



International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)



International  
Labour  
Office

# ***IPEC Evaluation***

## **Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in West Africa and Strengthening Sub-Regional Cooperation through ECOWAS I and II**

**P.340.10.100.051 - RAF/09/51/USA**

**P.250.07.100.053 - RAF/10/53/USA**

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

Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria

Original version

April 2014

**This document has not been professionally edited.**

## NOTE ON THE EVALUATION PROCESS AND REPORT

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

The evaluation was carried out by a team of external consultants<sup>1</sup>. The field mission took place in February and March 2014. The opinions and recommendations included in this report are those of the authors and as such serve as an important contribution to learning and planning without necessarily constituting the perspective of the ILO or any other organization involved in the project.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> **International Evaluators:** Andrew Gilboy, Team Leader, and Ghana and Nigeria; Yacouba Konate, Benin; Cheikh Tidiane Toure, Côte d'Ivoire.

**National Evaluators:** Adabanke Akinrimisi, Nigeria; Fred Afari, Ghana; and KAM Oleh, Côte d'Ivoire.

## Table of contents

<b>Abbreviations.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Executive summary .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>1. Evaluation methodology .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Approach.....	1
1.2 Principal Evaluation Questions.....	2
1.3 Scope and limitations .....	2
1.4 Interviews and site visits.....	3
<b>2. Analysis of information gathered and findings.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Design .....	5
2.1.1 <i>Logical framework</i> .....	6
2.1.2 <i>Findings</i> .....	6
2.2 Effectiveness and efficiency .....	9
2.2.1 <i>Program achievements by output</i> .....	9
2.2.2 <i>Finding: achievements by outputs</i> .....	16
2.2.3 <i>Finding: number of direct beneficiaries</i> .....	17
2.2.4 <i>Finding: capacity-building</i> .....	18
2.3 Potential Impact .....	18
2.3.1 <i>Increase in understanding of the types and definitions of the WFCL</i> .....	18
2.3.2 <i>Regional awareness of the gravity and extent of the WFCL has increased and momentum emerged to take action</i> .....	18
2.4 Relevance.....	19
2.4.1 <i>Findings</i> .....	19
2.5 Sustainability .....	20
2.5.1 <i>Findings</i> .....	20
2.6 Special aspects .....	22
2.6.1 <i>Unanticipated impact</i> .....	22
2.7 Implemented recommendations from the mid-term evaluation .....	22
2.8 Conclusions.....	23
2.9 Lessons learned.....	25
2.10 Potential good practices .....	27
<b>3. Recommendations .....</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1 For the ILO/IPEC in designing future project .....	29
3.2 For the USDOL.....	30
3.3 For stakeholders.....	30
<b>Annex I: Terms of Reference (ToR) .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Annex II Summary of evaluation findings by output by project .....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Annex III: Direct intervention sites .....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Annex IV: ILO/ECOWAS symposium on WFCL .....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Annex V: DBMR forms used by Ecowas I&amp;II projects.....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Annex VI: Comments noted regarding the DBMA.....</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Annex VII: List of persons interviewed.....</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Annex VIII: Evaluation matrix.....</b>	<b>102</b>

## Abbreviations

<b>AP</b>	Action Programme
<b>CCP</b>	Cocoa Communities Project
<b>CCPC</b>	Community Child Protection Committees
<b>CL</b>	Child Labour
<b>CLMS</b>	Child Labour Monitoring System
<b>CLU</b>	Child Labour Unit
<b>CSO</b>	Civil Society Organisation
<b>DBMR</b>	Direct Beneficiaries Monitoring Report
<b>DCPC</b>	District Child Protection Committees
<b>DWCP</b>	Decent Work Country Programme II
<b>ECOWAS I and II</b>	Acronym of ILO-IPEC project “Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in West Africa and Strengthening Sub-Regional Cooperation in West Africa”
<b>ECOWAS</b>	Economic Community of West African States
<b>GCLMS</b>	Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System
<b>HCL</b>	Hazardous List for Child Labour
<b>IA</b>	Implementing Agency
<b>ILO</b>	International Labour Organisation
<b>IMF</b>	International Monetary Fund
<b>IPEC</b>	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
<b>MESW</b>	Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare, Ghana
<b>MTE</b>	Mid-term Evaluation
<b>MOU</b>	Memorandum Of Understanding
<b>MOWAC</b>	Ministry Of Women And Children’s Affairs, Ghana
<b>MWASD</b>	Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development, Nigeria
<b>M &amp; E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>NAP</b>	National Action Plan
<b>NAPTIP</b>	National Agency for the Prohibition of Traffic in Persons
<b>NECPAD</b>	Network For Community Planning And Development
<b>NECPLEC</b>	National Programme For The Elimination Of Worst Forms Of Child Labour In Cocoa
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organization
<b>NSC</b>	National Steering Committee (Comité Directeur National de Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfants)
<b>OSH</b>	Occupational Safety and Health
<b>OVC</b>	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
<b>PPP</b>	Public-Private Partnership
<b>PRODOC</b>	Original Project document
<b>RCI</b>	République de Côte d'Ivoire (Republic of Côte d'Ivoire)
<b>SIMPOC</b>	Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour

<b>SOSTECI</b>	Système d’Observation et de Suivi du Travail des Enfants en Côte d’Ivoire
<b>SPIF</b>	Strategic Programme Impact Framework
<b>SSTEB</b>	Un Système de Suivi du Travail des Enfants
<b>ToR</b>	Term of Reference
<b>UNHCR</b>	United Nations Refugee Agency
<b>UNDP</b>	United National Development Programme
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children’s Fund
<b>USAID</b>	United States Agency for International Development
<b>USD</b>	US Dollars
<b>USDOL</b>	United State Department of Labor
<b>WDACL</b>	World Day against Child Labour
<b>WFCL</b>	Worst Forms of Child Labour

## Executive summary

Following the Terms of Reference (TOR) the team would produce a Final Evaluation of the ECOWAS I and ECOWAS II (EI&II) projects, defined as follows:

*Final evaluations focus on the outcomes of projects, programmes, strategies or policies and the likelihood that they will achieve impact. Evaluations provide an opportunity for in-depth reflection on the strategy and assumptions guiding the intervention.*

The first **purpose of the two overlapping projects**, implemented from 2009 to 2014<sup>2</sup>, was to support national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labour in Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Benin and Nigeria. The second aims at mobilizing sub-regional policy makers and improving sub-regional cooperation for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour among all fifteen member States of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS).

The **purpose of the evaluation**, as stated in the TOR was to:

- determine effectiveness at all levels – achievement of objectives at outcome and impact levels,
- identify unintended changes, if any,
- assess implementation efficiency,
- establish the relevance of any outcomes or sustainability attained,
- provide recommendations to sustain project outcomes and impacts, if any, and
- identify emerging potential good practices.

The **methodological approach** used to gather and verify information consisted of the following: desk review, information-gathering in the field (Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Benin and Nigeria), key informant triangulated interviews of stakeholders, donors and Implementing Agencies (IAs) at the national and local levels.

The **scope and limitations** the team encountered to take into consideration in reviewing the findings, conclusions and recommendations, include the following:

- **Data.** Although information was plentiful (e.g., quarterly progress reports, log frames, detailed activity descriptions, etc.) on the project hard data on Child Labour (CL) was insufficient.
- **Baseline.** Without a baseline, findings about impact had to be based on qualitative information only, triangulated throughout from interviews and focus groups.
- **Time.** The team could spend only two work weeks (for Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Benin) and three work weeks (for Nigeria) to meet with all stakeholders, travel up-country to visit at least three sites, and prepare and facilitate a Stakeholders' meeting.
- **Sampling.** Although all stakeholder groups were interviewed, no statistically-significant sampling method, which was not required by the TOR, was conducted.
- **Sectors.** Fishing in the Lake Volta Region of Ghana was the only sector targeted by the EI&II projects that could not be included in the evaluation.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Life of Project dates for each are as follow: ECOWAS I - Sept 30, 2009 to April 30, 2014; ECOWAS II – December 31, 2010 to April 30, 2014.

- **Potential Impact.** This evaluation considers *potential* impact, per the TOR, of likely changes at the project objective level based on information gathered.

**Interviews and site visits** were conducted during two-week country-level field visits simultaneously in February in Benin, Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire. In March a three-week visit was conducted in Nigeria. Selection of sites to visit was based on a variety of factors according to the exigencies of each country. All ke stakeholders were interviewed.

## **Analysis of information gathered and findings**

### ***Design***

The EI&II project designs reflect the complexity of the objective to contribute to the *elimination* of the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL). They consist of the expected elements found in many development project papers: analysis of the problem, presentation of the proposed objectives and underlying objectives, description of the activities to implement and their outputs, identification of the outcomes anticipated and the indicators upon which progress can be measured, and a list of assumptions and risks.

The EI&II project papers are comprehensive, detailed and highly prescriptive. They contain the standard hierarchical logical framework “tree” beginning at highest level with the objective (*to contribute to the elimination of the WFCL in West Africa*) with two *immediate* objectives at the next level down: 1) *By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in [Benin added for ECOWAS II] Ghana, Nigeria and Côte d'Ivoire will be accelerated*, and 2) *By the end of the project, the role played by ECOWAS in combatting the worst forms of child labour in the sub-region will be reinforced*.

Under each *Immediate Objective* are listed the *Outputs* (1.1, 1.2, 1.3 etc.) such as “technical assistance provided to ...” or “programmes designed and implemented to ...” which if achieved, would logically lead to Outcomes and Impacts desired. Objectives are properly articulated as future desired states viewed retroactively. Accompanying each *Output* are listed the *Main Activities* that the ILO is tasked to implement to achieve the Immediate Objectives.

### ***Findings***

- **Overall validity.** The design included in-depth analysis of the socio-economic environment in which the WFCL in the four countries occurs. The project objectives were well linked to the analytical findings. Appropriate assumptions were included to address risks, objectives were detailed and explained, and although the project lifespan was short, it was reasonable to predict the objectives could be met. The design respected cross-cutting aspects, for example that awareness-raising as an output (and an intervention mechanism) affected all beneficiaries, from national decision-makers to local entrepreneurs.
- **Level of Prescription.** The extensive detail in the Logical Framework was cited by IA managers and ILO project managers as overly burdensome. The ECOWAS I logical framework contained 6 Outputs under Immediate Objective 1, and 52 specific Activities spread across the six. Since Output 1 is sufficiently specific in itself, adding highly detailed descriptions of desired activities was unnecessary.
- **Monitoring & Evaluation.** The design included indicators to measure progress toward reaching each of the two Immediate Objectives. Although some indicators met the classic test of SMART: Smart – Measurable – Achievable – Relevant – Time-bound, many contained multiple indicators that make measurement problematic. The evaluation team noted the difficulties in verifying the data that was collected in the field. Although the M&E proposed in the design, and modified subsequently, was thorough and closely

linked to project activities, outputs and higher-level objectives, collecting the data and reporting were cumbersome.

- **Data.** There are two data collection systems being implemented by the project, each with a different purpose: the **Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS)** managed in-country by communities, and the **Direct Beneficiaries Monitoring Report (DBMR)**, intended primarily for donor use and not expected to continue post-project. The first is a well-designed system to collect data on children selected to be withdrawn or prevented in order to increase knowledge about the most important target population and to verify eligibility of the child for EI&II assistance. An anticipated by-product of the CLMS is increased community ownership of the entire process of reducing the WFCL. The other data collection system being used (DBMR) is donor-driven and aims to gather standardized data on the WFCL. The entities administering the DBMR forms reported that they found the information produced did not add value to their work. Many saw the form as overly-burdensome and contained questions inappropriate to the local setting.

## **Effectiveness and efficiency**

### ***Program Achievements by Output***

**ECOWAS I & II Objective 1: By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and Côte d'Ivoire will be accelerated**

**Output 1.1: Consultations and technical support delivered for finalising the National Action Plan (NAP), its validation and adoption and for integrating child labour into other national, relevant sectoral, sub-national and/or local action plans (ECOWAS I only)**

**Output 1.1: Consultations and technical support delivered for integrating child labour/trafficking concerns into national mining policies and laws, sub-national and/or local government action plans and social partner policies and plans in Benin and Nigeria (ECOWAS II only)**

**Summary:** National Action Plans (NAPs) were completed in all countries. Dissemination of the NAPs was either completed or would soon be completed in all countries. Understanding and applying the NAPs at the local level varied by country.

**Output 1.2: Capacity building programmes designed and delivered to fill gaps in relevant institutional capacity to implement NAP and combat the WFCL (ECOWAS I only)**

**Output 1.2: Capacity building programmes designed and delivered to fill gaps in relevant institutions capacity to combat the worst forms of child labour in the artisanal mining sectors in Benin and Nigeria (ECOWAS II only)**

**Summary:** Many training programs were developed in each country for all the stakeholders and primary movers in major institutions that could have an impact on reducing the WFCL. Organizational assessments designed to reveal the root causes for non-performance did not appear to have been conducted in the institutions targeted prior to beginning capacity building activities. If however the term “capacity-building” refers to “increasing understanding” of the WFCL and helping people learn how to implement programs to eliminate the WFCL, then “training” did serve its purpose “to implement NAP and combat the WFCL.”

Capacity-building interventions with the National Steering Committees in all four countries, played a critical role in increasing coordination among ministries, tripartite stakeholders and IAs. At the local level, the IAs played a direct role in implementing the capacity-building and often were not as familiar with the local institutional landscape, and the causes of performance gaps, as was the ILO at the



national (and regional) level. There were operational differences between implementing capacity-building at the national and local level that influenced whether results expected were achieved.

**Output 1.3: Technical assistance provided to reinforce national laws and law enforcement in Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria. (ECOWAS I only)**

*Summary:* (Ecowas I only): Technical assistance was provided by EI&II that was instrumental in ECOWAS achieving the desired outcomes. Significant new legislation, or new ways to support existing legislation, was passed or proposed in all countries as a result the project.

**Output 1.3: (ECOWAS II) and 1.4 (ECOWAS I) National and sub-national awareness raising and social mobilisation campaigns conducted in Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria (and Benin)**

*Summary:* Although awareness-raising campaigns were conducted widely, and were in most respects effective, they varied from country to country. Evaluators did not observe examples where innovative sensitization activities in one country were tried in another.

**Output 1.5: ECOWAS I: Studies undertaken to fill identified gaps in knowledge base on selected WFCL and the problems of forced labour and trafficking in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana**

**Output 1.4: ECOWAS II: Studies undertaken to fill identified gaps in knowledge base on artisanal mines and the problems of forced child labour and trafficking in Benin and Nigeria**

*Summary:* Studies were conducted in each country that assisted the ILO project staff, the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the IAs in implementing activities to target populations they better understood.

**Output 1.6: ECOWAS I: Models of intervention designed and piloted in four target sectors including models for withdrawing and preventing children working in forced labour and other WFCL in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire (ECOWAS I only)**

**Output 1.5: Models of intervention designed and piloted for withdrawing and preventing children working in the worst forms of child labour in Benin RCI , Ghana, and Nigeria (ECOWAS II only)**

**Output 1.6: Models of intervention designed and piloted to promote resilient family livelihoods and sustainable community development in Benin RCI , Ghana, and Nigeria (ECOWAS II only)**

*Summary:* Intervention models were developed to resolve the obstacles identified after children were withdrawn. The project achieved its targets to withdraw children from the WFCL. Over the course of the EI&II projects, increasingly complicated interventions at the local level had to be managed. These ever-expanding and challenging models presented significant limitations in terms of sustainability and manageability.

EI&II were able to facilitate reinsertion of children withdrawn from WFCL. These children were placed in schools, or in vocational centers and training programs to improve their skills. However, the evaluators did not observe monitoring mechanisms in place to track changes in student learning, for example, although there were careful attendance records kept of children withdrawn. Measuring student learning would require establishing a baseline with the rescued students, for example of their reading ability, then measuring that indicator after school attendance.

Supporting interventions helped retain children in school. Nearly 3,000 families received equipment they might use as support to generate income. The IA assisted families in pursuing these alternative livelihoods. The evaluators observed this project activity but can only attest that the intervention was completed, not that the well-being of families improved.

**ECOWAS I & II Objective 2: By the end of the project the role played by ECOWAS/CEDEAO in combating the worst forms of child labour in the sub-region will be reinforced**

**Output 2.1: Technical assistance provided to ECOWAS to establish protocols for monitoring member states' efforts to combat the worst forms of child labour, consistent with community policies and plans and reflecting international standards and norms (ECOWAS I only)**

**Output 2.1: Sub regional Plan of Action on Child Labour designed and adopted (ECOWAS II only)**

**Output 2.2: : Technical assistance provided to review ECOWAS monitoring mechanisms to combat the worst forms of child labour, consistent with community policies and plans and reflecting regional and international standards and norms. (ECOWAS II only)**

*Summary:* Based on document review, and discussions with ECOWAS, progress has been made in establishing ways to track the WFCL in member states. Significant achievements were made. Technical assistance provided by the EI&II projects, for example from international experts, was instrumental in reaching these outputs.

**Output 2.2: Programmes designed and implemented to strengthen the capacity of relevant ECOWAS technical departments to combat child labour in the sub-region (ECOWAS I only)**

*Summary:* Based on quarterly reports reviewed and discussions with those managing activities with ECOWAS, a number of constraints were noted early-on that challenged capacity-building at ECOWAS. Collaboration got off to a slow start due to what ILO/IPEC staff reported to be the frequent travel by key ECOWAS staff, plus overall delays due to the terrorist attack on the UN/ILO offices in Abuja. When activities eventually were launched, ECOWAS began to take ownership and regional initiatives, such as with workshops and preparatory work toward the Regional Action Plan. Whether the *relevant ECOWAS technical departments* were *strengthened* as the Output called for, cannot be confirmed without a performance analysis and baseline to know what changed institutionally. Interviews with ECOWAS and IPEC staff clearly demonstrated that individuals had greatly increased their knowledge of WFCL and regional activities were underway that were previously not envisaged, but the capacity of the technical departments would likely be significantly impaired by the departure of the individuals trained by the projects.

**Output 2.3: Sub regional forums organised to encourage networking and to share good practices among all ECOWAS member states**

*Summary:* After considerable delays in making progress at ECOWAS to move on adopting a regional action plan, the EI&II projects started showing impressive results. The planning for the large regional workshop held in Accra in itself contributed importantly to establishing a footprint in the region. First, the RAP was adopted by ECOWAS Ministers in December 2012, which contained a peer review mechanism; second, the tripartite Symposium held in Accra in May 2013 reviewed the roles and responsibilities to implement the RAP and concluded a Declaration which included Ghana's offer to be the first peer-reviewed country; and third, the peer review took place in November-December 2013 and was to be discussed in April 2014 among member states. Conducting a peer review, although an established process at ECOWAS, was not *de rigueur* for Child Labour.

### ***Findings: achievements by outputs***

Under Objective 1, the two EI&II projects substantially met their desired objectives, as documented under each Output above. Under Objective 2, there is no evidence to indicate that the technical departments at ECOWAS have been strengthened, nor is there evidence to indicate that they were not strengthened by the projects. Nonetheless, Objective 2 was reached in that the *role* played by ECOWAS in combatting the WFCL was *reinforced*. Whether this was the result of a particular mix of

individuals who became proactive and focused on the outcome (regionalizing efforts to end the WFCL drawing from the EI&II projects' successes in the four countries), or due to strengthened technical departments, cannot be determined.

#### ***Findings: number of direct beneficiaries***

The actual numbers of children at high risk prevented from engaging in the WFCL, the numbers of children withdrawn and number of households that received livelihood assistance, were reached as reported by the projects. The figures have not been verified in this evaluation. Observations about each of these categories of assistance are found in the report.

#### ***Findings: capacity-building***

Extensive training programs were designed and delivered in each country for all the stakeholders and primary movers in major institutions that could have an impact on reducing the WFCL. They played a direct role in improving understanding of the WFCL, increasing coordination among government agencies, strengthening the NSCs and raising awareness among stakeholders. In terms of building *institutional* capacity, organizational assessments did not appear to be conducted in the institutions targeted.

### **Potential impact**

#### ***Findings***

The following long-term effects of the ILO/IPEC project interventions were observed and can be plausibly attributed to ILO/IPEC actions in West Africa for over 15 years. It is more challenging to attribute these changes *only* to the EI&II projects, whose actual project life span stretched only from 2011 to 2014.

- Understanding of the types and definitions of the WFCL increased.
- Regional awareness of the gravity and extent of the WFCL has increased and momentum emerged to take action.

The Regional Action Plan was adopted by the conference attendees in its *Declaration*. The list of items in the Declaration reflects many of the lessons learned during the implementation of the EI&II projects.

### **Relevance**

#### ***Findings***

The EI&II projects address a pressing and growing issue that threatens the future of children. With millions of children between the ages of 5 and 17 engaged in the WFCL, the EI&II projects aim to eliminate the practice through interventions at various levels.

### **Sustainability**

#### ***Findings***

- Increased awareness at the national level of the WFCL will remain.
- People exposed to the WFCL are not likely to revert to previous perceptions.
- Policies developed remain in place.

- Livelihood assistance to families cannot be sustained, although in some cases the effect of the livelihood assistance may be sustained by the families.
- Vocational training and apprenticeships provided to older children are not readily sustainable, although the knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired may be.
- Educational support (school kits, etc.) to withdrawn children is unlikely to be sustainable overall.
- Local child support committees and community-based interest groups will likely continue to function.

## Special aspects

### *Unanticipated impact*

1. **Informal school:** a one-room school was organized in the market in Ibadan, Nigeria to begin orienting the children withdrawn from the WFCL while awaiting admission.
2. **Community cohesion strengthened:** project interventions at the local level tended to break down barriers between community groups – a critical by-product of EI&II.
3. **Partnering with youth:** in Nigeria, the project partnered with the National Youth Service Corps to raise community awareness of the WFCL.
4. **Police request training:** in Oyo State, Nigeria, the local police force requested training in the WFCL after hearing about the project's activities in Ibadan.

## Conclusions

### 1. Design

The EI&II project designs reflect the extent that the ILO/IPEC has incorporated major lessons learned over the two decades of their involvement in CL. The EI&II project architecture carefully addressed these key areas upon which progress to eliminate the WFCL rests: awareness of the problem and the form it takes (WFCL), policy environment to encourage and support changes, and direct action in proximity to CL where awareness and policy meet to withdraw children.

The ECOWAS II project design incorporated a range of additional community-based activities designed to support and supplement the direct withdrawal of children in the WFCL. By the same token, the level of detail in the design placed unnecessary burden on the implementers, both ILO staff and IAs.

### 2. Project Achievements

The EI&II projects successfully achieved the outputs anticipated. Nearly all of the outputs listed were achieved or surpassed. The level of prescription cited above perhaps set the stage for quarterly reporting that appeared excessive.

### 3. Data

The project designs included the expected elements of data collection strategies. The DBMR the system is compromised by two factors: a) the excessive burden on those charged with administering it and b) the questions required to ask risk collecting inaccurate data.

#### 4. Implementation Complexity

Highly-complex development interventions were required at the local level to respond to the forces working against eliminating the WFCL. Working in small towns and district capitals requires different skill-sets, tremendous patience and an intimate understanding of the socio-cultural context in which change has to be induced.

In this challenging environment, the breadth of services that the EI&II projects requested delivered by the IAs was in some respects unreasonable: from managing a rescue operation with law enforcement to providing micro-enterprise start-up assistance and counseling.

#### Lessons learned

1. *Preference for future allocations between awareness-raising, policy development and direct intervention*

Among these three thrusts of EI&II, allocating funds for direct withdrawal (*direct intervention*) of children from the WFCL as a strategy to eliminate CL is controversial. Some argue that withdrawing a few thousand children does not accelerate the movement toward ending CL since the number withdrawn is a tiny fraction of the total target population. Others claim that direct action demonstrates how to withdraw children at the community level so that it can be sustained without continuous external support and can be scaled up to other communities. When polled, respondents chose Direct Intervention as their preference for future funding, with Awareness Raising as the second choice, but with more effort at the local level. Policy Development received the lowest allocations, with respondents remarking that the policies were already in place and it is now a question of implementing them.

2. *The limitations of using Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in communities as a sustainable approach to reduce CL*

Although it is too early to determine, the evaluators did not find evidence that the NGOs can continue activities in communities when budget support ends.

3. *Effective direct withdrawal requires a breadth of development actions in resource-challenged environments*

Prescribing precisely the activities needed to manage withdrawal and prevention of children does not, by itself, lead to effective and sustainable local results.

4. *Scale up of Direct Intervention to other communities not generally evident*

The hope for direct action is that it can be scaled up to reach more beneficiaries by demonstrating to communities how the WFCL can be implemented using their own resources. But the experience of implementing the EI&II projects revealed that other supporting measures (e.g., support to families, schools and withdrawn children) were necessary, beyond the withdrawal. Implementing these other activities was taxing, positioning EI&II as community development agents affecting change in the health, education, law enforcement and social welfare sectors. Given the complexity of managing this full menu of local services to complement direct action, scale-up will be challenging to communities with similar resource constraints and no IPEC assistance.

5. *Targeting regional objectives worked*

The EI&II projects called for strengthening ECOWAS in an attempt to leverage any successes from implementing the projects in the four countries to the other 11 member states in West Africa. After a slow start, the ILO/IPEC team and ECOWAS began having

an impact which culminated in the Accra meeting, an endorsed Regional Action Plan and the peer review process being launched. Percolating up the experience of reducing the WFCL in the four countries, working through a West African run regional organization was ambitious, whose success was anything but certain. Obtaining ownership by ECOWAS of the projects' purpose and experience, through patient and persistent collaboration managed by the ILO/IPEC team, eventually produced solid results.

### Potential Good Practices

1. **Support for community-led efforts to ensure quality schools:** By partnering with civil society organizations the EI&II projects leveraged their support and built confidence that the community itself could identify solutions to many problems even without external support.
2. **Partnering:** The project initiated many partnerships with government, the media, private sector and civil society to extend the impact of their achievements.
3. **Identifying champions:** The EI&II projects enlisted powerful communicators at the national level to spread the message about the WFCL to various audiences.
4. **Validating policies proposed with local authorities:** In Nigeria, once the national policies regarding the WFCL were approved by the Federal Government, the EI&II projects designed “zonal” workshops in the six geographic zones of Nigeria to which state representatives were invited to a central location. This approach was highly effective in empowering the states to take action against CL.

### Recommendations

#### *For the ILO/IPEC in designing future project*

1. Apply the gains made at the national level to the local level.
2. Assist districts and communities to identify local resources and advocate for government resources (for education, law enforcement, labour inspecting, child protection, etc.) through a more diverse menu of direct actions.
3. Strengthen local institutions by training, mentoring and coaching officials continually on leadership, resource mobilization and monitoring.
4. Reinvigorate national awareness campaigns with creative and innovative ideas.
5. Continue providing ECOWAS with assistance to implement the Regional Action Plan.

#### *For the USDOL*

6. Provide funding to solve the data problem once and for all.

#### *For Stakeholders*

7. Advocate for local resource-mobilization and action against the WFCL.
8. Sell the successes of EI&II to new funding sources.

## 1. Evaluation methodology

1. The Terms of Reference (TOR) expect that the team would produce a Final Evaluation of the ECOWAS I and ECOWAS II (EI&II) projects, defined as follows:

*Final evaluations focus on the outcomes of projects, programmes, strategies or policies and the likelihood that they will achieve impact. Evaluations provide an opportunity for in-depth reflection on the strategy and assumptions guiding the intervention.*

2. The purpose of the evaluation, as stated in the TOR (included in the Annex I) is to ...
  - determine effectiveness at all levels – achievement of objectives at outcome and impact levels,
  - identify unintended changes, if any,
  - assess implementation efficiency,
  - establish the relevance of any outcomes or sustainability attained,
  - provide recommendations to sustain project outcomes and impacts, if any, and
  - identify emerging potential good practices.
3. This independent evaluation was managed by the Evaluation and Impact Assessment (EIA) unit of the International Labour Organization's (ILO) International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labor (IPEC) following a consultative and participatory approach. All major stakeholders were consulted and informed throughout the evaluation which was carried out to highest degree of credibility and independence and in line with established evaluation standards.
4. The evaluation was carried out by a team of external consultants. The field mission took place from February to March 2014.

### 1.1 Approach

5. Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour (WFCL) is complex, highly sensitive to local cultural, social, economic and political factors and touches many areas addressed by other development interventions, such as those in education, health, agriculture, women's affairs, labor and environmental protection. The TORs structured this evaluation in a way to produce a forward-looking final evaluation of two important, complex and articulated projects. The evaluation had to be conducted simultaneously in the four countries over a short period (3 months) in order to be completed by April 30, 2014, the end-of-project date.
6. The methodological framework placed greater emphasis on collecting qualitative information than on quantitative data, primarily due to time and cost constraints under which the evaluation team worked. Evaluators triangulated information received throughout the field work to reduce bias and increase reliability. Additional quantitative information came from a review of project achievements, in terms of outputs, specifically the number of beneficiaries receiving EI&II project support.
7. The methodological approach used to gather and verify information consisted of the following:
  - Desk review (prior to field work).
  - Work Plan for data collection (summarized in the Inception Report).
  - Information-gathering in the field (Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Benin and Nigeria).

- Key informant interviews – national level: stakeholders, project staff, etc.
- Key informant interviews – district/communal level: stakeholders, Implementing Agents (IAs), school teachers, etc.
- Direct beneficiary focus groups (children & parents) – district/communal level
- Random interviews: children, parents, employers
- Key informant interviews with the principal donor, U.S. Department of Labor
- Key informant interviews with ILO national, regional (Accra, Abuja and Dakar) and Headquarters staff.

## 1.2 Principal Evaluation Questions

8. Although the TOR contained many questions for evaluators to consider, it made clear that they were not all intended to be answered. They were grouped under the following rubrics to guide the study throughout: Design, Effectiveness and Efficiency, Impact, Relevance, Sustainability and Special Aspects, Potential Good Practices and Lessons Learned.
9. The evaluators asked many of the questions listed in the TOR, among which the most frequently asked were:
  - What were the principal challenges you encountered (or the project encountered) in working with EI&II?
  - What was the understanding of Child Labour, and the WFCL, before EI&II (in 2005 or 2006)? When the terms were used, what were the reactions?
  - What are the three most significant impacts you believe were achieved under EI&II?
  - If there are no more funds to continue working to eliminate the WFCL, what will remain? What changes that the EI&II projects helped bring about will continue?
  - If you were offered \$10 million for a new project to eliminate the WFCL, what allocations would you make among the following three components: Awareness raising, Policy development or Direct intervention/action
10. These five overarching questions prodded the persons interviewed to reflect in different ways about EI&II and think out of the box. The questions were generally asked frequently in each country, although the last one evolved spontaneously in Ghana and Nigeria more than in Benin and Cote d'Ivoire.

