO response: This was accomplished, in cooperation with ILO ROAS. Project proposals were developed and submitted to the Government of Spain, as well as Danida and CIDA[17] (the latter project has started).

Recommendation 5. Enhance coordination and mainstreaming: This recommendation builds on the conclusion that horizontal coordination (between the different actors at national, governorate and community levels, respectively) and vertical coordination (from national level through governorate level to community level) concerning child labour needed to be intensified, even within the concerned ministries. This was to be tested during the piloting process by attributing areas of responsibility and specific tasks to child labour focal points at different levels. It recommended to make it a priority to encourage joint efforts at a strategic level (through collective policy-influencing with other ILO-projects in particular and other UN organisations by actively supporting influential change agents in the ministries who are willing and able to drive processes of policy change.

ILO response: This evaluation has assessed that the Project has encouraged, and made efforts, to build capacity, understanding and commitment for the need to work together in a new way to reach the common goal of implementing the NFCL. The child labour database was, in this process, improved in order to better function as a tool in the identification, referral and monitoring work among the three ministries.

Recommendation 6. Support capacity development: The report stated that it did not appear to be clear, to most of the local stakeholders, how the national framework (NFCL) might be applied in practice, and what their respective contributions might be. It recommended that the subsequent project phase should include a cascading training system in selected relevant topics, including labour inspectors and social workers from different ministries, governorates and municipalities, offering Training of Trainers "system" enabling "cross-disciplinary groups of child labour focal points at national, governorate, municipality and district levels to develop the technical competencies and awareness of critical child labour issues required to implement the national framework". It also recommended that this process should be driven by the Child Labour Unit in the Ministry of Labour in coordination with the child labour focal points

---

[17] It is not known whether the ILO looked for additional resources to employ a full- or part-time specialist/ local consultant to focus on research and capacity development, in particular to support activities concerning the impact of the influx of Syrian refugees on child labour – as recommended, or whether the Director of Save the Children was "brought in to support the facilitation of a cascading approach to training and exchange of experiences.." or whether practical support from UN agencies were sought, as mentioned in this recommendation.

in the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Social Development and facilitated by the ILO and the Project, as well as Save the Children.

ILO response: It is clear that the Project since has provided support, training and capacity development which has included defining roles of the different stakeholders, however, it seems that it has been the Project that has driven the process, and not the CLU, MOL.

Recommendation 7. Concentrate on thematic priority areas: This very comprehensive recommendation is formulated as suggestion/s on what areas to focus on to ensure coherence; such as integrating child labour related questions into the national labour survey (undertaken by DOS on regular basis) with focus on the mechanics sector in Amman and Zarka governorates; Adopt athematic focus on the impact of the recent influx of Syrian refugees on child labour in urban areas, starting with Mafraq governorate; and support to the MOL to address the impact of the influx of Syrian refugees on the child labour situation in urban areas (in cooperation with UNICEF and Save the Children). A number of other suggestions were made inside this recommendation, including activities related to education.

ILO response: Each calendar quarter, DOS conducts a labour force "Employment and Unemployment" survey covering persons aged 15 years and above from a nationwide sample of 13,360 households in all governorates with support from ILO ROAS. The inclusion of child labour issues in the survey was done only once. The pilot implementation of NFCL for Mafraq Governorate was launched in May 2013 – an area with high incidence of Syrian refugees. It was reported by the Directorate of the MOL in Mafraq, that all child labour cases reported in September 2013 were Syrian refugee children. However, this evaluation has not come across any specific action to address the impact, as such.

Recommendation 8: Conceptualise and document good practice models: This is a suggestion to conceptualise and document any good practice models.

ILO response: Good practices were identified and documented in a comprehensive way and presented in a regional workshop in April 2016.

Recommendation 9. Address the impact of the influx of Syrian refugees: The recommendation says: "It seems pertinent that the ILO-IPEC project takes fully on board the role which they have been asked to adopt by local stakeholders in order to facilitate assessment of the impact of the influx of Syrian refugees on the child labour situation in Jordan and assist local stakeholders in addressing critical issues in this regard. It will be essential to establish what additional resources may be mobilised, from the ILO and elsewhere, the nature of the cooperation with key stakeholders such as the Ministry of Labour, Save the Children and UNICEF, and on that basis, determine the level of intensity to be adopted". It is also suggested that research could be based on the "initial results of a rapid assessment to be undertaken by the regional ILO-office which would include an assessment of the impact of the influx of Syrian refugees on the child labour situation. Among the ideas put forward was sharing the Jordan experience at the planned regional conference on Good Practices.

ILO response: Child labour in garages and auto-repair workshops in Zarqa Governorate was in November/December 2013 chosen as a theme for the rapid assessment. ILO published the report as a document for the region in October 2015. The response to the Syria crisis also entailed setting up the Child Labour Task Force (CLTF) that was formed within the Child Protection Working Group, in which Save the Children (STC) "co-chaired" with ILO. Further, ILO designed and mobilised funds for new projects as part of the response addressing Syrian refugees and their situation in Jordan. Other actions that followed the crisis were ILO´s invitation to UNHCR to be a member of the NCLC and ensuring that the Syrian refugee population was part of the national child labour survey.

Conclusion

1. Most of the recommendations were acted upon, although some were unrealistic in view of the time frame and some are directed to ILO-IPEC as a programme (not the Project), and could not reasonably be met by the Project under the circumstances.

2. A number of actions were taken as a response to the Syrian refugee crisis, including assessments (studies), forming a CLTF within Child Protection Working Group co-chaired by Save the Children, mobilising for new Projects focusing on Syrian refugees, working with UNHCR and including refugees as respondents in the national child labour survey.

Assessment of contributions made to coordinate action on child labour

The evaluation has also attempted to assess what has been generated in terms of research results to inform policy - constituting the immediate objective 1, which reads: A mechanism for coordinating action to combat child labour at

national and district levels and link child labourers and their families to improved educational provision and social protection will have been established[18].

The ILO Project has regarded the NFCA as a prerequisite in the Government´s goal to eliminate child labour in the country as it provides an official mandate for the Ministries of Labour, Education and Social Development and involved stakeholder organisations to act on combatting child labour[19]. With the Project´s support, it was rolled out on a pilot basis from 2013, starting with five governorates, and expanding to all 12 governorates in 2015-16.

The NCLC and task force have been linked to the national inter-ministerial body for the protection of the first NCLC that took place on 6 Feb 2012 (output 1.1). The CLM institutional framework has been set up and integrated into the NFCL (output 1.2), however; only the General Amman Municipality has been included in the CLM. The system needs to be broadened to include organisations other than Government institutions (Employers, Workers, and private sector organisations/NGOs).

Efforts were made to establish CLMTs in all governorates, however it was found that the system was inactive at the time of the final evaluation (output 1.3)

Regarding the referral system for child labourers, the Project aimed at having a CLM referral system in operation integrated into NFCL by the end of the Project (output 1.4). This entails that service providers are identified and willing to receive children who are found working, and their families, and that they can be referred to alternatives to child labour, such as formal education, non-formal educational institutions and vocational training institutes, and institutions for counselling, health care, social support, entrepreneurship, and those that can provide income generation for the care-takers. Mapping of service providers has been done and referral pathways were presented at NCCL technical meeting in January 2015 – however the system is not yet in operation.

A Child Labour Database was developed and first completed in 2012, and revised at the end of 2013 (Output 1.5). An assessment of the database in 2015 revealed certain problems in the format. For instance, the system did not easily generate reports, and there was an absence of a documented business process and administrative instructions, as well as a common understanding among the three ministries and between national, governorate and district levels on how to use it. Thus, 200 potential users had been trained but skills were not sustained, in part due to the absence of the above-mentioned instructions. It was assessed that a backlog of cases of identified child labour had not been entered into the database.

It was also found that there were no champions ("super users") within the ministries fully familiar with the database. Work to improve it started at the end of 2015. Child labour focal points (users) were trained for three days in Amman and they were able to access the system they will work with in their governorate offices. A user manual was developed. The new version was launched and demonstrated to the Ministry staff in June 2016. Ten different types of auto generated (click of a button) reports have been programmed into the new database to make it easy for the respective officials to receive, provide and analyse information. According to the consultant, and the Project management, this latest version is completed, installed and passwords/keys to enter the system were handed over to the MOL who currently is the owner. The new version was practically demonstrated and staff members were trained on its use in Amman, involving the Governorates.

During the field visit, the evaluator found, that the revised system was not in operation and the relevant staff outside Amman had not been given the IP address/passwords/keys and the official instruction or approval to start using the system they had been provided made then unable to enter the database. The focal points of the Ministries of Education and Labour also stated in an interview that there is a need for an improved regulatory framework/mandate to, for instance, make the necessary contacts with the other ministries (within the three concerned ministries) and explained that work overload made them relatively uninterested in working within the child labour framework including the database.

The Head CLU/MOL´s response to the database situation was that it was "not ready" for use despite the fact that it had been launched. To remedy this situation the Project CTA requested a meeting (after the evaluator left Jordan) with the Secretary General (SG), MOL, held on Monday, 22 August 2016, attended by the Head CLU and the IT Manager, MOL[20]. The SG gave instructions to his staff to a) activate the database immediately and b) provide access to the ministries of Education and Social Development, in addition to their own field offices and c) in order to give external access, to obtain a new IP address from the Ministry of Information Technology (MO-IT). The Project´s database

---

[18] Sources of information regarding the progress on producing outputs are interviews with ILO, the ministries and other constituents, stakeholder organisations Technical Project Reports from the start of the Project in 2011.

[19] Source: Good Practices report, ILO Project.

[20] Source: E-mail received from the Evaluation Manager, ROAS, on 26th August.

consultant met with MOL´s IT focal point and the database was activated within the MOL network thus the MOL staff can now enter data and use it within the Ministry.

The Evaluator has discussed the situation with the National Program Officer, who works (part time) for the Project on Syrian refugee child labour (Danida) project who ensured that the issues of maintenance and further training of staff on the CL Database will be covered in in this Project, and that there are funds in the budget.

It is clear that the Project has aspired to work on influencing policies and raise capacity and was not designed to be service-oriented - an element which has been part of so many other (former) ILO-IPEC technical cooperation projects around the world. Still, some key officials in the concerned ministries expressed to the evaluator that they had expected ILO to be able to show "how many children it had removed from child labour" – and commented that it had not been able to do this. This attitude, or mismatch of expectations, could be a sign that they have not fully participated in the decision-making, and/or do not feel they had ownership over the Project.

Conclusion

The Project has clearly made efforts to create the initial structures, and a mechanism for the coordinating of action to combat child labour and to link child labourers and their families to improved educational provision and social protection. In the continued work, the CLM referral system of the NFCL should be broadened to include other organisations among the Government, Employers and Workers organisations, as well as the private sector and NGOs. This evaluation has appreciated that the database, which has undergone much needed improvements, was only installed in July 2016, and training for the users was done in August, just before the Project came to a close.

Assessment of contributions made to research and policy influence

The evaluation has also attempted to assess what has been generated in terms of research results to inform policy - immediate objective 2 which reads: "Trends in child labour will be estimated, specific aspects of child labour in Jordan will have been researched and conclusions will have been used to inform policy decisions and guide direct action."

The Project has attempted to support the introduction of an element on child labour and youth employment into the *Labour Force Survey,* carried out by DOS with support from ILO to regularly, every quarter, gather information on trends and disseminate the results to policy makers and the media. This was done only once (output 2.1).

As part of the Project´s outputs on qualitative studies on child labour and youth employment, both a Rapid Assessment Survey and a School to Work Transition Survey (in 2013) were undertaken in the area of child labour in garages and auto-repair workshops in Zarqa Governorate, Jordan. The studies were carried out in collaboration with DOS, Amman, and with the ILO Youth Employment Project and the report was published as a regional report in 2015 (output 2.2).

The Project had planned to carry out a study on specific worst forms of child labour (output 2.3).

Instead, following the 2nd project revision approved by USDOL in January 2015 and the recommendations of the PIR, it was decided that a *full-fledged National Child Labour Survey for Jordan* would be carried out. This undertaking by Centre for Strategic Studies, University of Jordan, was constrained by the fact that although the donor agency reportedly had initiated the nationwide child labour survey, there were significant delays before the financing was available, resulting in a short timeframe for the study to be completed[21].

Preliminary results were expected in May 2016, with the draft report in June and the final report in July 2016. The summary results, however, were only presented on 16th July, in an official gathering at the University of Jordan, launched by the Minister, MOL; on the same day this Evaluation´s preliminary findings were presented and discussed. It is expected that a full report will be published shortly[22].

Conclusion

Assessment of contributions made to capacity development and enhancement

The evaluation has attempted to assess what has been generated to obtain immediate objective 3: "Capacity of ILO constituents to implement the National Framework to Combat Child Labour will have been enhanced"

Capacity development and awareness rising are viewed as very important elements in any ILO technical cooperation Project and in this Project it has clearly been a cornerstone.

---

[21] Government of Jordan officially announced the launch of the NCLS on 4/06/2015 but the contract with Centre for Strategic Studies of the University of Jordan could only be signed on 23rd of September.

[22] In the connection with the launching of the presentation, the Project CTA was interviewed by the local Aljazeera channel, Jordan.

Capacity development activities and related events were organised for staff of the MoL, MOE and MOSD, including the staff at Governorate levels such as labour inspectors and social workers, IT staff, key partners and stakeholders and service providers; these activities addressed the specific needs of girls and boys involved in child labour and their families. Beneficiaries have also been involved but at a smaller scale, e.g. youth and children.

827 stakeholder participants have attended training and workshops over the years of which it is estimated that 546 are females[23]. To this number should be added 90 young persons (trained by the IYF´s Auto Repair Pilot Project (2013-14) and 250 young persons who benefited from the Youth Apprenticeship training programme in 2016 (see Annex IX for details on topics, trainees and sex disaggregation).

An examples of advocacy and awareness raising activities about the issues, is the fruitful cooperation the Project initiated with the General Amman Municipality (GAM)[24] which took off in 2014 in which GAM Children's Parliament was supported, resulting in drama sessions and staged theatre with themes on child labour facilitated under the GAM sub-project. Two advocacy groups of students were also formed under this collaboration at the Universities of Mo'tah and Balka in which students conducted their own research on child labour issues (outputs 31, 3.2, and 3.3). As for the capacity of the employers' organizations to address child labour and youth employment, the Employers' associations were not involved extensively in this field[25] (output 3.4). Regarding cooperation with the trade unions this has not yielded any results (output 3.5).

Below are examples of ILO's earlier work on linkages between child labour and youth employment:

> The concept has previously been the subject of a research project implemented by ILO in many countries (2008) under the former ILO-IPEC[26]. Already during 2004-2005, IPEC developed the concept of linkages of child labour and youth employment. As early as 2004 a comprehensive concept paper, a "generic TOR", on the subject was produced. A working relationship was created initially with Youth Employment Network (YEN), established through the initiative of the then UN Secretary General and composed of the World Bank, UNDP and ILO, its Secretariat hosted by ILO. Collaboration also took place with the Youth Employment Programme (YEP), which was established within ILO HQs in 2005, working through employment specialists in the field. The set up was in conjunction with ILO´s resolution on Youth Employment and after ILO constituents had requested for more concerted action in this area.
>
> It was also the core element of the successful Project entitled Education and Skills Training for Youth (EAST) (2008-2010), which was a four-year technical cooperation project executed by the ILO funded by the Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands with a budget of US$ 22.7 million. It was the largest project ever implemented by the ILO in Indonesia, and involving 33 districts in six Provinces. The Project placed great importance on linking elimination of child labour to more relevant skills and better opportunities for youth, once they leave school - thus facilitating the school-to-work transition. It provided support to all categories of formal and non-formal education and skills providers for youth[27].

Conclusion

Capacity development and awareness raising are viewed as very important elements in any ILO technical cooperation Project and in this Project it has been clearly been a cornerstone. Regarding the concept of *linkages* between child labour and youth employment, this element has not come out as a strong feature of the Project, but the mini projects implemented by GAM and IYF were successfully carried out and good lessons can be learned from them. More efforts could have been made to find some way of involving the Employers and the Workers Associations e.g. in awareness-raising campaigns and as spokespersons against child labour.

Assessment of contributions made to integration of child labour and youth employment in policies

---

[23] NB: Some officials benefited from more than one event so the actual number of individuals is actually lower than the figure indicated.

[24] The Action Programme was *entitled NFCCL Training for GAM Inspectors and Child Labour Awareness*, engaging a new category of potential change agents in Jordan i.e. the Municipal Business License Inspectors who are mandated to visit all work places in the municipality, including in the informal sector, to inspect the business licenses. These inspectors are present in municipalities throughout Jordan, and there are over 300 of them in the GAM alone. That AP aims at training these inspectors so that they can effectively monitor child labour cases and take part in the NFCL (source: Project TPR, 2015).

[25] The Chamber of Commerce is since the second quarter of 2016 involved in the ILO child labour project for Syria refugees (Danida-Canda funded) in its CSR component, in which large companies in the private sector are approached (Source: In-depth interview).

[26] *Child Labour and Youth Employment Linkages, Phases I and II*, An independent final evaluation, 2008, by Lotta Nycander.

[27] Source: *Mid Term Evaluation Final Report ILO Project on Education and Skills Training for Youth (EAST) Technical Cooperation project INS/06/15/NET*, 2010, an Independent Evaluation, by Lotta Nycander, Michael Sachsse, Sinta Satriana, Martin Sirait.

Finally, an attempt has also been made to assess what has been generated towards immediate objective 4. Which reads: Elimination of child labour and the promotion of youth employment will have been mainstreamed into the national development policy frameworks.

The Project has continuously monitored the NFCL (as is the nature of the activities leading to this "output", including the integration of the CLMS). Related activities are attempts to make the framework known by the public, holding a media sensitisation workshop on child labour in Jordan. In the area of social protection, the Project has also kept monitoring the developments regarding the development of by-laws for the Juvenile Law. This ministry has shown interest and has been extending good cooperation with the Project in the process and now has CLU for which the Project helped formulate the mandate (output 4.1).

In the earlier progress reports, a list on hazardous child labour is said to have been incorporated in the CLMS during one-on-one coaching sessions. In 2015, it was reported that a Hazardous Labour manual has been developed and has been a part of Training of Trainers on Occupational Safety and Health in Amman in July 2016 (output 4.2). An effort to map national development policy strategies and action plans related to children and youth to assess the possibility to mainstream child labour elimination and promotion of decent youth employment was made in 2014, but the Project stated that the findings were apparently made redundant by changes in Jordan's overall policy framework (e.g. Jordan 2020, Jordan Response Plan and the Juvenile Law of 2014).

In 2013, the Project´s plans included the holding of a workshop with Parliamentarians and policy-makers to advocate for inclusion of child labour elimination and decent youth employment in policies and to ensure allocation of human and financial resources for implementation. The workshop was finally held in 28th March 2016, in which students from Balqa University made a presentation on child labour (output 4.3). The fourth output relates to the strengthening of regional cooperation. The activities that were carried out leading to this output are: A workshop (24-25 March 2015, Amman) with tripartite representatives from Jordan, Lebanon, Yemen, State of Palestine and Iraq. This workshop aimed at capacity building of tripartite participants and enhancing their knowledge of the principles and legal aspects of child labour issues, ILS and more. In October, the work on Good Practices and Lessons Learnt was initiated and a regional conference was held on 18-19 April 2016, when the work was presented along with the impact assessment on the NFCL[28] (output 4.4.)

The fifth output was added to the original 4, namely a comprehensive assessment of the impact and institutionalization of the NFCL, covering Sept 2011 to September 2015, to be carried out by the Project. The report highlighted obstacles and challenges to the functioning of the framework. It had 11 recommendations directed to the involved government agencies, including the need to form a supervisory committee to implement NFCL; provision of qualified and trained staff; allocation of funds; joint committees for follow-up; expanding the framework and scope of work by involving the private sector and NGOs; and establishing centres for the social rehabilitation of working children[29].

Experiences indicate that the actions undertaken in the Jordanian labour market in combatting child labour increased during the years 2009 to date, such as activating the national committee to combat child labour under the umbrella of the Ministry of Labour that comprised the different official and private institutions and NGOs; establishing the child labour unit at the Ministry of Social Development; supporting the child labour division at the Ministry of Labour and building the institutional capacities for both ministries in addition to the Ministry of Education and the other entities participating in the application of the framework. Moreover, a computerized system was established regarding the follow-up of the working children and the workers were trained to use this system. The list of hazardous and harmful work for the health of juveniles was revised, and manuals were prepared for the inspectors and employers.

The pilot application of the NFCL encountered several challenges, the most important being the high labour turnover of those working on the implementation of this framework, and a clear weakness in the application of the computerized follow-up system, lack of funding and increased workload for the employees. In the interview with the Head of the CLU, MOL, objections regarding the assessment were raised, e.g. the very fact that it was ILO who had carried out this activity, including the timing (it should have been the Ministry that should have carried out the assessment, not ILO, and it was too early). The MoSD representative with whom the evaluator discussed at the Ministry claimed that the assessment had come with "nothing new".

Child labour issues have also been integrated into UNDAF 2013-2017. Other related activities are participating staff´s contributions in working forums on national and/or district policy events related to children and youth and mainstream child labour elimination and decent youth employment. However, it was found that no *progress has been made and in*

---

[28] Participants came from Jordan, Lebanon, Occupied Palestinian Territories, Yemen, Iraq, Tunisia and Egypt and represented governments, employers and workers organisations, national and international NGOs, other UN agencies as well as a representative from USDOL (see details on the Lessons Learned in Annex IV).

[29] Assessment of the impact of the NFCL, report (pp. 36-37).

the planned activity to advocate with the Employers and Workers organisations incorporate child labour and decent youth employment into employers' and workers' plans of action (output 4.5).

Conclusion

The NFCL has been, and still is, in a pilot phase, which should imply that changes are made through "learning by doing" as experiences of how it works are gathered and analysed. This appreciation seems not yet to have been embraced by the involved Ministries, and does not seem to have been understood even by the CLU, MoL. This was evident as there was no assent by the CLU, MoL, to start trying out the improved version of the child labour database in the Governorates after the training courses in mid-2016. Neither the child labour Focal Points, nor the IT managers in the Governorates seemed to be able access the database system to which only the MOL had the key/password[30].

This final evaluation found that when rolling out the NFCL to the remaining Governorates in 2015-16, and re-training in the "old" pilot Governorates, there was a lack of awareness about the very existence of the framework among many government officials participating in the training. Committees that earlier had been active were not anymore active. It is here assessed that at central level it is evident that stakeholders, including the Ministry officials involved in child labour issues, have an enhanced understanding and knowledge about how it should work – but have not been able to convince this Evaluation - through documentation or any other evidence based information - that it works *in practice*, i.e. that the framework is actively used. On the contrary, government officials made statements to the effect that the framework cannot work because the Database does not function - and have not acknowledged/appreciated that the Database was installed to function as a tool, only, facilitating information gathering and sharing between the ministries involved – and not a prerequisite for taking action.

The pilot application of the NFCL encountered several challenges, among them is the high labour turnover of staff assigned to work on the implementation and the weaknesses of the child labour database (at least before it was revised in 2016). There has also been a lack of funding. The overall achievements of the Project involves the activating of the NCCCL (under MOL), now comprising Government agencies and private institutions and NGOs; support for the formation of the CLU at the MOSD; Support to the CLU, MOL; Building institutional capacities for the two ministries, and also MoE and the stakeholder organisations participating in the NFCL; developing and installing Database for the monitoring of child labourers and training staff on how to use it; updating the hazardous list (harmful work for young people) and preparing manuals for the inspectors and employers[31]. One of the most important challenges of piloting the NFCL was the high staff turnover and a clear weakness in the application of the (previously installed) database system, lack of funding and increased workload for the employees.

ILO's response to the Syrian refugee crisis in Jordan in 2013

The aim of the project had been to greatly reduce child labour in the country in a relatively short period of time and to be one of the countries to have achieved the target of eliminating the worst forms of child labour by 2016, but the situation changed in 2012 when huge numbers of refugees from Syria started entering Jordan due to the crisis in Syria. Although Jordan welcomed the refugees, there were heavy restrictions on their ability to access the labour market,[32] which made them dependent on humanitarian assistance. The number of child labourers among Syrian refugee populations increased, together with child labour among non-refugee populations and therefore this issue developed into a significant child protection challenge in the country.

The ILO was initially reluctant to use the Project to adopt strategies and action responding to the Syria crisis, although the first CTA strongly advocated for it and was actively involved in discussions with the international humanitarian organisations and UNICEF. Thematic working groups/task forces were formed regarding the coordination of the response to issues such as child protection/gender-based violence – with a focus on Za'atari camp. The Project CTA proposed to have concrete, close cooperation with UNICEF, and MOL also made appeals to ILO and UNHCR to provide extra support to Labour Inspectors.

When the crisis grew, an agreement between the donor agency and the ILO was made to revise the Project, accommodate new activities to address the situation, and allocate new funds. The evaluation has identified some activities and approaches geared to make a difference regarding Syrian refugee children, such as piloting NFCL in areas with high incidence of refugees, namely in Mafraq, Irbid, Amman and Zarka. Rapid assessments on child labour among Syrian refugees were conducted in the agriculture and urban informal sectors (commissioned by ILO ROAS).

---

[30] This was clear to the Evaluator when visiting Irbid Governorate, discussing with officials of the Ministries of Education and Labour in MoE office, as well as checking with the IT manager who showed the evaluator he could not enter the database, as he had no access to the right pass words/keys. NB: It has been learnt from the Project that the database – in its current shape – has been handed over to the CLU, MoL – and is not kept by the Project or the consultant who developed it.

[31] Impact assessment of the NFCL, report, pp-35-36.

[32] Report, by Nick Grisewood, ILO.

The incidence of child labour among Syrian refugees was monitored in the pilot implementation areas in dialogue with the humanitarian organisations. New funds were used to conduct the National Child Labour Survey in which Syrian refugee children and families have participated and one refugee camp could be included, with assistance of Ministry of Interior. The Project staff have also contributed to development of the ILO project on child labour with focus on Syrian children, funded by Danida and Cida, which is an 18 month project ending in 2018 with a small budget (€ 347,000)[33].

Effectiveness of management arrangements, monitoring and reporting

The evaluation found the current management and staff to be very capable in handling and managing the Project, and in producing very good progress reports. It was found, through, that the Project Monitoring Plan (PMP) originally drawn up at the start of the Project has been extended and used as a standard in each TPR (chapter III. (Performance information and assessment, containing "Measurement against project objectives"[34]). A problem here is that the *indicators* formulated at the immediate objective level cannot be used as measurement instruments of progress/achievement, as intended according to the LFA framework – because they are not quantified, i.e. not SMART, and the CTA confirmed that the Project had not used indicators in this way. Very few of the *targets,* are quantified as well, although actions against targets contain some quantified information e.g. number of meetings held, or field visits made – which can give some hint on the progress even if not placed against a SMART target.

The changes of staff over the years disrupted the implementation, with three changes in management and an almost 8-month period with only a consultant to follow up on the project activities and keeping in contact with MOL (mainly) while awaiting new funds.

The evaluation has assessed that the discontinuity of the tenure of the first CTA after two years was disruptive to the implementation of the Project, and had negative effects on the working relationships with some partner organisations for instance the CLU/MOL. The situation has been discussed with all parties and it is clear that *there exists no consensus on the issue* of ILO not continuing to use the services of the same CTA, and instead opening up the post for competition once the project was extended.

The three changes of administrators have also posed a challenge in the running of the Project, as it entailed re-introduction to the ILO rules and processes[35].

Gender issues assessment

The ILO, in cooperation with its counterparts, has emphasised the importance of acknowledging gender concerns in relation to child labour, and the gender issues were mentioned already in the conclusions and recommendations of the first Child Labour Study report in 2001.

The recent NCLS found that the vast majority of child labourers in Jordan are **boys** working outside the homes e.g. in construction work, which particularly for the Syrian and other non-Jordanian nationals is the most common work place for boys. It also found, perhaps not surprisingly, that except for shopping for the household (which involves stepping outside the house and therefore usually assigned to boys) the remaining major household chores are mainly in the domain of **girls**[36].

The steering document for the Project (the project document) has many references to "women" and "women and children" in Jordan emphasising the need to look into the gender issues, and refers to the need for synergies to be developed by the Project with the ILO programme to combat human trafficking as well as with the Better Work Jordan programme and the work being done on gender and equality in the world or work[37]. One of the Project outputs reads "The capacity of service providers to address specific needs of girls and boys involved in child labour and their families is enhanced". It has been difficult to gauge whether such capacity has been enhanced among the service providers; however, **the topic has been part of various training events and workshops. The Project is also commended for recording sex disaggregated information in relation to participation in various events (training and workshops)** - evidenced in the "summary of key events" reconstructed for this final evaluation (Annex IV).

The evaluation has not found any evidence that gender analysis has been carried out or that gender issues have been in focus *per se* in this Project, or that gender has been specifically part of any implementation plans. Not has it found that there were any efforts made to tap into ILO's vast knowledge on working with gender equality issues or mainstreaming, or integrating, gender concerns into TC projects. Nor could it detect that any effort was made, or

---

[33] Source: ILO Project TPR, April 2016 and discussion/interviews with ILO staff stakeholders.
[34] The TPR refers to the DED Note Project Monitoring Plans.
[35] Source: Interview, ILO staff, ROAS
[36] Summary report, National Child Labour Survey, 2016, p. 25.
[37] The Project Document, Section 190 (no page numbers).

discussions taking place regarding advocating for non-traditional skills training or apprenticeships for the young women and men participating in, for example, the IYE´s mini project in areas such as retail, food production, carpentry, mechanic, printing, hospitality and tailoring.

The evaluation has also noted that the PIR report did not make any conclusion or recommendation regarding gender that could have guided the Project at the mid-term stage on how to identify ways and means to approach the issue of gender[38]. The project could have made attempts to carry out some qualitative case studies on the largely hidden world of domestic work for girls. The work girls do in households is important since the time spent on it may adversely affect school attendance. The household chores that children attend to most frequently are shopping for the household, cooking, cleaning, and washing clothes, caring for children and old/sick family members.

At this point, when more information can be generated from the data gathered on gender through the national child labour survey, one should expect that continued research, work and funds will be devoted to creating ways to address the specific (and most probably different) needs of girls and boys who are child labourers, as well as young women and men needing training and employment.

Conclusion

Sex disaggregated data has been collected regarding participation in training events and workshops, and gender has been addressed to some extent in, for example, training created to increase understanding and awareness on the issues in relation to child labour and youth employment. The evaluation has, however, not found that any particular gender analysis[39] or piece of research/case study has been carried out, specifically addressing gender - or any strategy developed on how to address gender issues, and integrate gender into the Project to guide the policy-oriented dialogues with the decision-makers and collaboration with the partners.

This seems to be both an issue of lack of clear direction in the design, as well implementation – as the Project well could have found innovative ways and activities to bring gender to the forefront without specific instructions in the design. It is expected that (based on the recent initial survey results of the NCLS) **ILO and the Jordanian government will dedicate resources and activities to the issue of gender - relating to both girls and boys, to acquire more knowledge and design activities to meet their respective and (most likely) different needs.**

4.3   Efficiency

Efficiency can be understood as a measurement of the outputs (qualitative and quantitative) in relation to the inputs. It is applied to assess/determine whether the least costly resources possible were used to reach the intended results. In brief the evaluation has posed the questions "did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?" The assessment is that on the whole, the Project has been sufficiently efficient, but the following comments should be noted and taken into consideration by the ILO. MOL-CLU should in particular note the point raised regarding its participation in the Study Tour, below.

At the time of the data gathering phase in Jordan, there was still $93,863 in the budget (which includes programme support costs of $62,986) and there is still US$20, 000 unspent (and uncommitted) at the end of the project. Thus, the delivery rate at the end of the Project is assessed as satisfactory.

The following was the situation in July 2016 regarding what was spent and committed[40]:

Table 3. Status of Project´s expenditure July 2016.

Workshops/Seminars	$372,242.71
National Consultancies	$381,755.19
Direct Services	$1,182,823.00
Study tours	$16,850.00
Travel	$64,744.44
Equipment	$19,185.07
Salaries	$1,322,348.59
Publications (printing/design)	$18,134.30
Evaluation	$45,892.24

---

[38] Surprisingly, girls, boys or gender are not mentioned at all in the PIR report.

[39] A gender analysis would examine the differences in women's/girls´ and men's/boys´ lives, including those that could lead to social and economic inequity and apply this understanding to policy development and service delivery. Such an analysis would also be concerned with the underlying causes of these inequities and aim to achieve positive changes.

[40] Source: ILO ROAS.

Operational costs	$162,133.86
ILO overhead	$376,050.65
TOTAL	$3,962,160.05

NB. The equipment part includes recent equipment purchased that was transferred to the Child Labour Unit at the Ministry of Labour.

One major activity, at the price of USD 600,000, from the second large batch of funds received from the donor (budget revision 2014-15), is the NSCL. It is expected that the results of this major undertaking is going to be a very important source of information for Jordan and thus should justify the large cost incurred.

Regarding the inputs and costs incurred for other surveys and studies[41] the evaluation has assessed that *gender concerns should have been part of the study topics in relation to working boys and girls* (see section 4.6). This could easily have been done in relation to output 3.3, which specifically mentions needs of boys and girls[42].

The results obtained from incurring the cost of undertaking a Study Tour ($16,850.00) to Brazil is questioned by this evaluation[43]. This activity was part of the south-south support for capacity-building within the project with the participation of the Head of CLU-MOL[44] and the ILO National Programme Coordinator[45] organised by the Ministry for Development and the Fight Against Hunger, in collaboration with the ILO Sub-Regional Office (Bangkok) and IPEC (HQs) from 24 - 27 June 2013. The participants from Jordan also met with their CLU counterparts in Brazil. However, no report seems to exist on how the learning and experience from the tour was to be used to further the Project´s work towards the objectives, and since then, there has been no further steps taken by MOL/CLU to support the expansion of their unit according to the Project´s progress report (April 2016)[46]. It is assessed that the reason for no evidence of a specific report available in the Project is a combination of lack of proper planning, lack of participation of a higher-level representative from MOL and lack of requirement from the ILO Project to draw lessons or to transform new knowledge into action resulting from this visit.

The evaluator also enquired whether an audit report exists on the Project but has not received any information on this other than that the donor agency was planning to carry out an audit mission to Jordan in 2014 which apparently did not take place[47].

Conclusion

The assessment on efficiency is that on the whole, the Project has been sufficiently efficient, but the following should be noted:

a) The total costs incurred on would have been justified if gender concerns in relation to working boys and girls had been the topic of at least one study/survey dedicated to the topic (see section 4.6). This could easily have been done under output 3.3, which should address the needs of boys and girls;

b) The results obtained from incurring the cost of undertaking a Study Tour ($16,850.00) to Brazil is questioned by this evaluation as no report seems to exist on how the learning and experience from the tour was to be used to further the Project´s work towards the objectives, and since this time, according to the Project´s latest progress report in April 2016, there has been no further steps taken by MOL/CLU to support the expansion of their unit.

4.4 Impact and likelihood of sustainability

As this report has confirmed, the Project has actively contributed to the formulation of policies and the national framework, building the capacities of the main stakeholders on advocacy and raising awareness related to child labour and the linkages to youth employment. Under the Project, the legal framework has been adapted to international standards in the development of the draft by-laws for Articles 31 to 36 of the Juvenile Law of 2014 that identifies children engaged in Child Labour as 'children in need of protection' and submitted to Minister, MOSD. Child Labour concerns have been incorporated in the Jordan Response Plan as protection issue and into the UN framework UNDAF.

Support has been provided through participation in Child Labour Steering committee. Models have been developing on involving children in the spreading of messages on child labour (for instance through the GAM mini project).

---

[41] These are under "direct services" in the project budget.
[42] Output 3.3 reads "The capacity of service providers to address specific needs of girls and boys involved in child labour and their families is enhanced".
[43] Source: TPR October 2013, p. 25.
[44] Ms. Shereen Al-Taeib (the name will be removed in the final report).
[45] Ms Rula Al-Dajani (the name will be removed in the final report).
[46]
[47] Ibid.

Models were also created on linking child labour issues with youth employment issues (through e.g. the IYF´s work on apprenticeships); and a Task Force was initiated to find solutions to child labour and protection issues in Jordan.

The Project has also provided support to a Child Labour Technical committee and the reviving the CLU, MOL, and helped setting up the CLU, of MoSD, through drafting of the job descriptions of staff (February 2015) now headed by the former Focal Point. It has made much effort to put in place the NFCL and enhance capacity to activate it. It has contributed to the setting up of child labour committees, and linking these with local service providers also beyond the (current) Ministries of Labour, Education and Social Development, as well as testing the framework and "rolling it out" to all Governorates (piloting the NFCL was first done in Amman, Mafraq and Zarqa governorates in 2013, followed by Ajloon, Jarash and Madaba in 2015, followed by all 12 governorates in March 2016, and trained 65 government officials in 3 locations involving all child labour committees.