## 1.3 Scope and limitations

11. In conducting the document review, field work and analysis, the team identified the following limitations:
  - **Data.** Although information was plentiful on beneficiaries in the form of quarterly progress reports, log frames, detailed activity descriptions, and a comprehensive Mid-Term Evaluation; hard data on Child Labour (CL) was insufficient. For example, the team did not find disaggregated data on the extent of the WFCL by sectors (mining - quarries and artisanal), cocoa, fisheries, domestic workers, or by gender, region, age, home town, etc. Data on children withdrawn using EI&II resources was collected via the DBMR and CLMS (where implemented) systems.
  - **Baseline.** Without a baseline constructed at the inception of EI&II (from public opinion surveys, profiles of children and parents, etc.) from which the evaluators could measure changes (in behavior, in well-being, income, etc.), findings about impact were based on



qualitative information, triangulated throughout from interviews and focus groups, not on data from statistically-significant samplings.

- **Time.** Due to budgetary constraints and scheduling demands, the team could spend only two work weeks (for Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Benin) and three work weeks (for Nigeria) to meet with all stakeholders, travel up-country to visit at least three sites, and prepare and facilitate a Stakeholders' Meeting in each capital at the end to validate initial observations (for Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Benin) and in Nigeria with national stakeholders prior to the field visits, which were conducted by the National Evaluator alone.
- **Sampling.** Although all stakeholder groups were interviewed, no statistically-significant sampling method, which was not required by the TOR, was conducted.
- **Sectors.** Fisheries in the Lake Volta Region of Ghana was the only sector targeted by the EI&II projects that could not be included in the evaluation, due to constraints: a) the IAs had completed their field work with direct beneficiaries a year or more prior to the evaluation, and b) the geographic distance between Lake Volta in the East and the cocoa farming areas in the West made impossible to cover in the time allotted
- **Analysis.** Insufficient time was available in the field to analyze information gathered before presenting them at the Stakeholders' Workshop. One day was scheduled to analyze data, share findings with the evaluation team and prepare a Facilitator's Agenda and handouts prior to the meeting.
- **Potential Impact.** This evaluation considers *potential* impact, per the TOR, of likely changes at project objective level, based on information gathered following the methodology described above. The potential impact considered in this evaluation is different from impact derived using quantitative approaches.

#### 1.4 Interviews and site visits

12. Two-week country-level field visits were organized simultaneously in February in Benin, Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire. In March a three-week visit was conducted in Nigeria. Two international evaluators were engaged to gather information in Benin and Cote d'Ivoire separately while the Team Leader conducted the Ghana and Nigeria evaluations. National evaluators were hired in each country (except Benin) to accompany their international colleagues.
13. Each country-level visit was organized with logistic support by the ILO/IPEC project staff, to include the stakeholders and Implementing Agencies cited in Section A above. Evaluators visited the sites from where the children had been withdrawn and conducted informal focus groups with the withdrawn children and their parents (separately).
14. The selection of sites to visit were based on a variety of factors according to the exigencies of each country:
  - ECOWAS I or II direct intervention site.
  - Type of Implementing Agency (NGO, union, cooperative, government agency, etc.).
  - Existence of all project intervention types (withdraw, prevention of vulnerable children, family support, etc.).
  - Sites known to be "successes" as well as "problematic".
  - Sites identified in documents reviewed that offered possible good practices or appeared to be examples of specific questions raised.
  - Sites known for having a high number of children in the WFCL.

- Sites representing all sectors targeted (cocoa, mining, etc.).
15. Local ILO/IPEC staff, often in collaboration with the IA, assisted evaluators in selecting the sites to be visited. At the end of field visits to Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana and Benin, the international evaluator, assisted by the national evaluator, facilitated a "Stakeholder's meeting" whose purpose was twofold: to present preliminary observations based on the two weeks in-country, and to validate those observations with input from the stakeholders. Unlike in the other three countries, the team leader did not travel to direct intervention sites. The team leader and national evaluator conducted interviews in Abuja, after which the national evaluator managed the site visits in Ibadan and Abeokuta alone, reporting on results to the team leader.
  16. Since none of the IAs was based in Abuja, and in view of the reduced time available for the team leader in Nigeria, it was decided instead to ask them to travel to Abuja for in-depth interviews separately. The EI&II program coordinator based in Abeokuta also traveled to Abuja for meetings. The team leader and national evaluator visited all the other stakeholders (government, NGOs and ECOWAS) and facilitated a Stakeholder's Workshop prior to the field work being completed.
  17. The Annexes contain details by country of the Direction Intervention sites visited and people interviewed.

## 2. Analysis of information gathered and findings

18. This chapter presents evaluation findings on each of the primary areas: design, effectiveness and efficiency, impact, relevance, sustainability and special aspects.

### 2.1 Design

19. The development objective of the EI&II projects is *to contribute to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in West Africa*. The key word is *contribute* – although the long-term objective is the elimination of the WFCL. No activity could aim to eliminate such an entrenched social practice within a three-year project life span.
20. The EI&II project designs reflect the complexity of the objective to contribute to the *elimination* of the Worst Forms of Child Labour. They consist of the expected elements found in many development project papers: analysis of the problem, presentation of the proposed objectives and underlying objectives, description of the activities to implement and their outputs, identification of the outcomes anticipated and the indicators upon which progress can be measured, and a list of assumptions and risks.
21. Logic undergirds the entire framework: if intervention X is implemented, there is a high degree of likelihood that Output Y will occur, and that Outcome Z will result, all of which ideally leads to an impact. Five intervention mechanisms are used to reach the stated objectives included a) awareness-raising, b) policy development, c) direct action, d) capacity-building and e) research. Awareness-raising cross-cuts throughout, playing a key role in mobilizing key decision-makers to advocate to eliminate the WFCL at the regional and national level, crystalizing the need for policies at all levels (national, district and community) that support change, and sensitizing parents, siblings, law enforcement officers, micro-entrepreneurs and community leaders to take local actions to reduce the WFCL. Frequently viewed as a separate component of the project, in fact awareness-raising is a key type of intervention to bring about change.
22. Policy development is a necessary but insufficient factor in inducing sustainable change leading to reducing the WFCL. Most countries have adopted policies to mitigate myriad social threats, from Female Genital Cutting to child street begging. Positive and negative impact results from implementing (or in some cases, enforcing) policies adopted at various levels and sectors. Even then, policies that are put into action can fail to achieve their hoped-for impact. Law enforcement has many well-intentioned policies that upon activation produce a counter-intuitive result. For example, Ghana's effort to implement its policies regarding children in domestic work led to an increase in withdrawal and arrests, according to the Chairperson of the NSC's subcommittee on Direct Action. But insufficient capacity from social service agencies to house, counsel, orient and reintegrate the withdrawn children reduced the anticipated impact from improved enforcement. In Nigeria the National Agency for the Prohibition of Traffic in Persons (NAPTIP) recognized that by enforcing government commitments and policies to end the WFCL through arrests, the desired result (children withdrawn and reintegrated) was hampered without shelters available to house the children. Policy development and application in these cases were necessary but insufficient alone to achieve the hoped-for change.
23. Incorporating direct action into the project design was intended to a) demonstrate how policies could be applied (or enforced) at the national and local levels to reduce the WFCL, and b) to demonstrate how children could be withdrawn from child labor, integrated into the local educational system, and families supported so as to reduce the need for the child to work. The project also had to show that well-being of children was dramatically improved through allocation of a significant portion of project resources. A project that yielded impressive policy adoption and raised awareness of the WFCL needed to demonstrate, the evaluators learned, positive impact on the lives of the children targeted.

### 2.1.1 Logical framework

24. The EI&II project papers are comprehensive, detailed and highly prescriptive. They contain the standard hierarchical logical framework “tree” beginning at highest level with the objective (*to contribute to the elimination of the WFCL in West Africa*) with two *immediate* objectives at the next level down: 1) *By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in [Benin added for ECOWAS II] Ghana, Nigeria and Côte d'Ivoire will be accelerated*, and 2) *By the end of the project, the role played by ECOWAS in combatting the worst forms of child labour in the sub-region will be reinforced*. The use of *immediate* with *objective* implies time – that the objectives can be reached by the end of the project lifespan, which is the intention of the ILO. In this case, *progress* toward elimination can reasonably be expected to be achieved before the project expires, but not the elimination of the WFCL.
25. Under each *Immediate Objective* are listed the *Outputs* (1.1, 1.2, 1.3 etc.) such as “technical assistance provided to ...” or “programmes designed and implemented to ...” which if achieved, would logically lead to Outcomes and Impacts desired. Objectives are properly articulated as future desired states viewed retroactively. Accompanying each *Output* are listed the *Main Activities* that the ILO is tasked to implement to achieve the Immediate Objectives. Actions are detailed, such as “hold consultations,” “engage in advocacy,” “strengthen the capacity of ...,” “support the Ministry ....” The inter-relatedness and internal logic of the framework is respected down to the specific details at the activity level.

### 2.1.2 Findings

#### *Overall validity*

26. The design included in-depth analysis of the socio-economic environment in which the WFCL in the four countries occurs. The project objectives were well linked to the analytical findings. Appropriate assumptions were included to address risks, objectives were detailed and explained, and although the project lifespan was short, it was reasonable to predict the objectives could be met. The design respected cross-cutting aspects, for example that awareness-raising as an output (and an intervention mechanism) affected all beneficiaries, from national decision-makers to local entrepreneurs.
27. The links between the objectives, outputs and activities were coherent and logical. The development objective *to contribute to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in West Africa* is straightforward and uncontroversial. The two Immediate Objectives were achievable in the three-year timeframe allowed for project implementation. Indicators and means of verification were included for each output grouped under the Immediate Objective.

#### *Level of prescription*

28. Over the course of the project lifespan, the main activities described in the Logical Framework were revised with deletions and additions that reflected implementation challenges and changes encountered by the ILO/IPEC staff and the IAs. To achieve results, development projects have to be flexible and adapt to rapidly-changing circumstances. However, field interviews reflected consistently the view that the project was overly prescribed (some characterizing it as “top-down”), leaving both IAs following detailed deliverables which could limit identifying creative solutions in the local environment. The extensive detail in the Logical Framework was cited by IA managers and ILO project managers as overly burdensome. For the NGOs implementing project components as IAs, although they could not say it outright, it conveyed the notion that without this level of precision, they may not have the capacity to make decisions that will assist the project meet its stated outputs. Attempting to control activities in this way can also produce a reaction where local decision-makers see themselves as implementing activities for which they are not responsible. The presentations by two Nigerian NGOs of their accomplishments in

Abeokuta and Ibadan underscored this point: the evaluators noted how they viewed their role as implementers of a list of activities already decided.

29. The ECOWAS I logical framework contained 6 Outputs under Immediate Objective 1, and 52 specific Activities spread across the six, with a numbering system to help with tracking: # 1.1.5 would be Immediate Objective 1, Output 1, Activity 5: *Engage in advocacy tied to national budgeting processes so that the child labour unit staff strength and resources are increased in conformity with the management structure proposed under the NAPs*. Each activity indicated to which country or countries it applied (Activity 5 cited above applied to Ghana and RCI, in the revised framework). Since Output 1 is sufficiently specific in itself, adding highly detailed descriptions of desired activities was unnecessary.
30. Observations of IA implementation, both on the ground and from reviewing quarterly reports, confirmed that activities were implemented often to the letter (e.g., *IAs were to purchase a uniform, pencils/pens, and writing paper*). Nonetheless, the IAs did occasionally create solutions beyond the described activities, for example in Ibadan by creating a “pre-school” in the market to jump-start and help prepare the children withdrawn for the next school admissions window. In Nigeria a media group designed an innovative awareness-raising activity, which hadn’t been described in logical framework, to organize a rally/parade near a crowded market area in a poor section of Abuja culminating with speeches by the area’s traditional leader against CL.

#### *Monitoring & evaluation*

31. The design included indicators to measure progress toward reaching each of the two Immediate Objectives. Although some indicators met the classic test of SMART: Smart –Measurable – Achievable – Relevant – Time-bound, many contained multiple indicators that make measurement problematic. Semi-annual reports from the field provided the ILO/IPEC HQ staff and USDOL with detailed information on each indicator while quarterly reports on the off months furnished status updates. For example, numbers were provided by country for indicators with multiple measurement requirements such as these:
  - No. of children of legal working age withdrawn from the WFCL through protection at workplace/undertaking or by supporting their engagement in alternative sectors as appropriate and in all cases for children under the age of 18 working in the mining sector (1.5) Benin, RCI, Ghana and Nigeria.
  - Laws and regulations designed to discourage child labour are passed and/or strengthened in targeted countries and sectors. (1.1) Benin, Nigeria.
  - No. of at-risk families benefiting from economic empowerment schemes provided or facilitated by the project (1.5) Benin, RCI, Ghana and Nigeria.
32. Means of verification were outlined and, as the project unfolded, methods of collecting and verifying information were adjusted as circumstances evolved. However, the evaluation team noted the difficulties in verifying the data that was collected in the field – lack of equipment in some instances, lack of people trained in M&E or sufficiently motivated to ensure that data obtained was accurate and complete. In communities with scarce resources, relying on unpaid volunteers, as in the case of CLMS in Ghana and SOSTECI in Côte d'Ivoire, to assist in data collection and verification was mentioned as *insufficient motivation*. Also in Ghana, computers procured for a town’s Social Welfare office that were to be used for the CLMS were not in working condition.
33. Although the M&E proposed in the Design, and modified subsequently, was thorough and closely linked to project activities, outputs and higher-level objectives, collecting the data and reporting were reported by the IAs and some IPEC staff to be cumbersome. The difficulty

stemmed from bureaucratic requirements (especially with the DBMS) more than from lack of human, financial or technical resources. The IPEC staff in fact provided extensive training on using the DBMS and the CLMS versions for each country were rolled out with technical support. Technical Progress Reports (TPRs) provided extensive detail on project activities for each country (and ECOWAS), as illustrated in a table below. The TPRs ran between 50 and 125 pages, with attachments and explanations about all activities being undertaken under EI&II (see an example below).

Immediate objective No. 1	By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and cote d'Ivoire (RCI) will be accelerated						
Objectives/outputs/activities (As listed in project document or summary outline)	Start dates		Finish dates		Status	Resp. person	Remarks
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
Output 1.1: Consultations and technical support delivered for integrating child labour/trafficking concerns into national mining policies and laws, sub-national and/or local government action plans and social partner policies and plans in Benin and Nigeria.							
Activity 1.1.1: Consult and deliver technical support to the Ministry of Mines to integrate child labour/trafficking concerns into their policy and planning framework.	Oct 2011	July 2011	Mar 2012		Ongoing	IPEC (CTA and relevant National Programme Officers) and IAs	Ongoing in Benin, to be started in Nigeria
Activity 1.1.2: Consult and deliver technical support to the Ministry of Labour to review the HCL list with special attention to the mining and quarrying provisions; assess priorities, revise work plans accordingly.	Oct 2011	July 2011	Mar 2012		Ongoing	IPEC (CTA and relevant National Programme Officers) and IAs	Ongoing in Benin  Committee for identification of HCL has been formed in Nigeria. Committee to work with identified consultant to facilitate the review of the list
Activity 1.1.3: Consult and deliver technical support to the Ministries of Mines and Justice to address and enforce gaps in legislation against child labour in quarrying and mining.	Oct 2011	July 2011	Jun 2011		Ongoing	IPEC (CTA and relevant National Programme Officers) and IAs	Ongoing in Benin Not started in Nigeria

(from Project Technical Progress Report April - September 2011)

#### Data

34. There are two data collection systems being implemented by the project: the **Child Labor Monitoring System** (GCLMS for Ghana) and its Francophone counterpart (*SOSTECI* for Côte d'Ivoire and *SSTEB* in Benin), and the **Direct Beneficiaries Monitoring Report** (DBMR). The first is a well-designed system to collect data on children selected to be withdrawn or prevented in order to increase knowledge about the most important target population. It also is a method to verify eligibility of the child for EI&II assistance and was fully supported by the EI&II projects. It is expected to continue as the national system to collect data on CL after the closeout of EI&II. Although time did not permit thorough ground-truthing of the system in the localities where it is being applied, the evaluation team did make the following observations:

- In Benin, the system is starting to be rolled-out, with the SSTEB software installed in the Child Labour Unit (CLU) at the NSC and training conducted for those charged with operating the system.

- In Côte d'Ivoire, the SOSTECI is operational but there were many implementation obstacles observed that could limit its sustainability or expansion, as cited above (insufficient motivation, lack of electricity or working computers, etc.).
  - In Ghana, the CLMS is in its most advanced operational state, with a well-equipped and established national office and local coordinators collecting and feeding in data.
35. The other data collection system being used (DBMR) is donor-driven and aims to gather standardized data on the WFCL. Here is its purpose and description from the ECOWAS II project document:

*DBMR is a quality assurance tool which standardizes definitions of desired outcomes to allow for comparability and accountability. The system allows for accurate documentation of the status of children in respect of their education and work status and regular progress reporting as well as documenting success during evaluations, and for tracking and tracing for impact evaluation purposes.*

36. The DBMR has been developed over many years and is the subject of considerable training of staff implementing IPEC projects. It is not intended to be used by each country after the end of EI&II. There is no question that the need is great for accurate and standardized data drawn from various projects that can track and report on the numbers of children withdrawn, prevented, attending school regularly, from what forms of CL and many other characteristics. This thirst for data is reflected in the DBMR forms which are complex and difficult to administer in the field, according to the IAs and ILO project staff. The entities administering the forms reported that they found the information produced did not add value to their work. One NGO reported that they were compelled to complete the many forms but could only hire low-paid part-time staff to handle the work due to inadequate budget support. Many saw the form as overly-burdensome and contained questions inappropriate to the local setting that, when asked, would produce unreliable data. (See Annexes for a collection of comments on the DBMR used in Nigeria.)

#### SELECTED QUESTIONS FROM DBMR FORM USED

Q12: What type of work are adults of the household doing?

How much is the average monthly income of the adults of the household?

Comment: Some IAs administering the questions indicated that children could not answer these questions, even about their own income. For the father's income, one IA simply guessed at the income based on the father's work (carpenter, cloth salesman, etc.) and entered it on the form.

Q11: How many adults (+18 years) in household working?

Comment: Those administering the DBMR said that data from questions such as No. 11 were not likely to yield reliable information for cultural reasons (definition of "adult", "working," and that children often do not know how old other family members and may not know their own birthdate.

## 2.2 Effectiveness and efficiency

### 2.2.1 Program achievements by output

37. Following is a condensed version that merges the output entries for the EI&II projects to avoid repetition and to focus on the achievements of both projects. Most of the outputs for each project are similar and in some cases identical such that few non-ILO people the team encountered in the four countries could distinguish between the two projects, with the exception

of the Benin project which began under ECOWAS II. The table included in the Annex II, however, separates the projects by achievements as requested in the TOR.

### **Objective 1**

**ECOWAS I & II Objective 1: By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin and Nigeria (ECOWAS II only), and Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire (ECOWAS I & II) will be accelerated**

**Output 1.1: Consultations and technical support delivered for finalising the National Action Plan (NAP), its validation and adoption and for integrating child labour into other national, relevant sectoral, sub-national and/or local action plans in RCI, Ghana and Nigeria (ECOWAS I only)**

**Output 1.1: Consultations and technical support delivered for integrating child labour/trafficking concerns into national mining policies and laws, sub-national and/or local government action plans and social partner policies and plans in Benin and Nigeria (ECOWAS II only)**

38. *Summary of finding on Output 1.1:* National Action Plans were completed in all countries. Dissemination of the NAPs was either completed or would soon be completed in all countries. Differences exist among the countries in terms of how the NAPs will be integrated by stakeholder groups on the NSCs. Understanding and applying the NAPs at the local level varies, as shown below:
39. Hazardous work lists were completed that were critical to implementing changes framed in the National Action Plans. These work lists applied to mining, cocoa and other domains where CL persists. In Nigeria, the NAP was vetted at the state level and adjusted to include the input received.
40. In Benin, the NSC coordinates activities implemented by NGOs, the application of the NAP in the context of efforts to eliminate CL, and the coordination among ministries to ensure that the Annual Work Plan is followed. At the local level various agencies are implicated in operationalizing the work plan (for example, the *Comites de Surveillance de Securite et de Sante au travail (CSSST)* and the *Cellules Communales du Suivi du Travail des Enfants*).
41. In Ghana, according to both the ILO project staff and interviews with a local Social Welfare Officer (the focal point for the NSC) and others, local officials are aware of the NAP but work in weak institutions often with non-functioning equipment that impedes their ability to systematically implement NAP activities. Few sufficiently trained staff and meagre resources hamper their efforts. In Asutifi District, activities ramped up after 2009 when 10 Community Child Protection Committees were formed (out of 900 communities) after which the NGO responsible for implementing CL activities intervened with training and equipment (motorbikes, bicycles, computers, etc.). By the time of the field visit, a local official reported that the *DCPC (District Child Protection Committee)* used to be very active and counsel parents with children in *WFCL*, but now has been reduced to only a focal person. The IA in this case noted that CL issues that should be integrated into the District Assembly's Medium-Term Plans but the activities have no budget assigned.



**Output 1.2: Capacity building programmes designed and delivered to fill gaps in relevant institutional capacity to implement NAPin RCI, Ghana and Nigeria (ECOWAS I only)**

**Output 1.2: Capacity building programmes designed and delivered to fill gaps in relevant institutions capacity to combat the worst forms of child labour in the artisanal mining sectors in Benin and Nigeria (ECOWAS II only)**

42. *Summary of finding on Output 1.2:* Many training programs were developed in each country for all the stakeholders and primary movers in major institutions that could have an impact on reducing the WFCL. Programme implementers held exploratory meetings with stakeholders about their organizational capacity to implement CL elimination activities, which revealed gaps that the projects could address. The IPEC Strategic Programming Impact Framework (SPIF) was employed to identify partner organization needs. The description of the SPIF (see footnote) focuses on strategic planning, not on institutional performance assessment.<sup>3</sup> Good Practices to assist an organization improve performance call for assessing the root causes of below-par institutional performance using a process that goes beyond strategic planning, considering an organization's internal architecture or taking note of needs articulated by an organization's leadership. An in-depth institutional performance assessment is typically conducted prior to embarking on *training*, because training is only one of many potential interventions that can help fill the identified gaps.<sup>4</sup>
43. Organizational assessments of the type mandated by the ISPI, donors and performance technologists, are designed to reveal the root causes for non-performance and did not appear to have been conducted in the institutions targeted prior to beginning capacity building activities. If however the term "capacity-building" in the Output statement refers to "increasing understanding" of the WFCL and helping people learn how to implement programs to eliminate the WFCL, then "training" did serve its purpose "to implement NAP and combat the WFCL." Capacity-building in this sense can lead to better understanding of how to solve the problem but may not "fill the gaps in relevant institutional capacity" as stated in the Output description above.
44. At the national level, capacity-building interventions that included training, technical assistance and equipment support, in particular with the National Steering Committees in all four countries, played a critical role in increasing coordination among ministries, tripartite stakeholders and IAs. The performance gaps at the NSCs were well understood by the ILO project staff, as revealed in many interviews, and their interventions led to a significant increase in coordination and information sharing. At the local level, the IAs played a direct role in implementing the capacity-building and often were not as familiar with the local institutional landscape, and the causes of performance gaps, as was the ILO at the national (and regional) level. For example, the IA implementing activities in several Ghanaian towns operated from an office several hours away by road, impeding the effectiveness of sustainable capacity-building with local institutions. In Côte d'Ivoire the IA which did have a local presence in one community, engaged non-local officials to implement the program rather than draw from the surrounding communities. These operational differences between implementing capacity-building at the national and local level influenced whether results expected were achieved.

---

<sup>3</sup> *SPIF* is an approach to identify outcomes and impacts in an area of intervention (a given country, sector or target group) where a programme or project operates. Its intention is to place a project in context and provide the basis for strategic programming and linking of complementary interventions to enhance its effectiveness (SPIF Guidelines, 2002)

<sup>4</sup> Refs: International Society for Performance Improvement (ISPI) approach to *capacity building* and USAID's Human & Institutional Capacity Development (HICD) framework.

**Output 1.3: Technical assistance provided to reinforce national laws and law enforcement in Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria (ECOWAS I only)**

45. *Summary of finding on Output 1.3 (EI only):* Technical assistance provided was instrumental in ECOWAS achieving the desired outcomes. Significant new legislation, or new ways to support existing legislation, was passed or proposed in all countries as a result the project. An illustrative list is shown below:

*Ghana*

- Ratification of Convention 138
- National Action Plan endorsed by Cabinet
- National Assembly held hearings on CL for the first time
- Hazardous Work list promulgated.

*Nigeria*

- Hazardous List completed
- National Policy & Plan of Action on CL completed and validated.

*Côte d'Ivoire*

- Revision of the Hazardous Works list
- Government adoption of a bill against child trafficking and CL.

*ECOWAS Regional*

- Member states adopted Regional Action Plan in December 2012.

46. Although Benin was not included in ECOWAS I, and this Output was not included in the ECOWAS II logical framework, the project did contribute in producing the following achievements in Benin:

*Benin*

- Dissemination of the Hazardous Work list adopted in 2011
- Decree signed prohibiting CL in quarries
- New Child Law being considered by the National Assembly
- Activated a “911 Alert System” to help the Protection of Miners Brigade recognize child abuse.

**Output 1.3: (ECOWAS II) and 1.4 (ECOWAS I) National and sub-national awareness raising and social mobilisation campaigns conducted in Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria (and Benin)**

47. *Summary of finding on Output 1.3 and 1.4):* Although awareness-raising campaigns were conducted widely, and were in most respects effective, they varied from country to country. Evaluators did not observe examples where innovative sensitization activities in one country were tried in another.
48. In Ghana, awareness-campaigns took many forms, from printing and distributing posters, T-shirts and videos that can be shown on television. The ILO/IPEC team initiated a partnership

with government, called of Social Mobilisation Partners against Child labour (SOMOPAC), to diffuse messages on the WFCL throughout the country via the Ministry of Information. In Nigeria, workshops were held, led by local communications experts, to train community leaders working to reduce CL on effective ways to reach people through messages of various types. School-based workshops were also organized to reach younger and vulnerable audiences about the danger of the WFCL in Nigeria; a writing contest was launched offering prizes to the best entry on how to stop child domestic work. In all countries the EI&II projects organized special events around the World Day against Child Labour. In Benin a television debate was organized where the ILO tripartite organizations discussed progress on Benin's Roadmap 2010 toward elimination of CL by 2016.

49. An example of regional level awareness-raising, ECOWAS organized a workshop for member states in July of 2013 in Benin entitled *Training and Sensitization on Instruments for Child Protection* for ECOWAS member States.
50. Where Direct action has removed or prevented the WFCL, awareness-raising is a by-product. Efforts to use methods appropriate to a village or district environment could have a profound impact in communities that are not reached by awareness campaigns conducted in major cities.

**Output 1.5: ECOWAS I: Studies undertaken to fill identified gaps in knowledge base on selected WFCL and the problems of forced labour and trafficking in Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and ECOWAS**

**Output 1.4: ECOWAS II: Studies undertaken to fill identified gaps in knowledge base on artisanal mines and the problems of forced child labour and trafficking in Benin and Nigeria**

51. *Summary of finding on Output 1.5 and 1.4:* A study completed in Benin designed to learn about CL in the country's mines and quarries,<sup>5</sup> revealed the extent of CL in mining, specifically in the gravel, granite and gold sub-sectors. The report identified 102 operational artisanal mining sites employing 2,991 children aged 5 to 17, of which 86 percent combined school and work and approximately 50 percent had been working in the mines since 2012, after the EII project had begun. This study also explored the socio-economic roots of CL that helped the project design its direct interventions.
52. Studies were conducted in each country that assisted both the ILO project staff, the NSC and the IAs in implementing activities to target populations they better understood. The evaluation team could not determine the overall utility of the studies in terms of responding to the Output as described. Some studies were still on-going late in the project life, which raised the question of whether their findings would feed into the EI&II decision-making process, although the studies would add value to NSC post-project strategic planning.
53. Output 1.6: ECOWAS I: Models of intervention designed and piloted in four target sectors including models for withdrawing and preventing children working in forced labour and other WFCL in Ghana and RCI (ECOWAS I only)

---

<sup>5</sup> *Approfondissement des connaissances sur le travail des enfants les mines et carrières du Benin, Mai 2014.*

**Output 1.5: Models of intervention designed and piloted for withdrawing and preventing children working in the worst forms of child labour in Benin RCI , Ghana, and Nigeria (ECOWAS II only)**

**Output 1.6: Models of intervention designed and piloted to promote resilient family livelihoods and sustainable community development in Benin RCI , Ghana, and Nigeria (ECOWAS II only)**

54. *Summary of finding on Output 1.6:* Intervention models were developed to resolve the obstacles identified after children were withdrawn. The project achieved its targets to withdraw children from the WFCL (see table). As the children were withdrawn, as with any development intervention, new challenges were revealed, such as the lack of school equipment (or various fees in the case of Nigeria). These obstacles were then mitigated by new project interventions (school kits and obtaining a waiver in Oyo State from paying required fees).