Ministry staff of Labour, Education and Social Development also received Database training (all versions).

As seen from the above, the project has no doubt made an impact on policies and the creation of structures and systems (and capacity development as mentioned earlier). However, the anticipated impact of the Project has been affected by delays in approvals by both ILO and the donor agency linked to the access of funds and resulting in delayed start-up of planned activities – which are only some of the challenges identified by this evaluation.

Regarding the activation of the NFCL it appears it has been a long and challenging process that has seen many ups and downs, with its success heavily depending on the commitment of the three ministries to work together. All parties have accepted the framework as 'the' mechanism to coordinate action on child labour and specific roles have been assigned to each of the participating ministries. According to the Project CTA, they do deliver on their responsibilities, to some extent, albeit on their own and not yet in a joint manner. The evaluation found that no evidence exists that the NFCL *operates as expected*; i.e. there seems to be *no systematic effort* to remove child labourers from work and referrals to service providers for protection and/or education. Reportedly, at some point during 2013, the NFCL was in use but the holding of committee meetings in the Governorates had stopped in 2016, and was reported at the time of the evaluation[48]. This observation was confirmed by several of the stakeholders, as well as Project staff.

Through the implementation of this Project, ILO has also made efforts, through various capacity development activities, to ensure that what it entails - in terms of coordinated action between the three ministries - is well understood and that the tools developed are used as intended. Ultimately, making it effective and integrating it in the work routines of the Ministries and its affiliated Governorates requires not only that investments or financial support is provided, or that roles and responsibilities are defined, or that coordination mechanisms are establish – not even that a Database for monitoring and referrals are in place.

In order to make it effective and integrate it into the work routines of the Ministries and their affiliated Governorates, it is crucial that investments are made or financial support is provided, that roles and responsibilities are well defined, that coordination mechanisms are established and that a Database for monitoring and referrals is in place. Ultimately, however, to make it work and make it sustainable, more time and effort towards revisions may be required as well as a transformation in the organisational culture itself; this will involve changes in work ethics, attitudes, behaviour, and the way the actors communicate and interact within the organisation and with external partners.

The ILO is currently implementing the child labour project addressing Syrian refugees, however, it is small in terms of funding and constitutes only a small part of a larger programme. Another project is in the pipeline with funding from the Spanish Government. However, **sustainability is entirely dependent on internal investments such as human resources, home grown systems and influences and commitment - not external**. ILO should now expect the Government and other national organisations to generate even more commitment to develop and sustain what has been set up so far in terms of structures and systems. If such is guaranteed, the ILO should be willing to offer more technical support and expertise.

Conclusion

The evaluation concludes confidently that impact can be found in the ILO's influence in policy work and capacity development of key actors. **Sustaining what has been accomplished so far, however, is entirely dependent on internal investments of human resources, home grown systems and influences and commitment - not external**. The ILO should now expect that the Government and other national organisations are willing to generate even more commitment to use and sustain what has been set up in terms of structures and systems. With such guarantees, the ILO should be willing to offer more technical support and expertise.

---

[48] This was witnessed and firmly reported in an in-depth interview of the consultant who undertook the rolling out of the NFCL and conducted training for Governorate staff in 2015-2016, and confirmed by senior Project staff.

4.5 Good practices and lessons learned

In 2015-16 the Project identified and documented good practices emanating from the Project implementation, with the assistance of two consultants (the first of whom was the first CTA in the Project). Nine good practices were identified in the following areas[49].

1. Rolling out the national framework to combat child labour at the Governorate level;
2. Including child labour in national labour force surveys;
3. Developing effective tools for child labour inspections;
4. Responding to emerging crises and fragile situations;
5. Creating a centralised database on child labour;
6. Linking child labour to youth employment;
7. Broadening the core coalition;
8. Mobilizing children to lobby against child labour; and
9. Developing an action plan to tackle child labour in Petra.

The work has entailed validation by the stakeholders and the result was presented in a regional workshop in Amman, on the 18th and 19th of April 2016, in which the Project presented Good Practice and Lessons Learnt, with participants from Jordan, Lebanon, Occupied Palestinian Territories, Yemen, Iraq, Tunisia and Egypt. The documentation has been forwarded to CLU, MOL, for onward submission to the Technical Committee and the NCLC for discussion and policy interventions.

Each good practice has been accompanied by analysis and conclusions leading to lessons learned, carried out in a very commendable way (see lessons learned in Annex V).

Conclusion

The "Good practices and lessons learned" document is a comprehensive, well conceived document that should be promoted and used in other child labour oriented work as it can be used as a reference document for any organisation working on child labour related issues (and adapted to other countries/cultures) in particular by the ILO constituents and non-governmental organisations working in the same field.

---

[49] "Moving Towards A Child Labour Free Jordan". A Collection of Emerging Good Practices / International Labour Office, Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS) - Geneva: ILO, 2016.

5   Conclusions and recommendations

The following are the conclusions, based on findings of the evaluation:

5.1   Overall conclusion on achievements

The ILO, together with the Government, is clearly the lead international agency addressing child labour in Jordan. The evaluation has assessed that substantial efforts were invested in, and by, the Project and satisfactory achievements have been found regarding the Project´s work in relation to policy including mainstreaming the issue of child labour into national development policy frameworks and United Nations frameworks, i.e. the Jordan Decent Work Country Programme and the United Nations Development Assistance Framework. Achievements have also been made to encourage and build capacity, understanding and commitment for the need to work together in a new way to reach the common goal of implementing the National Framework of Child Labour. Systems to combat child labour and models on youth employment have been developed.

The National Committee on Child Labour and the Child Labour Unit, of the Ministry of Labour, have been supported. The NCCL now comprises government agencies, private institutions and NGOs. Support has been provided in the setting up of the Child Labour Unit, in the Ministry of Social Development and in enhancing institutional capacity of both these two ministries, as well as to the Ministry of Education, and other stakeholder organisations participating in the National Framework of Child Labour. The Project has developed a database for the monitoring of child labourers to better function as a tool in the identification, referral and monitoring work among the three ministries and trained staff on its use. It has updated the hazardous list (on harmful work for young people) and prepared manuals for the inspectors and employers. A national survey on child labour, which includes the Syrian refugee population, was undertaken with the results presented in Amman on 16th August 2016.

5.2   Specific conclusions

These are the specific conclusions, which all are based on findings:

1. Attention to language

ILO's use of the terms recipients and beneficiaries in technical cooperation project documents and other steering documents indicate passiveness. However, their designated roles as partners of the ILO require active involvement and thus this evaluation has attempted to gauge the extent of their active involvement as project participants and partners, and their contributions in reaching the Project objectives.

2. Building on ILO's earlier work to combat child labour in Jordan

The Project has built on a lot of activities undertaken earlier and on some of the structures created prior to its take off, such as the CLU-MOL, NFCL, National Steering Committee, SSC rehabilitation centre (for youth over 16 years only). Thus, certain awareness among stakeholders already existed among MOL and stakeholders, including the nature and prevalence of child labour through earlier studies and research.

3. Relevance and validity of the Project design

a) The results chain of the LFA of the Project design is sufficiently logical and coherent. There are, however, no outcome-level indicators, only immediate objectives-level indicators. These have been changed from the original indicators in the LFA and can still not be used as measurement of progress as they generally are not quantified, i.e. not SMART. It was also found that assumptions, risks and mitigation of risks are not SMART[50], as they seem not to be based on realistic assessment of the situation at the time of the start-up of the Project – and are also not beyond the control of the Project and its key actors.

b) The evaluation also found that the original, and intended division of management, between a CTA (2 years), and a NPC (2 years) was unrealistic in view of the ambitious goals to be obtained.

c) This evaluation have shown that due to changing circumstances, several revisions were made of the design regarding activities, outputs and budget throughout the years. The objectives, however, stayed the same which reportedly was an important factor in terms of continuity, in particular vis-à-vis the constituents, and it is assessed that they are still valid as goal statements even though activities were added or deleted due to the change of circumstances in the country i.e. the influx of Syrian refugees after the Project had taken off.

---

[50] SMART = Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time bound.

4. Inactive periods in the life of the Project

The Project was designed for an implementation period of four years, but in the end it was in operation over a five years period, from October 2011 to end of August 2016. Due to budget revisions, waiting for approvals and new management staff to be in place, there were quite long "fallow" periods during which new activities could not be implemented. The delays occurred from USDOL, where some administrative processes did take time, and delays were also caused by processes in the field and administrative procedures at the ILO.

The ILO's choice here was to either close down the Project as originally intended, or continue to wait for the new funds to be available so that the next phase could take off – and it chose the latter.

5. Some mismatch on expectations on the Project

It is clear that the Project has been designed to, and aspired to work on influencing policies and raise capacity and is not designed to be service-oriented, the latter being an element featured in so many other ILO-IPEC technical cooperation projects around the world. Despite this, some key officials in the concerned ministries expressed to the evaluation that it had expected ILO to be able to show how many children it had removed from child labour and similar comments and noted to the evaluation that it had not managed to do this. This attitude, or mismatch of expectations, could be a sign that the stakeholders have not fully participated in the decision-making, and/or do not have full ownership of the Project.

6. ILO's response to the recommendations of the Project Implementation Review in 2012

The nine recommendations of the PIR are lengthy and comprehensive, and mixed with conclusions. ILO has acted on the majority of them such as encouraging better coordination among the three ministries, requesting for a project revision and focusing on upstream activities (capacity development, database development) in favour of ensuring that the monitoring system was functioning as intended. The Project was also engaged in resource mobilisation jointly with ILO ROAS, resulting in project proposals for a small grant from Danida and the Canadian Government[51], and one in the pipeline for funding from the Government of Spain.

However, some recommendations are unrealistic in view of the time frame that existed at the time, and some premature, e.g. the recommendation to create "dynamic hubs" in the pilot governorates (in relation to the NFCL) in particular considering the fact that the Project CTA at the time had only one more year to manage the Project and during that year was supposed to coach the national project coordinator to be ready to take over the management during the third and last year. Several of the recommendations seem to be directed to the ILO-IPEC programme (which existed as a separate programme at that time), not to the Project *per se*, and could not reasonably be met by the Project under the circumstances.

7. ILO's response to the influx of Syrian refugees

The aim of the Project had been to greatly reduce child labour in the country in a relatively short period of time and to be one of the countries to have achieved the target of eliminating the worst forms of child labour by 2016, but the situation changed in 2012 already when huge numbers of refugees from Syria started entering Jordan due to the crisis in Syria. The evaluation identified a number of activities and approaches geared to make a difference regarding Syrian refugee children, such as piloting NFCL in areas with high incidence of refugees, namely in Mafraq, Irbid, Amman and Zarka. Rapid assessments on child labour among Syrian refugees were conducted in the agriculture and urban informal sectors (commissioned by ILO ROAS) and ILO initiated the Child Labour Task Force within Child Protection Working Group (co-chaired by Save the Children) and mobilised for new Projects focusing on Syrian refugees. ILO also invited UNHCR to be a member of the NCLC.

Furthermore, child labour incidences among Syrian refugees were monitored in the pilot implementation areas in dialogue with the humanitarian organisations. New funds were used to conduct the National Child Labour Survey in which Syrian refugee children and families participated and one refugee camp could be included, with assistance of Ministry of Interior. Project staff have also contributed to development of the ILO project on child labour project with focus on Syrian children, funded by Danida and the Government of Canada - an 18 month project ending in 2018 with a small budget (€ 347,000)[52].

8. Effectiveness of the Project and its management

---

[51] Project proposal entitled "Tackling child labour among Syrian refugees and their host communities in Jordan", (Danida and Canada funded), ILO, March 2015.
[52] Source: ILO Project TPR, April 2016 and discussion/interviews with ILO staff and stakeholders.

The *Project´s effectiveness* in producing outputs and reaching objectives is mainly found in the formulation of policies and the supporting of the national framework, and building the capacities of main stakeholders, on advocacy and raising awareness. The ILO is, together with the Government, clearly the lead international agency addressing child labour in Jordan. The evaluation has identified good achievements regarding the Project´s work in relation to policy including mainstreaming the issue into national development policy frameworks and UN frameworks such as the UNDAF for Jordan. Achievements have also been made to encourage and build capacity, understanding and commitment for the need to work together in a new way to reach the common goal of implementing the NFCL. Systems to combat child labour and models on youth employment have been developed.

The National Committee on Child Labour (NCCL) and the Child Labour Unit, of the Ministry of Labour have been activated. The NCCL now comprises government agencies, private institutions and NGOs. Support has been provided in the setting up of the Child Labour Unit, in the Ministry of Social Development and in enhancing institutional capacity of both these two ministries, as well as to the Ministry of Education, and of other stakeholder organisations participating in the National Framework of Child Labour. The Project has also clearly made efforts to assist the government in creating the initial structures, and a mechanism, for the coordinating of action to combat child labour and to link child labourers and their families to improved educational provision and social protection.

However, developing the structures, creating mechanisms and providing training are not sufficient to make it work after all. It was found that coordination and cooperation among main stakeholders was not systemized and was kept at management levels that were not high enough. It was found that the commitment from the MoL and CLU management was, on the whole, not adequate for the system to work as intended and for the child labourers (the ultimate beneficiaries) to be given the protection and education that was intended.

Effectiveness of the *Project management:* The evaluation found the Project management, as well as staff, to be capable and effective in handling the Project, including the monitoring and reporting. Not surprisingly though, the changes of staff over the years disrupted the implementation, with three changes in management and an almost 8-month period with only a consultant to follow up on the project activities and to keep in contact with MOL (mainly), while awaiting endorsement and new funds. The three changes of administrators have also posed a challenge in running the Project smoothly, although they too have been capable to perform the duties.

9. Activating the NFCL

The pilot application of the NFCL encountered several challenges, the most important being the high labour turnover of those working on the implementation of this framework, and a clear weakness in the application of the computerized follow-up system, lack of funding and increased workload for the employees.

However, this Evaluation found that when rolling out the NFCL to the remaining Governorates in 2015-16, and re-training in the "old" pilot Governorates there was a lack of awareness about the existence of the framework among many government officials participating in the training, and a lack of knowledge about the reasons that it had been put in place and added to their work load.

It is here assessed that at central level it is evident that stakeholders, including the Ministry officials involved in child labour issues, have an enhanced understanding and knowledge about how it should work but have not been able to convince this Evaluation that it works in practice, namely that the framework is actively used (through documentation or any other evidence based information). On the contrary, government officials have stated that it does not work because the *Database is not "working" and that this basically should be traced to the activities of the Project.*

10. Database on child labour

The Project has developed a database for the monitoring of child labourers to function as a tool in the identification, referral and monitoring work among the three ministries. The earlier database was revised in 2016 and trained staff at central and Governorate levels was re-trained. This evaluation found that it is premature to expect that the revised database will function smoothly already at this stage and that it will need further nurturing, trials and maintenance.

11. Capacity development

Capacity development and awareness raising are viewed as very important elements in any ILO technical cooperation Project and in this Project it has been clearly been a cornerstone. It was concluded that more efforts could have been made to find more effective ways of involving the Employers and the Workers Associations for example in awareness-raising campaigns and as spokespersons against child labour.

12. Linkages between child labour and youth employment

Regarding the concept of *linkages* between child labour and youth employment, this element has not come out as a strong feature of the Project but the mini projects ("action programmes") implemented by GAM and IYF were successfully carried out by dedicated staff in these agencies.

13. National survey on child labour

A comprehensive national survey on child labour, which includes Syrian refugee population, was undertaken under the umbrella of this Project. The summary results were presented in Amman on 16th August 2016. It is assessed that the report will be an important and very useful reference document in the future work against child labour.

14. Gender concerns and strategies

Sex disaggregated data has been collected regarding participation in training events and workshops, and gender has been addressed to some extent in, for example, training created to increase understanding and awareness on the issues in relation to child labour and youth employment. The evaluation has, however, not found that any particular gender analysis[53] or piece of research/case study has been carried out, specifically addressing gender - or any strategy developed on how to address gender issues, and integrate gender into the Project to guide the policy-oriented dialogues with the decision-makers and collaboration with the partners.

This seems to be both an issue of lack of clear direction in the design, as well implementation – as the Project well could have found innovative ways and activities to bring gender to the forefront without specific instructions in the design. It is expected that (based on the recent initial survey results of the NCLS) ILO and the Jordanian government will dedicate resources and activities to the issue of gender - relating to both girls and boys, to acquire more knowledge and design activities to meet their respective and (most likely) different needs.

15. Project efficiency

The assessment is that on the whole, the Project has been sufficiently efficient, but the following should be noted:

a) The total costs incurred on would have been more justified if gender concerns in relation to working boys and girls had been the topic of at least one study/survey dedicated to the topic (see section 4.6). This could easily have been done under output 3.3 which specifically mentions the needs of boys and girls; and

b) The results obtained from incurring the cost of undertaking a Study Tour ($16,850.00) to Brazil is questioned by this evaluation. The reasons are: a) No report seems to exist from MOL on how the learning and experience from the tour was to be used to work towards the Project´s objectives, and since the time of the study tour (according to the Project´s latest progress report in April 2016) there have been no further steps taken by MOL (CLU) to support the expansion of its child labour unit.

16. Impact and the likelihood of sustainability

The anticipated impact of the Project has been affected by delays in approvals by both ILO and the donor agency, that were linked to the Project´s access to funds, and resulting in delayed start-up of planned activities – among some of the challenges faced. The evaluation is in no doubt that <u>impact</u> can be found in the ILO's influence in policy work and capacity development of key actors. The <u>likelihood of sustainability</u> and nurturing what has been accomplished to far, however, is entirely dependent on internal investments of human resources, home grown systems and influences and commitment - not external.

5.3 Lessons learnt and emerging good practices

In 2015-16, the Project identified and documented nine good practices and many lessons that had emanated from the Project implementation. A regional conference was held on 18-19 April 2016, when the work was presented along with the impact assessment on the NFCL. The document, which was presented in a regional workshop in 2016, is a good quality document and should be very useful not only for ILO and its counterparts also in other countries, but also for any serious international and national organisation working to eliminate the worst forms of child labour. These are some of the most important good practices: setting up a national framework; effective tools for child labour inspections; responding to emerging crises; database on child labour; linkages between child labour and youth employment; and

---

[53] A gender analysis would examine the differences in women's/girls´ and men's/boys´ lives, including those that could lead to social and economic inequity and apply this understanding to policy development and service delivery. Such an analysis would also be concerned with the underlying causes of these inequities and aim to achieve positive changes.

letting children participate in the advocacy of combatting child labour. The identified good practices and lessons emanating from them are described in detail in Annex V.

5.4   Recommendations

The following are the recommendations that emanate from the conclusions (it should be appreciated that not all conclusions have warranted a recommendation):

1. Commit to setting clear targets, sustaining the impact and move forward to eliminate child labour (MOL, MOE, MOSD)

a) The Jordanian Government should, after so many years of technical cooperation with the ILO, make even more commitments in the area of child labour elimination, including setting targets, allocating more human resources and funds to reach national goals and to what has already been accomplished so far, such as the National Framework on Child Labour. This evaluation has assessed that MoSD could be more suitable to lead the work on the NFCL, than MOL. This Ministry has set up its own Child Labour Unit, run by a Focal Point.

b) In any continued support to increase the effectiveness of the NFCL, the CLM referral system must be broadened to include Employers and Workers organisations, as well as the private sector and NGOs.

2. Follow up, improve and maintain the Database on child labour (ILO, MOL, MOE, MOSD)

a) ILO should follow up (and later monitor the actions in the governorates) to ensure that the instructions given to CLU-MOL staff are followed, namely 1) activate the database immediately; and 2) provide access to the ministries of Education and Social Development, in addition to their field offices and 3) in order to give external access, to obtain a new IP address from the Ministry of Information Technology.

b) To make it work, full support from the top management of the involved ministries is required and further support on maintenance and nurturing by the ILO e.g. through the Syrian child labour project (Danida, Government of Canada).

3. Follow up closely on the reporting on the National Survey on Child (ILO, MOL, MOE, MOSD)

The ILO and the Jordanian government should follow up closely on the reporting on the national survey on child labour and ensure that all the relevant data collected is actually processed in the final report - including ensuring that all relevant data is sex disaggregated in the final analysis and that relevant data on refugees are accounted for. The ILO could follow up on the survey results with qualitative studies, including case studies to "dig deeper" and gain more knowledge about these specific areas.

4. Discuss interest for new technical cooperation on child labour and youth employment linkages addressing Syrian refugees in particular (ILO to initiate, and involve MOL, MOE, MOSD, Employers and Workers Organisations, UNICEF, UNHCR, Red Cross, NCFA, IYF)

a) Regarding potential future technical cooperation, ILO should explore the interest within the Jordan Government, and other constituents/actors and development partners/donors for developing the linkages between child labour and youth employment among Syrian refugees, in particular, including entrepreneurship for young people (some guarantees should be received from the Government that earlier systems invested on regarding child labour will be sustained, see recommendation 1. Above).

b) ILO Jordan and ROAS should here capitalise more on the knowledge and experience that now exists in its office in Amman (office of the ILO Coordinator) and draw lessons from earlier ILO work in other countries, in particular from ILO-IPEC´s previous research and project implementation. Such discussions could be commenced in parallel with the on-going implementation of the small project on Syrian refugee children mentioned here (planned to end in 2017).

c) The background work for such a project should very clearly define at the outset that exactly the ultimate project participants are (child labourers, youth and their families) are and under what conditions they live – even if the Project is to be policy oriented. The ILO and Jordanian Government (as well as other organisations) now have a much better prospect to do exactly this, in terms of Syrian refugee children as much more data is available thanks to the national child labour survey.

5. Enhance relevance and validity in design and set attainable and realistic goals to ensuring ownership of the Project (ILO, USDOL and Jordan Government)

a) ILO and USDOL should <u>set goals for its projects that are attainable and realistic</u> and should develop the projects in close participation with the Jordan counterparts in order to avoid misunderstanding of what the project´s objectives are, and avoid mismatch of expectations (and ensure that the Jordanian constituents have a translated copy of the project document for the sake of ownership and easy reference from day one).

b) Attention to language: <u>ILO should as much as possible refrain from using terms such as "recipients" and "beneficiaries"</u> (in design and implementation) of technical cooperation projects as they indicate passiveness. They should be decribed and treated as active project participants contributing to the achievement of the Project goals and objectives.

6. Look for innovative ways to more actively include Employers and Workers organisations (ILO, JCC, JCI, GFJTU and any other union federation if feasible)

ILO should in any future technical cooperation <u>find some ways to more actively involve all its constituents</u>, namely to also include the Workers' Organizations (e.g. the General Federation of Jordanian Trade Unions) and the Employers (e.g. the Chamber of Commerce) in awareness-raising campaigns and as spokespersons against child labour and promoting youth employment.

7. Integrate gender fully in Project design and implementation (ILO, Jordanian Government)

ILO should ensure that <u>gender analysis is part of the preparations for new technical cooperation projects, and that gender planning is part of Project Documents/proposals, and fully integrated in designs and implementation</u>. Thus, in its recruitment of project staff, ILO must look for knowledge and experience (apart from management and technical skills) on how to integrate/mainstream gender issues in the implementation of a Project. Project practitioners must be able to move beyond inviting (and counting) women to participate in the project´s training and events - to appreciating that specific research and actions may be required to reach full and effective participation and equal opportunities. It should also be understood that "gender" also means that the needs and roles of *men and boys* should be analysed to guide activities in reaching the goals.

8. Ensure that results of eventual new study tours clearly relate to the Project´s goals and make follow up of how these have had an impact or contributed to improvements (ILO – relating all TA implementation)

ILO and involved constituents should ensure that if undertaking study tours, e.g. to other countries under ILO project budgets, <u>their purposes must explicitly be related to furthering the Project´s objectives prior to undertaking such visits</u>, and be accompanied by <u>a follow-up report by the constituents/stakeholders</u> explaining how new learning, knowledge and/or lessons and good practices will be transformed into action in relation to the Project´s goals. ILO should not endorse such visits if the above-mentioned requirements cannot be met.

9. Learn from, and share the Good Practices and lessons learned document (ILO, MOL, MOE, MOSD)

ILO and the ministries who have been involved in the project should ensure that the Good Practices and Lessons Learned document should be <u>shared and learned from</u> in particular in discussions on new technical cooperation in Jordan and possible in the region if adapted to other countries/cultures. It could also be very useful for organisations outside of the constituents, e.g. UNICEF, Save the Children, other NGOs working on child labour issues in particular.

Annex I. Terms of Reference

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Terms of Reference (ToR) for Final Independent Project Evaluation
"Moving towards a child labour free Jordan"

1. KEY FACTS	
TC Symbol	JOR/10/50/USA
Iris code	102511
Country	Jordan
Duration	63 months
Starting date	31 December 2010
Ending date	31 August 2016
Project language	English/Arabic
Executing agency	ILO-International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
Administrative unit	Regional Office for the Arab States (ROAS)
Collaborating ILO Units	FUNDAMENTALS; Employment; Social Protection; STATISTCS
Funding agency	United States Department of Labour (USDOL)
Donor contribution	USDOL: US$4,000,000

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

IPEC background

1. The aim of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child labour (IPEC) [54] is the progressive elimination of child labour, especially its worst forms. IPEC is programme implemented by within the Fundamental

---

[54] IPEC is an ILO programme implemented within the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work branch under the Governance and Tripartism department.
Please see http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/how-the-ilo-works/departments-and-offices/governance/fprw/lang--en/index.htm for more information.

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

2. 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. From the perspective of the International Labour Organisation (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 Programme should be analysed.

4. ILO Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) have subsequently been developed and are being introduced in the ILO to provide a mechanism to outline agreed upon priorities between the ILO and the national constituent partners within a broader UN and International development context. For further information please see:
http://www.ilo.org/public/english/decent.htm

5. The DWCP defines a corporate focus on priorities, operational strategies, as well as a resource and implementation plan that complements and supports partner plans for national decent work priorities. As such, DWCP are broader frameworks to which the individual ILO project is linked and contributes to. DWCP are beginning to be gradually introduced into various countries' planning and implementing frameworks.

6. In the Jordan DWCP framework, effective progress by Jordan national programme to eliminate child labour is under "Outcome 1.1: An enabling environment for the elimination of residual child labour is created." It fits within Priority 1: "Decent work opportunities for young Jordanian men and women are expanded through the promotion of better work conditions, non-discrimination and equal rights at work".

7. SGD Target 8.7 calls on all to take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of all forms of child labour as an essential step to achieving decent work for all, full and productive employment and inclusive and sustained economic growth.

Project Background

8. The IPEC project, "Moving towards a child labour free Jordan (2010-2014)," aims to build on the outcomes of the previous Country Programme, as well as the CHF International child labour project, also funded by the US Department of Labour (USDOL), entitled "Combating Exploitive Child Labour through Education (CECLE)" which was in place from 2008 to 2012. The project focuses mainly on policy level interventions, including capacity building, to create an enabling environment to support the implementation of policy and legislative frameworks.

9. The project will contribute to:

a) The ILO Global Action Plan that sets the internationally agreed goal of eliminating the worst forms of child labour by 2016 and the Roadmap for achieving the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour by 2016- adopted by the Hague Global Child Labour Conference on 10-11 May 2010;

b) The Jordan DWCP;

c) The implementation of national efforts to prevent and eliminate child labour by supporting the ILO Global Jobs Pact which outlines strategies to guide recovery from the present economic crisis.

10. The project's Development Objective is "*to create an enabling environment for the elimination of residual child labour in Jordan*".

It also has four immediate objectives:

1. By the end of the project, a mechanism for coordinating action to combat child labour at national and district levels and link child labourers and their families to improved educational provision and social protection will have been established.

2. By the end of the project, trends in child labour will be estimated, specific aspects of child labour in Jordan will have been researched and conclusions will have been used to inform policy decisions and guide direct action.

3. By the end of the project, the capacity of ILO constituents to implement the National Framework to Combat Child Labour will have been enhanced.

4. By the end of the project, the elimination of child labour and the promotion of youth employment will have been mainstreamed into the national development policy frameworks.

11. According to the midterm Project Implementation Review conducted in November 2012, **the project's main achievements were**:

• Awareness-raising and empowerment of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the National Framework on Child Labour and gradual identification of their capacity gaps;

• Dialogue and trust building with stakeholders for improved coordination facilitated through a technical committee, which has now been turned into a national committee with additional members;

• Information gathering about the different child labour initiatives that have taken place in recent years and those that are still on-going, as well as exchanges with the organizations in charge, in order to learn from experiences, build on complementarities and develop synergies;

• Informal mapping of sectors and regions where child labour is concentrated resulting in the identification of the following sectors: agriculture, mechanics, and tourism;

• Response to the stakeholder request for ILO/IPEC to facilitate exchanges on the impact of the influx of Syrian refugees on CL by organizing several consecutive meetings;

• Internal review of the project strategy by the project team which has resulted in a project revision request to be submitted to the donor following the project implementation review.

First Extension 2014

12. In July 2014, the ILO submitted a request for project extension and cost increases. The project time extension was approved by USDOL later in the year and the cost increase was approved in January 2015. The project implementation timeline was therefore extended from 48 to 63 months, with the new end date of 31 March 2016. The overall budget allocation was also increased from US$2,000,000 to US$4,040,000.

Without changes to overall project objectives, the new project deliverables, under the project extension, consist of:

a. The overall NFCL implementation in both the current piloting areas (via the referral system) and five new Governorates to be prioritized based on their overall vulnerability resulting from the refugee influx;

b. Building capacity of the new Child Labour Unit at the Ministry of Social Development, which has a mandate to address the needs of vulnerable families and children through their current programs, including Conditions Cash Transfers;

c. Conducting a full-fledged National Child Labour Survey (NCLS) in Jordan which will have a complete geographical coverage of all households residing within Jordan, including the Syrian refugee population that has multiplied in recent months;

d. Increasing ILO-IPEC's role in coordinating service provision amongst the relevant UN and NGO actors already involved on the issue of child protection within the Syrian refugee population in Jordan, particularly with regards to children found working or vulnerable to engaging in work.

In addition the project also envisaged developing a model for jointly addressing youth unemployment and child labour and conducting a regional workshop to share good practices emerging from the project.

Second Extension 2016

13. As there were significant delays in approving the contract for the National Child Labour Survey, a no-cost extension was sought from USDOL in October 2015 for a further period of 5 months. The request was granted and in March 2016, the project was further extended up to the 31st of August 2016.

Without major changes to the overall objectives, outcomes, or budget, the following activities were added:

a. Train 100 Social Workers on the revised guidelines on how to address child labour;

b. Train 300 teachers and school counsellors on the revised guidelines on how to prevent drop outs and address child labour;

c. Strengthen the implementation of the NFCL at governorate level;

d. Train 50 officials and inspectors from the ministries of Labour and Health and from municipalities on the new Occupational Hazards Indicators;

e. Support the revision and amendment of the NFCL in line with the findings of the Assessment of Impact.

14. As of May 2016, the Project has reported having achieved the following outcomes:

a. The enabling environment to eliminate child labour in Jordan remains stronger.
b. The NFCL has been rolled out it all governorates. An assessment of the impact of NFCL has been conducted, gaps identified and recommendations made.
c. The web based CLMS is operational and has been redesigned.
d. Training tools for government officials tackling child labour (MOSD Social Workers, Labour inspectors, Municipal Inspectors, School counsellors) have been developed or at the final stages of adopting.
e. The MOSD Child Labour Unit has been officially established and operational under a ToR and organogram approved by the Minister.
f. A new model to link youth employment and child labour has been successfully tested and is ready for replication.
g. Data collection from the National Child Labour Survey has been concluded and the report is expected to be released in June/July 2016.
h. A Child Labour Task Force has been established under the Child Protection Sub Working Group
i. Over 279 inspectors from the Greater Amman Municipality have been trained to monitor child labour
j. The Children's Municipal Council of GAM have been trained and empowered to be advocates against child labour

Project Management Structure

15. The project design envisaged that a Chief Technical Advisor will manage the project, and will supervise one National Project Coordinator and one Administration and Finance Assistant. In addition, a driver position was included for the period May 2015 to May 2016.

The project is decentralised in that it is managed by the Regional Office for Arab States. The CTA reports to the DWT Director. Technical backstopping is provided by IPEC (later FUNDAMENTALS) through the Senior Desk Officer for Europe, Central Asia and Arab States based in Geneva.

Evaluation Background

16. 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 Regional Evaluation Officer at the ILO ROAS provides an independent evaluation function for all ILO projects.

17. The project has undergone an independent mid-term evaluation managed by ILO-IPEC's Evaluation and Impact Assessment (EIA) in November 2012.

18. The project document states that a final independent evaluation will be conducted at the end of the project implementation.

19. ILO's established procedures for technical cooperation projects are followed for monitoring, reporting and evaluation of the project throughout the project cycle and at different stages of project execution. Specific components of the ILO's M&E plan include a multi-layered logical framework and work plan to measure the timely achievement of results at the activity and output level as well as change at the outcome and development objective level.

Monitoring of individual objectives and activities based on indicators in the logical framework feed into the progress reports. Biennial progress reports were submitted so far and are attached to this terms of references.

In addition, the project underwent an internal review part of the Jordan DWCP review conducted in 2014.

3. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Purpose

20. The main purposes of the final evaluation are:

   a. Establish the relevance of the project design and implementation strategy;
   b. Determine the implementation efficiency of the project;
   c. Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives at outcome and impact level and to identify the supporting factors and constraints that have led to this achievement or lack of achievement;
   d. Identify unintended changes, both positive and negative at outcome and impact levels, in addition to the expected results;
   e. Assess the relevance of the sustainability strategy, its progress and its potential for achievement, identifying the processes that are to be continued by stakeholders;
   f. Identify lessons learned and potential good practice, especially regarding models of interventions that can be applied further;
   g. Provide recommendations to project stakeholders to support the completion, expansion or further development of initiatives that were supported by the project.

Scope

21. The evaluation will focus on the ILO/IPEC programme mentioned above, its achievements and its contribution to the overall national efforts to achieve the elimination of Child Labour. The evaluation should focus on all the activities that have been implemented since the start of the projects to the moment of the field visits. (i.e. action programmes/projects)

22. The evaluation should look at the programme as a whole, including issues of initial project design, implementation, lessons learnt, replicability and recommendations for current and future projects.

Aspects to be addressed

23. The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation available at http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_168289/lang-en/index.htm and with specific ILO Guidelines and Notes, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.

24. Gender concerns should be addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: "Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects". 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 evaluation process.

25. In line with results-based framework approach used by ILO for identifying results at global, strategic and project level, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analysing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the Immediate Objectives of the project using data from the logical framework indicators.

26. Annex I contains specific suggested aspects for the evaluation to address. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluation team in accordance with the given purpose and in consultation with ILO's ROAS REO. It is not expected that the evaluation address all of the questions detailed in the Annex; however the evaluation must address the general areas of focus. The evaluation instrument (summarised in the inception report) should identify the general areas of focus listed here as well as other priority aspects to be addressed in the evaluation.

27. The main categories that need to be addressed are the following:
a. Relevance and strategic fit
b. Design
c. Achievement (Implementation and Effectiveness) of Objectives
d. Effectiveness of management arrangements
e. Efficiency
f. Sustainability
e. Impact orientation
f. Lessons learned and good practices

4. METHODOLOGY

28. The following is the proposed evaluation methodology. While the evaluation team can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by the REO and the Project, provided that the research and analysis suggest changes and provided that the indicated range of questions is addressed, the purpose maintained and the expected outputs produced at the required quality.

29. An independent evaluator will be hired by the ILO to conduct the evaluation.
The evaluation will be conducted through:
1- Desk Review:

The evaluator will review project background materials before conducting any interviews or trips to the country.

2-Briefing: The evaluator will interview the donor representatives and ILO/IPEC HQ and regional backstopping officials through conference calls or face-to-face interviews early in the evaluation process, preferably during the desk review phase. The objective of the consultation is to reach a common understanding regarding the status of the project, the priority assessment questions, available data sources and data collection instruments and an outline of the final assessment report.

3-Individual Interviews and/or Group Interviews:
Following the initial briefing, the desk review and the inception report, the evaluator will have a mission to Jordan and have meetings with constituents/stakeholders together with interpreters supporting the process if needed. Individual or group interviews will be conducted with the following:
a) Project Staff / consultants that have been active/hired on the project.
b) ILO ROAS DWT Director, RPU, and Senior Specialists in Gender, Employers' and Workers' Organizations, Skills, and Social Security;
c) ILO Headquarters technical departments;
d) USDOL representatives;
e) Interviews with national counterparts (government, public institutions, social partners, IPs, etc.);
f) Interviews with beneficiaries;
g) Other international agencies working in the relevant fields.