**Table 1: Actual Life of Project Beneficiaries**

Actuals - Life of project			
Country/Key indicators	Number of Children at high risk and provided with educational services (E1-CAHR) (ECOWAS I)	Number of Children engaged in child labour and provided with educational services (E1-CL) – (ECOWAS II)	Number of households provided with initial livelihood services (L1) – (ECOWAS II)
RCI	789	462	786
Ghana	577	432	818
Benin	1040	713	1125
Nigeria	394	334	266
Total Actuals	2,800	1,941	2,995
Targets	2,220	1,780	3,000
Achievements	126.12% (targets exceeded)	109% (targets exceeded)	99% (targets almost achieved)

(from EI&II Status Report, January 2014)

55. Over the course of the EI&II projects, increasingly complicated interventions at the local level had to be managed. IAs had to procure school kits, negotiate entry into schools (that were overcrowded already) with teachers and headmasters, arrange for apprenticeships for certain age-groups, interact with families about their revenue-generating programs – in short, manage a panoply of socio-economic interventions in a resource-poor environment without relying on weak local institutions to assist. This ever-expanding and challenging model presents significant limitations in terms of sustainability and manageability.
56. In terms of implementing direct action to beneficiaries, EI&II were able to facilitate reinsertion of children withdrawn from WFCL. These children were placed in schools, or in vocational centers and training programs to improve their skills. However, the evaluators did not observe monitoring mechanisms in place to track changes in student learning, for example, or to ensure that education of a reasonable quality was provided to the children. Although there were careful attendance records kept of children withdrawn, monitoring focused on attendance rather than learning. . Measuring student learning would require establishing a baseline with the rescued students, for example of their reading ability, then measuring that indicator after school attendance. Nonetheless, , a child in school is far superior to a child in the WFCL. But to retain that child in an environment that produces no revenue, the educational environment would need to be attractive.
57. The model had evolved, understandably, to include actions in the community beyond the withdrawal or prevention of children in the WFCL, such as livelihood services to families of the withdrawn or prevented children. These supporting interventions based on the team's observations, discussions with teachers and verification of school registries, helped retain children in school.

58. The model, as described above, guided implementation in all the sectors targeted (artisanal mining, quarries, cocoa, fisheries, etc.). The specifics of its application were modified to fit the circumstances found in each sector. Withdrawing children from fisheries in Ghana's Volta region had to be executed differently from withdrawing child domestic workers, child miners or children on cocoa farms. The mechanics of withdraw differed but the model appeared to the evaluators to be consistent, especially with regards to post-withdrawal actions (school placement, family support, collaboration with local social and law enforcement officials, etc.).
59. As the table shows, nearly 3,000 families received equipment they might use as support to generate income (sewing machines, carpentry toolboxes, refrigerators, milling machines, etc.). In some instances, for example for cocoa farmers in Ghana, an assessment was conducted to identify the potential of revenue-generating activities in their area. The recommended list included palm oil and gari processing, vegetable farming, grasscutter rearing, mushroom farming and beekeeping. The IA then proceeded to assist families in pursuing these alternative livelihoods. The output indicator to measure the livelihood component – *No. of at-risk families benefiting from economic empowerment schemes provided or facilitated by the project* – does not measure whether the intervention was successful – that is, resulting in families with increased revenue. In terms of outcome, although the evaluators observed the equipment distributed, met with families and noted from quarterly reports the number of families reached, they can only note that the intervention was completed, not that the well-being of families may or may not have improved.

## **Objective 2**

**ECOWAS I & II Objective 2: By the end of the project the role played by ECOWAS/CEDEAO in combating the worst forms of child labour in the sub-region will be reinforced**

**Output 2.1: Technical assistance provided to ECOWAS to establish protocols for monitoring member states' efforts to combat the worst forms of child labour, consistent with community policies and plans and reflecting international standards and norms (ECOWAS I only)**

**Output 2.1: Sub regional Plan of Action on Child Labour designed and adopted (ECOWAS II only)**

**Output 2.2: : Technical assistance provided to review ECOWAS monitoring mechanisms to combat the worst forms of child labour, consistent with community policies and plans and reflecting regional and international standards and norms. (ECOWAS II only)**

60. *Summary of finding on Output 2.1:* Based on document review, and discussions with ECOWAS, progress has been made in establishing ways to track the WFCL in member states.
61. Despite delays and the prediction in the Mid-Term Evaluation that Objective 2 would not be achieved by the project end-date, significant achievements were made. A Child Protection M&E Framework encompassing a Child Labour Regional Action Plan was adopted by ECOWAS Ministers in December 2012 and a Declaration on the implementation of the Regional Action Plan was endorsed by the tripartite groups in the ECOWAS member states in May 2013. Technical assistance from EI&II in the form of provision of international experts, for example to draft documents for ECOWAS consideration, and guidance from ILO/IPEC staff, was instrumental in reaching these outputs.

**Output 2.2: Programmes designed and implemented to strengthen the capacity of relevant ECOWAS technical departments to combat child labour in the sub-region (ECOWAS I only)**

62. *Summary of finding on Output 2.2:* Based on quarterly reports reviewed and discussions with those managing activities with ECOWAS, a number of constraints were noted early-on that

challenged capacity-building at ECOWAS. Collaboration got off to a slow start due to what ILO/IPEC staff reported to be the frequent travel by key ECOWAS staff, plus overall delays due to the terrorist attack on the UN/ILO offices in Abuja. When activities eventually were launched, ECOWAS began to take ownership and regional initiatives, such as with workshops and preparatory work toward the Regional Action Plan. Whether the *relevant ECOWAS technical departments* were *strengthened* as the Output called for, cannot be confirmed without a performance analysis and baseline to know what changed institutionally. Interviews with ECOWAS and IPEC staff clearly demonstrated that individuals had greatly increased their knowledge of WFCL and regional activities were underway that were previously not envisaged, but the capacity of the technical departments would likely be significantly impaired by the departure of the individuals trained by the projects.

63. An assessment of ECOWAS designed to produce information for the ILO where capacity-building can be targeted, contributed limited value to implementing Output 2.2, according to interviews, since it focused on organizational structure (organigrams) rather than identifying root causes for performance gaps. The latter would lead to intervention solutions that can be proposed to the institution that will fill the gaps. One intervention proposed might be training, whereas others could be improving internal communications or providing updated equipment to modernize organizational processes. Individual training opportunities were provided to ECOWAS staff, for example in Turin, to upgrade knowledge and skills. Such training initiatives, however useful for the individuals, do not, by themselves, lead to *institutional* capacity strengthening.
64. Based on interviews with ILO/IPEC staff, the evaluation team cannot know whether the capacity (i.e., performance) of relevant ECOWAS technical departments has been significantly improved. Had a rudimentary performance baseline been established at the inception of EI&II, capacity development with ECOWAS since then could have been measured. Given that training and technical assistance were the principal activities the ILO sponsored, the result is understandable for these reasons: 1) training individuals does not generally result in improved institutional performance, as documented for decades by the ISPI and other organizational development associations in the UK, Canada and the United States, and 2) technical assistance leads to producing specific deliverables (e.g., a draft Regional Plan of Action) rather than resolving institutional performance constraints.

### **Output 2.3: Sub-regional forums organised to encourage networking and to share good practices among all ECOWAS member states**

65. **Summary of finding on Output 2.3:** After considerable delays in making progress at ECOWAS to move on adopting a regional action plan and supporting mechanisms, the EI&II projects started showing impressive results. First, the RAP was adopted by ECOWAS Ministers in December 2012, which contained a peer review mechanism; second, the tripartite Symposium held in Accra in May 2013 reviewed the roles and responsibilities to implement the RAP and concluded a Declaration which included Ghana's offer to be the first peer-reviewed country; and third, the peer review took place in November-December 2013 and was to be discussed in April 2014 among member states. Conducting a peer review, although an established process at ECOWAS, was not *de rigueur* for Child Labour. The planning for the large regional workshop held in Accra in itself contributed importantly to establishing a footprint in the region.

#### **2.2.2 Finding: achievements by outputs**

66. Under Objective 1, the two EI&II projects substantially met their desired objectives, as documented under each Output above.
67. As discussed above under Output 2.2, there is no evidence to indicate that the technical departments at ECOWAS have been strengthened, nor is there evidence to indicate that they

were not strengthened by the projects. Nonetheless, Objective 2 was reached in that the *role* played by ECOWAS in combatting the WFCL was *reinforced*. Whether this was the result of a particular mix of individuals who became proactive and focused on the outcome (regionalizing efforts to end the WFCL drawing from the EI&II projects' successes in the four countries), or due to strengthened technical departments, cannot be determined.

### 2.2.3 *Finding: number of direct beneficiaries*

68. The table 1 above shows the actual numbers of children at high risk prevented from engaging in the WFCL (Column 2), numbers of children withdrawn (Column 3) and number of households that received livelihood assistance (Column 4), as reported by the projects. The figures have not been verified, which was not required in the TOR.

69. The findings below apply to all four countries and were developed jointly by the international and national evaluators. They suggest the extent of impact on the beneficiaries themselves based on focus group interviews, random encounters with children and meetings with local officials. Due to the time available, the results presented do not derive from a quantitative, statistically-representative sampling of the beneficiaries:

- The result of being withdrawn from the WFCL on individual children improved the quality of the children's lives in many respects: self-confidence, increased hope, better socialization due to interaction with peers, pride of self, etc.
- Level of children's academic abilities (e.g., reading levels) could not be assessed.
- In focus groups, many children indicated they could not continue in school after the EI&II projects support ends, despite their wanting to.
- In cases where the schools provided lunch (usually as part of a national school feeding program), children reported that this would be a significant incentive to remain in school and would provide the parents with additional relief.
- In Côte d'Ivoire, where evaluators encountered children presented as having been withdrawn, some had not been in the WFCL (nor were identified as vulnerable) yet were receiving ILO/IPEC support. Based on the 60+ children encountered in the four countries, the frequency of non-compliance with ILO/IPEC requirements was low.
- Some children continue to be engaged in the WFCL while in school (weekends, early morning, evenings or during absences from school).
- A few cases were observed where older children were withdrawn from an activity generating reasonable income (e.g., barbering, braiding) during school hours, enrolled in school at a level beyond their reading capacity, resulting in a worsening of the child's economic status.
- Assessing the impact on children vulnerable to being drawn into the WFCL was difficult due to the challenge of attributing whether their decisions not to take work defined as the WFCL were based on the projects' interventions or on other factors.
- Due to the paucity of viable data on the WFCL disaggregated by sex, sector, location, or age, the team could not estimate the impact of withdrawing children as a percentage of the total number of children in the WFCL. Even though this question was not part of the TOR, it is mentioned here since it was a frequent subject of discussion by stakeholders.
- Based on the assisted families interviewed during field work, some received tools and equipment as part of the economic empowerment component but were not able to increase their revenue. The equipment purchased in some cases was either inappropriate to their needs or too difficult to maintain, or they could not manage the new activity. In other cases families increased revenues that helped them counter the revenue loss from

their children not being engaged in the WFCL. For others, short-term family assistance (bag of rice, oil) smoothed the way for the child to be withdrawn and enrolled, but was temporary.

#### **2.2.4 Finding: capacity-building**

70. As discussed above in connection with Outputs calling for capacity building, extensive training programs were designed and delivered in each country for all the stakeholders and primary movers in major institutions that could have an impact on reducing the WFCL. They played a direct role in improving understanding of the WFCL, increasing coordination among government agencies, strengthening the NSCs and raising awareness among stakeholders. The evaluators repeatedly noted highly-complimentary reactions from participants in these training programs, which were organized primarily in-country rather than overseas. An example is the media workshop held in Lagos, or training for Ghanaian journalists, where evaluators could attribute a plausible connection between an increase in accurate media coverage of the WFCL to the training received.
71. In terms of building *institutional* capacity, organizational assessments did not appear to be conducted in the institutions targeted. In some instances where both training and equipment were provided to government divisions (for instance, the CLUs or the entities managing the CLMS), improved capacity to develop policies, communicate with stakeholders and monitor data occurred. At the local level, however, evaluators did not observe that the institutions responsible for reducing the WFCL were strengthened to the same degree. In other words, training and equipment had their anticipated impact at the national level whereas at the decentralized district level, the same was not observed.

### **2.3 Potential Impact**

72. The following long-term effects of the ILO/IPEC project interventions were observed and can be plausibly attributed to ILO/IPEC actions in West Africa for over 15 years. It is more challenging to attribute these changes *only* to the EI&II projects, whose actual project life span stretched only from 2011 to 2014.

#### **2.3.1 Increase in understanding of the types and definitions of the WFCL**

73. As leaders comprehend the layers of CL they become enabled for action against it. When actions against the WFCL result in reducing its frequency, change occurs. There is no doubt that at many levels, especially in the capital cities, decision-makers, government functionaries, school teachers, NGO leaders, politicians, journalists and religious leaders know about CL and how it differs from traditional “child work.” They also see the WFCL all around. The media coverage of CL, and its worst forms, has soared in the four countries visited. No matter how the team posed its question about the level of understanding of CL and WFCL today compared to prior years, the answers were the same: dramatic change from resistance to an idea imposed from the West, as was cited in two countries, to passionate seizing of the issue to mitigate national embarrassment. The work the ILO/IPEC has done to bring this about, with the support from the USDOL, is impressive.

#### **2.3.2 Regional awareness of the gravity and extent of the WFCL has increased and momentum emerged to take action**

74. Again, the team has no irrefutable evidence short of opinions expressed during interviews, observations made and documents read, to back up the above finding. Several proxy indicators did appear, however: more media coverage of the WFCL appeared in the four countries



(evaluators viewed newspaper clips, for example). (See earlier comments that attribute this increase to the EI&II-sponsored training and outreach to the media.) Also, participation in the ECOWAS-sponsored workshop in Benin on building awareness of the WFCL may increase regional awareness in that participants learned tools for effective communication in their respective countries.

75. The most significant indicator of the progress made to “regionalize” the fight against the WFCL was the meeting convened in Accra in May 2013. The ILO/IPEC provided major support for this ECOWAS conference, including organization, logistics and facilitation. All ECOWAS member states sent tripartite representatives (government, unions and employers’ associations), many of whom were senior-level leaders. The meeting culminated a multi-year process managed by ECOWAS with technical assistance from the EI&II projects, without which the meeting, and its declaration on CL, would not have taken place at this time.
76. The RAP was adopted by ECOWAS Ministers in December 2012 and the *Declaration* (a copy of which is included in the Annex III) in May 2013 outlined the roles and responsibilities of the member states in implementing the RAP. The list of items in the Declaration reflects many of the lessons learned during the implementation of the EI&II projects, for example:
  - Facilitating comprehensive birth registration
  - Governments take systematic steps to avoid using child labour inadvertently in the goods and services they procure
  - Providing decent work opportunities to adults who are susceptible to sending their children to work
  - Member states collect consistent, comparable and regular statistics on child labour.
77. Interviews with the key ECOWAS counterparts for EI&II confirmed that without the EI&II – sponsored technical assistance with technical aspects, information dissemination and overall advocacy, the RAP would not have been adopted in 2012. That being said, one key informant commented that ECOWAS would have eventually arrived at a RAP but over time, and given the urgency of the subject (CL), the help from the EI&II projects was instrumental in accelerating the process.

## 2.4 Relevance

### 2.4.1 Findings

78. The EI&II projects address a pressing and growing issue that threatens the future of children. With millions of children between the ages of 5 and 17 engaged in the WFCL, the EI&II projects aim to eliminate the practice through interventions at various levels: high-level inter-ministerial steering committees, national stakeholders representing powerful groups (e.g., ILO’s tripartite partners) and civil society and media groups, among others. The projects work at this high level to promote policies and mainstream the elimination of the WFCL into public-sector planning, budgeting and systems. As policies are adopted, they can begin to effect change as they are operationalized and cascaded to the local levels. At the local levels (regional, district, village/town), the projects implement direct action to remove and prevent children from continuing in the WFCL, and to provide economic empowerment / alternative livelihood assistance to their families.
79. These interventions have the effect of impassioning people to take action on their own to end CL in its worst forms. They demonstrate locally the mechanisms to rid communities of the WFCL. In the process, diverse local administrative structures and influence clusters (child protection, labour, health officers, law enforcement, agricultural cooperatives, etc.) begin to

work together to reduce the demand for CL, increase the attractiveness of education as an alternative and refer families to access existing resources to support the education of their children.

80. The EI&II projects, like few interventions in a developing country, direct their resources to eliminate a practice scorned by most people but witnessed by them daily. In that sense it is highly relevant for the well-being and future of the affected families and communities that the EI&II projects were undertaken. On the national level, countries with the WFCL risk having their image tarnished internationally, which was a major motivating force, according to interviews, behind Nigeria, Benin, Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire welcoming the EI&II projects and their predecessors. Ignoring the gravity of the WFCL compounds the larger issue of unemployed and angry youth in terms of a country's future stability. On the regional level, eliminating the WFCL is paramount for many reasons, among them to be in compliance with international standards and ratified agreements and to confront the reality that the WFCL in one ECOWAS country has cross-border consequences on its neighbors (ref: Nigeria-Benin cross-border CL migration).

## **2.5 Sustainability**

81. In the EI&II project documents, sustainability was addressed with considerable specificity and it is monitored and discussed regularly in the quarterly reports.

### **2.5.1 Findings**

*Increased awareness at the national level of the WFCL will remain.*

82. In each country, evaluators triangulated questions to determine the extent to which awareness of the WFCL changed since the inception of the EI&II projects. Answers were unanimous throughout, with many respondents describing a) their own misunderstandings of CL and WFCL prior to the projects, and b) the higher level of public debate surrounding the topic in the public space, including among religious, political, youth and academic leaders. The ILO Tripartite partners all reported that their constituents had a stronger grasp on the difference, for example, between CL and WFCL.
83. In Ghana, a senior member of the National Parliament has adopted Child Labour and its worst forms as a major theme and convened a hearing on the subject with the ILO/IPEC team in attendance. He also participated in the stakeholder's meeting. Political leaders in all four countries have spoken out about the elimination of CL in its worst forms.

*"Visibly hidden" children in WFCL revealed*

84. Interviewees frequently noted that when people become aware of the WFCL "hidden in front of them," they do not forget or revert to their previous imperviousness. Investments in awareness raising, it is believed, will produce long-term behavior change, as long as the sensitization campaigns target new populations less knowledgeable of the WFCL and they are innovative and well adapted to the cultural setting.

*Policies developed remain in place*

85. Each of the four countries has succeeded in instituting new policies, and in some cases legislation or regulations, as a result primarily of the EI&II projects, which relentlessly advocated for coordination among the major stakeholders via the national steering committees (see Program Achievements by Output section above). Once adopted, these policies are unlikely to be rescinded due to overwhelming public support to eliminate the WFCL. The

challenge is to mainstream the new policies and protocols throughout government so that at the local level, change will be supported.

*Livelihood assistance to families has succeeded in some cases but not all; for those where it has not improved livelihood, external assistance cannot be sustained*

86. In cases where expendable commodities were provided (rice, oil, etc.) to increase the likelihood that the withdrawn or prevented children would remain in school, these transfers are not likely to continue post-project. The IAs administering the funds do not have resources to continue this type of assistance. In cases where equipment was provided to foster alternative livelihoods *and* the aid led to a *stable* increase of revenue, the impact of the empowerment can be sustained. In cases where the livelihood assistance provided failed to lead to increased family revenue, for whatever reason, supplementary assistance will not be forthcoming. The evaluators observed both positive and negative examples of livelihood assistance during the course of the field visits: families who leveraged the assistance to improve their revenue and stability, or the Nigerian woman head-of-household who received a freezer to sell drinks, but electricity outages and lack of capital to purchase inventory prevented the assistance from achieving its intended result. What is clearly not sustainable is continued *assistance* to affected families who have not been able to improve their status after the projects close.

*Vocational training and apprenticeships provided to older children is not readily sustainable, although the knowledge, skills and attitudes acquired may be*

87. Evaluators observed cases where children in this category (15-17 years old) were successfully placed with local business people (carpenters, tailors, etc.) or provided start-up tools (hair salon equipment, carpentry tools, etc.) and were managing their informal micro-enterprises. Cases were also reported where vocational training did not lead to gainful employment. But without an organization designated to identify, interview and place the children in vocational training, it is unlikely this will be continued. However, sustainability can be achieved when local residents organize to identify opportunities for young people with artisans and businesspeople in the community.

*Educational support (school kits, etc.) to withdrawn children is unlikely to be sustainable overall*

88. Interviews with students, parents, the project leadership, NGOs and community leaders reported that substitute funding for withdrawn children will unlikely be found after the projects end. There were some examples of local support materializing to sustain the momentum begun under EI&II (a small mainstreamed budget noticed in Ghana and school improvements made in Côte d'Ivoire from local funding). However, the support forthcoming is unlikely to be at a level where observers could affirm that educational support initiated by EI&II will be sustained. Moreover, the IAs are not positioned to mobilize funds for this purpose, in particular the NGOs operating in Nigeria, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Benin.

*Local child support committees and community-based interest groups will likely continue to function*

89. Women's groups, cooperatives, local government authorities and CSOs will likely continue to work against CL in their communities, although at a slower pace without technical assistance provided by the EI&II projects, and without budgets available to carry out their mandates. In Ghana, a Social Welfare Officer reported that activities had slowed since IA support stopped. He hopes that the increase in community awareness will provide the stimulus to continue the work. In Nigeria, although the principal IA for the EI&II projects is a semi-autonomous government agency with a budget, and can continue its work to combat the WFCL, the key informant reported that local social service agencies the IA relies on to implement activities are so under-resourced that they cannot sustain the project gains.

## **2.6 Special aspects**

### **2.6.1 Unanticipated impact**

90. The team observed a number of examples of unanticipated impact during the field visits, some of which are listed below:

#### *Informal school*

91. A one-room school was organized in the market in Ibadan, Nigeria to begin orienting the children withdrawn from the WFCL while awaiting the opening of school. The make-shift room attracted children working in the WFCL in the market and encouraged the parents to release them for basic schooling. Volunteer teachers taught the children numeracy and literacy and prepared them to enter primary school. This creative solution removed the children from the WFCL without immediately enrolling them, built anticipation and increased their self-confidence with pre-school learning, and pleased the parents who saw their children cared for, happy and in school.

#### *Community cohesion strengthened*

92. Project interventions at the local level tended to break down barriers between community groups, which were in some places a critical by-product of EI&II activities. In Côte d'Ivoire, for example, participants from diverse backgrounds (local residents, immigrants, and other “non-locals”) speaking different languages and practicing different belief systems, found themselves unified around the issue of the WFCL in a way that increased community cohesion, according to comments during interviews. In Soubre, residents came together to supply school management committees with local materials (bamboo, wood) to repair schools destroyed during the recent civil war. In Ghana, a Social Welfare Officer reported receiving calls for the first time from concerned residents that a neighbor was not allowing their child to attend school. He received six calls within one month and organized visits to the homes with law enforcement to investigate.

#### *Partnering with youth*

93. In Nigeria, the project partnered with the National Youth Service Corps to raise community awareness of the WFCL. The NYSC is a large Nigerian government-sponsored agency that organizes 12 months of obligatory post-graduation service by college students across the country. Involving youth in awareness-raising of the WFCL can have a dramatic ripple effect far beyond what a project's efforts could achieve. The national youth services extend to the far corners of the country. Ghana also has a highly-organized, mandatory national service scheme for any student graduating from a public tertiary institution.

#### *Police request training*

94. In Oyo State, Nigeria, the local police force requested training in the WFCL after hearing about the project's activities in Ibadan. Fifty-seven officers were subsequently trained in how to withdraw, identify and assist in the elimination of the WFCL. The impact of requesting services from the project is enhanced ownership of the process of reducing the WFCL and an increased possibility that the trained officers will inspire others in law enforcement to change.

## **2.7 Implemented recommendations from the mid-term evaluation**

95. The Mid-Term evaluation was completed in August, 2012 and contained over 30 recommendations for the EI&II project managers to consider. Below are a few culled from the

short list (on the pages indicated below) that the evaluators observed having been implemented in the 18 months following the evaluation.

*The two projects' end-date should coincide (MTE - Para 96, p. 41)*

96. This action was taken in December of 2013 that greatly assisted in this evaluation being conducted and in a more reasonable close-out of two similar projects.

*The country programme in Nigeria should be separate from activities involving the ECOWAS*

97. This recommendation could not be implemented, although the Nigeria country director ultimately was able to build relationships in ECOWAS and provide technical assistance which was critical in achieving the regional impact described in this evaluation. (para 100, p.41)

*Develop consistent messages to combat CL (para 102, p. 42)*

98. The projects created thematic messages, such as "Say No to Child Labour," although the evaluators did not determine whether this approach predated the MTE.

*Certify Products to Be Child Labour-Free (para 111, p. 43)*

99. This suggestion was not fully accepted at the time, and the evaluators did not observe indications that "CL-free" products or materials were being marketed domestically.

*Advocate for Launching a Birth Registration Campaign (para 112, p. 44)*

100. The EI&II projects responded to the demand for birth registrations by developing activities led by IAs that were successful.

*Move project activities to Oyo state (Nigeria) as a solution to the lack of children found in quarries in Ogun state (para 120, p. 45)*

101. The EI&II projects adjusted their target areas and included Ibadan in Oyo state to withdraw children from the WFCL. The projects however remained in Abeokuta and focused on children in the WFCL other than in the quarries.

## **2.8 Conclusions**

*Design*

102. The EI&II project designs reflect the extent that the ILO/IPEC has incorporated major lessons learned over the two decades of their involvement in CL. The EI&II project architecture carefully addressed these key areas upon which progress to eliminate the WFCL rests: awareness of the problem and the form it takes (WFCL), policy environment to encourage and support changes, and direct action in proximity to CL where awareness and policy meet to withdraw children.
103. The ECOWAS II project designs incorporated a range of additional community-based activities designed to support and supplement the direct withdrawal of children in the WFCL. The project called for assistance to families of the withdrawn children, vocation training for older withdrawn children and micro-enterprise start-up assistance to adult breadwinners to help replace any lost revenue from the withdrawn children. In short, the project was broadened to address other drivers keeping children in the WFCL. The ILO/IPEC approach evolved to a more holistic approach to resolving the myriad challenges faced by withdrawing children at the community level.

104. By the same token, the level of detail in the design, perhaps ironically resulting from the ILO/IPEC's depth of knowledge of how to reduce the WFCL, placed unnecessary burden on the implementers, both ILO project staff and IAs. The evaluators noted the level of detail included in the quarterly reports and data-gathering requirements for each child or family assisted and questioned the cumulative value of so much reporting and input tracking.

#### *Project achievements*

105. In examining the information contained in the quarterly TPRs, and the many attachments illustrating activities that had taken place, and based on observations and triangulated interviews and focus groups in the field, the team found that the EI&II projects successfully achieved the outputs anticipated. Although at times attribution of a result to EI&II-sponsored interventions was challenging, given predecessor ILO/IPEC-managed projects dating from 2001 that stakeholders cited, overall it is plausible to state that the EI&II projects brought about the significant changes both for the lives of the children withdrawn, prevented and enrolled in school, and for the families assisted with project resources.
106. Nearly all of the outputs listed were achieved or surpassed. The level of prescription in particular at the Activity Level, mandated that the project be implemented in the manner set out in the Logical Framework. Yet for the most part, the activities when completed did contribute directly to achieving the output described. Along the way the project managers revised both the Immediate Objectives, in some instances, and the outputs taking into account the realities on the ground and the information flowing back to the higher-level decision-makers. Understanding that inducing change through targeted interventions is an iterative process that requires frequent alterations and openness to learning was likely a factor that enabled the project to meet or exceed its anticipated outputs.
107. The level of prescription cited above perhaps set the stage for quarterly reporting that appeared to the evaluation team excessive. Every donor agency and government oversight entity needs to be informed of progress toward achieving a project's objectives on a regular basis. Finding the most effective balance between the need for information and the time burden on those implementing the project is always a challenge. In this case, that equilibrium appeared to sap time and resources away from a focus on managing the interventions.

#### *Data*

108. In terms of the strategies to collect data to support all aspects of the project, in particular monitoring and evaluation, the project designs included the expected elements. In the field, however, collecting accurate and useful data on the WFCL presented significant challenges which the evaluation team did not observe resolved. There was progress made in establishing a foundation for future improved data collection and reporting, especially in Ghana, but the data collected had not been integrated into decision-making or linked to research sponsored.
109. If rolled out in every locality where children are being targeted for intervention, the administrative burden to operate the CLMS systems would be high. The desire to obtain information on children affected by CL is worthy but the team observed little capacity locally to scale up such a system in communities with so few non-project resources. The team noted that there were opportunities to develop local indicators to track mainstreaming, for example, or changes at the level of the local police, but there was no functional structure to localize data collection effectively. The way in which the CLMS is structured, with local volunteers trained to collect information that can build a profile of each child, is impressive. The reality on the ground raises questions of its long-term administrative viability.
110. In terms of the DBMR, as previously addressed, the system is compromised by two factors: a) the burden the evaluators consider excessive on those charged with administering it (which

includes ILO/IPEC staff as well as the IAs), and b) the questions required to ask risk collecting inaccurate data due to the difficulty or inappropriateness of the questions in the local cultural setting. Despite these observations based on the evaluators' discussions with implementers and their review of the DBMR questionnaire, an ILO audit report, which was not reviewed, is said to have found the reporting accurate.

### *Implementation complexity*

111. Highly-complex development interventions were required at the local level to respond to the forces working against eliminating the WFCL. Compared to designing and delivering awareness-raising campaigns and advocating for better public policies regarding CL, all critical to the reducing CL, working in villages, small towns and district capitals requires different skill-sets, tremendous patience, networking and relationship-building, knowledge of organizational behavior and intimate understanding of the socio-cultural context in which change has to be induced. And work has to proceed in a resource-starved environment, often without basic support infrastructures, such as reliable power, safe drinking water, available and functional schools and adequate health care. In villages and towns visited, evaluators often had to hold meetings outdoors under a tree there being no office in which to sit.
112. In this challenging environment, the breadth of services that the EI&II projects requested delivered by the IAs was in some respects unreasonable: from managing a rescue operation with law enforcement in often unfriendly territory, to providing micro-enterprise start-up assistance and counseling to families, while interviewing and counseling children possibly traumatized by the swirl of events. Each IA in essence had to become a full-service local economic and social development agency operating on a minimal budget. The fact that so much was achieved at the local level can only be a testimony to what the evaluation team observed as committed, passionate and qualified personnel of the IAs. In terms of continuing the laudable work, if the IAs have no long-term commitment and involvement, combined with a capacity to mobilize resources to fight the WFCL, they will likely not be able to provide the valuable services delivered.