4-Debriefing:

The evaluator will debrief stakeholders at the end of the field visit to validate results. The national stakeholders' workshop will be held in Amman, and will be attended by ILO/IPEC staff and key stakeholders (i.e. partners), including the donor as appropriate. These will be an opportunity for the evaluator team to gather further data, present the preliminary findings for verification and discussion, present recommendations and obtain feedback. This will take place towards the end of the fieldwork.

The evaluator will be responsible for organizing the methodology of the workshops.
The identification of the number of participants of the workshops and logistics will be the responsibility of the project team in consultation with the evaluator.

5- Reporting: The evaluator will be responsible for drafting and finalizing the evaluation report. The findings of the evaluator will incorporate the feedback from the stakeholder workshops. The draft report executive summary will be circulated to stakeholders in Arabic for their feedback and comments. The evaluator will further be responsible for finalizing the report incorporating any comments from stakeholders as appropriate.

The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the ILO ROAS REO and with the logistical support of the programme office in Amman. The REO will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting it to the evaluator.

Evaluation timeframe

30.

Phase	Duration	Dates
Desk review	3 days	4-6 July
Inception report	2 days	11-12 July
Field mission	15 days	20 July – 11 August
Draft report	6 days	12-22 August
Consultation	2 weeks	22 August – 5 September
Final report	4 days	6-9 September

Total Level Of Effort: 30 days

Evaluation management

31. The evaluation team will report to ILO REO in ROAS and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with the REO, should issues arise. The ILO project office in Amman will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission.

5. MAIN DELIVERABLES

32. The main outputs of the evaluation consist of the following:
   - Deliverable 1. Inception report
   - Deliverable 2. Stakeholder debrief, PowerPoint Presentation (PPt), and minutes of meeting
   - Deliverable 3. Draft evaluation report
   - Deliverable 4. Final evaluation report with executive summary (report will be considered final after an additional review by EVAL. Comments will have to be integrated).
   - Translation of the final report to Arabic (Project team)

33. INCEPTION REPORT:
The evaluator will draft an Inception Report, which should describe, provide reflection and fine-tuning of the following issues:
   • Project background
   • Purpose, scope and beneficiaries of the evaluation
   • Evaluation criteria and questions
   • Methodology and instruments
   • Main deliverables
   • Management arrangements and work plan.

34. FINAL REPORT:
The final version of the report will follow the below format and be in a range of 30-35 pages in length, excluding the annexes:
   1. Title page
   2. Table of Contents, including List of Appendices, Tables
   3. List of Acronyms or Abbreviations
   4. Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
   5. Background and Project Description
   6. Purpose of Evaluation
   7. Evaluation Methodology and Evaluation Questions
   8. Status of outcomes
   9. Clearly identified findings
   10. A table presenting the key results (i.e. figures and qualitative results) achieved per objective (expected and unexpected)
   11. Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations (identifying which stakeholders are responsible)
   12. Lessons Learned
   13. Potential good practices
   14. Annexes (list of interviews, TORs, list of documents consulted, etc.)

35. The quality of the report will be assessed against the EVAL Checklists 4, 5, and 6.
The deliverables will be submitted in the English language, and structured according to the templates provided by the ILO.

6. LEGAL AND ETHICAL MATTERS

- This independent evaluation will comply with ILO evaluation guidelines and UN Norms and Standards.
- These ToRs will be accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluation "Code of conduct for evaluation in the ILO" (See attached documents).
- UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed through-out the independent evaluation.
- The consultant will not have any links to project management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

7. ATTACHED DOCUMENTS

The following is an initial list of documents. The consultant may be provided with further documents upon request.

1. Project Document
2. Grant Modification 1
3. Grant Modification 2
4. Grant Modification 3
5. Technical Progress Report October 2011
6. Technical Progress Report April 2012
7. Technical Progress Report April 2015
8. Technical Progress Report October 2015
9. Technical Progress Report April 2016
10. National Framework on Combatting Child Labour
11. NFCL Impact Assessment Report English translation
12. Child Labour Survey ToR
13. Child Labour Focal Points Training Package
14. Child Labour Electronic Monitoring Sys Design
15. Terms of Reference Child Labour TF
16. Child Labour Task Force Work Plan
17. Good Practices Report
18. International Youth Foundation August-November progress report

(**Annex I Suggested aspects to address**)

Relevance and strategic fit

1. Examine whether the project responded to the real needs of the beneficiaries and stakeholders, including specific target groups and sub-national areas.

2. Assess whether the problems and needs that gave rise to the project still exists or have changed. How did the project take the Syria crisis impact on child labour into consideration during its implementation and extension? Did the extension reflect the recommendations of the PIR and DWCP review with relation to emerging needs?

3. Did the strategy address the different needs and roles, constraints, access to resources of the target groups, with specific reference to the strategy of mainstreaming and thus the relevant partners, especially in government?

4. Assess the validity of the programme approach and strategies and its potential to be replicated and scaled-up.

5. How do project's objectives fit under the ILO Jordan Decent Work Country Programme for countries and broader development frameworks (UNDAF) as well as UNCT programming documents?

6. How do the project objectives respond to USDOL priorities in targeted countries?

7. Are the project objectives aligned with tripartite constituents objectives and needs?

Design

1. Determine the validity of the project design, in particular whether it assisted or hindered the achievement of the project goals as set out in the Project Document.

2. Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent:
    *   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)?
    *   Were the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives clear and logical?
    *   Were the different components of the project (i.e. capacity building, policy and legislation, awareness raising, direct action to beneficiaries, etc.) clearly and realistically complementing each other?
    *   How relevant are programme indicators and means of verification? Please assess the usefulness of the indicators for monitoring and measuring outcomes.
    *   Has the time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities been logical and realistic?
    *   Were the expectations of the roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders realistic and likely to be achieved?

3. Analyse whether available information on the socio-economic, cultural and political situation of Jordan was taken into consideration at the time of the design and whether it was reflected in the design of the project.

4. To what extent have key external factors been identified and assumptions formulated in the Project document? Have the identified assumptions on which the project was based, proven to be true?

5. 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.

6. Does the design of the project take into account the existing institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders (i.e. education, livelihoods, etc.)? Does it fit into existing mainstreaming activities that would impact on child labour?

7. How have gender issues been taken into account in the project design in its components and outcomes?

8. Has the strategy for sustainability of project results been defined clearly at the design stage of the project?

9. Does the project design fit within and complement existing initiatives by other organizations to combat child labour?

10. Assess the effectiveness of the project's monitoring and evaluation system. In general, are indicators SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant (to project goals), Time-bound)? Have plans for data collection and analysis matched plans for indicator reporting? Please also assess the efficacy and appropriateness of the project's written procedures and guidelines for verifying the accuracy/quality of data collected, and the actions taken to follow these procedures.

Effectiveness

1. Assess whether he project has achieved the planned outcomes (analysis of achievements and challenges by outcome is required, also focusing on the targeted numbers in the indicators).

2. Identify positive and negative factors (supporting and challenging issues) that arose during process. Assess how the project responded and adapted the implementation process in order to utilise/overcome these issues?

3. Assess how far the project has been able to mobilize the tripartite constituents (government, workers and employers) and other actors (civil society, UN, other development agencies) in the country in action against child labour and in contributing towards achieving the project's goals and objectives. What contributed to the commitment or lack of it on the part of constituents?

4. How has the project addressed the recommendations of the midterm evaluation and DWCP review? What has been the impact and if recommendations were not followed what were the reasons?

5. Assess the extent to which the project used media and public advocacy.

6. What unintended outcomes can be identified?

Effectiveness of management arrangements
1. Assess the impact of staff continuity/turnover on the project.
2. What was the division of work tasks within the project team and has the use of local skills been effective?
3. Review the value of support received from programme partner organizations and relevant ILO units (including ILO Geneva, Sub regional and Regional Office).

Efficiency
1. Assess the effectiveness of the programme i.e. compare the allocated resources with results obtained. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?
2. To what extent has the project been able to build on other ILO or national/regional initiatives and create synergies in cost sharing?

Sustainability
1. Assess the design of the sustainability strategy, and assess the progress of the strategy.

2. Determine the potential to sustain the gains of the project beyond its life and what measures are needed to ensure this.
3. Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners.
4. Focus on the sustainability of the project to build national level and governorate level government inter-agency coordinating mechanisms.

Impact orientation
1. What is the likely contribution of the project initiatives, including the approaches and methodologies to the stated development objective of the intervention?

2. Assess the role and contribution of the project to the impact of the NFCL.

Lessons learned/good practices
1. Identify and assess three good practices that have emerged as a result of this project, and the extent to which they are replicable.

Annex II. Evaluation instrument, methods and sources of data

The evaluation objectives are (below) translated into relevant and specific evaluation key questions **-** the evaluation instrument **-** to inform the development of the methodology. They are *examples* of questions posed to the ILO staff and to relevant constituents/stakeholders.

Regarding relevance – including relevance of the Project design

➢ What was the basis on which the Project was designed? Was any initial needs assessment, diagnostic study, or baseline study undertaken prior to, or at the start of the Project? Was any gender analysis carried out?

➢ To what extent has the Project responded to the needs of the beneficiaries and stakeholders?

➢ How did the Project take the Syria crisis impact on child labour into consideration during its implementation and phases after the extensions?

➢ How are the Project's objectives aligned with national policies and frameworks, including the Jordan DWCP and broader development frameworks (e.g. UNDAF and the UNCT programming documents)?

➢ 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)?

➢ Were the different components of the project (i.e. capacity building, policy and legislation, awareness raising, direct action to beneficiaries, etc.) clearly and realistically complementing each other?

➢ To what level was information regarding the socio-economic, socio-cultural and political situation of Jordan taken into account when designing the Project?

➢ What is the quality of the assumptions formulated in the Project document e.g. to what extent were assumptions specified at outcome level and to what extent were they formulated as being *outside of the control or influence* of the Project actors and stakeholders?

➢ How have gender issues been integrated, or mainstreamed in the Project design - in its components and outcomes? Was any gender analysis conducted at the start, or before the start-up?

Effectiveness

➢ To what degree has the Project achieved the planned outcomes and reached immediate objectives? If not fully achieved, which were the obstacles and reasons?

➢ How did the Project respond to the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation in 2012 and DWCP Review with relation to emerging needs?

➢ To what extent was the National Framework to Combat Child Labor tailored to match the specific needs of each Governorate?

➢ To which extent has the referral mechanism system served children in sectors that are most common in the following regions: Agriculture (Zarka and Amman); Street work (Irbid and Al Mafraq); and Tour guiding (Petra, Ma'an)?

➢ To what extent has the National Framework been translated into concrete actions? Which actions are required for the National Framework to deliver and be sustainable after the end of the project?

➢ How was the Project able to address, or impact, the level of capacity among ILO constituents? Which constituents have been involved and benefitted from capacity development activities and what capacity issues were addressed?

➢ How has the Project contributed to the institutionalisation of the capacity building tools that have been developed/revised during the implementation period?

➢ How has the Project been able to promote youth employment, and linkages between child labour and youth employments, at national levels?

➢ To what extent has the referral system served Syrian refugee children, especially those working in sectors where they are the most vulnerable, i.e. agricultural and street work?

➢ To what extent can it be assessed that the NCLS accurately reflects the child labour situation across all of Jordan?

➢ To what extent has the referral system served Syrian children especially those working in sectors where they are they are most vulnerable: agricultural and street work.

➢ To what level has the Child Labour Monitoring System (CLMS) been effective and sustainable?

➢ To what extent did the staff turnover impact on Project implementation and performance?

➢ Review the value of support received from programme partner organizations and relevant ILO units (including ILO Geneva, Sub regional and Regional Office).

Efficiency

➢ Assess the efficiency of the Project, i.e. compare the allocated resources with results obtained. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?

➢ To what extent has the Project been able to build on other ILO or national/regional initiatives and create synergies in cost sharing?

Impact orientation and likelihood of sustainability

➢ What is the likely contribution of the Project initiatives, including the approaches and methodologies to the stated development objective of the intervention?

➢ To what extent has the Project contributed to any impact resulting from the NFCL?

➢ What contributions are the result of the Project regarding the strengthening of the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders? What contributions have been made to encourage ownership among the ILO constituents and Project partners?

Relevance
Relevance is here understood as the extent to which the Project´s activities are in line with the priorities and policies of the country/stakeholders and (direct, indirect, ultimate) beneficiaries, as well as the ILO itself and the development partners (donor agency).

Overall:

• What was the basis on which the Project was designed? Was any initial needs assessment, diagnostic study, or baseline study undertaken prior to, or at the start of the Project? Has any gender analysis been carried out?

• To what extent has the Project responded to the needs of the beneficiaries and stakeholders?

• To what extent do the problems that gave rise to the Project still exist? Have they changed?

- How did the Project take the Syria crisis impact on child labour into consideration during its implementation and phases after the extensions?

- How are the Project's objectives aligned with national policies and frameworks, the Jordan DWCP and broader development frameworks (such as UNDAF and the UNCT programming documents)?

Design of the Project (Project Document/Logical Framework Analysis):

To what degree is the Project design valid? Has it facilitated or hindered the achievement of the project goals? To what extent was the Project design logical and coherent, i.e.:

➢ 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)?

➢ Were the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives clear and logical?

➢ Were the different components of the project (i.e. capacity building, policy and legislation, awareness raising, direct action to beneficiaries, etc.) clearly and realistically complementing each other?

➢ How SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound) are programme indicators and how relevant are the means of verification?

➢ In the M&E system - to what extent have plans been made for data collection and analysis – and if so have they matched plans for indicator reporting?

➢ Has the time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities been logical and realistic?

➢ Were the expectations of the roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders realistic and likely to be achieved?

➢ To what level was information regarding the socio-economic, socio-cultural and political situation of Jordan taken into account when designing the Project?

➢ What is the quality of the assumptions formulated in the Project document e.g. to what extent were assumptions specified at outcome level and to what extent were they formulated as being *outside of the control or influence* of the Project actors and stakeholders?

➢ How have gender issues been integrated, or mainstreamed in the Project design - in its components and outcomes? Was any gender analysis conducted at the start, or before the start-up?

➢ To what level has the strategy for sustainability of project results been defined clearly at the design stage of the project?

➢ Does the project design fit within and complement existing initiatives by other organizations to combat child labour?

Effectiveness
Effectiveness is here understood as relating to the extent to which activity/strategies reach or contribute to meeting the stated objectives.

Overall:

To what degree has the Project achieved the planned outcomes and reached immediate objectives? If not fully achieved, which were the obstacles and reasons?

How did the Project´s extension/s deal with the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation in 2012 and DWCP Review with relation to emerging needs?

Questions under Project Objective 1:

A) To what extent was the National Framework to Combat Child Labor tailored to match the specific needs of each Governorate?

To which extent has the referral mechanism system served children in sectors that are most common in the following regions: Agriculture (Zarka and Amman); Street work (Irbid and Al Mafraq); and Tour guiding (Petra, Ma'an)?

B) To what extent is the environment enabling, or positive, for reaching results vis-à-vis the set outcomes and objectives? To what extent has the National Framework been translated into concrete actions? Which actions are required for the National Framework to deliver and be sustainable after the end of the project?

Question under Immediate Objective 2:

What specific policy improvements are the results of the Project´s actions - at local and central level, respectively?

Question under Immediate Objective 3:

A) How was the Project able to address, or impact, the level of capacity among ILO constituents? Which constituents have been involved and benefitted from capacity development activities and what capacity issues were addressed?

B) How can the ILO contribute to the institutionalisation of the capacity building tools that have been developed/revised during the implementation period?

Questions under Project Objective 4:

A) How has the Project been able to promote youth employment, and linkages between child labour and youth employments, at national levels?

B) How has the Project worked with the up-grading of informal apprenticeship activities – and do opportunities exist for expansion and up-scaling of the activities?

Questions for new project deliverables within First extension phase:

Deliverable a:

To what extent has the referral system served Syrian refugee children, especially those working in sectors where they are the most vulnerable, i.e. agricultural and street work?

Deliverable b:

To what extent is the Child Labour Unit, Ministry of Social Development, equipped to identify and address the needs of children working in the informal sector? Are there any capacity issues to be concerned about, in relation to sustaining this work at the unit after the closing of the Project?

Deliverable c:

To what extent can it be assessed that the NCLS accurately reflects the child labour situation across all of Jordan?

Deliverable d:

To what extent has the referral system served Syrian children especially those working in sectors where they are they are most vulnerable: agricultural and street work.

Question on CLMS:

To what level has the Child Labour Monitoring System (CLMS) been effective and sustainable?

- ➢ Specifically: i) To what extent will the CLMS be functional at the close of the Project? ii) To what extent were stakeholders able to access the CLMS and use it to ensure that child labourers were provided services?

- ➢ Which positive factors, and which challenging issues arose during the process? How did the Project respond and adapt to the implementation process in order to utilise/overcome these issues?

- ➢ How far has the Project been able to mobilize the tripartite constituents (government, workers and employers) and other actors (civil society, UN, other development agencies) in the country in action against child labour and in contributing towards achieving the project's goals and objectives?

- ➢ What contributed to the commitment, or lack thereof, on the part of constituents?

- ➢ How has the project addressed the recommendations of the MTE and DWCP review? What has been the impact- and if recommendations were not followed, what were the reasons?

- ➢ To what extent has the Project used media and public advocacy?

- ➢ What unintended outcomes of the Project can be identified?

Effectiveness of management arrangements

- ➢ To what extent did the staff turnover impact on Project implementation and performance?

- ➢ What was the division of work tasks within the Project team, and has the use of local skills been effective?

- ➢ Review the value of support received from programme partner organizations and relevant ILO units (including ILO Geneva, Sub regional and Regional Office).

Efficiency

Efficiency is here understood as a measurement of the outputs (qualitative and quantitative) in relation to the inputs. It is applied to assess/determine whether the least costly resources possible were used to reach the intended results.

- ➢ Assess the efficiency of the Project, i.e. compare the allocated resources with results obtained. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?

- ➢ To what extent has the Project been able to build on other ILO or national/regional initiatives and create synergies in cost sharing?

Impact orientation and likelihood of sustainability

Impact is here understood as concerned with the positive and/or negative changes produced by the Project directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators. This also includes the positive and negative impact of external factors, such as changes in terms of e.g. policy and socio-economic conditions.

- ➢ What is the likely contribution of the Project initiatives, including the approaches and methodologies to the stated development objective of the intervention?

- ➢ To what extent has the Project contributed to any impact resulting from the NFCL?

- ➢ What is the quality of (the design of) the Project´s sustainability strategy?

- ➢ What is the likelihood of sustaining the gains of the Project beyond its life and what measures are needed to ensure this?

- ➢ What contributions are the result of the Project regarding the strengthening of the capacity and knowledge of national stakeholders? What contributions have been made to encourage ownership among the ILO constituents and Project partners?

- ➢ To what extent has the Project made efforts in building national level, and governorate level, inter-agency coordination and mechanisms for increased coordination?

Lessons learned/good practices

- ➢ Which are the key lessons and good practices that have emerged as a result of this Project?

Annex III. Questions sent by e-mail

The following are brief sets of questions sent in e-mails to ILO and UN agencies:

Questions to Project staff

1 Project design

This relates to the objectives, outcomes, activities, duration, staff, location, target group, beneficiaries, and/or number of stakeholders and more – of the Project?

1.1 How relevant and/or realistic was the design? Should it have been designed in any other way (pls. indicate if you comment on the <u>original or revised project design</u>).

2 Working relationships with constituents and stakeholders

2.1 How do you view the fruitfulness of the working relationship with the government agencies involved (MoL, MoE, MoSD - and their Governorates – DOS and University of Jordan or other GOs)?

	Very good	Quite satisfactory	Not satisfactory	Bad
MoL				
MOE				
MOSD				
Governorates (pl specify if possible)				
DOS				
UOJ				
Other (pls. specify				

Any comments?.....................................

2.2 How do you view the fruitfulness of the working relationship with the Chamber of Commerce and Chamber of Industry (pls specify the organisation)?

	Very good	Quite satisfactory	Not satisfactory
CoC			
CoI			

Any comments?.....................................

2.3 How do you view the fruitfulness of the working relationship with the Project´s cooperation with the General Federation of Jordanian Trade Unions (GFJTU) (or any other workers association) (please specify the organisation)?

	Very good	Quite satisfactory	Not satisfactory
GFJTU			
Other			

Any comments?......................................

2.4 How do you view the fruitfulness of the working relationship with the following international organisations?

	Very good	Quite satisfactory	Not satisfactory
UNICEF			
UNHCR			
Save the Children			
IYF			
Other			

Any comments?......................................

2.5 How do you view the fruitfulness of the Project´s (earlier) working relationship with the large national "royal organisations" (including JOHUD and National Council for Family Affairs)?

	Very good	Quite satisfactory	Not satisfactory
JOHUD			
NCFA			
Other similar (specify)			

Any comments?......................................

3. Support received from ILO

3.1 How do you view the quality of the support received from ILO ROAS?

Excellent	Sufficient	Not sufficient

Any comments?...

3.2 How do you view the quality of the support received from ILO HQs?

Excellent	Sufficient	Not sufficient

Any comments?...

Explain if you want: …………….

4 Project´s overall achievements or lack thereof

4.1 How do you view the Project´s (overall) achievements to date?

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Not satisfactory

Any comments?...

4.2 Which achievements or impact are you most proud of/pleased about?

4.3 Which were the factors that led have to achievement/success?

4.4 Which major activities/outputs/outcomes have <u>not</u> been accomplished (as foreseen, planned)

4.5 Which factors do you think hindered non-achievements?

4.6 Have you faced any (work-related) obstacles or challenges? If "yes", which are they?

4.7 Were you able to overcome the challenge or solve the problem? Yes – no

Any comments?...

5. How do you view the level of team work & team spirit in the Project team?

Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Not satisfactory

Any comments?...

6. Do you have any particular suggestions for the Way Forward for ILO regarding addressing child labour in Jordan? If yes, which are they?

Questions to ILO Headquarter and ROAS staff

1 Project design

1.1 The Project has undergone a number of revisions, extension and staff changes. In hindsight, how relevant and/or realistic was the underlined original Project design?

1.2 How do you view the process and/or result from revising the Project design in 2012, which included revision of outputs, adding new activities and budget allocations?

1.3 How do you view the process and/or result of revising the Project in 2015?

2 Management performance

2.1 Under the circumstances - to what extent were Project managers performing satisfactorily (this refers to implementation, communication, maintaining good working relationships with constituents and stakeholders, timeliness and quality of reporting).

CTA (12/10 – 31/10, 2013)

	Very good	Quite satisfactory	Not satisfactory

NPC (01/11 2013 – 10/04/2014)

	Very good	Quite satisfactory	Not satisfactory

Consultant (17/4 2014 – 30/11/2014) - *recruited to follow up on the project*

	Very good	Quite satisfactory	Not satisfactory

CTA (16/04/2015 to date)

	Very good	Quite satisfactory	Not satisfactory

Any comments?................................

3 Quality assurance

3.1 How has the Project managers handled "quality assurance", e.g ensuring access and utilisation of knowledge and experience within ILO - particularly regarding child labour related issues and experience?

This refers to contributions by the Project to e.g. policy-level discussions, workshops and training manuals.

	Very good	Satisfactory	Not satisfactory
Phase 1			
Phase 2			
Phase 3			

Any comments?..

4 Level of commitment to the Project by the GO agencies

From your understanding and perspective at HQs - how do you view the commitment to the Project and the contributions made to the Project objectives – by the following organisations:

	Very good	Satisfactory	Not satisfactory
MoL			
MOE			
MOSD			
DOS			
UOJ			
Other (pls. specify			

Any comments?.....................................

5 Level of commitment to the Project objectives by organisations representing the Employers

How do you view the commitment to the Project and the contributions made to the Project objectives – by the following organisations:

	Very good	Satisfactory	Not satisfactory
Chamber of Commerce			
Chamber of Industry			

Any comments?.....................................

6 Level of commitment to the Project objectives, and contributions by the Workers Organisations

How do you view the commitment to the Project and the contributions made to the Project objectives – by the following organisation/s:

	Very good	Satisfactory	Not satisfactory
GFJTU			
Other Workers associations			

Any comments?......................................

7 Fruitfulness of working relationships and/or contributions to the Project

How do you view the fruitfulness of the working relationships with the Project and the contributions made to the Project objectives – by the following organisations:

	Very good	Satisfactory	Not satisfactory
UNICEF			
Save the Children			
UNHCR			
International Youth Foundation			
Others (including national organisations)			

Any comments?...

8 How do you perceive the level of team work & team spirit in the current Project team?

Excellent	Good	Not good

Any comments?...

9 Any *other* comments about the Project and its performance – feel free to express:

Questions to UNICEF

1. Your working contacts with the Project

Since the launch in 2010, the Project has been managed by two Chief Technical Advisers (CTAs). During periods in between their tenures in Amman, other staff have managing the Project, for instance between 01/11/2013 and 30/11/2014), awaiting new funds for activities.

Please indicate during which periods you were in contact with the Project, and/or the Project CTA/manager?

Period: 12/10/2011 – 31/10/2013 (CTA as manager)?.............

Period: 01/11/2013 – 10/04/2014 (National Project Coordinator as manager)?..........

Period: 17/4 2014 – 30/11/2014 (Consultant as manager)?.............

Period: 16/04/2015 to date (CTA as manager)?.............

2. Your overall perception/assessment of the performance of the Project

According to what you know about the Project - how would you assess the level of performance of the Project?

Very good	Medium level	Not satisfactory

Elaborate on this if you wish…………………………………….

3. Contact with ILO – other than this Project

Apart from your contacts with the Project, have you also been in contact with any other ILO projects implemented in Jordan, or other ILO staff (working from Amman; Beirut, or ILO HQs) in relation to its activities on *child labour, youth employment*, or other?

If yes, please mention briefly which events, or circumstances………………………

4. ILO´s role as a player among other organisations in Jordan

4a) To what extent has the ILO Project played an important role (policy role) in the area of combatting child labour in Jordan?

4b) To what extent has the Project played an important role in promoting linkages between child labour and youth employment?

	Very important	**Fairly important**	**Not significant**	**Don´t know**
Policy-related work on Child Labour				
Linkages between CL and Youth Employment				
Any other area/topic (be specific)				

Elaborate on this if you wish…………………………………….

5. Do you have any *other* comments related to the above?

…………………………………………………………………………..

Questions to UNHCR

1. Your working contacts with the Project

Since the launch in 2010, the Project has been managed by two Chief Technical Advisers (CTAs). During periods in between their tenures in Amman, other staff have managing the Project, for instance between 01/11/2013 and 30/11/2014), awaiting new funds for activities.

Please indicate with a **X** during which periods <u>you were in contact with the Project</u>, and/or the Project CTA/manager?

<u>Period:</u> 12/10/2011 – 31/10/2013 (CTA as manager)?.............

<u>Period:</u> 01/11/2013 – 10/04/2014 (National Project Coordinator as manager)?..........

<u>Period:</u> 17/4 2014 – 30/11/2014 (Consultant as manager)?.............

<u>Period:</u> 16/04/2015 to date (CTA as manager)?.............

2. Regarding ILO addressing needs of Syrian refugee children

2a) According to what you know about the Project – has it addressed Syrian refugee children, and/or their families, in its policy work or implementation?

<u>If your answer is "yes"</u>, please mention if you can, <u>what </u>was addressed by the Project and <u>how:</u>

…………………………………………………..

2b) To what extent has the work been important, according to you?

	Very important	Fairly important	Not significant	Don´t know
ILO addressing the needs of (Syrian) refugee children & families *(policy-related work on Child Labour)*				
Any other area/topic (be specific)				

3. Do you have any *other* comments related to the above?

....

Annex IV. Summary achievements on reaching Outputs (2011 – 2016)

Output No.	Output content (including the changes made)	Achieved/not achieved
Output 1.1	NCLC and Task Force expanded and linked to a national inter-ministerial body for the protection of children.	Achieved (the first NCLC took place on 6 Feb 2012)
Output 1.2	Child Labour Monitoring Institutional Framework is set up and integrated into NFCL.	Achieved
Output 1.3	CLMTs are set up at the local level in focal areas	N.A. – this output was deleted in the 2012 project/budget revision
Output 1.4	CLM referral system is operational and integrated into NFCL.	Structures created but not operational at the time of this Evaluation
Output 1.5	A web-enabled CLMS Database is designed and maintained.	Achieved but late, and needs maintenance
Output 2.1	Module on child labour and youth employment is incorporated in the DOS Labour Force Survey	Achieved only once (year), as a stand-alone pilot case.
Output 2.2	Qualitative surveys on child labour and youth employment are conducted.	Achieved
Output 2.3	In-depth data collection on specific worst forms of child labour is conducted.	Achieved
Output 3.1	The capacity of the Child Labour Units at MoL and Ministry of Social Development is enhanced	Achieved
Output 3.2	The capacity of key partners including labour inspectors on Child Labour Monitoring to raise awareness on CL and youth employment is enhanced	Achieved
Output 3.3	The capacity of service providers to address specific needs of girls and boys involved in child labour and their families is enhanced.	Achieved
Output 3.4	"The capacity of employers organisations to address child labour and youth employment is enhanced.	Not achieved
Output 3.5	The capacity to address child labour and youth employment issues is enhanced	Achieved
Output 3.6	The capacity of local governments to raise awareness on CL and youth employment is enhanced	Achieved
Output 4.1	The NFCL is monitored and reviewed, including the integration of the CLMS	The impact of the framework was reviewed and assessed.
Output 4.2	Revised hazardous child labour list made known and disseminated	Achieved – but was made part of a Hazardous Manual – not separate list
Output 4.3	Child labour and Youth Employment issues mainstreamed into the national development policy frameworks	Achieved
Output 4.4	Regional cooperation on child labour and youth employment is strengthened	Achieved
Output 4.5	Impact assessment towards institutionalization of the NFCL implementation model is conducted	Achieved (this was an added activity)

Annex V. Lessons learned and good practices

The below are the good practices lessons learned, discussed and disseminated in an ILO regional workshop (source: "Moving Towards a Child Labour Free Jordan, Good Practices, ILO):

Good Practice No. 1

Jordan rolled out the National Framework to Combat Child Labour (NFCL) on a pilot basis from 2013, starting with five governorates. To support the implementation of the Framework, a Technical Working Group was set up at the central level and coordination mechanisms were established at governorate level. A web-based child labour database was created and over 200 officials from three ministries (Labour, Social Development and Education) were trained on the NFCL.

Lessons learned

- Going beyond the ratification of Conventions, a national framework is very important to support action to combat child labour in a country. A national framework not only gives an official mandate to relevant ministries and organisations to act on the issue but it also serves as a common platform for the coordination of efforts and division of roles and responsibilities.

- A national framework can only be effective if it is implemented on the ground. Policy frameworks need to be translated into action, and to kick start the process, both the government and the international community need to make investments, particularly during the initial stages. Capacity building and the development of infrastructure is an important component of that investment.

- Having a Technical Working Committee and the support of an ILO consultant was crucial to the successful roll out and implementation of the NFCL on the ground.

- The NFCL roll out could have been more effective if it had been coupled with an annual work plan to set specific targets for all actors collectively as well as for each actor individually, with clear milestones and indicators.

Good Practice No. 2

Each calendar quarter, Jordan's Department of Statistics (DOS) conducts a labour force "Employment and Unemployment" survey covering all persons aged 15 years and above from a nationwide sample of 13,360 households. For each local region (governorate), the survey collects information on gender, education, employment status, sector of employment, job category and wage level. In 2014, with the support of the ILO, the DOS included a module on child labour in the survey. The results of these questions were analysed separately to get specific information on child labour.

Lessons Learned

- Even when it is challenging to conduct national child labour surveys frequently, there are opportunities within the country to increase and update its knowledge on child labour through incorporating child labour questions into other national surveys. The quarterly Employment and Unemployment Survey is such a good opportunity.

- The incorporation of child labour questions in other national surveys can be a cost efficient method since the overhead costs are covered by the principal survey. Additional costs are only incurred for the separate analysis of data.

- A challenge in using other surveys as vehicles to collect data on child labour is that the scope and amount of information obtained through them are limited to the scope of the survey in question. In this case, the data was limited to children aged between 15 and 18, thus providing a limited picture of the child labour situation.

Good Practice No. 3

Ministries and agencies mandated to address child labour need practical tools to guide inspectors on the application of child labour laws and the Hazardous Work List. In 2013, Jordan developed a simplified manual for labour inspectors to enable them to identify and address hazardous child labour. In 2015, the ILO supported Jordan in further developing the manual, including guidance on action to be taken in various scenarios.

Lessons Learned

- It is not enough to have policies and legislations in place; it is also important to back them up with tools and mechanisms to implement them

- Developing effective tools for inspectors is an important aspect of building their capacity. Tools give the inspectors guidance on what kind of appropriate action can be taken in the various scenarios they come across, in addition to giving them the confidence to address hazardous work.

- Manuals and guidelines have to be periodically updated so that they remain relevant to changing contexts and situations, and conform to new knowledge.

Good Practice No. 4

The USDOL funded ILO project was designed in 2010 and implementation began in 2011, before the unfolding of the Syria crisis. When the conflict in Syria intensified and hundreds of thousands of refugees started flowing into the country from 2012 onwards, a UN-led humanitarian response was launched to address the emergency. Even though the ILO's project was exclusively focused on policy and systems development, the ILO, in consultation with USDOL, responded to the situation and incorporated activities focused on the crisis. By doing this, the project was able to make a much needed contribution to the humanitarian response and remained relevant to the evolving context.

Lesson Learned

- In times of crisis and in fragile situations, a flexible approach is needed to address emerging problems. Rigidly sticking to pre-crisis plans may make projects ineffective and irrelevant to new contexts. Such refocusing does not mean disregarding past achievements, but rather building on these and linking them to the present context.

- The following basic lessons have been learned through the ILO initiatives mentioned above: first, it is important to rapidly assess the situation and the needs of the affected communities; secondly, as well as analysing what is needed, it is vitally important to be able to respond quickly with concrete actions that have a real impact on the population affected by the crisis and to gain credibility; and thirdly, it is essential to work with and through local stakeholders to empower them to be better equipped and resilient, should the crisis last over a prolonged period of time.

- The ILO should invest more in research about the link between the right of Syrian refugees to work and child labour. Preventing Syrian refugees from working has a direct adverse effect on child labour.

Good Practices No. 5

A centralized database was created to facilitate information sharing between the three key ministries involved in the implementation of the National Framework to Combat Child Labour (NFCL). With the support of the ILO, the system was developed and field based officers from the Ministries of Labour, Social Development and Education were given on-the-ground responsibilities to register child labour cases and share information. This significantly reduced the amount of time and resources spent on meetings and paperwork, and created a centralized database accessible from anywhere at any time.

Lessons Learned

- In a middle income country like Jordan, an electronic database accessible through intranet can significantly bridge the physical and bureaucratic gap between officials of different ministries who have to work together in addressing child labour cases. The initial investment entails some costs and may require external resources, but once the system is established it can be maintained at a relatively low expense.

- The transition process from paper based documentation to electronic documentation has to be done gradually. An overnight shift from one system to the other can on the one hand generate resistance, particularly from officers who are not familiar with the use of computers and electronic devises, and on the other hand can slow down the progress of some activities that require direct interaction between officials.

- Sponsors of centralised databases need to receive firm prior commitment from the ministries that utilising the database will be part of the implementing officers' job functions. Without this obligation, a risk exists that the system will not be fully utilised.

Good Practices No. 6

The ILO and the International Youth Foundation (IYF) developed a successful model of linking child labour and youth employment through upgrading informal apprenticeships and implementing a programme targeting 120 youth between the ages of 16 and 24. Through a scientifically developed training curriculum, 120 situations of child labour and/or potentially exploitative situations were converted into apprenticeships where the youth engaged in a learning process leading to better career and employment opportunities.

Lessons Learned

- Upgrading informal apprenticeships is an effective way of tackling child labour, particularly in situations where the child is of legal working age but is engaged in hazardous child labour. This can be done by ensuring the child is not engaged in any dangerous tasks and by converting the work place into a safe and healthy learning environment through training and increasing the awareness of not only the child but also the employer and the co-workers about workplace hazards and risks.

- The apprenticeship programme can be significantly strengthened by involving a mentor. The mentor is usually a qualified trainer, who visits the work site on a regular basis, develops a training plan for the apprentice together with the employer and the youth in a participatory manner, monitors and provides advice on the progress of the training.