## **2.9 Lessons learned**

### *Preference for Future Allocations between Awareness-Raising, Policy Development and Direct Intervention*

113. The evaluators asked stakeholders and some key informants where future funding should be allocated between the three components shown above. Among these three thrusts of EI&II, allocating funds for direct withdrawal (*direct intervention*) of children from the WFCL as a strategy to eliminate CL is controversial. Some argue that withdrawing a few thousand children does not accelerate the movement toward ending CL since the number withdrawn is a tiny fraction of the total target population. Others claim that direct action demonstrates how to withdraw children at the community level so that it can be sustained without continuous external support and can be scaled up to other communities. When polled, respondents chose Direct Intervention as their preference for future funding, with Awareness Raising as the second choice, but with more effort at the local level. Policy Development received the lowest allocations, with respondents remarking that the policies were already in place and it is now a question of implementing them.
114. Interviewees believed that although withdrawing only a few thousand children from the WFCL did not have any measurable impact on the number of children in WFCL nation-wide, continuing with direct action showed local communities how to take on the responsibility themselves to reduce CL. Beyond that, they stated that a strong by-product of withdrawal and enrollment was awareness-raising at the level of families living outside large cities and towns.

They also pointed out that a community that successfully controls CL will be noticed and respected by others.

115. Awareness-raising was the second choice of respondents for future allocations, but with more effort at the local level. Many commented that people in cities are much more aware after years of these campaigns of the WFCL and that the effort is more needed locally. Policy advocacy received the lowest allocations, with some respondents remarking that the policies were already in place, thanks to EI&II, and it is now a question of implementing them. Again, eyes turned to working at the local level to increase demand for government services, strengthening local institutions to better manage their resources and operationalize and enforce the policies the projects helped develop.

*The limitations of using NGOs in communities as a sustainable approach to reduce child labour*

116. The EI&II project documents call for selecting NGOs in most situations as the Implementing Agency to manage direct interventions in communities and towns. In Côte d'Ivoire implementation relied more on cooperatives and unions. Although it is too early to determine, the evaluators doubt that the NGOs can continue activities in communities when budget support ends. Although NGOs may be effective and efficient implementing agencies, if they cannot continue the work on CL (capacity building, support to children, etc.), another intervention approach may offer better sustainability, such as working directly with local social service agencies to strengthen their performance and ability to continue beyond the project funding. Local organizations could then become stronger advocates for government and private-sector support and could also identify existing community resources to fight CL.

*Effective direct withdrawal requires a breadth of development actions in resource-challenged environments*

117. Prescribing precisely the activities needed to manage withdrawal (and prevention) of children from the WFCL does not by itself lead to effective and sustainable local results. The EI&II projects increasingly were called to provide more and more social support – even psychosocial (e.g., the SCREAM training for school systems) – to ensure that children withdrawn would remain in school and not in the WFCL. Or to assist families to overcome revenue shortages from their child being in school not able to contribute to the family's income. When confronted with a basic problem such as the lack of birth certificates, the IAs had to find solutions. When children had no families nearby, the project was called to trace their families, contact them to determine if the child should be returned or not (depending on the factors behind their being sent away) and if the child was an orphan, find a way to improve that child's life. Direct intervention at the community level requires a complicated set of social services to be provided over time and with minimal budgets, an important lesson that if demonstrated by previous projects, then the EI&II projects underscored their importance as never before.

*Scale up of direct intervention to other communities not generally evident*

118. The hope for direct action is that it can be scaled up to reach more beneficiaries by demonstrating to communities how the WFCL can be implemented using their own resources. But the experience of implementing the EI&II projects revealed that other supporting measures (e.g., support to families, schools and withdrawn children) were necessary beyond the withdrawal. Implementing these other activities was taxing, positioning EI&II as community development agents affecting change in the health, education, law enforcement and social welfare sectors. Given the complexity of managing this full menu of local services to complement direct action, scale-up will be challenging to communities with similar resource constraints and no IPEC assistance



119. This being said, some examples of scale up are occurring. For example, the Oyo State Steering Committee plans to expand interventions to 33 Local Government Areas sourcing funds, the evaluators were told, from the Validated State Action Plan.

#### *Targeting regional objectives worked*

120. The EI&II projects called for strengthening ECOWAS in an attempt to leverage any successes from implementing the projects in the four countries to the other 11 member states in West Africa. After a slow start, the ILO/IPEC team and ECOWAS began having an impact which culminated in the Accra meeting, an endorsed Regional Action Plan and the peer review process being launched. Percolating up the experience of reducing the WFCL in the four countries, through working through a West African run regional organization, was ambitious whose success was anything but certain. Obtaining ownership by ECOWAS of the projects' purpose and experience, through patient and persistent collaboration managed by the ILO/IPEC team, eventually produced solid results. These achievements laid the groundwork for the successes of the four countries in reducing the WFCL and laying the foundation through policy gains and awareness-raising accomplishments to be shared and perhaps replicated in West Africa. Objective 2 of the EI&II project documents was an ambitious attempt to work through a major regional organization to have an impact in the regions, and under strong ILO/IPEC project management, it has gotten off to a good start.

#### **2.10 Potential good practices**

121. In implementing such a complex project at multiple layers in four countries, plus striving to regionalize the achievements and lessons learned, the ILO/IPEC teams developed many "Good Practices" along the way. They became part of implementation and faded away from being considered "good practices" worthy of note. For example, using well-founded development principles in working with a community (build strong relationships, work with all points of influence, listen to community needs, etc.) is expected. Recommending that specialized sub-committees be formed by the NSCs, as was done, is a Good Practice as well as being *de rigueur*. Below are a few good potential practices that stood out from the observed ones.

#### *Support for community-led efforts to ensure quality schools*

122. In Côte d'Ivoire a community rallied around repairing the local schools damaged by the war which enabled children withdrawn to be enrolled. Parents took the lead in gathering local materials, as described earlier in this report. The EI&II projects supported these efforts and saw this as a "mini private-public partnership" that identified local resources to resolve a local problem without waiting for distant government officials to respond to their needs. By partnering with CSOs the EI&II projects leveraged their support and built confidence that the community itself could identify solutions to many problems even without external support.

#### *Partnering*

123. Any effort to reduce the WFCL is limited by lack of resources in light of the extent of the problem world-wide. Awareness-raising is a critical component to increase the urgency to end CL and mobilize funds. Policy development is also a necessary precursor to establishing an enabling environment for actions to be taken beyond the support of a project. Direct action can have some impact beyond the direct beneficiaries as discussed in this report. However, donor-supported projects can have a major impact on reducing the WFCL by leveraging their activities through partnering with existing organizations. Working through the ILO tripartite constituencies, for example, spreads awareness and raises the social bar against CL. The project initiated many partnerships with government, the media, private sector and civil society to extend the impact of their achievements.

### *Identifying champions*

124. The EI&II projects enlisted powerful communicators at the national level to spread the message about the WFCL to various audiences. The same approach was used in some communities that had powerful impact the evaluators observed. In Abengourou, Côte d'Ivoire, the local traditional leader became passionate about ending CL and wanted his district declared “Child Labor Free.” In Nigeria, the project obtained endorsements from the traditional leader in a poor outlying community that helped reach new populations where CL is frequent. Champions are essential to reaching beyond the limitations of an externally-funded project to sustain a movement to end CL.

### *Validating policies proposed with local authorities*

125. In Nigeria, once the national policies regarding the WFCL were approved by the Federal Government, the EI&II projects designed “zonal” workshops in the six geographic zones of Nigeria to which state representatives were invited to a central location. The purpose of the workshops was to build support for each state to adopt similar legislation and regulations on CL and to validate (and modify as necessary) the policies handed down by the central government in Abuja. This approach was highly effective in empowering the states to take action against CL.

### 3. Recommendations

126. The evaluation team decided to focus on presenting a small number of major recommendations based on a wealth of observations made during the brief field visits.

#### 3.1 For the ILO/IPEC in designing future project

##### *1. Apply the gains made at the national level to the local level*

127. The EI&II projects aimed appropriately at changing the top through awareness-raising interventions and promoting significant policy and statutory changes. This report cites impressive gains at the national level that are precursors for lasting change to take place at local levels, including the community level in major cities. Direct interventions balanced the national focus by modeling the removal and prevention of children caught up in the WFCL. Future projects can increase the attention given to operationalizing the policies and regulations adopted to increase support to districts and localities. In one sense the challenge is to activate the National Action Plans so that there are measurable changes that result, in particular at the local level.

##### *2. Assist districts and communities to identify local resources and advocate for government resources (for education, law enforcement, labour inspecting, child protection, etc.) through a more diverse menu of direct actions*

128. The team observed communities that had rallied behind the campaigns to eliminate CL. Parents, church leaders, local officials, women's groups and youth organizations have become passionate about taking action. Finding ways to strengthen these emerging local advocates would increase the sustainability of the project's local actions and empower local groups, government officials and leaders to direct their own anti-CL campaigns. Future projects might consider identifying local champions, rather than NGOs that might not be present locally, and funding their advocacy work inside community-based organizations.

##### *3. Strengthen local institutions by training, mentoring and coaching officials continually on leadership, resource mobilization and monitoring*

129. Capacity building is not achieved by offering local officials training programs to attend. Strengthening local capacity involves long-term assistance delivered in close proximity to the organizations. It calls for facilitation and group work to help resolve local problems, find solutions and identify new resources no one ever imagined were available. In short, future projects could build local demand for external (government) services while demonstrating the breadth of resources available locally that few have seen.

##### *4. Reinvigorate national awareness campaigns with creative and innovative ideas*

130. Although the awareness-raising activities were generally well done, used a broad variety of communication approaches (media, SCREAM for schools, publications, T-shirts, collaboration with NGOs and CSOs, etc.) and produced the expected results, they need a fresh start. Sensitization must be fun, accessible, appealing to the young and targeting the least involved and the most vulnerable. Future projects can consider traveling theatres, associating nationally-recognized artists with eliminating the WFCL, involving locally-respected traditional and religious leaders as change champions, radio shows in local languages, prizes, television celebrities, etc., some of which have been tried and can be replicated and expanded.

### *5. Continue providing ECOWAS with assistance to implement the Regional Action Plan*

131. The ECOWAS actions, with technical help from the EI&II projects, to spread the know-how and tools to eliminate the WFCL in the sub-region reached impressive results. As hoped for in Objective 2, the role of ECOWAS has been strengthened. Given that the peer review is close to being approved, and the Regional Action Plan has been endorsed, timing is propitious to continue to assist ECOWAS move forward to execute the RAP as soon as possible.

### **3.2 For the USDOL**

#### *6. Provide funding to solve the data problem once and for all*

132. To effectively implement Recommendation 5, the project will need to produce data that shows progress toward eliminating the WFCL. Currently data from the EI&II projects shows the numbers of children whose lives have been improved by project assistance. To scale up so that future projects show impact on reducing the WFCL by country or region, data similar to that which is collected by PEPFAR for a range of health conditions will be needed. It is expensive but necessary. The gains made in lowering the incidence of HIV and AIDS is likely due in no small part to the comprehensive data systems developed *and implemented* in every country. With the proper data, today Nigeria can identify the prevalence of many diseases and harmful practices by geographic region, gender and ethnicity. Data then feeds into decision-making, resource mobilization and to effective actions to change behaviors. Similarly, malaria has seen strong data systems develop to support both research, prevention and monitoring of the greatest cause of child mortality in Africa. But a scourge as widespread and harmful as the WFCL has scarce accessible, recent data. The EI&II projects have helped by assisting agencies collecting labour force data to include CL questions in recent years, and by commissioning a number of studies on CL that have helped fill knowledge gaps. But the movement to end the WFCL needs far better data for the future. Although it requires significant resources, collecting data on CL poses challenges no more difficult than conducting surveys on HIV, AIDs, FMC or MSM, all of which are routinely included in the country-based Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS). Or, perhaps future CLMS versions could be integrated into existing national data-collection systems for the health and social sectors.

### **3.3 For stakeholders**

#### *7. Advocate for local resource-mobilization and action against the WFCL*

133. Pressure National Steering Committees, government agencies, national leaders and respected opinion-makers, and local authorities to ensure that budgets, resources and media attention provide support to local communities so that Direct Action and other efforts to eliminate the WFCL can continue and be replicated elsewhere.

#### *8. Sell the successes of EI&II to new funding sources*

134. Develop a strategy through the National Steering Committees to present the successes and lessons learned from EI&II to new donors and the private sector so that the momentum developed to eliminate the WFCL is sustained

## Annex I: Terms of Reference (ToR)



### International Labour Organization- International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour

**ILO/IPEC**

Final version

## **Terms of Reference**

**For**

### **Independent Final Evaluation**

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

	ECOWAS I	ECOWAS II
ILO Project Code	RAF/09/51/USA	RAF/10/53/USA
ILO Project Number	P.340.10.100.051	P.250.03.100.053
Duration	55 months	40 months
Country	Sub regional (15 countries)- National in Cote D'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria	Sub regional (15 countries)- National in Benin, Cote D'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria
Starting Date	30 September 2009	30 December 2010
Ending Date	30 April 2014	30 April 2014
Project Language	English and French	English and French
Financing Agency	USDOL	
Donor contribution	USD 7,950,000	USD 5,000,000

## List of abbreviations

<b>AP</b>	Action Programme
<b>CL</b>	Child Labour
<b>CLMS</b>	Child Labour Monitoring System
<b>DBMR</b>	Direct Beneficiaries Monitoring and Reporting
<b>EIA</b>	Evaluation and Impact Assessment section off IPEC
<b>DWCP</b>	Decent Work Country Programmes
<b>ECOWAS</b>	Economic Community of West Africa States
<b>HQ</b>	Headquarters
<b>ILO</b>	International Labour Organization
<b>IO</b>	Immediate Objective
<b>IPEC</b>	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
<b>NAP</b>	National Action Plan
<b>NC</b>	National consultant
<b>NGO</b>	Non-governmental Organization
<b>OSH</b>	Occupation safety and health
<b>PRSP</b>	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
<b>SAP-FL</b>	Special Action Programme for combating Forced Labour
<b>TBP</b>	Time Bound Programme
<b>TL</b>	Team leader
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>UNDAF</b>	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children's Fund
<b>USDOL</b>	United States Department of Labour
<b>WFCL</b>	Worst Forms of Child Labour

## **I. Background and Justification**

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

direct actions emphasizing the development of mechanisms that ensure mainstreaming into the work of mandated institutions.

8. The ECOWAS organization, that comprises 15 States members in West Africa, has been taken measures since 2008 to work on this thematic area, in particular by adopting a regional CL and Strategic Action Plan. For IPEC to strengthen the capacities of committed organizations, like ECOWAS, is central in providing sustainable structures (i.e. Africa) regarding CL and trafficking as well. This encompasses collaboration with ECOWAS in policy development, monitoring, peer review, information sharing and capacity building among the member states. It should be also noted that this is a potentially useful example of work with regional and sub-regional institutions in Africa involves the establishment of mechanisms for policy monitoring (e.g., through peer review systems), linked to regional/sub-regional policies and protocols, capacity building (training, dissemination of good practices, etc.) and information sharing (web sites, e-mail lists, communities of practice, etc.).
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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. The four countries have DCWP, at different stages of evolution, that will be considered in this evaluation . For further information please see : <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/decent.htm> .

### **Programme background**

12. As has been said earlier, elimination of CL is a major task that should involve all available stakeholders, not only at national or local level. In this sense, ECOWAS I and II have been formulated having in mind the potential of working in West Africa supporting an African governmental-based sub regional organization, ECOWAS. A major project challenge is to upstream achievement and learning in direct actions in local and results at national level (i.e. changes in institutional environment, policy level, etc.).
13. These two projects articulate therefore, a different approach in terms of developing capacities of African countries constituencies<sup>6</sup>.
14. The ECOWAS I and II Projects have two common immediate objectives. The first one is oriented to support national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labour in Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Benin and Nigeria. The second aims at mobilizing sub-regional policy makers and improving sub-regional cooperation for the elimination of the worst forms of child labour

---

<sup>6</sup> The Italian funded project "Support to the development of NAPs in Sub Saharan Africa through policy support, research, knowledge building and advocacy, in particular through UCW Programme" is another recent experience to work in more than one country in Africa under the same project. Even though, the approach is not the same; it should be referred during the desk review phase (i.e. the Final evaluation report).



among all fifteen member States of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). The outputs per objective are presented in Annex II.

15. By linking these two components, and through strategies to foster knowledge sharing, the projects will enable the four countries to serve as models and learning laboratories for the benefit of decision makers and other stakeholders across the sub-region.
16. It is relevant to mention that, in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire, the projects are closely linked to the Cocoa sector, as this is a central economic sector for both countries. As said earlier two other IPEC projects are focus on this sector: CCP and PPP.
17. Regarding Benin and Nigeria, same situation applies in relation to the mining sector.

## **ECOWAS I**

18. The objective one includes direct action in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire. In Ghana it includes working in cocoa (and coffee production) areas, mining and quarries and lake Volta fishing. In Cote d'Ivoire it includes cocoa (and coffee) and domestic child labour.
19. 4,950 children will be withdrawn and 4,650 will be prevented from the WFCL in the targeted areas, through provision of education and vocational and skills training, including labour rights and appropriate OSH measures for adolescents, plus training of employers on workplace risk assessment and management.
20. Up to September 2013 5,545 children have been withdrawn and 4,599 children have been prevented.
21. The project also support development of Child Labour Monitoring Systems ( CLMS).
22. The objective 2 focus is on combating all worst form of child labour in the sub region including the following areas of intervention:
  - Developing [statutory] monitoring and reporting arrangements for relevant policies.
  - Reinforcing the professional capabilities of relevant ECOWAS officials to deal with issues of child labour and trafficking.
  - Co-organizing sub-regional forums and developing knowledge sharing tools designed to forge partnerships, share good practices, and foster sub-regional multi-stakeholders networks.
23. The project will collaborate with the ILO Special Action Programme to combat forced labour (SAP-FL), the International Cocoa Initiative, the World Cocoa Foundation, and the International Organization of Migration to complement their own expertise. The project will also complement effort with other USDOL and IPEC projects working in the same region on cocoa issues.

## **ECOWAS II**

24. In Ghana and Cote D'Ivoire the project complements strategies and activities with ECOWAS I and the USDOL-funded ILO/IPEC project "Towards child labour free cocoa growing communities through an integrated area based approach" (CCP).
25. In Benin, it has direct action programmes in the artesian mining sector. The project addresses also the displacement effect on child labour by working also other activities like markets, plantations, domestic service and street-vending. Moreover, it targets additional families with

livelihoods/decent work interventions, and new action programs in cocoa growing districts using strategies similar to those already implemented in ECOWAS I.

26. In Nigeria the target group includes artisanal mining and quarrying, street hawking, market vending, domestic work, farm work, and street begging.
27. The project also reinforces ECOWAS I interventions in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire to strengthen and expand their child labour monitoring systems (CLMS) and will initiate support for CLMS in Benin.
28. It strengthen the capacity of ILO tripartite constituents and other relevant partners in Benin and Nigeria to enhance and implement national policies, plans and bi-lateral agreements to combat the worst forms of child labour.
29. 4,000 children will be withdrawn or prevented from the WFCL in the targeted areas: 2,000 in cocoa growing districts in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire and 2,000 children in artisan mining and stone quarries in Benin and Nigeria.
30. Up to September 2013 1,331 children have been withdrawn and 1,913 children have been prevented 3,000 households to be targeted for livelihoods services (2,172 up to September 2013).
31. ECOWAS I and II Project achievements and most significant activities as reported by the project, as of September 2013, are:

#### *Ghana*

- Local development of a National Plan of Action on the Elimination of WFCL (NPA) which has been endorsed by Cabinet.
- Government ratified Convention 138.
- Mainstreaming of NPA into the broad National development framework, in government departments, and workers and employers organizations.
- Mainstreaming of child labour into decentralized local government administration.
- Around 260 law enforcement personnel (not only police) trained.
- Ghana Trades Union Congress and Ghana Employers Association have included child labour Collective bargaining agreement (CBAs).
- Working in the Fishing and Mining and Quarrying Sectors with 14 Selected Metropolitan/Municipal/District Assemblies to identify, prevent, remove or protect children in WFCL.
- Formation of more than 120 Community Child Protection Committees.
- More than 100 community-based child protection volunteers sensitized, trained and mobilized for action against child labour in their localities.
- Improved attitudes of parents, teachers, schools and communities to enhance children's welfare.
- Validation of the Hazardous Works Frameworks.
- Strong capacity building of the Child Labour Unit, National Steering Committee, Ghana Journalist's Association, GEA, etc.
- Capacities of the members of the Council of Indigenous Business Association on dealing with CL in the informal sector strengthened.

- The Ghana National Association of Teachers launched a handbook on CL.
- Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection is developing legal instruments to enhance the implementation of the Human Trafficking Act.
- Ghana Child Labour Monitoring System on implementation.
- Child labour committees at district, community levels, created, trained and operating.
- Fight against child labour mainstreamed in the final draft of the 2010-16 UNDAF for Ghana.
- Enhanced collaboration with the media (including rewarding the best journalist in conjunction with the UN Ghana and the Ghana Journalists' Association) and production of different IEC materials.
- Technical, Institutional and logistical Capacity Building for key national and subnational partners including the Child Labour Unit, Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAJ), The Ghana Police Service (Anti-Human Trafficking and Domestic Violence and Victim Support Units), Immigration Service, National Development Planning Commission, Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations (MELR), Ghana Employers' Association, Trades Union Congress of Ghana, Department of Social Welfare, Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development and Selected Metropolitan/Municipal/District Assemblies. Results.

#### *Côte d'Ivoire*

- National Plan of Action on child labour developed and officially launched.
- The Direction de la Lutte Contre le Travail des Enfants (DLTE), former SALTE (government office in charge of CL elimination), is revising the list of hazardous works.
- National CLMS (SOSTECI) framework harmonized, validated, officially launched and ready for implementation.
- In June 2010 the Government adopted a bill against child trafficking and child labour developed with the project support.
- APs on social dialogue with social partners, including outreach programmes with the Ivorian Trades Union Congress (UGTCI).
- Child protection committees created and operating.
- Efforts to address the issue of birth certificates ongoing.
- Large campaigns on child labour, including production of key IEC materials (e.g. documentary), capacity building of the media (awards for the best journalist and media house), etc.
- Capacity of key stakeholders strengthened to take action against child labour. These include the 'Conseil National de Surveillance' on child labour, the Inter-ministerial Committee on Child Labour, the Ministries of Labour and their departments, other sector ministries and departments, social partners, law enforcement agencies, NGOs, among others at different levels.

#### *Benin*

- List of hazard works launched.
- Decent Work Country Program, including focus on measures to eliminate the WFCL, launched.

- National Plan of Action on child labour developed and officially launched.
- Capacity of key stakeholders strengthened to take action against child labour. These include Ministries of Labour and their departments, other sector ministries and departments, actors in the area of education, social partners, labour inspectors, law enforcement agencies, NGOs, among others at different levels.
- Large campaigns on child labour, including production of key IEC materials (e.g. documentary).
- Child labour committees created and operating.
- Enhanced national capacity for the development and piloting of the first national model of Child Labour Monitoring System in Benin.
- On-going pilot programmes to build the capacity of key actors (DG of Mines, CSOs, communities, parents, children at risk or in child labour, media, etc.) in the mining and quarrying sectors towards the elimination of child labour in those areas.
- On-going pilot programmes to combat child trafficking and child labour across border (Nigeria-Benin) on-going with key actors (Government agencies, CSOs, etc.).
- Improved knowledge base on child labour in the mines and quarries.
- Children's act developed and finalised, awaiting validation by Parliament.

#### *Nigeria*

- National Policy and Plan of Action on Child Labour developed and validated by all stakeholders, including Government.
- Capacity of key stakeholders strengthened to take action against child labour. These include Ministries of Labour and their departments, other sector ministries and departments, social partners, law enforcement agencies, NGOs, among others at federal and state levels.
- Improved knowledge and understanding of child labour in two States (Ogun and Oyo).
- Pilot programmes to combat child trafficking and child labour (notably in the informal sector) across border (Nigeria-Benin) on-going with all concerned actors (Government agencies, CSOs, etc.).
- Large awareness raising campaigns, including collaboration with the media, at different levels.
- Capacity building of NAPTIP (National Agency for the Prohibition of Traffic in Persons and Other Related Matters) and other law enforcement agents on different aspects of child trafficking and child labour (e.g. establishment of a National Referral Mechanism, withdrawal and rehabilitation and social integration of child victims in Ogun and Oyo States of Nigeria, etc.).

#### *Sub-regional*

- ECOWAS Member States endorsed the Regional Action Plan for the elimination of child labour in May 2013.
- ECOWAS to conduct a peer review of the action taken by a member country by the other members of ECOWAS on voluntary basis.
- Ghana has offered that their performance with regard to the Elimination of Child labour may be verified under the Peer review process as proposed in the 'Accra Declaration'. This process is currently underway.

## Evaluation background

32. The project ECOWAS I has been undergone, jointly with ECOWAS II, through a mid-term evaluation between October 2011 and March 2012.
33. These projects are going to be evaluated as integrated in one program. Analysis will provide the possibility to read the discussion, conclusions, recommendations and lessons and potential good practice disaggregated by project, while reflection will go toward understanding each one separately, but also how complement each other.

---

## II. Purpose and scope

### Purpose

34. The main purposes of the final evaluation, at project and program levels are:
  - a) Determine project effectiveness at national and states/province levels: achievement of Project objectives at outcome and impact levels, and understanding how and why have/have not been achieved
  - b) Identify relevant unintended/unexpected changes effects at outcome and impact levels
  - c) Assess the project implementation efficiency
  - d) Establish the relevance of the project outcomes and the level of sustainability attained.
  - e) Provide recommendations regarding relevant stakeholders, building on the achievements of the Project in supporting the NAPs at national and regional level (i.e. ECOWAS region) toward the sustainability of the project outcomes and initial impacts
  - f) To identify emerging potential good practices for key stakeholders.
35. The final evaluation should provide all stakeholders (i.e. the regional, national and sub national/local stakeholders, the project management team, the donor and IPEC) with information to assess and revise, as it is needed, work plans, strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements and resources. It should identify the potential impact on mainstreaming policy and strategies and suggest a possible way forward for the future.

### Scope

36. The evaluation will focus on the ILO/IPEC projects/programme mentioned above, its achievements and its contribution to the overall national and sub-regional efforts to achieve the elimination of WFCL. The evaluation should focus on all the activities that have been implemented since the start of the projects to the moment of the field visits. (i.e. action programmes)
37. The evaluation should look at the programme as a whole, including issues of initial project design, implementation, sustainability of outcomes and impact, lessons learnt, replicability and recommendations for current and future programmes.
38. The evaluation should cover expected (i.e. planned) and unexpected results in terms of non-planned outputs and outcomes (i.e. side effects or externalities). Some of these unexpected changes could be as relevant as the ones planned. Therefore, the evaluation team should reflect on them for learning purposes.

39. The analytical scope should include identifying levels of achievement of objectives and explaining how and why have been attained in such ways (and not in other alternative expected ways, if this would be the case).

### **III. Suggested Aspects to be addressed**

40. The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy, the ILO Guideline, the specific ILO-IPEC Guidelines and Notes, the UN System Evaluation Standards and Norms, and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.
41. The evaluation will address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability (and potential impact) to the extent possible as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation: Principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations (i-eval resource kit)', January 2012.
42. In line with results-based framework approach used by ILO-IPEC for identifying results at global, strategic and project level, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analysing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the Immediate Objectives of the project using data from the logical framework indicators.
43. Annex I contains specific suggested aspects for the evaluation to address. Other aspects can be added as identified by the evaluation team in accordance with the given purpose and in consultation with ILO/IPEC Geneva's Evaluation and Impact Assessment section (EIA) and the project coordinator. 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.
44. Below are the main categories that need to be addressed:
- Design
  - Effectiveness and efficiency of the project (Implementation of the process and achievement of objectives)
  - Potential impacts
  - Relevance
  - Sustainability
  - Special Aspects to be Addressed.

### **IV. Expected Outputs of the Evaluation**

45. The expected outputs to be delivered by the evaluation team are:
1. Inception report: this report based on the Desk review should describe the evaluation instruments, reflecting the combination of tools and detailed instruments needed to address the range of selected aspects. The instrument needs to make provision for the triangulation of data where possible. The report will include the points defined in the EIA Inception Report outline. It will include also the outline of the evaluation report and the distribution of responsibilities within the whole assignment.

2. Quantitative and qualitative data collected in the field for the four countries regarding ECOWAS I and ECOWAS II.
  3. Stakeholders workshop at the end of the field work in each country
  4. Stakeholders workshop at the end of the field work in the two intervention areas in Nigeria (if feasible)
  5. Draft evaluation report focused in ECOWAS I and II as an integrated programme: the evaluation report should include and reflect on findings from the field work and the stakeholders' workshops.
  6. Final evaluation report focused in ECOWAS II and in both projects as an integrate programme after comments from stakeholders consolidated by EIA and provided to the evaluation team.
46. Draft and Final evaluation reports include the following sections:
- Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons and good practices
  - Clearly identified findings
  - A table presenting the key results (i.e. figures and qualitative results) achieved per objective (expected and unexpected)
  - Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations (i.e. specifying to which actor(s) apply)
  - Lessons learned
  - Potential good practices and effective models of intervention.
  - Appropriate Annexes including present TORs
  - Standard evaluation instrument matrix (adjusted version of the one included in the Inception report).
47. The total length of each report should be a maximum of 30-40 pages. This is excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated.
48. The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.
49. The entire draft and final reports (including key annexes) have to be submitted by the evaluation team in English and French (making explicit which language is there master one).
50. All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible for Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO-IPEC and the consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of ILO-IPEC. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.
51. The draft reports will be circulated to key stakeholders (project management, ILO/IPEC, ILO Regional, all participants present at the stakeholders' evaluation workshop, donor and others as identified by EIA) for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by EIA

and provided to the team leader. In preparing the final report, the team leader should consider these comments, incorporating as appropriate and providing a brief note explaining the reasons for not doing it when this last case applies.

---

## **V. Evaluation methodology**

---

52. 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 EIA 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.
53. The evaluation will be carried out, as a first step, through desk review. This activity includes review of appropriate materials, including the project documents, progress reports, outputs of the programme and the projects (action programmes), results of any internal planning process and relevant materials from secondary sources. At the end of the desk review period, it is expected that the evaluation team leader will prepare an Inception report indicating the methodological approach to the evaluation in the form of the evaluation instrument, to be discussed and approved by EIA and provided to the Project for input prior to the commencement of the field mission.
54. The evaluation team leader (with support of international team members as appropriate) will interview the donor representatives and ILO/IPEC HQ and regional backstopping officials through conference calls interviews from home.
55. The evaluation team will undertake field visits to programme in Benin, Ghana, Cote D'Ivoire and Nigeria. The evaluators will conduct interviews with project partners and implementing agencies, direct beneficiaries (i.e. children) and parents, do observations on the field and teachers and facilitate a workshop toward the end of the field visits in each country (in Nigeria there will be two workshops: for national and ECOWAS stakeholders one and another for direct intervention areas).
56. The selection of the field visits locations should be based on criteria to be defined by the evaluation team. Some criteria to consider include:
  - Locations with successful and unsuccessful results from the perception of key stakeholders. The rationale is that extreme cases, at some extent, are more helpful than average cases for understanding how process worked and which results have been obtained
  - Locations that have been identified as providing particular good practices or bringing out particular key issues as identified by the desk review and initial discussions.
  - Areas known to have high prevalence of child labour.
  - Locations next to and not so close to main roads
57. The national workshops will be attended by IPEC staff and key stakeholders (i.e. partners), including the donor as appropriate. These events will be an opportunity for the evaluation team to gather further data, to present the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations and to obtain feedback. These meetings will take place toward the end of the fieldwork in Ghana, Cote D'Ivoire, Nigeria (2 stakeholders workshops, see above) and Benin. .



58. The evaluation team will be responsible for organizing the methodology of the workshops. The identification of the participants of the workshop and logistics will be the responsibility of the project team in consultation with the evaluation team leader
59. The team leader has the ultimate responsibility of the whole process. He/she will be responsible for drafting and finalizing the evaluation reports, with support from national consultants. Upon feedback from stakeholders to the draft report, the team leader will further be responsible for finalizing the report incorporating any comments deemed appropriate.
60. The evaluation will be carried out with the technical support of the IPEC-EIA section and with the logistical support of the programme offices in the four countries, in particular the main project office in Accra.
61. EIA will be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting them to the team leader.
62. It is expected that the evaluation team will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct and follow the UN evaluation standards and norms.

### The team responsibilities and profile

63. Team leader (International consultant)

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leading desk review of programme documents</li> <li>Development of the evaluation instrument</li> <li>Briefing with ILO/IPEC-EIA</li> <li>Interviews with IPEC HQ officers, donor</li> <li>Technical guidance to evaluation team members</li> <li>Undertake country visit in Ghana and Nigeria (i.e. National stakeholders and ECOWAS organization)</li> <li>Facilitate stakeholders' workshop in Nigeria and Ghana</li> <li>Draft evaluation reports</li> <li>Final evaluation reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Not have been involved in the project.</u></li> <li>Relevant background in social and/or economic development.</li> <li>Experience in the design, management and evaluation of complex multinational development projects, in particular with policy level work, institutional building and local development projects as team leader and at the UN system or other international context as team leader</li> <li>Relevant sub-regional experience</li> <li>Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework and operational dimension are highly appreciated.</li> <li>Experience at policy level and in the area of education and legal issues would also be appreciated.</li> <li>Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience including preferably international and national development frameworks in particular PRSP and UNDAF.</li> <li>Fluency in English and French is essential</li> <li>Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings.</li> </ul>

64. International evaluator

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review of programme documents</li> <li>Development of the evaluation instrument</li> <li>Briefing with ILO/IPEC-EIA</li> <li>Interviews with IPEC HQ officers, donor</li> <li>Technical guidance to national consultant</li> <li>Undertake field visits in one country: Cote d'Ivoire and Benin</li> <li>Facilitate stakeholders' workshops</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Not have been involved in the project.</u></li> <li>Relevant background in social and/or economic development.</li> <li>Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institutional building and local development projects. And at the UN system or other international contexts</li> <li>Relevant sub-regional experience</li> <li>Experience in the area of children's and child labour issues and rights-based approaches in a normative framework and operational dimension are highly appreciated.</li> <li>Experience at policy level and in the area of education and legal issues would also be appreciated.</li> </ul>

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide inputs to the draft and final evaluation reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience in the UN system or similar international development experience including preferably international and national development frameworks in particular PRSP and UNDAF.</li> <li>Fluency in English and French is essential</li> <li>Experience facilitating workshops for evaluation findings.</li> </ul>

65. Three National consultants ( Ghana, Cote D'Ivoire and Nigeria)

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

**Note:** For Benin (where only ECOWAS II is implemented) there will only one international consultant.

### Evaluation timetable and schedule

66. The total duration of the evaluation process is four months January-April 2014.

### Tentative timetable

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	No of days				
			TL	Support	IC	NC*	Nig NC
0.	Team leader assistant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Logistics and technical assistance to the team leader</li> </ul>	0	3	0	0	0
1	Evaluation team leader and evaluation team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Briefing with ILO/IPEC-EIA</li> <li>Desk Review of programme related documents</li> <li>Telephone briefing with the donor, ILO regional office and IPEC HQ</li> </ul>	4	0	3	1	1
2	Evaluation team with logistical support by project in the 4 countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In-country for consultations with program. staff</li> <li>Consultations with programme staff /management</li> <li>Interviews with programme staff and partners</li> <li>Field visits</li> <li>Consultations with girls and boys, parents and other beneficiaries</li> </ul>	24	0	12	11	16
3	Evaluation team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshops with key stakeholders in the 4 countries: sharing of preliminary findings and feedback from participants</li> </ul>	3	0	1	1	1
4	Evaluation team leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integrate draft report (based on consultations from field visits, desk review and workshops)</li> </ul>	6	0	2	1	1
5	EIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Circulate draft report to key stakeholders</li> <li>Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader</li> </ul>	0	0	0	0	0
6	Evaluation team leader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalize the report including explanations for comments that were not included</li> </ul>	2	0	1	0	0
TOTAL			39	3	19	14	19

\* Benin, Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana

### Summary schedule of consultants assignment

Phase	Duration (days)	Dates
0-1	4	December 10-Feb 1
2-3	21	Feb 2-March 18
4	6	March 24-29
5	14	March31-April 11
6	2	April 14-15

### Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings

Available at HQ and to be supplied by EIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project document</li> <li>• EIA Guidelines and ILO guidelines</li> </ul>
Available in project office and to be supplied by project management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reports/Status reports</li> <li>• Other studies and research undertaken</li> <li>• Action Programmes</li> <li>• Project files</li> <li>• National Action Plans</li> </ul>

#### *Consultations with:*

- Project management and staff
- ILO/HQ and regional backstopping officials
- Partner agencies
- Child labour programs in the country
- Social partners Employers' and Workers' groups
- Government and ECOWAS stakeholders (e.g. representatives from Department Labour, Social Development etc.)
- Policy makers
- Direct beneficiaries, i.e. boys and girls (taking ethical consideration into account.)
- Parents of boys and girls
- Community members as identified by the project management and evaluation team leader
- USDOL
- US Embassy staff

### Final Report Submission Procedure

1. The process for both reports is as follows:
  - The evaluator will submit the draft report to **IPEC EIA in Geneva.**
  - IPEC EIA will forward a copy to **key stakeholders** for comments on factual issues and for clarifications.

- **IPEC EIA** will consolidate the comments and send these to the **evaluator** by date agreed between EIA and the evaluator or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders.
- The final report is submitted to IPEC EIA who will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including the donor.

## VI. Resources and management

### Resources

67. The resources required for this evaluation are:

*For the evaluation team leader:*

- Fees for an international consultant for xx 39 work days.
- Fees for DSA in project locations.
- Travel from consultant's home residence to Nigeria and Ghana in line with ILO regulations and rules.

*For the international consultants:*

- Fees for an international consultant for xx 19 work days.
- Fees for DSA in project locations.
- Travel from consultant's home residence to Cote D'Ivoire and Benin in line with ILO regulations and rules.

*For the national consultant in Ghana, and Cote d'Ivoire:*

- Fees for 14 days.
- Fees for local DSA in project location.

*For the national consultant in Nigeria:*

- Fees for 19 days.
- Fees for local DSA in project location.

*For the field phase in each of the four countries:*

- Local travel in-country supported by the project.
- Stakeholders' workshops in Accra, Abidjan, Abuja, Abeokuta and Cotonu expenditures.

68. A detailed budget is available separately.

### Management

69. The evaluation team will report to IPEC EIA in headquarters and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with EIA, should issues arise.
70. IPEC project officials and the ILO Office in Accra, Abidjan, Abeokuta and Cotonu will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission.

## **TORs Annex I: Suggested aspects to address**

### **Design**

- Determine the validity of the project design, the effectiveness of the methodologies and strategies employed and whether it assisted or hindered the achievement of the project's goals as set out in the Project Document.
- Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent:
- Were the objectives and targets of the project clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including financial and human resources)?
- Were the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives clear and logical?
- Were the different components of the project clearly and realistically complementing each other?
- Have been the time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities logical and realistic?
- Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent and took into account the institutional arrangements, roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders.
- Assess the external logic of the project: degree to which the project fits into existing mainstreaming activities that would impact on child labour.
- How well did the project design take into account local, national and sub-regional efforts already underway to address child labour and promote educational opportunities for targeted children and existing capacity to address these issues?
- Analyze whether available information on the socio-economic, cultural and political situation was taken into consideration at the time of the design and whether these were reflected in the design of the project.
- Has the project included a gender dimension?
- To what extent were external factors identified and assumptions identified at the time of design? Have these underlying assumptions on which the project has been based proven to be true?
- Assess whether the problems and needs were adequately analyzed.
- Is the strategy for transferring models of intervention, promising practices, and lessons learned clearly defined in the PRODOC (i.e. within APs and for non-project countries)?
- Was the strategy for sustainability of project results defined clearly at the design stage of the project?
- How relevant and useful are project indicators and means of verification for measuring project impacts and outcomes. Do they reflect the combined focus on direct action projects and mainstreaming activities?
- What lessons were learned, if any, in the process of conducting baseline survey for the identification of target children?
- Does the project design fit within and complement existing initiatives by other organizations to combat child labor?
- Do the projects designed under the programme provide clear linkages and complement each other regarding the programme strategies and programme components of intervention?

- Were the linkages between ECOWAS I and II inputs, activities, outputs and objectives clear and logical?
- Is the ECOWAS II strategy for increasing the capacity of the ECOWAS I project clearly defined?

## **Effectiveness and efficiency of the project (Implementation of the process and achievement of objectives)**

### *General*

- Assess whether the project has achieved its immediate objectives. If not, what were the factors that contributed to the project delay and were they justifiable (i.e. shortened length of service)?
- Examine delivery of project outputs in terms of quality and quantity
- Assess the effectiveness of the project. In general, did the results obtained justify the costs incurred?
- Have unplanned outputs and results been identified and if so, why were they necessary and to what extent are significant to achieve project objectives?
- Assess the project's gender mainstreaming activities (including framework applied)
- How effective were the APs, and research and policy activities, and how are they contributing to the project meeting its immediate objectives?
- How was the capacity of the implementing agencies and other relevant partners to develop effective action against child labour enhanced as a result of project activities?
- How has the project responded to obstacles (both foreseen and unforeseen) that arose throughout the implementation process? Has the project team been able to adapt the implementation process in order to overcome these obstacles without hindering the effectiveness of the project?
- Have there been any changes to external factors and the related assumptions in design?
- Assess the process for documenting and disseminating models: scale-up, lessons, etc.

### *Enabling environment (Capacity Building)*

- Analyze the level and nature of the project's contribution and support to the enabling environment at national and local levels.
- Assess how much has the project contributed to build the capacity of government agencies on the federal, state, and local levels to coordinate quality services to migrant workers?
- Examine any network that has been built between organizations and government agencies working to address child labour on the national state, and local levels.
- How effective has the project been at stimulating interest and participation in the project at the local, national and sub-regional levels?
- How effectively has the project leveraged resources (e.g., by collaborating with non-IPEC initiatives and other projects launched in support of the NAP process thus far)?
- Assess the relevance of the leveraged resources
- How well has the project coordinated and collaborated with other child-focused interventions supported by other organizations?

- How successful has the project been in mainstreaming the issue of child labour into on-going efforts in areas such as education and poverty reduction?
- How relevant and effective were the studies commissioned by the project in terms of affecting the national debates on child labour?
- Examine how the ILO/IPEC project interacted and possibly influenced national and regional level policies, debates and institutions working on child labour.
- Assess to what extent the planning, monitoring and evaluation tools have been promoted by the project for use at the state and national levels, such as national data collection and poverty monitoring or similar process (such as CLMS)
- Assess the extent to which the ILO/IPEC project has been able to mobilize resources, policies, projects, partners and activities to be part of the NAP.

#### *Direct Targeted Action*

- Assess the effectiveness of the different action projects implemented and their contribution to the immediate objectives of the project.
- Has the capacity of community local and national levels agencies and organizations been strengthened to plan, initiate, implement and evaluate actions to prevent and eliminate child labour?
- Has the entire target population been reached?
- What kinds of benefits have the target beneficiaries gained?
- How effective were the strategies implemented for child labour monitoring? Are the initiatives on child labour monitoring likely to be sustainable?
- Assess the criteria for selecting beneficiaries and implementing agencies for the projects
- Identify whether actions have been taken to ensure the access of girls, indigenous people, migrant children and other vulnerable groups to services and resources.
- Have been identified lessons from collection and analysis of children and households data collection disaggregated by sex?
- How do the levels of cooperation, team working, roles and linkages among related agencies and networks support the implementation of the project?
- In cases where the action programs link beneficiaries with existing programs, assess the value-added of the project's interventions.
- Assess the integration of livelihood services (from ECOWAS II) in the project field activities and outputs (i.e. in ECOWAS I activities)
- How effective are the projects in improving and diversifying livelihoods for parents and children above the legal minimum working age? (i.e. improving small producers' production techniques, diversifying their sources of income, improving their marketing and business skills, improving access to agricultural and other inputs, supporting cooperative development, and supporting access to microfinance).

#### **Potential impact**

- Assess the major high level changes that the project has contributed towards the project development objective at national, and local levels
- Has the project generated unintended impacts on child labour prevention and elimination?

## **Relevance of the project**

- Examine whether the project responded to the real needs of the beneficiaries and stakeholders.
- Assess validity of the project approach and strategies and its potential to be replicated and scaled up.
- Assess whether the problems and needs that gave rise to the project still exists or have changed.
- Assess the appropriateness of the sectors/target groups and locations chosen to develop the projects based on the finding of baseline surveys.
- How is this project supporting and contributing towards the formulation of a NAP? How did the strategy used in this project fit in with the national education, agriculture and anti-poverty efforts, and interventions carried out by other organizations (including national and international organizations)?
- How is this project contributing to the DWCP?

## **Sustainability**

- Examine if outcomes would last after project based on the phase out strategy implemented.
- Assess to what extent a phase out strategy has been defined and planned and what steps have been taken to ensure sustainability (e.g. government involvement).
- Assess whether these strategies had been articulated/explained to stakeholders.
- Assess whether the program's interventions to withdraw and prevent children from exploitative child labour are making lasting impacts on the beneficiaries. Will the result of children being withdrawn or prevented be sustained or are additional interventions needed?
- Assess what contributions the project has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of national and local stakeholders (government and implementing agencies) and to encourage ownership of the project to partners.
- Assess project success in leveraging resources for on-going and continuing efforts to prevent and eliminate child labour towards the formulation of a NAP.
- Analyse the level of private sector / employers' organizations support towards a NAP, paying specific attention to how these groups participated in project activities.
- Assess the degree to which the project has worked with a gender perspective, reflected in project design and implementation, with focus on sustainability of project outcomes.

## **Sub regional approach in the projects**

- Assess the effectiveness of the strategic management of ECOWAS articulated to other thematically linked projects in the sub region
- Have the projects shared lessons from the tested models in the sub region?
- Assess the intervention models developed
- Are these models of implementation valid for scaling-up/replication, either at local, national or sub regional level?



### **Specific Aspects to be addressed**

- How has the project addressed the recommendations of the midterm evaluation?
- What has been the progress in applying the Mid-term evaluation recommendations?
- Assess knowledge sharing effectiveness between the project countries?
- Are ECOWAS Projects well-articulated with other national, USDOL, private sector and other Child labour centered or linked on-going initiatives and project?
- How did the project integrate with other projects ILO-IPEC programs and what did this contribute to the overall effectiveness of the project and of the other projects?
- Assess with particular emphasis project achievements in the cocoa sector and in the development and institutionalization of child labor monitoring systems for cocoa in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana (i.e. articulation with the other ILO IPEC projects in these two countries)
- Assess the monitoring process for the livelihood component of ECOWAS II (reflecting, for instance in the Direct Beneficiary Monitoring System (DBMS) inclusion of households as beneficiaries) Assess if significant number of the children project's beneficiaries were already in school at the time of their enrollment in the project. If this is the case, please address whether the education services provided were appropriate and necessary. For example, was the provision of uniforms and/or supplies to children already in school supported by the needs assessment, and based on each child's needs? Was this strategy appropriate?

## TORs Annex II: Log frames

### II.a. ECOWAS I Project: revised logical framework: Grant modification 4 (January 2013)

Development Objective: To contribute to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in West Africa	
Outputs	Main activities
Immediate Objective 1: By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst form of child labour in, Ghana Nigeria and Cote d'Ivoire (RCD will be accelerated).	
Output 1.1: Consultations and technical support delivered for finalizing the National Action Plan (NAP), its validation and adoption and for integrating child labour into other national, relevant sectoral, sub-national and/or local action plans in Côte d'Ivoire (RCI), Ghana and Nigeria.	<p>1.1.1. Hold consultations, using Strategic Program Impact Framework (SPIF), with MOL, social partners and other relevant national institutions to facilitate finalisation of the NAP and its endorsement by the tripartite constituents, including specific components to address WFCL in inland fishing cocoa and mines and quarries (Ghana)</p> <p>1.1.2. Hold consultations with stakeholders to reconfirm priority sectors and update the National Action Plan (NAP) (RCI and Nigeria) 1.1.2B: REVISED ACTIVITY: Finalize and adopt the NAP for Nigeria with follow up activities as relevant (eg. Dissemination budgets awareness raising, resource mobilization, linkages to state level actions) (Nigeria)</p> <p>1.1.3. Support the promulgation and dissemination of the NAP and its integration into the DWCP, PRSP and UNDAF and the policy framework of all relevant agencies (RCI, Ghana, Nigeria)</p> <p>1.1.4. Negotiate and support the institutions assigned lead roles in the NAP to integrate, budget and monitor child labour interventions into their annual and multiyear action plans (RCI, Ghana, Nigeria)</p> <p>1.1.5. Engage in advocacy tied to national budgeting processes so that the child labour unit staff strength and resources are increased in conformity with the management structure proposed under the NAPs (RCI, Ghana, Nigeria)</p> <p>1.1.6. Develop a resource mobilization strategy that engages both national and potential international donors in supporting NAP implementation. (RCI, Ghana, Nigeria)</p> <p>1.1.7. Mainstream child labour in action plans and budgets on mining and fishing (Ghana)</p> <p>1.1.8. Mainstream child labour into district development plans in direct action regions (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.1.9. Organize preliminary sub-national consultation meetings and regional workshops in project targeted zones (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.1.10. Organize initial consultations with relevant social partners and stakeholders to identify possible target intervention zones for future work on mining/quarrying (Nigeria)</p> <p>1.1.11. Support the governments to arrange independent evaluation of the NAPs (RCI, Ghana, Nigeria)</p>
Output 1.2: Capacity building programmes designed and delivered to fill gaps in relevant institutions capacity to implement the NAP in Côte d'Ivoire (RCI), Ghana and Nigeria.	<p>1.2.1. Reinforce the role and mandate of the NSC, nationally and within MOL, and of the Child Labour Unit to coordinate and promote efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labour including managing initiatives to strengthen the legal framework on child labour, to train and raise the awareness of public servants, and to manage an information system on child labour (RCI, Ghana, Nigeria)</p> <p>1.2.2. Strengthen the capacity of labour inspection services, other law enforcement agencies and public services and relevant social partners to identify and report child labour violations, refer children to appropriate social services, negotiate agreements and design codes of conduct through training and sensitization (RCI, Ghana, Nigeria)</p> <p>1.2.3. Strengthen the capacity of the judiciary and relevant law enforcement agents through training and sensitization, to recognize and prosecute human trafficking and forced labour (RCI, Ghana)</p> <p>1.2.4. Strengthen capacity of labour inspectors, employment agencies and domestic workers' unions to recognize violations of the labour law, report employer abuse to relevant authorities and refer victims to available social services (RCI)</p> <p>1.2.5. Support the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry of Agriculture and the social partners in promoting occupational safety and health in the cocoa and coffee sector through training and sensitization (RCI)</p> <p>1.2.6. Support the ministries of Labour, Agriculture and Fishing, Mines and the Chamber of Mines, the Minerals Commission and the social partners in promoting occupational safety and health in the Lake Volta fishing and mining/quarrying sectors through training and sensitization (Ghana)</p>

Development Objective: To contribute to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in West Africa	
Outputs	Main activities
	<p>1.2.7. Provide training to workers delivering services to agricultural communities, such as social workers and agricultural extension officers, to enable them to identify and report child labour violations and refer children to appropriate social services (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.2.8. Engage relevant official institutions including the MOL labour inspectorate and Ministry of Family and Children social work service to implement and coordinate community and district level child labour monitoring systems (RCI and Ghana)</p>
Output 1.3: Technical assistance provided to reinforce national laws and law enforcement in Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria.	<p>1.3.1. Provide technical assistance to the relevant ministries for the development of a specific law on domestic work to reinforce the legal framework related to domestic work, in particular as it pertains to children, through (RCI)</p> <p>1.3.2. Strengthen the workers' and employers' organizations' role in advocating for the development of a specific law on domestic work and promote the universal right of freedom of association for domestic workers (RCI)</p> <p>1.3.3. Provide technical assistance to the Ministries of Labour and Women and Children's Affairs for the formulation of a law on trafficking and the worst forms of child labour (RCI)</p> <p>1.3.4. Engage the Ministries of Labour, Women and Children's Affairs, Justice and Attorney General, Employment and Social Welfare, Lands and Natural Resources, Agriculture and Fishing, Mines and Chambers of Mines, Minerals Commission, in consultation with the relevant social partners, to address and enforce the gaps in legislation against child labour in the quarrying and mining, cocoa and fishing sectors (Ghana)</p> <p>1.3.5. Provide technical assistance to the Council on Technical and Vocational Education and Training (COTVET) to revise legal texts and regulations governing apprenticeship arrangements (Ghana)</p> <p>1.3.6. Provide technical assistance to the Ministry of Women and Children's Affairs to amend the Child Rights Act and related child rights legislation to integrate provisions of C182 including the definition of worst forms of child labour (Ghana)</p> <p>1.3.7. Support, through tripartite consultation, a periodic update of the national list of hazardous work (RCI, Ghana)</p> <p>1.3.8. Support, through tripartite consultation, the finalization, validation and promulgation and application of the national list of hazardous work (Nigeria)</p>
Output 1.4: National and sub-national awareness raising and social mobilization campaigns conducted in Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria.	<p>1.4.1. Build on existing work to support relevant social partner organisations to develop and strengthen social dialogue towards integration of COL and WFCL in the cocoa sector in their action plans and commitments in conformity with the NAP and the list of hazardous work (RCI)</p> <p>1.4.2. Building on the existing work of the General Agricultural Workers Union, engage with relevant social partner organisations to develop and strengthen social dialogue towards integration of the worst forms of child labour in cocoa and inland fishing in their action plans in conformity with the NAP and the list of hazardous work (Ghana)</p> <p>1.4.3. Engage implementing agencies to mobilise community action against child labour along Lake Volta and especially to establish community child labour committees (Ghana)</p> <p>1.4.4. Engage with relevant social partner organisations, in pursuit of the Global Call to action, to support the development/strengthening of structures for social dialogue in mining and quarrying sector and shared commitment to the elimination of child labour - including consultations with and support for the efforts of Ghana Mineworkers' Union to organise small-scale operators (Ghana)</p> <p>1.4.5. Support actions by implementing agencies to mobilise social partners and communities for action against child labour in quarrying and mining (Ghana)</p> <p>1.4.6. Engage the Ghana Mineworkers' Unions, other relevant employers and employers' organizations and supportive district-based CBOs/NGOs to raise awareness and educate the public on the dangers of child labour in quarrying and mining (Ghana)</p> <p>1.4.7. Organize awareness raising at all levels on the national, regional and international standards related to child trafficking and the worst forms of child labour, in the context of ECOWAS trafficking and forced labour agreements (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.4.8. Engage implementing agencies to establish community child labour committees and mobilise community actions against child labour in targeted sectors (RCI and Ghana)</p>

Development Objective: To contribute to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in West Africa	
Outputs	Main activities
	<p>1.4.9. Sensitise families and children in receiving and sending communities on the consequences of child trafficking and the hazards of child labour in targeted sectors, taking into account the special needs of girls (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.4.10. Provide assistance to implementing agencies to develop and deliver information, education and communication (IEC) materials to support social actions (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.4.11. REVISED ACTIVITY: Raise the awareness of the dangers of child labour. <del>Support a national awareness raising campaign on the dangers of child labour in conjunction with the planned awareness raising campaign supporting Education for All (Nigeria)</del></p>
Output 1.5: Studies undertaken to fill identified gaps in knowledge base on selected worst forms of child labour and the problems of forced child labour and trafficking in Côte d'Ivoire (RCI) and Ghana and Nigeria and the ECOWAS Commission	<p>1.5.1. Conduct rapid participatory appraisals on child domestic labour (RCI)</p> <p>1.5.2. In consultation with the Ministry of Labour, and relevant social partners, and with reference i.a. to the experience of the IOM, conduct, with the support of SIMPOC and the Ghana Statistical Office further analytical studies on the scope, nature and dimensions of CL in Lake Volta fishing, including the extent of trafficking into the sector especially of children from other regions and countries; and, disseminate the research findings among social partners and other key stakeholders in the sector (Ghana)</p> <p>1.5.3. In consultation with the Ministry of Labour and relevant social partners, conduct, with the support of SIMPOC and the Ghana Statistical Office a baseline survey on the scope, nature and dimensions of child labour in mining and quarrying, including the extent of trafficking into the sector especially of children from other regions and countries (Ghana)</p> <p>1.5.4. In consultation with key stakeholders, prepare and adopt guidelines on combating worst forms of child labour in all economic sectors targeted by the project and promote the application of the guidelines (RCI and Ghana) Focus during the extension period will be on the promotion of the guidelines</p> <p>1.5.5. Diffuse research results through national media, web, newsletter and through partner networks information services (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.5.6. Develop good practice compendiums and guidelines for diffusion through national and regional (ECOWAS) networks (RCI and Ghana and NIGERIA)</p> <p>1.5.7. Produce papers on key messages, models and lessons learned from the whole ECOWAS I project experience (RCI, Ghana, Nigeria and ECOWAS)</p>
Output 1.6: Models of intervention designed and piloted in four target sectors including models for withdrawing and preventing children working in forced labour and other worst forms of child labour in Ghana and RCI.	<p>1.6.1. Localities identified and models of intervention in the selected worst forms of child labour developed and agreed among the stakeholders (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.6.2. Carry out social services mapping for fishing, mining, and child domestic work in project intervention zones (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.6.3. Engage implementing agencies with proven expertise on child labour in the targeted sectors to withdraw children from the worst forms of child labour, rehabilitate and reintegrate them into education and/or appropriate vocational/apprenticeship training. These children will also be provided with other appropriate services which may include health care, counselling, shelter, youth clubs, literacy classes, etc. (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.6.4. Engage implementing agencies to identify at risk and working children in the selected areas and sectors and collect baseline data on direct project beneficiaries through the implementation of a DBMR system (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.6.5. Support the institutional strengthening of the Integrated Child Labour Monitoring System through further technical support for the Labour Ministry Child Labour Unit and statistical unit and other ICLMS stakeholders and extension of ICLMS to districts targeted by the project, supporting also the leading role of labour inspection services at district level (Ghana)</p> <p>1.6.6. Mobilise, train and equip relevant partners at the community, district and national levels to reinvigorate an effective child labour and child trafficking monitoring system, inter alia by building on existing expertise in the CLU and by supporting the leading role of labour inspection services at district level (RCI)</p> <p>1.6.7. Target children provided with education services. Provide non-cash scholarship package for targeted children at risk of entering child labour, in the form of school uniforms and supplies (books, pencils, etc.) and other appropriate services. Regular school at-</p>