- Traditional child labour programmes in Jordan have mainly provided life skills and vocational training to children in an ad hoc manner. Bringing in advanced methods and tools such as market analysis, development of occupational standards, the use of DACUM processes etc. significantly increased the quality of the programme, increased its relevance to the local context and strengthened the motivation and commitment of the participants and employers.

Good Practices No. 7

In 2014, ILO started to work with the Greater Municipality of Amman (GAM) to maximise their potential as a municipal authority to address child labour in the Capital Governorate. The Greater Amman area hosts more than half of the country's entire population. It has 279 municipal inspectors who have access to almost all business establishments, market places, industries and informal work locations and can make a significant contribution to tackling child labour. The ILO conducted a Training of Trainers for 20 senior municipal health inspectors in 2015 who in turn trained their peers, thereby making GAM a key player in monitoring child labour in the city.

Lessons Learned

- Involving non-traditional partners and actors in combatting child labour can significantly increase the impact and effectiveness of the programme as they bring new perspectives, skills and additional advantages with them. It falls upon the primary actors to constantly look for and reach out to non-traditional actors and broaden the coalition to combat child labour.

- The role and potential of municipal inspectors in combatting child labour is often neglected. Given their wide presence throughout the country and their mandate that allows them to inspect almost any and every workplace in their area of jurisdiction, they are ideally placed to contribute to the elimination of child labour.

Good Practices No. 8

The Social Programmes Department of the Greater Amman Municipality provided support to the Children's Municipal Council, empowering children to become committed advocates on child labour issues. With the ILO's support, 83 Child Municipal Councillors were trained and they have now become among the most vocal and effective advocates on the issue.

Lessons Learned

- Children have proven to be powerful, committed and highly influential advocates for combatting child labour. Their presence and involvement is less threatening to employers. Children can access the families of working children with relatively less cultural barriers, and working children themselves are more open to listening to their peers. Engaging and empowering children can be a highly effective way to raise awareness and mobilise action against child labour.

- When working with children, it is important to always keep in mind what is in the best interests of the child. Their involvement in such programmes should not, for example, be at the cost of their studies but rather complement their education in becoming responsible citizens.

- While the importance of awareness raising in the context of combatting child labour is well known, new methods and approaches need to continually be explored. A lot can be gained by being open to and supporting new and innovative ideas coming from various actors who may not be 'expert' specialised organisations or traditional actors.

Good Practices No. 9

In Petra, tackling child labour can be linked to other issues, such as the protection of the cultural heritage and animal welfare. Given the unique situation, the ILO joined forces with the Care for Petra campaign and supported the development of an Action Plan that was accepted by the Petra Development and Tourism Regional Authority (PDTRA), effectively incorporating child labour issues into PDTRA's overall plan.

Lessons Learned

- While promoting national systems and mechanisms, it is important to be aware of unique situations that require unique solutions and make use of emerging opportunities at the right time. Child labour in Petra could have remained unaddressed for a long time had there not been a special focus and a special approach to address it.

- It is well known that child labour is interlinked with other socio economic issues such as poverty, illiteracy and marginalisation. But in some situations, as in that of Petra, there can be links with other very specific, unconventional issues such as the treatment of animals and preserving cultural heritage. Addressing child labour thus requires equally unconventional partnerships between actors who have very different mandates. Such partnerships can be quite effective in developing focused and unique approaches to addressing the problem.

Project Title: Moving towards a Child Labor Free Jordan
Project TC/SYMBOL: JOR/10/50/USA

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander   **Date:**
30/11/2016

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	**Lessons Learned** Upgrading informal apprenticeships is an effective way of tackling child labour, particularly in situations where the child is of legal working age but is engaged in hazardous child labour. This can be done by ensuring the child is not engaged in any dangerous tasks and by converting the work place into a safe and healthy learning environment through training and increasing the awareness of not only the child but also the employer and the co-workers about workplace hazards and risks.
Context and any related preconditions	Traditional child labour programmes in Jordan have mainly provided life skills and vocational training to children in an ad hoc manner. Bringing in advanced methods and tools such as market analysis, development of occupational standards, the use of DACUM processes etc. significantly increased the quality of the programme, increased its relevance to the local context and strengthened the motivation and commitment of the participants and employers.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Children (girls and boys) who are of legal working age but who are engaged in hazardous child labour.

Project Title: **Moving towards a Child Labor Free Jordan**
Project TC/SYMBOL: **JOR/10/50/USA**

Name of Evaluator: **Lotta Nycander**   **Date:**
30/11/2016

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	• The challenge of developing workable models on linking child labour issues with youth employment. • The relatively higher costs of pilot activities/projects. The apprenticeship projects need to involve a mentor or qualified trainer, who visits the work site on a regular basis, develops a training plan for the apprentice together with the employer and the youth in a participatory manner, monitors and provides advice on the progress of the training. • The challenge of engaging participants in non-traditional skills training or apprenticeships for example, e.g. for girl, such as making them interested in occupations other than traditional girl/women occupations, i.e. going beyond tailoring, handicraft etc. and received training in ITC, retail, food production, carpentry, mechanics, printing, hospitality and more.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	The International Youth Foundation (IYF) in Jordan developed a successful model of linking child labour and youth employment through upgrading informal apprenticeships and implementing a programme targeting 120 youth between the ages of 16 and 24. Through a scientifically developed training curriculum, 120 situations of child labour and/or potentially exploitative situations were converted into apprenticeships where the youth engaged in a learning process leading to better career and employment opportunities.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	ILO has much experience from many countries in this area and should ensure that apprenticeships programmes are carefully designed and implemented through (preferably) Civil Society Organisations. If possible pilots should be arranged involving both the private sector and governments – i.e. through some kind of Public Private Partnership, with careful monitoring and support by the ILO.

Project Title: Moving towards a Child Labor Free Jordan
Project TC/SYMBOL: JOR/10/50/USA

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander   **Date:**
30/11/2016

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element   **Text**

Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	**Lessons Learned** Going beyond the ratification of Conventions, a **national framework is very important to support action to combat child labour in a country**. A national framework not only gives an official mandate to relevant ministries and organisations to act on the issue but it also serves as a common platform for the coordination of efforts and division of roles and responsibilities.
Context and any related preconditions	A national framework can only be effective if it is implemented on the ground. Policy frameworks need to be translated into action, and to kick start the process, both the government and the international community need to make investments, particularly during the initial stages. Capacity building and the development of infrastructure is an important component of that investment. Having a Technical Working Committee and the support of an ILO consultant was crucial to the successful roll out and implementation of the NFCL on the ground. The NFCL roll out could have been more effective if it had been coupled with an annual work plan to set specific targets for all actors collectively as well as for each actor individually, with clear milestones and indicators.

Project Title: Moving towards a Child Labor Free Jordan
Project TC/SYMBOL: JOR/10/50/USA

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander   **Date:** 30/11/2016

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	The targeted users were, in this project, the designated officials (child in labour focal points), within each of the three ministries involved, i.e. MoL, MoE and MoSD. They were also viewed by the Project as beneficiaries, while the ultimate beneficiaries were the child laborers.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	- As the Project got a late start with a CTA who was not recruited and in place until November 2011 – another organization with financial support by USDOL, had created and finalized a NFCL without technical input from ILO. This framework was not sufficiently inclusive, as for instance, no civil society organization was involved in the implementation, which is a assessed missed opportunity. - The high labor turnover of those working on the implementation of this framework was a challenge, and a clear weakness in the application of the computerized follow-up system, lack of funding and increased workload for the employees. - When rolling out the NFCL to the remaining Governorates in 2015-16, and re-training in the "old" pilot Governorates there was a lack of awareness about the existence of the framework among many government officials participating in the training, and a lack of knowledge about the reasons that it had been put in place and added to their work load. - It is here assessed that at central level it is evident that stakeholders, including the Ministry officials involved in child labour issues, have an enhanced understanding and knowledge about how it should work but have not been able to convince this Evaluation that it works in practice yet.

Project Title: **Moving towards a Child Labor Free Jordan**
Project TC/SYMBOL: **JOR/10/50/USA**

Name of Evaluator: **Lotta Nycander**   **Date:**
30/11/2016

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	Project was able to reactivate the dormant NFCL and raise interest and awareness and increase empowerment of stakeholders involved in the framework.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	It is crucial that ILO advocates for inclusive approaches to such frameworks, not only in the representation of the high level national committees but at ground level, in this case in the Governorates. Emphasis on including civil society may not be sufficient but may require resources to be allocated for external technical support when setting up new systems.

Annex VI. Validation Workshop 16 August (presentation and participant list)

The below is the text was used in the PPT presentation of the final evaluation of the *Moving towards a Child Labour free Jordan,* on 16th August 2016, at Hotel Millennium, Amman.

The main topics were outlined to be the following:

<u>Slide 1. This presentation is about:</u>

Key facts about the Project; About the Evaluation – what it is (criteria, instrument, methods); Background to ILO's involvement in child labour issues in Jordan; Achievements; Challenges; Strengths and Opportunities (in implementation).

<u>Slide 2. Key facts about Project</u>

"Moving towards a child labor free Jordan" – a policy oriented & capacity development project implemented by ILO and Government agencies in Jordan (MoL, MoE, MoSD) and Governorates

Development partner (donor): US Labour Department.

Other partners and stakeholders: Employers (CC and CI) & Workers associations (GJTU), GAM, DOS, Centre for Strategic Studies (CSS) (UoJ), MoI, and NGOs (IYF). Intern´l organisations (UNICEF, Save the Childeen, UNHCR) members in NSC.

Indirect beneficiaries: Working children (child labourers and youth). Project budget: first amount: US$2,000,000, increased to a total of US$4,040,000 in 2014-2015 (Large part for the Child Labour Survey).

<u>PPT 3. Key facts about Project (continued)</u>

Time line of implementation period: 2011 – 2016 (Project launched in Oct 2011)

- 1st extension with large cost increase, approved Jan 2015 (funds from other USDOL projects). Time line extended from 48 to 63 months.
- 2nd extension (sought Oct 2015 due to delays in appr contract for NCL survey) approved in March 2016.
- 3rd extension to 31st of August 2016.

PPT 4. Project staff & changes

Current project staff: CTA came April 2015, one NPC (20%), one admin officer, one driver.

- Chief Technical Adviser 12/10/2011 – 31/10/2013 = **<u>24 mts</u>**
- NPC (01/11 2013 – 10/04/2014) = **<u>5 mts</u>**
- Consultant (17/4 2014 – 30/11/2014) – to <u>follow up</u> on project activities, contact with ministries & stakeholders = **<u>7 mts</u>**
- Chief Technical Adviser (16/04/2015 to date) = **<u>16 mts</u>**
- 3 different administrators

PPT 5. About the Evaluation

Purpose, scope & evaluation criteria

- Purpose: Provide recommendations to support the further development of initiatives that were supported by the project.
- Scope: All major activities implemented since the take off in 2011 – to date
- Evaluation criteria (OECD-DAC): Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact orientation & sustainability

PPT 6. Evaluation instrument (examples of questions)

• How did the Project take the Syria crisis impact on child labour into consideration..? How are objectives aligned with national policies? To what extent was the Project design logical? Was any gender analysis made before, or at the start of the Project? (relevance)

• How were the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation in 2012 handled? To what extent has the NFCL been translated into concrete actions? How has the referral mechanism served children working in agriculture, street work and tourism (Petra)? (effectiveness)

• Did the results obtained justify the costs incurred (efficiency)

• To what extent has the Project contributed to any impact resulting from the NFCL? What is the quality of Project´s sustainability strategy? (impact and sustainability)

PPT 7. Evaluation instrument (examples of questions continued)

• Which lessons are learnt?

• Are there any good practices – to be replicated in other programmes, countries/regions?

• How has issues related to gender concerns been handled (in design, implementation, follow up)?

PPT 8. Methodology

▪ Qualitative methods are used to gather both qualitative and quantitative data and information (quantitative data from secondary sources).

▪ Methodological triangulation to increase the credibility & validity of the results, minimise bias.

▪ Documentation review, meetings, in-depth interviews (face-to-face and through Skype still work in progress). Data gathering in Jordan for 2 ½ weeks.

PPT 9. Aim of the Project

Overall objective: Enabling environment for the elimination of residual child labour in Jordan. Four immediate objectives:

1. A mechanism for coordinating action to combat child labour at national and district levels and link child labourers and their families to improved educational provision and social protection will have been established

2. Trends in child labour will be estimated, specific aspects of child labour in Jordan will have been researched and conclusions will have been used to inform policy decisions and guide direct action

3. Capacity of ILO constituents to implement the National Framework to Combat Child Labour will have been enhanced

4. Elimination of child labour and the promotion of youth employment will have been mainstreamed into the national development policy frameworks

PPT 10. How to meet the objectives?

Strategy:

Focus on policy level interventions particularly to ensure (particularly WFCL) is integrated into GO policy frameworks & that families of child labourers become the special target group for poverty alleviation and social protection schemes

Key words: Coordination & capacity building of concerned ministries, social partners & CSOs in implementation of NFCL (referral mechanism in this framework is based on identifying & registering data,

capturing child labour cases through labour inspection services and referrals to MOE and MOSD for solutions re. formal/ non-formal education, social services and cash support).

Approach: Take care of « residual pockets of CL". Build on the results from earlier ILO-IPEC programmes, data from DOS-SIMPOC survey, CECLE baseline survey, study on hazards faced by chilldren, studies by National Council for Family Affairs on the impact of CL on physical and psychological health.

PPT 11. How to meet the objectives? Continued.

In total 18 outputs designed to meet objectives:

- Studies/surveys (NCLS added to original project design)
- Integration of CL monitoring framework & operational referral system into NFCL
- Increased capacity among constituents/stakeholders
- Development of online user-friendly child labour database/system where datas can feed into all 3 ministry systems (added to original project design)
- Assessment of NFCL (added to original project design

PPT 12. Findings on: Background to ILO´s involvement in child labour issues in Jordan

PPT 13. Background

- ILO's work on CL in Jordan - already in 2000 helping to set up CLU in MOL - and since then ILO IPEC involved through various activities, building capacity and awareness-raising.
- The first comprehensive CL field sample survey was carried out already in 2001 (Labour Inspection Directorates, MOL) interviewing 2,539 children at their work places.
- ILO partnered with CECLE (USDOL-funded) project, managed by CHF International which ended in July 2012 *(re. evaluation report of CECLE).*

PPT 14. Background (continued)

- The policy (NFCL) was initiated by the National Council of Family Affairs. Was adopted by the government August 2011 - several months **before start-up** of new IPEC project.
- Current project was developed (designed) in 2010-11- relying on numbers of CLs from a HH survey in 2007-2008 by DOS and SIMPOC, **showing 37,760 children (2.1%)** of the 1,785,596 children in Jordan between the ages of 5-17 **were economically active.**
- Documents refer to a belief that the current CL Project could contribute to significantly reduce CL in Jordan within a short period (Project was to end in 2014). Jordan would be a country to reach the target of **eliminating the worst forms of child labour by 2016.**

PPT 16. Preliminary findings on: Achievements and Challenges

PPT 17. Project´s response to Syrian crisis

Huge Syrian refugee influx to Jordan in 2012 –new dimension for the Project which had started before the refugee influx (end 2011). CL among Syrian refugee population increased sharply.

Project was very early engaged in dialogue with UN agencies (thematic working groups and task forces coordination on Syrian refugees, issues of Child Protection/Gender-Based Violence etc. Much focus was on Za'atari camp). Project CTA proposed to have concrete, close cooperation with UNICEF. MOL made appeals to ILO and UNHCR to provide extra support to Inspectors.

ILO HQs was reluctant to endorsing changes to original focus of project. Eventually some activities were undertaken as Project´s response to the Syrian crisis:

Piloting NFCL in 2013 in areas with high incidence of refugees: Mafraq, Irbid, Amman, Zarka

PPT 18. Project´s response to Syrian crisis, continued

- Conducting rapid assessments on child labour among Syrian refugees in the agriculture and urban informal sectors (commissioned by ILO ROAS).

  Monitored child labour incidences among Syrian refugees in the pilot implementation areas – in dialogue with the humanitarian organisations.

- Acquired new funds to conduct the National Child Labour Survey making efforts to have *Syrian refugee children participate* in the survey (and one refugee camp was included with assistance of Ministry of Interior).

- Contributed to development of Danida CL project with focus on Syrian children (18 mts, ends in 2018, budget € 347,000)

PPT 19. Situation of Child Labour in Jordan 2016

- Today - National Child Labour Survey (implemented under ILO project, 20,000 plus 2 HHs which includes Syrian children) has presented its results.

- Found that working children are 75,982 – which includes 69,661 child labourers - of which 44,917 work in hazardous conditions

PPT 20. Examples of policy-oriented activities

- Making efforts to put in place the NFCL and enhance capacity to activate it. includes setting up CL Committees & "linking" them with local service providers also beyond the (current) Ministries of Labour, Education and Social Development (compl. April 2016), and testing & upgrading it and "rolling out" to all Governorates.

- Adapting legal framework to international standards in the development of the draft by-laws for Articles 31 to 36 of the Juvenile Law of 2014 that identifies children engaged in Child Labour as 'children in need of protection'. Submitted to Minister, MOSD.

- Incorporating Child Labour concerns in the Jordan Response Plan as protection issue.

- Supporting and working through a Child Labour Steering committee

- Developing models on involving children to spread messages on child labour (ex: GAM´s work)

- Developing models on linking CL issue with youth employment (through e.g. IYF) – (apprenticeships)

- Initiating and leading a Task Force to find solutions to child labour and protection issues in Jordan – with international agencies (not taken off yet, initiated February 2016).

PPT 21. Structures put in place..

- A CL Technical committee – project supporting it and (revived) CLU.
- NFCL - Piloted in Amman, Mafraq and Zarqa Governorates in 2013..
- then Ajloon, Jarash and Madaba in 2015,
- then all CL committees in March 2016 in all 12 governorates. 65 government officials were trained in 3 locations.

- Staff of ministries of Labour, Social Dev´t and Education and other stakeholders as relevant trained on online CL database and given passwords.
- CLU, MoSD – Project helped formalise CLU (approved Feb 2015). Former CL Focal Point is heading the Unit (now 3 staff).

PPT 22. Capacity enhanced..

Capacity development has involved (examples):

Hundreds of officials persons trained on: ILO & CL conventions & Decent Work Agenda; systems and frameworks (e.g. online database and systems of referrals as part of the NFCL); OSH training of labour inspectors in detecting hazardous work among CLs and many more topics; vocational training of youth through an NGO and more..*(evaluation has requested breakdown of training data, incl. gender disaggregated info).*

Training Manuals produced: For social workers on addressing CL; for School Counsellors on preventing drop-out; for Labour Inspectors on referral system & identifying & addressing hazardous labour; for Master Trainers of MoSD for training of social workers.