Development Objective: To contribute to the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in West Africa	
Outputs	Main activities
	<p>tendance by the beneficiaries of the scheme will be expected and verified through school registers and other monitoring means (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.6.8. Target children provided with other services than education. Engage implementing agencies to provide at-risk children with pre-school activities, extra-curricular and/or leisure activities, as well as remedial classes to ensure school retention (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.6.9. Promote, through the training of trainers, greater use of SCREAM as a valuable component of prevention (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.6.10. Building on the efforts of the Ministry of Labour and the social partners to promote occupational safety and health, provide support in the form of safe working tools and personal protective equipment, for children of legal working age in targeted sectors, in conformity with Convention no. 182 and Recommendation no. 190 (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.6.11. Engage reputable implementing agencies to identify and provide professional care for trafficked children and, where appropriate, refer them to specialized agencies and make arrangements for their repatriation in collaboration with a publicly mandated agency (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.6.12. Engage implementing agencies to develop income generation activities and or refer families to existing programmes in their community in order to contribute to the economic empowerment of the families of targeted children (RCI and Ghana)</p> <p>1.6.13. Implement community-based child labour monitoring system (CLM) in project intervention zones. Mobilize, train and equip relevant partners at the community, district and national levels to develop a child labour and child trafficking monitoring system, supporting the leading role of labour inspection services at district level by building on existing good practices, and extending to new areas and selected sectors (RCI and Ghana)</p>
Immediate Objective 2: By the end of the project the role played by ECOWAS in combating the worst forms of child labour in the sub-region will be reinforced.	
Output 2.1: Technical assistance provided to ECOWAS to establish protocols for monitoring member states' efforts to combat the worst forms of child labour, consistent with community policies and plans and reflecting international standards and norms.	<p>2.1.1. REVISED ACTIVITY: Hold consultations with relevant ECOWAS units and UNICEF to determine roles and responsibilities for designing monitoring system for the Child Policy. <del>Review mechanisms in place to monitor TIP</del></p> <p>2.1.2. REVISED ACTIVITY: Provide technical assistance to increase the capacity of the ECOWAS Commission to combat child labour and integrate with existing ECOWAS mechanisms on child protection and trafficking. <del>Provide technical assistance for the elaborate protocols to monitor aspects of the child policy directly relating to child labour</del></p> <p>2.1.3. <del>Pilot monitoring mechanisms in three project core countries</del></p>
Output 2.2: Programmes designed and implemented to strengthen the capacity of relevant ECOWAS technical departments to combat child labour in the sub-region	<p>2.2.1. Implement needs assessment of relevant ECOWAS technical units to determine priority areas for capacity building activities</p> <p>2.2.2. REVISED ACTIVITY: Identify or design and deliver appropriate training programmes to build ECOWAS capacity on child labour. <del>Identify appropriate training programmes with the ILO training centre in Turin and host training in core countries or Turin, whichever offers the best value in terms of cost efficiency and output</del></p> <p>2.2.3. <del>Design and deliver other training programmes as needed and appropriate</del></p>
Output 2.3: Sub- regional forums organized to encourage networking and to share good practices among all ECOWAS member states	<p>2.3.1. Develop database of government, social partners and civil society actors engaged in combating child labour in the region including e-mail addresses and other points of contact for the purpose of information diffusion</p> <p>2.3.2. Inventory of training resources, manuals, guides and good practices and compendia for on-line posting on ECOWAS website</p> <p>2.3.3. REVISED ACTIVITY: Identify and train ECOWAS resource persons to deliver and manage information management systems and post identified resources to website and <u>manage ECOWAS mechanisms on child labour</u></p> <p>2.3.4. REVISED ACTIVITY: Organize tripartite sub-regional fora with the ECOWAS Commission, as needed. <del>Organize at least two tripartite sub-regional forums during project life in collaboration with the ECOWAS Commission</del></p>

Source: Proposed revised logical framework for ECOWAS I project

II.b. ECOWAS II Project: revised logical framework: Project revision (May 2013)

**ECOWAS II Log frame and work plan reflecting revisions (status of activities up to April 2013)**

Immediate objective No. 1	By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and Cote d'Ivoire (RCI) will be accelerated					
Objectives/outputs/activities (As listed in project document or summary outline)	RCI	GHANA	NIGERIA	BENIN	ECOWAS	REMARKS
<b>Output 1.1: Consultations and technical support delivered for integrating child labour/trafficking concerns into national mining policies and laws, sub-national and/or local government action plans and social partner policies and plans in Benin and Nigeria.</b>						
<u>Activity 1.1.1:</u> Consult and deliver technical support to the Ministry of Mines to integrate child labour/trafficking concerns into their policy and planning framework (Benin).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.1.2:</u> Consult and deliver technical support to the Ministry of Labour to review the HCL list with special attention to the mining and quarrying provisions; assess priorities, revise work plans accordingly.	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	Not started	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
<u>Activity 1.1.3:</u> Consult and deliver technical support to the Ministries of Mines and Justice to address and enforce gaps in legislation against child labour in quarrying and mining (Benin).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.1.4:</u> Provide technical support to the relevant national consultative/coordinating committee to review experience, re-design and put into force a sustainable CLMS in Benin; reinforce linkages with the labour inspectorate for reporting cases and with other ministries (education, social welfare) for handling referrals, determine national, district, and local data management system (in conjunction with Obj.2). (Benin).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.1.5:</u> Organize preliminary sub-national consultation meetings and regional workshops in project targeted zones. Consultations will be held individually and collectively with members of the Ogun State anti-trafficking task force and the National Coordination Committee on	N/A	N/A	Completed	Completed	N/A	

Immediate objective No. 1	By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and Cote d'Ivoire (RCI) will be accelerated					
Objectives/outputs/activities (As listed in project document or summary outline)	RCI	GHANA	NIGERIA	BENIN	ECOWAS	REMARKS
Child Protection in Benin to identify the communities where ILO/IPEC will engage in direct action, to formulate strategies and activities, identify implementing partners and agree on the contributions of task force members.						
<u>Activity 1.1.6:</u> Deliver technical support to commune/district governments to integrate actions to address the root causes of child labour into their commune/district development plans, assist in embedding the CLMS in these plans in Benin. (Benin)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not started	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
<u>Activity 1.1.7:</u> Organize a workshop and possibly field visits with appropriate social partners and producers' and workers' associations in the artisanal mining sector to develop an action plan for working together to eliminate child labour in the sector.	N/A	N/A	Completed	Ongoing	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.1.8:</u> In consultation with key stakeholders, prepare and adopt guidelines on combating worst forms of child labour in the artisanal mining sector and promote the application of the guidelines (Benin).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not started	N/A	
<b>Output 1.2:</b> Capacity building programmes designed and delivered to fill gaps in relevant institutions capacity to combat the worst forms of child labour in the artisanal mining sectors in Benin and Nigeria						
<u>Activity 1.2.1:</u> Evaluate training requirements and deliver capacity building programmes to members of the NSC and the Child Labour Unit on new strategies to combat child labour with particular reference to the artisanal mining sector.	N/A	N/A	Completed	Not started	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.2.2:</u> Deliver training and adapt relevant ILO materials to reinforce the Ministries of Labour and of Mines' capacity to promote occupational safety and health in the artisanal mining sector and assist them in developing and implementing a strategy (along with social partners, OSH	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not started	N/A	

Immediate objective No. 1	By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and Cote d'Ivoire (RCI) will be accelerated					
Objectives/outputs/activities (As listed in project document or summary outline)	RCI	GHANA	NIGERIA	BENIN	ECOWAS	REMARKS
specialists) for appropriate alternatives for children of 15+ years (Benin)..						
<u>Activity 1.2.3:</u> Strengthen the capacity of relevant actors at the State level to enforce the law with support of local communities through training, networking and integrating their work with community-based child labour monitoring systems. In Nigeria, the project will work with the State office of the Federal Office of Labour, the NAPTIP zone office that covers south west Nigeria, the trafficking in persons task force within the immigration service, and the office of Citizens Rights within the Ministry of Justice.	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	Ongoing	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.2.4:</u> Train relevant local development agents working in project targeted communities, such as social workers, agricultural extension officers and community development agents working for partner NGOs, to enable them to identify and report child labour violations and refer children to appropriate social services.	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	Ongoing	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.2.5:</u> Deliver capacity building to institutions engaged in transitional care of trafficking victims. Support will enable them to develop, enhance and/or apply relevant child protection standards and codes of conduct.	N/A	N/A	Not started	Not started	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
<u>Activity 1.2.6:</u> Deliver capacity building to empower local communities to design and implement alternatives to child labour by engaging them in the conception and implementation of community development plans and activities and by strengthening parent teacher associations and other community-based self-help associations.	N/A	N/A	Not started	Not started	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.2.7:</u> Promote, through the training of trainers, greater use of SCREAM in education programmes led by teachers and youth leaders.	N/A	N/A	Not started	Not started	N/A	



Immediate objective No. 1	By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and Cote d'Ivoire (RCI) will be accelerated					
Objectives/outputs/activities (As listed in project document or summary outline)	RCI	GHANA	NIGERIA	BENIN	ECOWAS	REMARKS
Activity 1.2.8: In project target communities, train and sensitize judiciary and relevant law enforcement agents to recognize and prosecute human trafficking and forced labour in collaboration with relevant national agencies (NAPTIP in Nigeria, Brigade for the Protection of Minors in Benin).	N/A	N/A	Not started	Ongoing	N/A	
Activity 1.2.9: Train and sensitize labour inspectors, primary health care workers, employer and worker organizations, and monitoring teams to do risk assessments and to recognize the special vulnerabilities of working youth.	N/A	N/A	Not started	Not started	N/A	
Activity 1.2.10: Build the capacity of relevant official institutions especially the MOL labour inspectorate and Ministry of Family and Children social work service to implement the Child Labour Monitoring System in the target areas in line with the overall plan established at national level in Benin (1.1.4). (Benin).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	N/A	
<b>Output 1.3: National and sub national awareness raising and social mobilization campaigns conducted in Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria</b>						
Activity 1.3.1: Engage with relevant social partner organisations, in pursuit of the 2005 Global Call to Action, to support the development/strengthening of structures for social dialogue in mining and quarrying sector and shared commitment to the elimination of child labour (Benin).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not started	N/A	
Activity 1.3.2: Support actions by implementing agencies to mobilise social partners and communities for action against child labour in quarrying and mining (Benin).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	N/A	
Activity 1.3.3: Establish a strong linkage with the media using strategies such as training and delivering awareness raising to journalists aimed at increasing their coverage of child labour including trafficking related stories (Benin,	Ongoing	Ongoing	Not started	ongoing	N/A	

Immediate objective No. 1	By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and Cote d'Ivoire (RCI) will be accelerated					
Objectives/outputs/activities (As listed in project document or summary outline)	RCI	GHANA	NIGERIA	BENIN	ECOWAS	REMARKS
RCI, Ghana, Nigeria).						
Activity 1.3.4: Engage implementing agencies to establish community child labour committees and mobilise grassroots actions against child labour in targeted sectors (Benin, RCI, Ghana, Nigeria).	Ongoing	Completed	Not started	Not started	N/A	
Activity 1.3.5: Sensitise families and children in receiving and sending communities on the consequences of child trafficking and the hazards of child labour in targeted sectors, taking into account the special needs of girls Benin, RCI, Ghana, Nigeria).	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	N/A	
Activity 1.3.6: Provide assistance to implementing agencies to develop and deliver information, education and communication (IEC) materials to support social actions (Benin, RCI, Ghana, Nigeria).	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	N/A	
Activity 1.3.7: Organize awareness raising campaigns on child labour involving the main partners (including local administrative authorities, social partner organisations, decision makers, religious institutions, communities, parents, children, teachers, placement agencies, community leaders) and produce child friendly books on child rights and child labour (Benin, Nigeria).	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	Ongoing	N/A	
Output 1.4: Studies undertaken to fill identified gaps in knowledge base on artisanal mines and the problems of forced child labour and trafficking in Benin and Nigeria						
Activity 1.4.1: With support from SIMPOC, carry out rapid assessments or baseline surveys of the target regions (Nigeria and Benin).	N/A	N/A	Completed	Not started	N/A	
Activity 1.4.2: Diffuse research results through national media, web, newsletter and through partner networks information services (Benin Nigeria).	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	Ongoing	N/A	
Activity 1.4.3: Develop good practice compendiums and	N/A	N/A	Not started	Not started	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014

Immediate objective No. 1	By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and Cote d'Ivoire (RCI) will be accelerated					
Objectives/outputs/activities (As listed in project document or summary outline)	RCI	GHANA	NIGERIA	BENIN	ECOWAS	REMARKS
guidelines for diffusion through national and regional (ECOWAS) networks. (Benin and Nigeria).						
<b>Output 1.5: Models of intervention designed and piloted for withdrawing and preventing children working in the worst forms of child labour in Benin RCI , Ghana, and Nigeria</b>						
<u>Activity 1.5.1:</u> Localities identified and models of intervention in the selected worst forms of child labour developed and agreed among the stakeholders (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).	Completed	Completed	Completed	Completed	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.5.2:</u> Carry out social services mapping for project intervention zones (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).	Completed	Completed	Ongoing	Not started	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.5.3:</u> For children under 15 years engaged in the WFCL, withdraw, rehabilitate and reintegrate them into an appropriate educational programme, providing them with other support services as necessary which may include health care, counselling, shelter, youth clubs, literacy classes, etc. (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).	Ongoing	Ongoing	Not started	Ongoing	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
<u>Activity 1.5.4:</u> Engage implementing agencies to identify at risk and working children in the selected areas and sectors and collect baseline data on direct project beneficiaries through the implementation of a DBMR system (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.5.5:</u> For children being provided with educational services, provide non-cash scholarship package for targeted children at risk of entering child labour, in the form of school uniforms and supplies (books, pencils, etc.) and other appropriate services. Regular school attendance by the beneficiaries of the scheme will be expected and verified through school registers and other monitoring means. (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).	Ongoing	Ongoing	Not started	Ongoing	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
<u>Activity 1.5.6:</u> Target children provided with other services	Ongoing	Ongoing	Not started	Ongoing	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014

Immediate objective No. 1	By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and Cote d'Ivoire (RCI) will be accelerated					
Objectives/outputs/activities (As listed in project document or summary outline)	RCI	GHANA	NIGERIA	BENIN	ECOWAS	REMARKS
than education. Engage implementing agencies to provide at-risk children with early childhood education extra-curricula and/or leisure activities, health care as well as remedial classes to ensure school retention (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).						
<u>Activity 1.5.7A:</u> For children of legal working age but engaged in hazardous child labour, assist the Ministry of Labour and social partners in drafting a comprehensive "safe work/youth employment model of intervention" that would include risk assessment, employer training, workplace improvement, apprenticeships, vocational training, counselling, and income generating activities that could be viable alternatives to hazardous work in cocoa and mining. (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).	Ongoing	Not started	Not started	Not started	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
<u>Activity 1.5.7B:</u> Provide technical assistance in implementing the strategy using existing ILO tools (e.g. Safe Work for Youth, KAB, etc.) (Benin, RCI and Ghana).	Ongoing	Not started	N/A	Not started	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
<u>Activity 1.5.8:</u> Engage reputable implementing agencies to identify and provide transitional and rehabilitative care facilities for trafficked children and, where appropriate, refer them to specialized agencies and make arrangements for their repatriation in collaboration with a publicly mandated agency, for example NAPTIP in Nigeria and the Brigade for the Protection of Minors in Benin (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	Ongoing	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
<u>Activity 1.5.9:</u> Mobilize, train and equip relevant partners to implement the local component of the national child labour monitoring system (CLMS) in project intervention zones. Incorporate existing good practices, and promote extension to new areas (Benin, RCI, and Ghana).	Not started	Ongoing	N/A	Ongoing	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
<b>Output 1.6:</b> Models of intervention designed and piloted to promote resilient family livelihoods and sustainable community development in Benin RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria						

Immediate objective No. 1	By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and Cote d'Ivoire (RCI) will be accelerated					
Objectives/outputs/activities (As listed in project document or summary outline)	RCI	GHANA	NIGERIA	BENIN	ECOWAS	REMARKS
Activity 1.6.1: Engage implementing agencies to offer livelihood alternatives and or refer families to existing programmes in their community in order to contribute to the economic empowerment of the families of targeted children (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).	Ongoing	Ongoing	Not started	Not started	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
Activity 1.6.2: Conduct a rapid assessment of alternative activities for example small commerce, small animal husbandry or beekeeping as part of its livelihoods strategy and if feasible, support adult family members of working children to engage in these activities. (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).	Ongoing	Completed	Ongoing	Not started	N/A	
Activity 1.6.3: Engage implementing partners and local development agencies to apply appropriate ILO programs to support livelihoods. (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).	Ongoing	Ongoing	Not started	Not started	N/A	
Activity 1.6.4: Engage and support workers' organizations to organize in project target zones and engage in social dialogue with employers to promote improved working conditions for adult family members of project direct beneficiaries. (Benin, RCI, Ghana and Nigeria).	Ongoing	Not started	Not started	Ongoing	N/A	
Activity 1.6.5: Engage and support employers' associations to improve services to their small scale enterprise members in project targeted sectors and to develop and apply codes of conduct that prohibit child labour on their premises. (Benin, RCI and Nigeria).	Not started	N/A	Not started	Ongoing	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
Activity 1.6.6: Engage agricultural extension agents and other relevant rural development organizations to support improved production and marketing methods in project target zones (RCI, Ghana and Nigeria).	Ongoing	Ongoing	Not started	N/A	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014
Activity 1.6.7: Pilot alternative livelihoods and income generating activities for artisanal mining families and for	Ongoing	Ongoing	Not started	Ongoing	N/A	To be completed by 30 April 2014

Immediate objective No. 1	By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and Cote d'Ivoire (RCI) will be accelerated					
Objectives/outputs/activities (As listed in project document or summary outline)	RCI	GHANA	NIGERIA	BENIN	ECOWAS	REMARKS
cocoa farming families, and promote sustainable practices within rural communities (Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria).						
<u>Activity 1.6.8</u> : Implement direct action programs at community level to improve the social service infrastructure including education, health and housing in remote cocoa farming (RCI).	Ongoing	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
<u>Activity 1.6.9</u> : Engage communities to use improved and adapted technologies in cocoa production and artisanal mining by the project, through the progressive modernization of the production systems (Benin, RCI, Ghana).	Ongoing	Ongoing	N/A	Not started	N/A	

Immediate objective No. 2	By the end of the project, the role played by ECOWAS in combating the worst forms of child labour in the sub-region will be reinforced.					
Objectives/outputs/activities (As listed in project document or summary outline)	RCI	Ghana	NIGERIA	BENIN	ECOWAS	REMARKS
<b>Output 2.1: Sub-Regional Plan of Action on Child Labour designed and adopted.</b>						
Activity 2.1.1: Provide technical support to relevant ECOWAS departments for the drafting of a Sub-Regional Plan of Action on Child Labour taking into account NAPs of target countries.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	
Activity 2.1.2: Support a regional forum for the validation and adoption of the Plan with representatives of the 15 ECOWAS Member States.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not started	
Activity 2.1.3: Support the dissemination of the Sub-Regional Plan of Action on Child Labour at sub-regional level and national levels through the NSCs.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Ongoing	
Activity 2.1.4: Provide technical support to relevant Government agencies involved in the endorsement, implementation and supervision of the Sub-Regional Plan of Action on Child Labour.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not started	To be completed by 30 April 2014
Activity 2.1.5: Support ECOWAS and the Member States to pilot the RAP monitoring mechanism.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not started	To be completed by 30 April 2014
<b>Output 2.2: Technical assistance provided to review ECOWAS monitoring mechanisms to combat the worst forms of child labour, consistent with community policies and plans and reflecting regional and international standards and norms.</b>						
Activity 2.2.1: Organize tripartite regional workshops, as needed in collaboration with the ECOWAS Commission and the sub regional workers and employers' organizations, to monitor and evaluate the progress of implementation of the Sub-Regional Plan of Action on Child Labour.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not started	To be completed by 30 April 2014
Activity 2.2.2: Carry out training of trainers on the Sub Regional Plan of Action on child labour, based on the needs assessment, using the relevant available materials.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not started	To be completed by 30 April 2014

### **TORs Annex III: MTE recommendations**

The Mid-term Evaluation surfaced issues that, with some modifications, would enhance the project's effectiveness and help to meet the long-term objectives. Recommendations are made in the interest of deepening the foundations of the ECOWAS I and II projects, so that greater impact may occur. Some recommendations relate to programmatic adjustments while others concern project management. It is recognised that there are budgetary implications in meeting recommendations. Keeping in mind the Model Project aspect of all of the interventions, it may be necessary to install new procedures and revisit some assumptions in order for the project to be replicated in the ECOWAS/CEDEAO countries.

These recommendations are focused on activities within the project's domain. Suggested changes would be made at the country level, although it may be necessary for ILO-IPEC Headquarters to support their execution. The recommendations are directed first to the project leadership in each host country, who must act accordingly with Implementing agencies, government or social partners. The TA or IPO responsible for ECOWAS I or II and the West Africa Project leadership of ILO-IPEC projects in Accra and Geneva backstopping must also see how they are accountable for considering and implementing the recommendations. Those which concern project support or modifications to the functioning of the National Steering Committees or Action Programmes must be channelled through National Programme Officers. In the recommendations that follow, the entity or person to whom the recommendation is directed is in brackets [-].

Out of more than thirty recommendations, eleven have been selected that are cross-cutting or address the entire ECOWAS I and II project implementation. A priority recommendation is selected for each country that is relevant for all of the country programmes. Considering the length of the Mid-term Evaluation, it is expected that countries have already addressed areas where gaps were identified. In the following list, a recommendation is categorised under the country where it originated. The MTE team would like to underline the importance of recognising that a recommendation may apply to other countries, and to other ILO-IPEC projects. The total list of recommendations is found in Annex G.

#### *1. Maximise Comparative Advantage of ILO-IPEC across Country Programmes - [WAP leadership, ILO-IPEC Geneva]*

This recommendation is in response to the MTE impression that the ECOWAS I and II projects first and foremost comprise multiple layers of development experiences. As the projects progress, these experiences should be shared across the project breadth. For all of the components, the ILO-IPEC project management is taxed. The IAs and the social partners implement many of the activities, but the coordination, technical assistance, monitoring and evaluation (including assessment of quality products) rests on the staff.

One way of streamlining the tasks across borders would be for the project to optimise the multiple talents and skills within the project staff by forming special task-driven teams to develop Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for the whole project. Suggested areas where supplemental technical support are needed:

- special needs of girls;
- quality of educational programmes (formal and apprenticeships); and
- implementing livelihood support.

The teams should comprise members from country programmes who show particular expertise, experience and interest in these or other areas. The special team approach makes best use of existing personnel and harmonises approaches taken to address the objectives established by ECOWAS I and II. The operating procedures will provide a roadmap for implementing agencies in carrying out their work at the field level. Members from the IAs could also participate in the special teams. Teams



should also have access to specific consultants if they feel the need. Establishing guidelines for procedures will revitalise the work. The ensuing results will reinforce the commitment of country programmes across the region to improve and refine their approaches in these key programmatic areas. Other areas where special teams could be used:

- Governance and mobilising strategies to keep local vigilance committees motivated;
- Expanding children's involvement in the project; and
- Project management issues, such as streamlining reports or information management

2. *Solicit Extension and Increased Funding - [ILO-IPEC HQ, USDOL]*

Many country project activities have only just started. The focus on strengthening ECOWAS/CEDEAO is also just beginning. Much more time is needed for the strategy to get a foothold in the core countries and across the sub-region. The project management should request a no-cost extension to improve the chances of finishing the project successfully. A good case can also be made to earmark the project in Nigeria for special attention and allocate more support and resources to fast-track its implementation. More resources (especially personnel, office equipment, and vehicles) should be allocated to the project to enhance successful implementation.

The end dates of the two projects should coincide, and the final evaluation can take place for both. The activities and outcomes are ambitious, and a more plausible date would be to extend the project by one year to December 31, 2014, so that the "end child labour campaign by 2015" will be a capstone of their efforts.

3. *Address Objective Two with more Vigour as an Important and Separate Activity - [ECOWAS I and II direction and staff, ILO-IPEC HQ]*

As a way of linking the two objectives, the country projects are expected to create models and serve as learning laboratories for the benefit of decision makers and other stakeholders across the sub-region. The country programmes are an integral part of the overall plan, so programme staff and stakeholders should regularly review progress made on Objective 2 outputs to identify key areas of convergence.

The project's approach to create models and pilot new ideas assumes that knowledge should be shared widely about the project. As activities unfold, data incorporated into the DBMR and research on child labour and its worst forms is collected and analysed. The combined results begin to tell a story about the ease or difficulty of preventing child labour in the core countries. Leadership at the appropriate levels needs to take the initiative and see that knowledge is accumulated, presented and discussed as the project moves forward.

The Mid-term evaluators believe that the project is moving in the right direction with the Economic Commission (ECOWAS/CEDEAO). The strategy as described is a sound one and holds enormous promise for the members' states. However, it is a complex multilateral commission and it needs to be approached as such. Senior level staff needs to build relationships throughout the institution and with other similar level UN groups, such as UNICEF. The study commissioned by the project proved to be somewhat superficial. A deeper understanding of the workings of the commission on the part of the WAP CTA and TA is warranted.

Further, the country programme in Nigeria should be separate from activities involving the Economic Commission. Both activities are important, but they are very distinct from one another. Each requires full-time attention.

4. *Position the Project as a leader in fighting Child Labour and Go to the Top in Building Advocates for Child Labour - [WAP CTA, NPOs]*

If the project wants to make an impact, it has to be positioned as the central leader in the sub-regional fight against WFCL. This does not mean it should not share the spotlight or the burden. All staff

should be seen as experts upon whom Ministries and leaders can rely. All staff must be known, and that comes through dogged advocacy for the project goal.

Some leaders are already good allies to the project. The Minister of Labour in Benin was a strong proponent of ILO-IPEC projects when she was Directrice at the MTFP. Now Minister, she has already shown her continued interest in supporting the project's aims. She should be cultivated, especially since she will attend the interministerial conference of ECOWAS/CEDEAO, and the ILO Conference in Geneva. The First Lady of Côte d'Ivoire has launched a campaign against child labour and child trafficking. As the wife of the nation's leader, she garners attention. She may need to be kept update of the accomplishments of the project. The project leadership should also publicly appreciate her role. The WAP CTA should be involved in nurturing leaders, and this role should be an integral part of his job description.

5. *Expand Awareness Raising Techniques and Audiences - [ECOWAS I and II All country programmes, Implementing Agencies]*

Changing attitudes and practices related to child labour requires a long term effort. World Day against Child Labour is a proven avenue for advocacy, and techniques used on a single day were very successful in reaching huge audiences. The project uses various media, such as the mobilisation of the population (including children as a spokesperson).

These are sensible avenues of raising awareness. It may be time to add marketing techniques to these approaches. The project could invite representatives from the advertising divisions of local companies, including mobile phone companies, to ask how they might market an end to child labour. The national Elephants soccer team in Côte d'Ivoire could be invited to participate. These players are people of privilege, but they are also individuals who have had their share of life experiences. Schools should be recognised as powerful locales for raising awareness.

Even if informational anti- child labour materials have been produced by IAs separately, the project needs to develop consistent messages, and have technical assistance provided.

Choose a central theme for the entire sub-region that endures for the length of the project and is as recognisable as MTN, Orange or Coca Cola. ILO-IPEC has had successful runs with other themes, such as "Red Card against child trafficking" and the "Go for The Goal: End Child Labour" theme for World Day Against Child Labour.

6. *Change conduct with Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice (KAP) on Accidents and Death - [ECOWAS I and II direction and staff]*

In the behaviour change approach, an appreciation of the incidence and types of accidents and deaths that occur among children (working or not) is one way that people might move through the continuum of increased knowledge, modified attitudes, and changed practices (KAP). Machete use was mentioned repeatedly by parents, with their own scars and half-hacked fingers held up as evidence. Meanwhile, the MTE evaluator visited a schoolyard where children, engaged in clean-up day, were running with machetes in hand, swinging machetes, and engaging in pretend sword fights. A parent leader should be invited to the school to give a class on machete safety.

The project is advised to begin a Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice (KAP) exercise to create a strong single-message, yet contextually appropriate, campaign to stop child labour. Comprehensive research, data collection, research analysis, as well as child monitoring would certainly inform the knowledge base. The project has a clear and vital research agenda and has already validated a study on domestic work.

7. *Review Staffing Patterns (specifically in Nigeria, but across ECOWAS I and II) - [WAP CTA, ILO-IPEC]*

As concluded in the section on Organisational Structure, it is odd to divide the project management into two entities according to ECOWAS project I and ECOWAS project II without function following the form. It would seem far more logical to put the functional responsibility for Objective Two into the hands of a policy expert/technician. That recognises the connection that policy in each of the core countries has with the unique role of ECOWAS/CEDEAO. It puts all policy-oriented tasks together and strengthens ILO-IPEC's strategy to harmonise approaches. The other components also require expertise which could be construed as more mutually congruent. Project supervision and support to action programmes require a lot of attention. Policy issues require time-taking advocacy and technical support. The MTE noted that the Nigeria-based TA already had difficulty fulfilling all that was required before taking in the work of monitoring and supervising ECOWAS I.

The WAP CTA has suggested some changes to the ECOWAS I and II project organisational chart as it relates to the job descriptions of the CTA in Nigeria and the International Programme Officer based in Accra who directs ECOWAS I and II. As understood by the team, the strategy divides the ECOWAS I and ECOWAS II responsibilities between the TA in Abuja and IPO based in Accra. The changes were only under consideration at the time of the MTE and, hence, not assessed in this report. However, the idea of separating the project responsibilities across temporal rather than function creates great concern. Why should two projects be divided according to two separate, but quite similar projects, when other divisions of managing and reporting responsibility make more sense. For example, (1) ECOWAS/CEDEAO reinforcement and country policy making are two activities that are congruent and distinct from (2) activities such as providing support to implementing agencies; livelihood support; education; or child labour monitoring.

As has been suggested, the WAP CTA needs to be involved at a top level with the ECOWAS/CEDEAO leadership. The Nigeria TA must take on a more proactive role of building relationships of stature to establish the project as a force with the government of Nigeria and the ECOWAS. The PO's professional experience and contacts could be extremely useful in engaging national-level players in government and social partners to push the national policy agenda, but this staffer is also responsible for start-up of the APs. As the Action Programmes progress, they will need support in M & E, and meeting their responsibilities in advocacy and raising awareness. Given that the project has lost time, an examination of the work plan to ensure that expanded roles of staff is consistent with meeting project objectives is recommended. Similarly, the project may consider additional professional staff or hiring consultants for specialised tasks, including reporting.

8. *Certify Products to Be Child Labour-Free [Benin country programme, CDN, Labour Ministry]*

The building boom, road construction, and government physical infrastructural projects require sand, gravel, crushed rock and granite, all of which come from the interior of the country. According to most sources, these products are probably purchased from artisanal quarries. In the course of interviews and meetings with stakeholders during the MTE, the idea of tracing the materials to child labour as an awareness raising tool surfaced. Several suggestions were made to "certify" or "label" materials as child-free, and to get the government to guarantee its building materials did not come from child labour in artisanal mines. Either through the work of the journalist network RETRAME, or a consulting firm, the project could contract for a study and project design to carry this suggestion further.

9. *Advocate for Launching a Birth Registration Campaign - [RCI Country programme, CDN, Line ministries, WAP CTA, IPO]*

Birth registration is a Cross-cutting issue for several of the core countries, and in other ECOWAS/CEDEAO member states. Particularly in rural areas, parents often did not declare the birth of their children, either out of ignorance or because they could not afford the fees for birth certificates. This could result in denial of public services such as education and health care. The lack of birth registration was cited as the gravest of problems and the biggest deterrent to keeping children in school and

out of WFCL in Côte d'Ivoire, where informants said more than half of the children do not have birth certificates. Without birth registration papers, children cannot qualify for the national examinations. For many parents, this offers sufficient disincentive to even sending their children to primary school.

The problem has reached pandemic proportions, and is regarded as a crisis by the child protection community, according to Stakeholders. While the ECOWAS project focuses on returning or enrolling children in school to protect them for their engagement in WFCL, their lack of status is a clear barrier. Some innovative approaches generated in the course of the MTE include:

- At the level of the Implementing Agencies providing direct services:
  - a) organise a campaign within their own localities and make the registration of their constituents' part of their project.
  - b) Registration can be an income generating activity or small business. Just as some literate people have businesses to write letters, a small enterprise could be established where a reasonable fee is charged to handle the documentation. The birth registration is a legal process, but trained "paralegal" level individual could take this on.
- At the national level, the ECOWAS project can advocate for various approaches, such as:
  - a) Hold a national dialogue
  - b) Launch a campaign advocating a resolution to the issue of birth certificates
  - c) Ask the ministries involved and UNICEF to organise a national day of registration.
  - d) Just as national immunisation campaigns have been successful in vaccinating children against childhood disease; mobile units could make this a national event. (Maybe it could happen on WDACL). Ask the government to waive fees for that day alone, or reduce costs.

*10. Project Management: Use Dynamic, Useful Management/Implementation Plans - [WAP CTA, ECOWAS I and II direction and Ghana staff]*

Information from the International Programme Officer in an interview in April, 2012 is that this recommendation (from the Ghana Country Phase I of MTE Report) has already been addressed. If so, it is reassuring to believe that the ECOWAS project management continues to be flexible and responsive. The recommendation is left in this larger report as (1) an overall suggestion for all country projects; and as (2) a means of verification for the final evaluation:

The ECOWAS projects were conceived from an assessment of needs, and originated from in-depth conceptualising and planning. Many planning documents related to reporting have been generated, but they seem more useful for reporting to donors than for project guidance. For such a complex project, with multiple partners performing many activities, the project management needs to have a more visual plan of action whereby progress can be easily and rapidly monitored. The final outputs are clearly identified, but the steps leading to are less defined. While it appears that each of the partners has planning tools, the project office does not appear to have its own unique, visual device, such as a Gantt chart, a Pert Chart, Results Framework (specific to the Ghana programme) or a management/implementation plan (MI/P), to show the necessary critical path for things to happen.

For sustainable results, the Ghana office needs to create and utilise country-specific plans that serve as a clear road map, with unambiguous, identifiable steps to reach the already well-defined outcomes; and short term deadlines that reveal progress towards the laudable and possible objectives; not just the performance monitoring forms required from donors. If the MTE team missed these tools, it is because they were not in evidence to be actually used on a regular basis.

*11. Retain Focus on Mining/Quarrying as a Sector of Child Labour - [Nigeria Country programme staff, NSC]*

Considering the small target numbers in Nigeria, serving non-quarrying labourers runs the risk of diluting the project's impact as a pilot and model. Those groups which have been identified as possible implementing partners have knowledge and could be forceful actors in consulting with Ministries of Mines and Justice to address and enforce gaps in legislation against child labour in quarrying and mining, one of the project indicators. With the focus on mining and quarrying, the project will be better equipped to consult and deliver technical support to the Ministry of Labour as indicated in the Logical Framework.

Studies and valid supplemental information on the issue of child labour in stone quarries in Ogun state confirms that the area is already saturated with interventions on child labour issues. Previous projects in the area have had a positive impact in reducing CL. Law enforcement agents and other partners pointed out that many Benin children, previously working in stone quarries in Ogun State, may have moved on to other areas such as Oyo State, or to other activity sectors (e.g. informal urban sector or child domestic work).

A flexible approach may be adopted when selecting the communities and the activity sectors to be targeted for intervention. The MTE team suggests an adjustment be made on previously identified project sites and a move to Oyo State for the locus of target beneficiaries. Just as children in cocoa communities in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire are withdrawn from non-cocoa child labour, children in Nigeria's quarry areas, particularly in Oyo state, may also be withdrawn from other types of WFCL. However, the priority should be given to children working in the artisanal mines and quarries.

## Annex II Summary of evaluation findings by output by project

### ECOWAS I Objective I

<p><b>Immediate Objective 1:</b> By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Ghana, Nigeria and Côte d'Ivoire will be accelerated.</p>
<p><b>Output 1.1:</b> Consultations and technical support delivered for finalizing the National Action Plan (NAP), its validation and adoption and for integrating child labour into other national, relevant sectoral, sub-national and/or local action plans in Cote d'Ivoire (RCI), Ghana and Nigeria.</p>
<p>The NAP is a framework whereby the national CL labour policy is defined and its implementation presented. It should contain “coherent and complementary policies, strategies and interventions with the long-term purpose of reducing and eventually eliminating CL.”</p> <p>National Action Plans were completed in all countries. Dissemination of the NAPs was either completed or would soon be completed in all countries. Differences exist among the countries in terms of how the NAPs will be integrated by stakeholder groups on the NSCs. In all cases, however, the NAPs served importantly to bring together stakeholders to coordinate their efforts to end CL, without which activities would have been scattered and less effective.</p> <p>In Ghana, according to both the ILO project staff and interviews with a local Social Welfare Officer (the focal point for the NSC) and others, local officials are aware of the NAP but work in weak institutions often with non-functioning equipment that impedes their ability to systematically implement NAP activities. Few sufficiently trained staff and meagre resources hamper their efforts. In Asutifi District, activities ramped up after 2009 when 10 Community Child Protection Committees were formed (out of 900 communities) after which the NGO responsible for implementing CL activities intervened with training and equipment (motorbikes, bicycles, computers, etc.). By the time of the field visit, a local official reported that the <i>DCPC (District Child Protection Committee)</i> <i>used to be very active and counsel parents with children in WFCL, but now has been reduced to only a focal person.</i> The IA in this case noted that CL issues that should be integrated into the District Assembly’s Medium-Term Plans but the activities have no budget assigned.</p> <p>In Nigeria, training programs were organized to further the development and implementation of NAPs in target countries. States were involved in reviewing the proposed NAP so that their input was ensured. Two states were adopting their state-wide Action Plan to supplement and contextualize the NAP. In Côte d'Ivoire the NAP was adopted and launched and contributed to harmonizing other efforts being made regarding Child Labour.</p>
<p><b>Output 1.2:</b> Capacity building programmes designed and delivered to fill gaps in relevant institutions’ capacity to implement the NAP in Cote d'Ivoire (RCI), Ghana and Nigeria.</p>
<p>Many training programs were developed in each country for all the stakeholders and primary movers in major institutions that could have an impact on reducing the WFCL. Programme implementers held exploratory meetings with stakeholders about their organizational capacity to implement CL elimination activities, which revealed gaps that the projects could address. The IPEC Strategic Programming Impact Framework (SPIF) was employed to identify partner organization needs. Good Practices to assist an organization improve performance call for assessing the root causes of below-par institutional performance using a process that goes beyond strategic planning, considering an organization’s internal architecture or taking note of needs articulated by an organization’s leadership. An in-depth institutional performance assessment is typically conducted prior to embarking on <i>training</i>, because training is only one of many potential interventions that can help fill the identified gaps. In-depth organizational assessments are designed to reveal the root causes for non-performance, which did not appear to have been conducted in the institutions targeted prior to beginning capacity building activities.</p> <p>If however the term “capacity-building” in the Output statement refers to “increasing understanding” of the WFCL and helping people learn how to implement programs to eliminate the WFCL, then “training” did serve its purpose “to implement NAP and combat the WFCL.” Capacity-building in this sense can lead to better understanding of how to solve the problem but may not “fill the gaps in relevant institutional capacity” as stated in the Output description above.</p>

At the national level, capacity-building interventions that included training, technical assistance and equipment support, in particular with the National Steering Committees in all four countries, played a critical role in increasing coordination among ministries, tripartite stakeholders and IAs.

The performance gaps at the NSCs were well understood by the ILO project staff, as revealed in many interviews, and their interventions led to a significant increase in coordination and information sharing. At the local level, the IAs played a direct role in implementing the capacity-building and often were not as familiar with the local institutional landscape, and the causes of performance gaps, as was the ILO at the national (and regional) level.

**Output 1.3:** Technical assistance provided to reinforce national laws and law enforcement in Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria.

Technical assistance was provided that was instrumental in reinforcing national laws and law enforcement in each country. Significant new legislation or new ways to support existing legislation, was passed or proposed in all countries as a result of the project (see details in report). The most significant achievement was the adoption officially and dissemination of hazardous work lists in each country. In Ghana, training programs to explain CL to police officers were designed and delivered and CL was added to the policy academy curriculum.

**Output 1.4:** National and sub-national awareness raising and social mobilization campaigns conducted in Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria.

Awareness-raising campaigns were conducted widely, and were in most respects effective. Types of campaigns varied and included workshops for journalists, building strong relationships with NGOs that diffused information on the WFCL, rallies, t-shirts, TV and radio public service announcements, celebrity endorsements and activities targeting schools. A few specific examples are described below:

In Ghana, awareness-campaigns took many forms, from printing and distributing posters, T-shirts and videos that can be shown on television. The ILO/IPEC team initiated a partnership with government, called of Social Mobilisation Partners Against Child labour (SOMOPAC), to diffuse messages on the WFCL throughout the country via the Ministry of Information. In Nigeria, workshops were held, led by local communications experts, to train community leaders working to reduce CL on effective ways to reach people through messages of various types. School-based workshops were also organized to reach younger and vulnerable audiences about the danger of the WFCL in Nigeria, a writing contest was launched offering prizes to the best entry on how to stop child domestic work. In all countries the EI&II projects organized special events around the World Day Against Child Labour.

**Output 1.5:** Studies undertaken to fill identified gaps in knowledge base on selected worst forms of child labour and the problems of forced child labour and trafficking in Cote d'Ivoire (RCI), Ghana and ECOWAS

Studies were conducted in each country that assisted both the ILO project staff, the NSC and the IAs in implementing activities to target populations they better understood. The evaluation team could not determine the overall utility of the studies in terms of responding to the Output as described. Some studies were still ongoing late in the project life, which raised the question of whether their findings would feed into the EI&II decision-making process, although the studies would add value to NSC post-project strategic planning.

**Output 1.6:** Models of intervention designed and piloted in four target sectors including models for withdrawing and preventing children working in forced labour and other worst forms of child labour in Ghana and RCI.

Intervention models were developed for each of the four target sectors based on the particularity of each. For

instance, for Fisheries in Ghana the model evolved where specific protocols were developed based on the location of the children (isolated islands), the security concerns and availability of local schools to enroll the rescued children. Although the project achieved its targets to withdraw children from the WFCL, as the children were withdrawn, as with any development intervention, new challenges were revealed, such as the lack of school equipment or ability of families to pay school fees.

## ECOWAS I: Objective 2

**Immediate Objective 2: By the end of the project the role played by ECOWAS/CEDEAO in combating the worst forms of child labour in the sub-region will be reinforced.**

**Output 2.1:** Technical assistance provided to ECOWAS/CEDEAO to establish protocols for monitoring member states' efforts to combat the worst forms of child labour, consistent with community policies and plans and reflecting international standards and norms.

Based on document review, and discussions with ECOWAS, progress has been made in establishing ways to track the WFCL in member states. Despite delays and the prediction in the Mid-Term Evaluation that Objective 2 would not be achieved by the project end-date, significant achievements were made. A Child Protection M&E Framework encompassing a Child Labour Regional Action Plan was adopted by ECOWAS Ministers in December 2012 and a Declaration on the implementation of the Regional Action Plan was endorsed by the tripartite groups in the ECOWAS member states in May 2013. Technical assistance arranged by the project in the form of provision of international experts, for example to draft documents for ECOWAS consideration, and guidance from ILO/IPEC staff, was instrumental in reaching these outputs.

**Output 2.2:** Programmes designed and implemented to strengthen the capacity of relevant ECOWAS technical departments to combat child labour in the sub-region

Based on quarterly reports reviewed and discussions with those managing activities with ECOWAS, a number of constraints were noted early-on that challenged capacity-building at ECOWAS. Collaboration got off to a slow start due to what ILO/IPEC staff reported to be the frequent travel by key ECOWAS staff, plus overall delays due to the terrorist attack on the UN/ILO offices in Abuja. When activities eventually were launched, ECOWAS began to take ownership and regional initiatives, such as with workshops and preparatory work toward the Regional Action Plan. Whether the *relevant ECOWAS technical departments* were *strengthened* as the Output called for, cannot be confirmed without a performance analysis and baseline to know what changed institutionally. Interviews with ECOWAS and IPEC staff clearly demonstrated that individuals had greatly increased their knowledge of WFCL and regional activities were underway that were previously not envisaged, but the capacity of the technical departments would likely be significantly impaired by the departure of the individuals trained by the projects.

An assessment of ECOWAS designed to produce information for the ILO where capacity-building can be targeted, contributed limited value to implementing Output 2.2, according to interviews, since it focused on organizational structure (organigrams) rather than identifying root causes for performance gaps. Individual training opportunities were provided to ECOWAS staff, for example in Turin, to upgrade knowledge and skills. Such training initiatives, however useful for the individuals, do not, by themselves, lead to *institutional* capacity strengthening.

Based on interviews with ILO/IPEC staff, the evaluation team cannot know whether the capacity (i.e., performance) of relevant ECOWAS technical departments has been significantly improved.

**Output 2.3:** Sub regional forums organized to encourage networking and to share good practices among all ECOWAS member states

After considerable delays in making progress at ECOWAS to move on adopting a regional action plan and supporting mechanisms, the project started showing impressive results. First, the RAP was adopted by ECOWAS Ministers in December 2012, which contained a peer review mechanism; second, the tripartite Symposium held in Accra in May 2013 reviewed the roles and responsibilities to implement the RAP and concluded a Declaration



which included Ghana's offer to be the first peer-reviewed country; and third, the peer review took place in November-December 2013 and was to be discussed in April 2014 among member states. Conducting a peer review, although an established process at ECOWAS was not *de rigueur* for Child Labour. The planning for the large regional workshop held in Accra in itself contributed importantly to establishing a footprint in the region.

## ECOWAS II: Objective 1

**Immediate Objective 1: By the end of the project, progress on the elimination of the worst forms of child labour in Benin, Ghana, Nigeria and Côte d'Ivoire will be accelerated.**

**Output 1.1:** Consultations and technical support delivered for integrating child labour/trafficking concerns into national mining policies and laws, sub-national and/or local government action plans and social partner policies and plans in Benin and Nigeria.

Hazardous work lists were completed that were critical to implementing changes framed in the National Action Plans. These work lists applied to mining, cocoa and other domains where CL persists. In Nigeria, the NAP was vetted at the state level and adjusted to include the input received.

In Benin, the NSC coordinates activities implemented by NGOs, the application of the NAP in the context of efforts to eliminate CL, and the coordination among ministries to ensure that the Annual Work Plan is followed. At the local level various agencies are implicated in operationalizing the work plan (for example, the *Comites de Surveillance de Securite et de Sante au travail (CSSST)* and the *Cellules Communales du Suivi du Travail des Enfants*).

**Output 1.2:** Capacity building programmes designed and delivered to fill gaps in relevant institutions capacity to combat the worst forms of child labour in the artisanal mining sectors in Benin and Nigeria.

Many training programs were developed in each country for all the stakeholders and primary movers in major institutions that could have an impact on reducing the WFCL. Programme implementers held exploratory meetings with stakeholders about their organizational capacity to implement CL elimination activities, which revealed gaps that the projects could address. In terms of targeting artisanal mining in Benin and Nigeria, programs were developed in both countries although in Nigeria the emphasis evolved away from mining to other venues where CL existed. In Benin, quarries were the major focus of sensitization campaigns.

However, Good Practices to assist an organization improve performance call for assessing the root causes of below-par institutional performance using a process that goes beyond strategic planning, considering an organization's internal architecture or taking note of needs articulated by an organization's leadership. An in-depth institutional performance assessment is typically conducted prior to embarking on *training*, because training is only one of many potential interventions that can help fill the identified gaps. In-depth organizational assessments are designed to reveal the root causes for non-performance, which did not appear to have been conducted in the institutions targeted prior to beginning capacity building activities. The emphasis was on increasing understanding of CL.

If however the term "capacity-building" in the Output statement refers to "increasing understanding" of the WFCL and helping people learn how to implement programs to eliminate the WFCL, then "training" did serve its purpose "to implement NAP and combat the WFCL." Capacity-building in this sense can lead to better understanding of how to solve the problem but may not "fill the gaps in relevant institutional capacity" as stated in the Output description above.

**Output 1.3:** National and sub national awareness raising and social mobilization campaigns conducted in Benin, RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria.

Awareness-raising campaigns were conducted widely, and were in most respects effective. Types of campaigns varied and included workshops for journalists, building strong relationships with NGOs that diffused information on the WFCL, rallies, t-shirts, TV and radio public service announcements, celebrity endorsements and activities targeting schools. A few specific examples are described below:

In Ghana, awareness-campaigns took many forms, from printing and distributing posters, T-shirts and videos

that can be shown on television. The ILO/IPEC team initiated a partnership with government, called of Social Mobilisation Partners Against Child labour (SOMOPAC), to diffuse messages on the WFCL throughout the country via the Ministry of Information. In Nigeria, workshops were held, led by local communications experts, to train community leaders working to reduce CL on effective ways to reach people through messages of various types. School-based workshops were also organized to reach younger and vulnerable audiences about the danger of the WFCL in Nigeria, a writing contest was launched offering prizes to the best entry on how to stop child domestic work. In all countries the EI&II projects organized special events around the World Day Against Child Labour.

In Benin a television debate was organized where the ILO tripartite organizations discussed progress on Benin's Roadmap 2010 toward elimination of CL by 2016.

**Output 1.4:** Studies undertaken to fill identified gaps in knowledge base on artisanal mines and the problems of forced child labour and trafficking in Benin and Nigeria.

Studies were conducted in each country that assisted both the ILO project staff, the NSC and the IAs in implementing activities to target populations they better understood. However, the evaluation team could not determine the overall utility of the studies in terms of responding to the Output as described. Some conducted in specific sites helped planners and IAs design local activities while other studies were still ongoing late in the project life, which raised the question of whether their findings would feed into the EI&II decision-making process

A study completed in Benin designed to learn about CL in the country's mines and quarries,<sup>7</sup> revealed the extent of CL in mining, specifically in the gravel, granite and gold sub-sectors. The report identified 102 operational artisanal mining sites employing 2,991 children aged 5 to 17, of which 86 percent combined school and work and approximately 50 percent had been working in the mines since 2012, after the EII project had begun. This study also explored the socio-economic roots of CL that helped the project design its direct interventions.

Studies were undertaken in Nigeria also in both Ogun and Oyo states that helped ILO/IPEC adjust the Nigerian program to fit the context.

**Output 1.5:** Models of intervention designed and piloted for withdrawing and preventing children working in the worst forms of child labour in Benin RCI, Ghana, and Nigeria

Intervention models were developed to resolve the obstacles identified after children were withdrawn. The project achieved its targets to withdraw children from the WFCL. As the children were withdrawn, as with any development intervention, new challenges were revealed, such as the lack of school equipment or ability of families to pay school fees. These obstacles were then mitigated by new project interventions (e.g., school kits and obtaining a waiver in Oyo State from paying required fees).

Over the course of the project, increasingly complicated interventions at the local level had to be managed. The ever-expanding and challenging models presented significant limitations in terms of sustainability and manageability due to the micro-level of implementation required, from agencies whose continued involvement in the project after closure is doubtful.

In terms of implementing direct action to beneficiaries, the project was able to facilitate reinsertion of children withdrawn from WFCL. However, the evaluators did not observe monitoring mechanisms in place to track changes in student learning, for example, or to ensure that education of a reasonable quality was provided to the children.

Implementation models evolved, understandably, to include actions in the community beyond the withdrawal or prevention of children in the WFCL, such as livelihood services to families of the withdrawn or prevented children. These supporting interventions based on the team's observations, discussions with teachers and verification of school registries, helped retain children in school.

The models guided implementation in all the sectors targeted (artisanal mining, quarries, cocoa, fisheries, etc.).

<sup>7</sup> *Approfondissement des connaissances sur le travail des enfants les mines et carrières du Benin, Mai 2014*

The specifics of their application were modified to fit the circumstances found in each sector. Withdrawing children from fisheries in Ghana's Volta region had to be executed differently from withdrawing child domestic workers, child miners or children on cocoa farms. The mechanics of withdraw differed but the models appeared to the evaluators to be consistent, especially with regards to post-withdrawal actions (school placement, family support, collaboration with local social and law enforcement officials, etc.).

**Output 1.6:** Models of intervention designed and piloted to promote resilient family livelihoods and sustainable community development in Benin RCI , Ghana, and Nigeria

Models evolved according to the context. Families that depended on income from their children doing CL were provided support to develop alternative livelihoods. The IAs implemented these activities based on studies (on local job demand, for example) and recommendations from civil society and local government. Over the course of the project, the ILO/IPEC planners benefitted from lessons learned in reviewing the various models being used to reduce the WFCL.

Models for community development stretched the IAs beyond their ability, in the view of the evaluators. Community development is a broad effort far beyond the focus of withdrawing children from the WFCL. Creating jobs, mobilizing local resources, supporting productive work and building local leadership are objectives associated with many major players, such as government ministries charged with Planning, Agriculture, Women's Affairs, EPA, Education, Water and Sanitation, not to mention faith-based institutions, donors and NGOs.

The output indicator to measure the livelihood component – *No. of at-risk families benefiting from economic empowerment schemes provided or facilitated by the project* – does not measure whether the intervention was successful – that is, resulting in families with increased revenue. In terms of outcome, although the evaluators observed the equipment distributed, met with families and noted from quarterly reports the number of families reached, they can only note that the intervention was completed, not that the well-being of families may or may not have improved.

## ECOWAS II: Objective 2

<p><b>Immediate Objective 2: By the end of the project, the role played by ECOWAS/CEDEAO in combating the worst forms of child labour in the sub-region will be reinforced.</b></p>
<p><b>Output 2.1:</b> Sub regional Plan of Action on Child Labour designed and adopted</p> <p>Based on document review, and discussions with ECOWAS, progress has been made in establishing ways to track the WFCL in member states. Despite delays and the prediction in the Mid-Term Evaluation that Objective 2 would not be achieved by the project end-date, significant achievements were made. A Child Protection M&amp;E Framework encompassing a Child Labour Regional Action Plan was adopted by ECOWAS Ministers in December 2012 and a Declaration on the implementation of the Regional Action Plan was endorsed by the tripartite groups in the ECOWAS member states in May 2013. Technical assistance arranged by the project in the form of provision of international experts, for example to draft documents for ECOWAS consideration, and guidance from ILO/IPE</p>
<p><b>Output 2.2:</b> : Technical assistance provided to review ECOWAS monitoring mechanisms to combat the worst forms of child labour, consistent with community policies and plans and reflecting regional and international standards and norms.</p> <p>Based on quarterly reports reviewed and discussions with those managing activities with ECOWAS, a number of constraints were noted early-on that challenged capacity-building at ECOWAS. Collaboration got off to a slow start due to what ILO/IPEC staff reported to be the frequent travel by key ECOWAS staff, plus overall delays due to the terrorist attack on the UN/ILO offices in Abuja. When activities eventually were launched, ECOWAS began to take ownership and regional initiatives, such as with workshops and preparatory work toward the Regional Action Plan. Whether the <i>relevant ECOWAS technical departments</i> were <i>strengthened</i> as the Output called for, cannot be confirmed without a performance analysis and baseline to know what changed institutionally. Interviews with ECOWAS and IPEC staff clearly demonstrated that individuals had greatly increased their knowledge of WFCL and regional activities were underway that were previously not envisaged, but the capacity of the technical departments would likely be significantly impaired by the departure of the individuals trained by the projects.</p> <p>An assessment of ECOWAS designed to produce information for the ILO where capacity-building can be targeted, contributed limited value to implementing Output 2.2, according to interviews, since it focused on organizational structure (organigrams) rather than identifying root causes for performance gaps. Individual training opportunities were provided to ECOWAS staff, for example in Turin, to upgrade knowledge and skills. Such training initiatives, however useful for the individuals, do not, by themselves, lead to <i>institutional</i> capacity strengthening.</p> <p>Based on interviews with ILO/IPEC staff, the evaluation team cannot know whether the capacity (i.e., performance) of relevant ECOWAS technical departments has been significantly improved.</p>

## Annex III: Direct intervention sites

### Côte d'Ivoire

Towns	Villages	Stakeholders
Abengourou	Ekrakro	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CGECI (zone Abengourou)</li><li>• Groupe d'apprenants du champ école de Djangobo</li><li>• Community leaders and members of local CL surveillance committees</li><li>• Group of Apprentices (student mechanics, - withdrawn from PFTE)</li></ul>
	Djangobo	
	Niablé	
Daloa	Gonaté	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Coopérative KAVOKIVA (zone Daloa)</li><li>• Community leaders and members of local CL surveillance committees</li><li>• Group of Apprentices (student mechanics, - withdrawn from PFTE)</li></ul>
	Bonon	
	Sokrolaye	
Location	Stakeholders	
Abidjan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ASA staff,</li><li>• ILO staff,</li><li>• USDOL represented by the Embassy Officer in charge of Labor affairs.</li></ul>	
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Government officials at the national, regional, and district level : (<i>La Direction de la Lutte contre le Travail des Enfants, le Conseil National de Surveillance, inspection régional du travail, regional labor inspectors, police officers from Abengourou district, regional and local educational officers and teachers</i>)</li><li>• Workers' Organizations (DIGNITE, FESACI) and Employer's Organizations (CGECI), NGOs (ASA, Coopérative KAVOKIVA).</li></ul>	

### Ghana

Location	Stakeholders
Accra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ILO/IPEC Staff: Chief Technical Adviser, International Programme Officer, National Programme Officer</li> <li>Chairperson on NSC Sub-Committee on Direct Action and Head of the Anti-Human Trafficking Unit of Ghana Police Service, CID Headquarters, Accra.</li> <li>Members of the Child Labour Unit (CLU) and others at Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations (MERL):</li> <li>Chief Director, MERL, Chief Labour Officer, Head of CLU, EIB.</li> <li>Consultant- JMK Consulting Ltd.</li> <li>National Development Planning Commission – NDPC</li> <li>Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAJ)</li> <li>Director, Administration, and others ,Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources</li> <li>Acting Coordinator, and Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour in Cocoa (NPECLC), Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations</li> <li>GJA Secretary, and others, Ghana Journalist Association (SOMOPAC).</li> <li>Executive Director/NECPAD, Accountant, and Field Staff</li> <li>Site Visit: Quarry on outskirts of Accra. Talked with manager</li> <li>Sire Visit: primary school next to Quarry: met with focal point</li> </ul>
Kenyasi & Kwasari	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Social Welfare Officer, Asutifi District Assembly</li> <li>District Assemblyman (name not noted) (accompanied us to galamsey site)</li> <li>Kenyasi Primary School</li> <li>Kwasari: primary school (accompanied by NPECLC staff from Accra &amp; Kumasi)</li> </ul>

### Benin

Communes	Stakeholders
Lokossa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Associations des Mères d'Elèves,</li> <li>Comité de surveillance de Sécurité et de Santé au Travail (C3ST),</li> <li>Cellule Communale de Suivi, de Coordination et de Protection de l'Enfant,</li> <li>Les Directions Départementales du Travail et des Mines,</li> <li>Centre de Promotion Sociale (CPS).</li> <li>Mine sites where children have worked</li> </ul>
Zakpota	

Communes	Stakeholders
Parakou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schools where students have been taken out of minework.</li> <li>The NGO : ARED (Association de Recherche pour un Développement Endogène) working in the Communes of Lokossa, Houéyogbé and Dogbo.</li> <li>The 'Fondation Terre des Hommes' (TDH) in Zakpota.</li> <li>The sub project « : « <i>Elimination du travail des enfants dans les mines et carrières du Mono/Couffo et du Borgou et amélioration de la productivité des artisans miniers</i> » in Parakou.</li> </ul>
Location	Stakeholders
Cotonou	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ASA staff,</li> <li>IPEC staff,</li> <li>Conseil National du Patronat (focal point of the « Comité Directeur National de lutte contre le travail des Enfants CND) »,</li> <li>Bureau National de l'ONG Terre des Hommes du Bénin,</li> <li>Observatoire Intersyndical de Suivi de l'Application des Conventions de l'OIT sur le Travail des Enfants (OBISATE),</li> <li>Direction Générale des Mines,</li> <li>Direction Générale du Travail,</li> <li>Embassy of the United states of America,</li> <li>Direction de la protection judiciaire de l'Enfance et de la Jeunesse (Point focal de la Commission Nationale des Droits de l'Enfant),</li> <li>Direction de la Famille, de l'enfance et de l'adolescence (Observatoire de la Famille, de la femme et de l'enfant).</li> </ul>

## Nigeria

Location	Stakeholders
Abuja	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ILO Staff: Director, Technical Advisor, Child Labour Focal Point, Programme Officer, Project Focal Person</li> <li>Staff of ECOWAS: Director, Humanitarian Affairs; Regional Adviser, Directorate of Humanitarian and Social Affairs.</li> <li>FGD with staff of Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity</li> <li>ILO Staff: Project Focal Person, Chief Technical Officer, Project Office</li> <li>Members of the Media: chairperson of the National Association of Women Journalists (NAWOJ), FCT Chapter</li> <li>Nigeria Employer's Association (NECA) Desk Manager, Abuja,</li> <li>Implementing Partners: National Agency for Prohibition of Traffic in Persons and Other related Matters (NAPTIP), Galilee Foundation, Women Consortium of Nigeria (WOCON)</li> <li>Meeting with Staff of the Federal Ministry of Labour and Productivity (FMOLP): Acting. Director, Inspectorate; Deputy Director, Inspectorate; Head, Child Labour Unit; ADL; ACLI; PLO, Child Labour Unit; ADF.</li> </ul>
Lagos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sought After Foundation,</li> <li>Vocational Centre – Hair dressing Salon,</li> <li>Beneficiaries from Benin,</li> <li>Beneficiaries from Nigeria.</li> </ul>
Ogun State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff of Federal Ministry of Labour Ogun State Field office,</li> <li>Five beneficiary families,</li> <li>FGD with child beneficiaries in a Secondary School,</li> <li>Immigration Officer,</li> <li>Three Members of CLMC,</li> <li>Street School Teachers.</li> </ul>
Oyo State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FGD with Adult Beneficiaries in Sabo Community,</li> <li>Police Officer (a member of CLMC),</li> <li>Immigration Officer,</li> <li>FGD Session with child beneficiaries in a shelter</li> </ul>