PPT 23. But NFCL not actively in use..

Evaluation has found no evidence that NFCL is operated as intended (yet) e.g. systematic efforts to refer/remove child labourers from work and provide social protection or education.

Database is at time of evaluation not in operation although practical demonstrations that it works have been made and training done. Officers claim: "It doesn´t work" "I cannot enter Database (no access?)", or even: "There is no datbase".

Focal Points want more regulatory framework/mandate to make contacts with other ministries.

Work overload - many other issues to deal with - at local GO levels (esp. since Syrian crisis).

Lack of **equipment.**

NB: At some point (2013) NFCL reportedly was in use but **committee meetings stopped (in Governorates)** when Project did not provide funds to hold meetings for instance (gap in Project impl. funding in 2014).

PPT 24. Recent high-level meeting with 3 Ministries

High-level officials in June 2016 agreed to:

Revise Inspectors´ job descriptions to include CL work as duty.

- Review the NFCL (an Assessment Report already exists from 2016 w. recommendations to CL National Steering Committee)
- Continue to encourage use of Database (it was demonstrated in the meeting). (Danida project can take on maintenance).
- Officials should: Produce own work/implementation plans; Do fund-raising (proposals for support); Implement plans with *targets* for continued work (ILO project provided model work plans).

PPT 25. Challenges faced

Within Ministries: Frequent staff changes, incl. Governorate levels - a hindrance in sustaining knowledge & routines. Not adequate dedicated work to set NFCL in motion.

Within ILO Project: Project design faulty (original period for 1ˢᵗ CTA was too short to accomplish tasks). Project extensions after 1ˢᵗ CTA led to discontinuity in staffing and "fallow" periods of awaiting new funding for activities - seriously affected results.

First CL database version had problems in design (e.g. not "child centric", so was easy to make mistakes). Fixing it was time consuming and use of new system delayed - as new training of inspectors was required (all Governorates).

PPT 26. Strengths and Opportunities

- Among stakeholders evaluation met - ILO is seen as lead agency, now "driving" CL issues in Jordan.

- Critical mass GO officers & stakeholders have enhanced capacity and awareness raised among stakeholders.

- The results of the CL study should generate new interest, targets and strategies and action among GO, and NGO/SCOs

- Good Practices documented should benefit a wider audience (national, international stakeholders and experts in the fields of child labour elimination and child protection)

- Child labour has meaningfully been placed in a larger context through the London conference on Syrian refugees - created funding opportunities for addressing child labour.

- Strengths & Opportunities (continued)

- There are potential partners for child labour monitoring (CLM) among Chamber of Commerce (already in), Workers federation (was not been much involved), NGOs, private sector with emphasis fund raising and CSR..

- Learn lessons from Danida-funded short-time CL project (Syrian children) will assist help solve any problems with CL Database. Also a new ILO project proposal exists with possible funding from new donor.

- More learning and monitoring through the new Task Force on child protection.

- Monitoring the outcome of the Juvenile law (expected to take long time..)

PPT 27. What is the way forward? (questions for the Group Work)

- Should the NFCL be broaden (who – how?) How to enhance commitment for it?

- CLU (MOL) needs up-grading– to ensure adequate managerial capacity and dedicated staff to lead the CL work in ministry.

- MOE has no CLU – should it have one..? What is needed?

- How to encourage/ensure Gov´t puts more HR, funds, other resources in planning and follow up and to run systems that are in place?

- What is overall required to ensure child labourers are removed from hazardous work and protected? More regulations? Instructions to officers? More capacity development?

Participants in the Validation Workshop, Tuesday 16th August, 2016, at the Grand Millennium Amman Hotel, Jordan.

#	Name of Participant	Organization
1.	Abeer Al-Brim	ILO Consultant
2.	Sheeraz Almukhaimer	United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
3.	Lana Bani Hani	Jordan Chamber of Commerce (JOCC)
4.	Mohammad Alfoqaha	The Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development (JOHUD)
5.	Munir Asad Ahmad	Consultant
6.	Adel Lutfi	Consultant
7.	Nahayat Dabdub	ILO
8.	Rima Alqaisi	International Youth Foundation (IYF)
9.	Isabella Taillofat	Consultant (Petra Development Tourism Region Authority (PDTRA))
10.	Insaf Nizam	ILO
11.	Lars Johansen	ILO
12.	Nathalie Bavitch	ILO
13.	Choascharaon Lsrimsmain	Consultant
14.	Ahmad Albadareen	Consultant
15.	Ahmad Alshhaidat	Ministry of Social Development (MOSD)
16.	Mahmoud Mashaal	Ministry of Education (MOE)
17.	Shireen Altayeb	Ministry of Labour (MOL)
18.	Sana Alhyari	Save the Children

Annex VII. Documents consulted

Project Document, International Labour Organisation

Technical Progress Report, Jordan, 27 April 2016 (covering October 2015 to 31 March 2016).

Technical Progress Report, Jordan, 24 October 2015 (covering 1 April 2015 to 30 September 2015)

Technical Progress Report, Jordan, 24 April 2015 (covering 1 October 2014 to 31 March 2015)

Technical Progress Report, Jordan 29 October 2014 (covering May 2014 - 30 Sept 2014)

Technical Progress Report, Jordan, 30 April 2014 (covering 1 October 2013 - 30 April 2014)

Technical Progress Report, Jordan, 1 April 2013 (covering 30 Sept 2013 - 30 Oct 2013)

Technical Progress Report, Jordan 23 April 2013 (covering 1 Oct 2012 - 31 March 2013)

Technical Progress Report, Jordan, 18 March 2012 (covering 1 October 2011 to 31 March 2012)

Status report, Jordan, 21 January 2012 (covering 1 October 2011 -31 December 2011)

Technical Progress Report, Jordan, 1 Oct 2012 (covering 1 April 2012 - 30 Sept 2012)

Technical Progress Report, Jordan, 22 October 2011 (covering 1 April 2011 - 31 September 2011)

Technical Progress Report, Jordan, 5 May 2011 (covering 31 December 2010 - 31 March 2011)

Project budget and Work Plans

Mid Term Evaluation report, ILO

Guidelines and materials produced by the Project (in Arabic)

Jordan Decent Work Country Programme (2015-2016)

Jordan Decent Work Country Programme (2010-2014)

Performance and Monitoring Plans (PMP) (USDOL)

Jordan Vision (JV) 2025 plan

Jordan's Executive Development Plan 2011-2013

National Employment Strategy

National Agenda 2006-2015

World Employment Social Outlook Trends for Youth 2016, ILO

Project proposal to Danida entitled "*Tackling child labour among Syrian refugees and their host communities in Jordan*", ILO, March 2015.

The Twin challenges of Child labour and Youth employment in the Arab States, An overview 2015, ILO.

Project concept note (to USDOL): "*End Child Labour among Refugees and Host Communities in Jordan*", by ILO ROAS

DWCP - Stocktaking of country context preparation process and practices, Lotta Nycander), DWCL Country Level Policies Information & Knowledge Management (unpublished report, ILO Headquarters, Geneva, October 2012).

Final Evaluation, Combating Child Labor through Education Project (CECLE) in Jordan, August 30, 2012

ILO EVAL Guideline for Inception Reports, ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-based Evaluation: principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations (2013) and ILO Guidance Note No.4: Integrating Gender Equality in Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects (March 2014).

UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (up-dated June 2016)

Inter-Agency, Baseline Report, Vulnerability Assessment Framework, May 2015, available at http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/download.php?id=8844. …..

"Moving Towards A Child Labour Free Jordan". A Collection of Emerging Good Practices / International Labour Office, Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS) - Geneva: ILO, 2016

Impact Assessment of the National Framework for Combating Child Labour in Jordan during its Pilot Phase, 2011-2015, Final Report, Prepared by Adel Lutfi, ILO Consultant, January 2016

Jordan Response Plan (JRP)

National Framework for Combating Child Labor, Jordan, 2011 (no Author mentioned)

Final Evaluation, Combating Child Labor 5hrough Education Project (CECLE) in Jordan, August 30, 2012, report by Nahla Hassan Independent Development and Communication Consultant

A Report on the Status of Child Labour in Jordan 2001, by Dr. Mohammed Shahateet and Nihaya Issa Dabdub, July 2002

Survey Analysis, December 2006, Ministry of Labour and ILO. This study was in effect restricted to hazardous work.

Country Partnership Framework for Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan for the period FY17-FY22, June 15, 2016. Document of the World Bank Group, Report No. 102746-JO (p.1).

Jordanian reversal on Syrian work permits starts to bear fruit, By Yolande Knell, BBC News, Ramtha, Jordan, BBC article.

Syrians having easier access to jobs in Jordan — UNHCR, Article in Jordan Time, April 25th, 2016, By Mohammad Ghazal.

Child labour doubles in Jordan since 2007 – Survey (source: http://www.ilo.org/beirut/media-centre/news/WCMS_510750/lang--en/index.htm)

Child Labour and Youth Employment Linkages, Phases I and II, An independent final evaluation, 2008, by Lotta Nycander

Mid Term Evaluation Final Report ILO Project on Education and Skills Training for Youth (EAST) Technical Cooperation project INS/06/15/NET, an Independent Evaluation, by Lotta Nycander, Michael Sachsse, Sinta Satriana, Martin Sirait.

Annex VIII. Persons consulted and interviewed

ILO regular staff, Project staff, former staff and development partner (donor)

Snezhi Bedalli, Senior Programme and Operations Officer (Europe/Arab States) ILO HQs, Geneva

Nick Grisewood, ILO HQs, Geneva

Azfar Khan, Head of Research and Knowledge Building Unit, ILO HQs, Geneva

Frank Hagemann, DRD- DWT Director, ILO ROAS, Beirut

Lars Johansen, Chief RPU, ILO ROAS, Beirut

Lama Oueijan, Senior Employers Specialist, ILO ROAS, Beirut

Mustapha Said, Workers Specialist, ILO ROAS, Beirut

Ursula Kulke, Senior Regional Social Security Specialist, ILO ROAS, Beirut

Amin Al-Wreidat, Labour Inspection & Occupational Safety and Health Specialist, ILO ROAS, Beirut

Nathalie Bavitch, Regional M&E Officer, ILO ROAS, Beirut

Shaza Aljundi, Desk Officer, ILO, ROAS, Beirut

Sanaa Abou Sleiman, Programme Assistant, ILO ROAS, Beirut

Insaf Nizam, Chief Technical Advisor, ILO Project, Amman

Patrick Daru, Country Coordinator – Jordan & Sr. Skills Specialist, ILO, Amman

Maha Katta, Response Coordinator Syrian Refugee Crisis, ILO, Amman

Mohammad Sarhan, Project Assistant, ILO Project, Amman

Nihayat Dabdoub, National Program Officer, ILO Project, Amman

Bijoy Raychaudury, ILO Consultant (Former ILO Staff/SIMPOC)

Choascharaon Lsrimsmain, ILO Consultant

Christine Carlson-Ajlani, Project Manager, US Labour Department, Washington

Other international organisations

Sana Al Hyari, Child Protection Adviser, Save the Children

Rafiq Khan, UNICEF

Zaina Jadaan UNHCR

Rima Al Qaisi, Program Director, International Youth Foundation, Amman

Banan Al Jarrah, Case Manager Supervisor, Terre des Hommes

Government of Jordan

Mahmoud Mashaal, Child Labour Liaison focal point, Ministry of Education

Secretary General, Ministry of Labour

Hamada Abu Nigmehl (former Secretary General, Ministry of Labour)

Abdallah Jbour, Director of Labour Inspection Directorate, Ministry of Labour

Shireen Al Tayeb, Head of Child Labour Unit, Ministry of Labour

Focal Point, Ministry of Labour, Irbid Governorate

Focal Point, Ministry of Education, Irbid Governorate

Mahmoud Al Hrout, Director of Social Defense Directorate, Ministry of Social Development

Ahmad Al Sheidat, Head of Juvenile and Probation Department, Ministry of Social Development

Dr. Ahmad Abu Haidar, Director of Policies & Strategies, Ministry of Social Development

Nancy Abuhayyaneh, Head, Social Services Department Greater Amman Municipality

Ikhlas Aranki, Assistant Director, Department of Statistics, Jordan

Dr. Musa Shteiwi, Centre for Strategic Studies, University of Jordan

Employers

Lana Bani Hani, Head of Human Resources Department, Child Labour Liaison Officer, Jordan Chamber of Commerce

Anan Zeitoun, Head of SME Technical Support Unit, Jordan Chamber of Industry

Workers

Khaled Al Habahbeh, Public Relations Officer, General Federation of Jordanian Trade Unions

National organisations

Mohammed Al Foqha, Director of Child Labour Program, The Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development (JOHUD)

Mai Sultan, Policies & Data Senior Specialist, National Council for Family Affairs

National consultants

Dr. Munir Assad, IT Consultant, Amman

Isabelle Veronique, Consultant, Amman

Adel Lutfi Abedalrahim, Consultant/Trainer, Amman

Abeer Al-brim, Consultant, Amman

Ahmad Albadareen, Consultant

Annex IX. Project key events: Topics and participants in numbers

No	Key events organised by the Project	Organisations	No of events	Year	No (days)	Attending (all)	Female
1	Inter-Ministerial Planning Workshop on Piloting of the National Framework on Child Labour	MOL, MOSD,GAM, Save the Children, Local community	1	2012	2	50	16
2	Inter-Ministerial Planning Workshop on Piloting of the National Framework on Child Labour	Supporting the implementation of the National Framework on (NFCL)	1	2012	2	10	4
3	Child Labour in Tourism in Petra - Stakeholders' Workshop	MOL,MOSD,GAM, Save the children, Local and NGO community Patra	1	2012	2	63	20
4	Capacity-Building of Trade Unions on National Framework for Child Labour	Trade Unions on National Framework for Child Labour	1	2012	2	24	8
5	Regional Workshops NFCL Roll-Out Activities at the Governorates Level	MOL,MOSD, GAM,	1	2012	1	50	19
6	Capacity Assessment for Ministry of Education,	MOE	1	2012	2	32	12
7	1st National Children's Conference on Child Labour, 18-19 June 2013, World Day Against Child Labour 2013	MOL,MOSD, GAM, Save the children, Local community	1	2013	2	120	42
8	ILO-EJABI-JCI Workshop on Integrating Child Labour into EJABI Training Curricula for Employers/Managers, EJABI, Amman, 4 February 2013	JCI member organisations	1	2013	1	11	8
9	ILO-EJABI-JCI Workshop on Integrating Child Labour into EJABI	JCI member organisations	1	2013	1	15	8
10	Capacity Needs Assessment, CL Unit & Inspectorate Child Labour Focal Points	MOL	1	2013	2	35	9
11	Media Workshop on National Framework on Child Labour	Media	1	2013	1	42	24
12	Workshop on Pilot Implementation of National Framework to combat child labour in Al-Rusayfah, Zarqa Governortate	Zarqa Governorate, MOL,MOSD,MOE, Save the Children, and local and NGO	1	2013	2	60	35
13	Trade Union Action Plan Development for the National Framework to Combat Child Labour	Trade Unions on National Framework for Child Labour	1	2013	2	35	10
14	Workshop on Integrating Child Labour into the Labour Force Survey	DOS, UNICEF and Save the Children International. NFCL	1	2013	2	25	7
15	IPEC Jordan and Child Labour Unit in Study Tour, Brasilia, Brazil	Child Labour Unit, MOE , ILO	1	2013	3	2	2

No	Key events organised by the Project	Organisations	No of events	Year	No (days)	Attending (all)	Female
16	Workshop on implementation National Framework to Combat Child Labour and the Occupational Safety and Health Manual	MOL\CLU	1	2014	2	30	10
17	Support NFCL activities five governorates of Jordan at district level	MOSD, MOE, MOL	3	2015	6	60	25
18	NFCL Roll-Out activities at the old and new Governorates Level.	MOSD, MOE, MOL	5	2015	10	125	50
19	Training of MOSD social workers on CL issues	MOSD	1	2015	4	22	5
20	Technical Start Up Meeting of the NCLS	JUCSS, DOS, MOL and ILO national NCLS consultant and Team.	1	2015	2	25	8
21	impact assessment the NFCL in Jordan, through the piloting phase	MOSD,MOL,MOE, Save the Children, GAM JTU	1	2015	1	17	8
22	Technical Committee within MOE to Review the MOE Manual	MOE	1	2015	1	12	4
23	Capacity building of MOSD Staff (Workshop in Turin)	MOSD, MOE,MOL	1	2015	6	5	3
24	Training Workshop to Support NFCL Roll-out Activities in Petra.	MOL and the Petra Authority it was decided that the next NCSL	1	2016	1	35	12
25	Training Workshops for Jordan MOSDOn Manual for Probation Officers and Social Workers to limitation child labuor in training in Aqaba	Probation Officers and Social Workers at Jordan MOSD	1	2016	3	21	8
26	Training Workshops for Jordan MOSD, MOE, MOL On Child Labour Database	Focal Point and data entry Officers from concerned agencies	1	2016	3	15	1
27	Support NFCL Roll-out Activities in Petra	MOL and the Petra Authority	1	2016	1	30	10
28	the Good Practices Sub Regional Workshop	Palestine, Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, Tunis, Egypt.	1	2016	2	50	19
29	Training Workshops for Jordan MOSD On Manual for Probation Officers and Social Workers to limitation child labuor in two provinces (Irbid and Amman) of Jordan	Probation Officers and Social Workers at Jordan MOSD	3	2016	3	58	31
30	Training Workshops for Jordan MOE On Manual of Students Protection against Evasion and Early Joining of Labor Market (Irbid, Aqaba and Amman) of Jordan	School Teacher and Counselors at Jordan Mol	3	2016	3	68	30
31	Training Workshops for Jordan MOE, MOSDt, MOE, MOH, Training Corporation, GAM, Vocational On Manual of Hazardous Forms of Child Labour (OSH)	OSH Officers and Labour Inspectors	2	2016	3	45	20

No	Key events organised by the Project	Organisations	No of events	Year	No (days)	Attending (all)	Female
32	Training Workshops for Jordan MOE, Ministry of Social Development and Ministry of Labour On Child Labour Database	Focal Point and data entry Officers from concerned agencies	2	2016	3	52	16
33	SCREAM training on Child Labour	University student, GAM, Children, local community	1	2016	6	25	17
	TOTAL No. of participants:					**827**	**546**