## **Annex IV: ILO/ECOWAS symposium on WFCL**

### **DECLARATION**

#### **of the ECOWAS/ILO Symposium on the West Africa Regional Action Plan to Eliminate Child Labour, Especially the Worst Forms Accra, Ghana 27-29 May 2013**

We, the tripartite participants from Governments, Unions and Employers' Associations of the ECOWAS Member States responsible for the elimination of child labour in West Africa, having:

- participated in the ECOWAS/ILO Symposium on the West Africa Regional Action Plan to Eliminate Child Labour, especially its Worst Forms, held in Accra on 27-29 May 2013;
- exchanged experiences and shared views about progress and challenges from our countries;
- reviewed our own roles and responsibilities in the light of the West Africa Regional Action Plan, adopted by Ministers in December 2012;
- discussed the way forward regarding future activities at national and regional level, including with the ECOWAS Commission:

RECOGNISE that:

- i) child labour violates the rights of children, is condemned by international Conventions and is prohibited by our countries' national laws because it harms their development, health, education, morals and future prospects, and exposes them to hazards and other worst forms of child labour;
- ii) despite encouraging progress in some areas, the incidence of child labour in West Africa remains stubbornly high, is not reducing in line with economic growth, and in some

ECOWAS/ILO Symposium on West Africa Regional Action Plan to Eliminate Child Labour, 27-29 May 2013, Accra, Ghana

countries may be rising, with higher prevalence in some sectors or localities;

- iii) child labour perpetuates poverty for future generations of adults, that peace and stability can be jeopardised by frustrated youth with few prospects, and that child labour calls into question the governance of development activities in our countries;
- iv) the lack of regular and comprehensive statistics on the prevalence of child labour in West African countries hampers good policy-making and targeting of programmes/interventions;
- v) child labour continues despite the efforts of governments, enforcement agencies, local authorities, unions and employers' organisations, and development partners to end the practice;
- vi) nonetheless, Member States of ECOWAS have diverse experiences implementing actions and interventions to eliminate child labour, with some successes, which can be shared to mutual benefit;
- vii) child labour is normally more prevalent in the informal, unregulated economy, subsistence activities and small-scale family enterprises yet the product of child labour often enters the value chain of the formal sector, through public and private procurement, and to foreign consumers through international trade;
- viii) children are sent to labour predominantly as a coping mechanism by parents from the poorest and most vulnerable sections of society, who generally lack opportunities for decent work, do not benefit from social protection programmes and cannot access essential services;
- ix) the design of social protection programmes can have a significant impact on the incidence of child labour;



- x) free, accessible and good quality universal education is still not available to many children in West Africa, yet the costs of sending children to school are immediate while the benefits are only apparent longer-term;
- xi) child labour undermines our countries' ability to achieve the education and other Millennium Development Goals and that combining school and work is becoming more widespread, with consequences for pupil attendance rates and low educational attainment;

DECLARE the following:

- a) ECOWAS Member States make faster progress and increased efforts towards the goal of eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in West Africa by 2015 and all child labour as soon as possible thereafter;
- b) Member States collect consistent, comparable and regular statistics on child labour as a means of quantifying the problem and creating the empirical conditions for evidence-based policies on child labour, and share data with the ECOWAS Commission;
- c) Member States call upon the ECOWAS Commission to assist them in sharing lessons on effective interventions against child labour, in assessing each other's performance and methods for reducing child labour, and in providing a forum or platform for finding ways to accelerate progress towards the elimination of child labour in the spirit of collaboration between West African countries and in line with the Regional Action Plan;
- d) the peer review mechanism in the ECOWAS Regional Action Plan to Eliminate Child Labour is of great value for sharing good practices and highlighting deficiencies and, in that respect, encourage other Member States to follow the example of Ghana to submit to peer review;

ECOWAS/ILO Symposium on West Africa Regional Action Plan to Eliminate Child Labour, 27-29 May 2013, Accra, Ghana

- e) more attention will be given to certain key precursors for reducing child labour, such as:
- i) facilitating comprehensive birth registration;
  - ii) enforcing free, accessible and good quality compulsory education, including transitional and non-formal education or training for adolescents, so all children can benefit from a proper education, and providing children in or at risk of child labour with the necessary means (such as meals, books, uniforms, etc.) to attend school regularly;
  - iii) designing social protection programmes for the poorest families, which remove the financial need and opportunity-cost of sending their children to school;
  - iv) providing decent work opportunities to adults who are susceptible to sending their children to work;
  - v) establishing governance, enforcement and remedial structures in rural and urban communities and in sub-national authorities responsible for creating a child labour-free environment in their localities;
  - vi) providing the leadership, co-ordination and resources at national level, especially amongst relevant ministries and agencies, planning bodies and through building links with civil society institutions and NGOs, so that the objective of eliminating child labour is mainstreamed into their activities and they take responsibility for attaining that goal, and, in that respect, fortify and re-invigorate the role of the National Steering Committees and Child Labour Units (or equivalent) in each country in West Africa;
  - vii) agreeing, amongst governments and social partners in each country, a list of hazardous work in sectors of economic activity that must not be

undertaken by children, and to keep the list up-to-date, in accordance with the full implementation of ILO Conventions;

- viii) further efforts to prevent and interrupt the trafficking of children and to implement fully the protocols and mechanisms of ECOWAS on this issue;
  - ix) ensuring that an adequate system of child protection is in place for children in or at risk of child labour, especially systems for identification, withdrawal and remediation of children in the worst forms of child labour;
- f) unions nationally and regionally take further steps to raise awareness amongst their members and organise workers, especially in the informal sector, and negotiate agreements with counterparties against child labour;
- g) employers' organisations nationally and regionally take further steps to raise awareness amongst their members and others, especially small and medium sized enterprises in the informal sector, and avoid using child labour in their operations or anywhere in their value chain of suppliers and collaborators and to audit compliance thereof;
- h) unions and employers' organisations nationally and regionally cooperate more closely with each other to use their combined voice to achieve these objectives and hold partners to account;
- i) governments take systematic steps to avoid using child labour inadvertently in the goods and services they procure and review their procurement rules so that suppliers and contractors guarantee they are child labour free, and audit compliance thereof;
- j) an integrated, co-ordinated approach by all stakeholders in tackling child labour, especially its worst forms, is essential to accelerate progress and that each country will be guided in this by a National Action Plan, endorsed by its government,

overseen by a representative National Committee and accountable to all through regular monitoring of achievements and impact;

- k) all governments of West Africa ratify ILO Convention 138 on the minimum age and other relevant ILO Conventions, fully domesticate the ratified Conventions into national legislation and take necessary steps to implement them in an efficient and effective manner;
- l) our Parliaments monitor progress in the National Action Plans and hold governments to account for adequate progress to meet targets;
- m) bilateral and multilateral development partners and those organisations giving advice on economic and social policies should assess and make explicit the impact of their partnership and advice on the incidence on child labour in our countries;
- n) resources devoted to eliminating child labour are generally insufficient so effective and efficient use must be made of existing public budgets and other resources which are relevant to the elimination of child labour in a co-ordinated and prioritised manner and in a way that accelerates timely implementation of National Action Plans;
- o) cost estimates of the actions and programmes necessary to eliminate child labour will be prepared by each country in order to quantify the budgetary consequences of achieving the objective and, with ECOWAS and ILO together, mobilise resources nationally and internationally for eliminating child labour in the countries of West Africa.

Each year, we will collectively monitor our performance in delivering this Declaration, using the good offices of the ECOWAS Commission.

This Declaration is addressed to the Governments, unions and employer organisations of the 15 Member States of ECOWAS, to the ECOWAS Commission, and to development partners. It will be submitted to the Brazilian hosts of the Global Conference on Child Labour on 8 – 10 October 2013.

ECOWAS/ILO Symposium on West Africa Regional Action Plan to Eliminate Child Labour, 27-29 May 2013, Accra, Ghana

## Annex V: DBMR forms used by Ecowas I&II projects

<b>Child Beneficiary Profile (intake)</b>		<b>PAGE 1/2</b>
To be filled in by Implementing Agency		
*Source/respondent: Key sources which should be used as indicated are A=the child, B=parent other adult in household, C=employer, D=school, E= other credible source (please see DBMR guidelines for more detail), indicate what, F=person filling in the form. If field not filled in indicate reason why not and/or write "not known".		Source/ enquête
1. Project		F
2. Implementing Agency		F
3. Action Programme		F
4. Profile filled in by		F
5. Profile filled in on date		F
6. IPEC ID (the name and address of the child are maintained on a separate list from this data. The IPEC ID code is a unique code given to the child to connect the data on this form to his/her name and address)		F
7. Sex (M/F)		A
8. Age and date of birth. Specify the exact source of this information. Also indicate if the information is an estimate (if for example no ID document or birth certificate or similar exists). (See DBMR guidelines Annex 5)		A, B
9. Home address		A, B
10. How many people in household?		A, B
11. How many adults (+18 years) in household working?		A, B
12. What type of work are adults of the household doing?		A, B
How much is the average monthly income of the adults of the household?		A, B
13. How many children in household aged 6-15 not attending school?		A, B
14. How many children in the household are in child labour and what are the sectors they are working in?		A, B
<b>If the child is not enrolled in education at the moment:</b>		
15. Has the child ever attended school?		A, B, D
16. What was the level and grade completed?		A, B, D
17. If the child attended school previously and dropped out, what are the reasons for this?		A, B, D
<b>If the child is enrolled in education at the moment:</b>		
18. Type of education attending and place		A, B, D
19. Level and grade of education attending	Tick: <input type="checkbox"/> primary, <input type="checkbox"/> secondary <input type="checkbox"/> transitional class <input type="checkbox"/> bridging course Grade/class of level attending :.....	A, B, D
20. On how many days did the child miss school last month?		A, B, D
21. Did the child miss school because of having to work (other than acceptable household chores inside home)?		A, B, D
<b>If the child is working:</b>		
22. Sector of work		A, B, C
23. Type of work		A, B, C
24. Working alongside parent/guardian? (Yes/No)		A, B, C
25. Main jobs/tasks the child performs		A, B, C
26. Location of workplace		A, B, C
27. Working hours (days per week/hours per day)	Day per week: Hours per day:	A, B, C
28. Time of work (seasonal, night, day, during school hours, after school hours, weekends, etc.)		A, B, C
29. Remuneration		A, B, C
30. Age when first started work		A, B, C
31. Reasons for starting work		A, B, C

Child Beneficiary Profile (intake)		PAGE 2/2
32. Is the child in child labour? Yes or No. _____ Child labour refers to work that is mentally, physically, socially or morally dangerous and harmful to children and interferes with their schooling by depriving of the opportunity to attend school, by obliging them to leave school prematurely, by requiring them to attempt to combine school attendance with excessively long and heavy work. The minimum age for admission to employment or work is determined by national legislation and can be set at 14, 15 or 16 years. The minimum age at which light work is permissible can be set at 12 or 13 years.		F
33. Is the child in a Worst Form of Child Labour (WFCL)? Yes or No. _____ By nature all forms of slavery, forced labour, sale and trafficking of children, forced recruitment of children for use in armed conflict; us of children in prostitution, pornography, illicit activities and mining, are WFCL. WFCL also includes other types of work which are hazardous. If the work is hazardous by nature the child should be removed regardless of age. If the work can't be made safe through protection at workplace, the child should be removed regardless of age.		F
34. Was the child a victim of trafficking? Yes or No _____ - Trafficking includes 1. Recruitment 2. Movement and 3. Exploitation; - Movement to (as a rule) unfamiliar territory (and not necessarily cross border); - Through a third party that intends to exploit; - End result: Not just CSEC, also other forms of labour exploitation as per ILO Convention 138; Note: Children under 18 are especially vulnerable to exploitation. Their consent to any of the above mentioned elements of trafficking is irrelevant.		A, B, C, E
z1. Does the child work in commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC)? Yes or no : _____ CSEC is the use of girls and boys in sexual activities remunerated in cash or in kind (commonly known as child prostitution).		A, B, C, E
If the child is NOT working:		
35. Project specific questions - based on project selection criteria - for targeting children for <u>prevention</u> (include questions and required sources for the information here). Only children who are not working in child labour can be targeted for prevention.		
Targeting		
36. Is the child targeted for withdrawal through <u>removal</u> or protection or prevention: (remember only a child in child labour can be targeted for withdrawal and only a child who is not in child labour can be targeted for prevention).	<input type="checkbox"/> Removal <input type="checkbox"/> Protection <input type="checkbox"/> Prevention <i>(Tick one)</i>	F
37. If targeted for withdrawal through <u>protection</u> have the hazards at his/her workplace been identified and the risks they pose been assessed, and are the findings attached to this form?	Yes or No <i>(circle if applicable)</i>	F
38. If targeted for <u>prevention</u> what is the high-risk situation the child is exposed to engage in child labour? What could be the likely sector the child could engage in?	Tick: <input type="checkbox"/> Has a brother or sister working in child labour, or <input type="checkbox"/> Is exposed to a set of conditions or circumstances (family environment, vicinity of economic activities/businesses known to employ children) that put the child at risk of being pulled into child labour, or <input type="checkbox"/> Child is out of school, or <input type="checkbox"/> Child is currently in school but at high risk of dropping out, or <input type="checkbox"/> Other specifically detailed criteria:.....	F
z2. If targeted for prevention, what is the likely sector of work the child could engage in because of the high risk ?	Details of sector:..... or tick if applicable either: <input type="checkbox"/> CSEC or <input type="checkbox"/> Trafficking Describe why the sector would be likely for the child to engage in: .....	A,B,C,F
39. Services to be provided by the project (include detail of service provider, place where service is offered, duration and/or content of service)	Tick: <input type="checkbox"/> formal education services <input type="checkbox"/> non-formal education services <input type="checkbox"/> vocational training services <input type="checkbox"/> employment services (only if child above minimum age of employment) <input type="checkbox"/> economic strengthening services (only if child above minimum age of employment) <input type="checkbox"/> livelihood services other than employment services or economic strengthening <input type="checkbox"/> Other services  Details of services: .....	F
40. Services to which child will be referred to (include detail of service provider, place where service is offered, duration and/or content of service)	Type/place, Duration, Provider: ..... ..... .....	F

**Child Beneficiary Monitoring Form**  
**Filled in at least every three months by the Implementing Agency**

BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT CHILD (To be filled in by Implementing Agency)				
Project (1): _____				
Implementing Agency (2): _____				
AP Location (3): _____				
IPEC ID (4): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/> Male				
The child was targeted for (5): <i>(Tick one)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Removal <input type="checkbox"/> Prevention <input type="checkbox"/> Protection				
INFORMATION FROM MONITORING VISITS				
Date of visit	1 <sup>st</sup> visit (____/____/____)	2 <sup>nd</sup> visit (____/____/____)	3 <sup>rd</sup> visit (____/____/____)	4 <sup>th</sup> visit (____/____/____)
Work Status	Sector of work (11)	_____ _____ _____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>	_____ _____ _____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>	_____ _____ _____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>
	Type of work (12)	_____ _____ _____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>	_____ _____ _____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>	_____ _____ _____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>
	Main jobs/tasks the child performs (13)	_____ _____ _____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>	_____ _____ _____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>	_____ _____ _____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>
	Location of workplace (14)	_____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>	_____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>	_____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, C, or _____ <i>(Circle or fill in)</i>
	Working hours (15)	• # days worked per week: _____ • # hours worked per day: _____ • Seasonal work? Yes/no: _____	• # days worked per week: _____ • # hours worked per day: _____ • Seasonal work? Yes/no: _____	• # days worked per week: _____ • # hours worked per day: _____ • Seasonal work? Yes/no: _____

	Time of work (16). Fill in by ticking each time period the child is usually working during weekdays and weekends.	Weekdays Weekends 00:00 - 04:00: _____ 04:00 - 06:00 : _____ 06:00 - 08:00: _____ 08:00 - 12:00: _____ 12:00 - 14:00: _____ 14:00 - 18:00: _____ 18:00 - 20:00: _____ 20:00 - 22:00: _____ 22:00 - 24:00: _____	Weekdays Weekends 00:00 - 04:00: _____ 04:00 - 06:00 : _____ 06:00 - 08:00: _____ 08:00 - 12:00: _____ 12:00 - 14:00: _____ 14:00 - 18:00: _____ 18:00 - 20:00: _____ 20:00 - 22:00: _____ 22:00 - 24:00: _____	Weekdays Weekends 00:00 - 04:00: _____ 04:00 - 06:00 : _____ 06:00 - 08:00: _____ 08:00 - 12:00: _____ 12:00 - 14:00: _____ 14:00 - 18:00: _____ 18:00 - 20:00: _____ 20:00 - 22:00: _____ 22:00 - 24:00: _____	Weekdays Weekends 00:00 - 04:00: _____ 04:00 - 06:00 : _____ 06:00 - 08:00: _____ 08:00 - 12:00: _____ 12:00 - 14:00: _____ 14:00 - 18:00: _____ 18:00 - 20:00: _____ 20:00 - 22:00: _____ 22:00 - 24:00: _____
Educational Status		(6) 1 <sup>st</sup> visit (____/____/____)	(7) 2 <sup>nd</sup> visit (____/____/____)	(8) 3 <sup>rd</sup> visit (____/____/____)	(9) 4 <sup>th</sup> visit (____/____/____)
	Did the child enrol in an education activity as a direct result of the project? (21)	Yes or No (Circle one) Info. source <sup>8</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	Yes or No (Circle one) Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	Yes or No (Circle one) Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	Yes or No (Circle one) Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)
	Date of enrolment (22)	____/____/____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	____/____/____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	____/____/____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	____/____/____ Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)
	Type and level of education (23)	• Formal or Informal or Vocational (circle one) • Grade level _____ • Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	• Formal or Informal or Vocational (circle one) • Grade level _____ • Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	• Formal or Informal or Vocational (circle one) • Grade level _____ • Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	• Formal or Informal or Vocational (circle one) • Grade level _____ • Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)
	Did the child attend school for more than 75% of the time since the last monitoring visit? (24)	• Start date of monitoring period: ____/____/____ • End date of monitoring period: ____/____/____ • Total # school days in period: _____ • # of days present in school during period: _____ • Attendance rate (%): _____ • Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, <u>D</u> and ____ (Circle one or fill in)	• Start date of monitoring period: ____/____/____ • End date of monitoring period: ____/____/____ • Total # school days in period: _____ • # of days present in school during period: _____ • Attendance rate (%): _____ • Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, <u>D</u> and ____ (Circle one or fill in)	• Start date of monitoring period: ____/____/____ • End date of monitoring period: ____/____/____ • Total # school days in period: _____ • # of days present in school during period: _____ • Attendance rate (%): _____ • Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, <u>D</u> and ____ (Circle one or fill in)	• Start date of monitoring period: ____/____/____ • End date of monitoring period: ____/____/____ • Total # school days in period: _____ • # of days present in school during period: _____ • Attendance rate (%): _____ • Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, <u>D</u> and ____ (Circle one or fill in)
	Completion date of	Completion date: ____/____/____	Completion date: ____/____/____	Completion date: ____/____/____	Completion date: ____/____/____

1: **Information source must be completed as follows:**

A= child beneficiary, B=parent/other adult in household, C=employer, D=school attendance register, E= other credible source (to be specified)



	educational programme and level completed. (25)	Level completed: _____	Level completed: _____	Level completed: _____	Level completed: _____
	Fill in, as appropriate	Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)
	Was child attending education but dropped out/stopped attending (provide date, reason and follow-up action) (26)	Drop out date: ____/____/____ Reasons: _____ _____ _____ Follow up actions: _____ _____ _____	Drop out date: ____/____/____ Reasons: _____ _____ _____ Follow up actions: _____ _____ _____	Drop out date: ____/____/____ Reasons: _____ _____ _____ Follow up actions: _____ _____ _____	Drop out date: ____/____/____ Reasons: _____ _____ _____ Follow up actions: _____ _____ _____
	Fill in, as appropriate	Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)	Info. Source <sup>1</sup> : A, B, D or _____ (Circle one or fill in)
Summary		(6) 1 <sup>st</sup> visit (____/____/____)	(7) 2 <sup>nd</sup> visit (____/____/____)	(8) 3 <sup>rd</sup> visit (____/____/____)	(9) 4 <sup>th</sup> visit (____/____/____)
	Has the child attended education services or training opportunities at least 75% in past three months? (x1)	Yes or No (Circle one)	Yes or No (Circle one)	Yes or No (Circle one)	Yes or No (Circle one)
	Has the child been in child labour during the past three months? (27)	Yes or No (Circle one)	Yes or No (Circle one)	Yes or No (Circle one)	Yes or No (Circle one)
	Educational services or training opportunities provided to child (details and duration) (28)	Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Formal education services <input type="checkbox"/> Non-formal education services <input type="checkbox"/> Vocational training services Details: _____ Duration: _____	Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Formal education services <input type="checkbox"/> Non-formal education services <input type="checkbox"/> Vocational training services Details: _____ Duration: _____	Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Formal education services <input type="checkbox"/> Non-formal education services <input type="checkbox"/> Vocational training services Details: _____ Duration: _____	Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Formal education services <input type="checkbox"/> Non-formal education services <input type="checkbox"/> Vocational training services Details: _____ Duration: _____
	Non-educational services delivered to child (details and duration) (29)	Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Employment services <input type="checkbox"/> Economic strengthening	Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Employment services <input type="checkbox"/> Economic strengthening services	Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Employment services <input type="checkbox"/> Economic strengthening services	Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Employment services <input type="checkbox"/> Economic strengthening services

		<input type="checkbox"/> services <input type="checkbox"/> Livelihood services other than employment services or economic strengthening <input type="checkbox"/> Other non-educational services Details: _____ Duration: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Livelihood services other than employment services or economic strengthening <input type="checkbox"/> Other non-educational services Details: _____ Duration: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Livelihood services other than employment services or economic strengthening <input type="checkbox"/> Other non-educational services Details: _____ Duration: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Livelihood services other than employment services or economic strengthening <input type="checkbox"/> Other non-educational services Details: _____ Duration: _____
Other critical info		Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Died (date): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Transferred(date) : _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Not found(date) _____ Details : _____	Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Died (date): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Transferred(date) : _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Not found(date) _____ Details : _____	Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Died (date): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Transferred(date) : _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Not found(date) _____ Details : _____	Tick as applicable: <input type="checkbox"/> Died (date): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Transferred(date) : _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Not found(date) _____ Details : _____
Conclusions	Date that the child can be considered as <b>WITHDRAWN THROUGH REMOVAL AND REHABILITATION</b> from child labour using DBMR definitions		Date: __/__/____ <i>(complete only if appropriate for this monitoring period)</i>	Date: __/__/____ <i>(complete only if appropriate for this monitoring period)</i>	Date: __/__/____ <i>(complete only if appropriate for this monitoring period)</i>
	Date that the child can be considered as <b>WITHDRAWN THROUGH PROTECTION</b> from child labour using DBMR definitions		Date: __/__/____ <i>(complete only if appropriate for this monitoring period)</i>	Date: __/__/____ <i>(complete only if appropriate for this monitoring period)</i>	Date: __/__/____ <i>(complete only if appropriate for this monitoring period)</i>
	Date that the child can be considered as <b>PREVENTED</b> from child labour using DBMR definitions		Date: __/__/____ <i>(complete only if appropriate for this monitoring period)</i>	Date: __/__/____ <i>(complete only if appropriate for this monitoring period)</i>	Date: __/__/____ <i>(complete only if appropriate for this monitoring period)</i>

MONITORING FORM FOR Children targeted for PROTECTION only		Elements identified during initial risk assessment			
	List the areas of working conditions identified during the risk assessment process that must be improved before child can be found to be working in non-hazardous situation.	1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____ 5. _____ 6. _____ 7. _____ 8. _____ 9. _____  Source of data: Risk Assessment or other (to be specified) _____ <i>(Add additional pages if needed)</i>			
	(17)	1 <sup>st</sup> visit (dd/mm/yyyy)	2 <sup>nd</sup> visit (dd/mm/yyyy)	3 <sup>rd</sup> visit (dd/mm/yyyy)	4 <sup>th</sup> visit (dd/mm/yyyy)
	Indicate if risk element has been fully addressed or if it still needs to be addressed..	1. Addressed ou Ongoing <i>(Circle un)</i> 2. Addressed ou Ongoing <i>(Circle un)</i> 3. Addressed ou Ongoing <i>(Circle un)</i> 4. Addressed ou Ongoing <i>(Circle un)</i> 5. Addressed ou Ongoing <i>(Circle un)</i> 6. Addressed ou Ongoing <i>(Circle un)</i> 7. Addressed ou Ongoing <i>(Circle un)</i> 8. Addressed ou Ongoing <i>(Circle un)</i> 9. Addressed ou Ongoing <i>(Circle un)</i>	1. Addressed ou Ongoing 2. Addressed ou Ongoing 3. Addressed ou Ongoing 4. Addressed ou Ongoing 5. Addressed ou Ongoing 6. Addressed ou Ongoing 7. Addressed ou Ongoing 8. Addressed ou Ongoing 9. Addressed ou Ongoing	1. Addressed ou Ongoing 2. Addressed ou Ongoing 3. Addressed ou Ongoing 4. Addressed ou Ongoing 5. Addressed ou Ongoing 6. Addressed ou Ongoing 7. Addressed ou Ongoing 8. Addressed ou Ongoing 9. Addressed ou Ongoing	1. Addressed ou Ongoing 2. Addressed ou Ongoing 3. Addressed ou Ongoing 4. Addressed ou Ongoing 5. Addressed ou Ongoing 6. Addressed ou Ongoing 7. Addressed ou Ongoing 8. Addressed ou Ongoing 9. Addressed ou Ongoing
	Information Source: Observation by Monitor	Information Source: Observation by Monitor	Information Source: Observation by Monitor	Information Source: Observation by Monitor	Information Source: Observation by Monitor
Additional notes on protection measures, as needed:					

## Implementing Agency Data Verification Form

To be filled in by IA coordinator/manager/supervisor based on 5% sample size or maximum 75 every three months. The minimum sample size is 30.

Agency:

AP Location:

Date of verification

Location where verification done

Verification done by

IPEC ID code for the child	1 <sup>st</sup> child:	2 <sup>nd</sup> child:
1. Was data on monitoring form completed (no blank fields)? Yes or No. What information has not been filled in?	Yes or no. Missing information: ..... ..... .....	Yes or no. Missing information: ..... ..... .....
2. Was all data on monitoring form found to be correct (assessment based on interviews, observations etc.)? Which information was not correct ?	Yes or no. Incorrect information: ..... ..... ..... .....	Yes or no. Incorrect information: ..... ..... ..... .....

Use the same sources to verify the information that was used to fill in the monitoring form. At minimum verify the school attendance register to check the school attendance and interview the child beneficiary.

3. Has the child been monitored at least twice not to be in child labour and does monitoring data show this? Yes or No. What is your conclusion and justification for the conclusion?	Yes or no. Your conclusion and justification: ..... ..... .....	Yes or no. Your conclusion and justification: ..... ..... .....
4. Has the child attended education services at least 75% for three consecutive months prior to reporting? Does the information recorded on the monitoring form show this ? How many school days were there during the three months prior to reporting the child? On how many of the school days did the child come to school as per the school attendance register?	Yes/No. School days :..... Days attended :..... Details :..... ..... ..... .....	Yes/No. School days :..... Days attended :..... Details :..... ..... ..... .....

If you answered no to any of the questions 1-4 it means the data is not correct and you cannot report these children to IPEC until all data is correct and/or the child has not been in child labour for three months prior to reporting. You must verify the information for all of your child beneficiaries to be reported.

Proper verification means that you have interviewed the child, parents, community members, teacher and others to come to your conclusion. You should have checked school attendance register. Explain here the sources of your verification visit and activities.

This form has to be signed by a supervisor to the member of staff of the Implementing Agency conducting the verification.

By signing this form the supervisor confirms that the form was completed in full and accurately.

## ILO-IPEC Staff Data Verification Form

To be filled in by ILO staff based on a minimum sample of 15 children reported by the Implementing Agency to IPEC for the first time. Thereafter verification is conducted as per a verification schedule document detailing sampling procedure and location selection.

Agency:

AP Location:

Date of verification

Location where verification done

Verification done by

IPEC ID code for the child

1<sup>st</sup> child:

2<sup>nd</sup> child:

1. Was data on monitoring form completed (no blank fields)? Yes or No. What information has not been filled in?

Yes or no. Missing information:

.....  
.....  
.....

Yes or no. Missing information:

.....  
.....  
.....

2. Was all data on monitoring form found to be correct (assessment based on interviews, observations etc.)? Which information was not correct ?

Yes or no. Incorrect information:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Yes or no. Incorrect information:

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Use the same sources to verify the information that was used to fill in the monitoring form. At minimum verify the school attendance register to check the school attendance and interview the child beneficiary.

3. Has the child been monitored at least twice not to be in child labour and does monitoring data show this? Yes or No. What is your conclusion and justification for the conclusion?

Yes or no. Your conclusion and justification:

.....  
.....  
.....

Yes or no. Your conclusion and justification:

.....  
.....  
.....

4. Has the child attended education services at least 75% for three consecutive months prior to reporting? Does the information recorded on the monitoring form show this ? How many school days were there during the three months prior to reporting the child? On how many of the school days did the child come to school as per the school attendance register?

Yes/No.

School days :.....

Days attended :.....

Details :.....

.....

.....

.....

Yes/No.

School days :.....

Days attended :.....

Details :.....

.....

.....

.....

If you answered no to any of the questions 1-4 it means the data is not correct and you cannot report these children to IPEC until all data is correct and/or the child has not been in child labour for three months prior to reporting. You must verify the information for all of your child beneficiaries to be reported.

Proper verification means that you have interviewed the child, parents, community members, teacher and others to come to your conclusion. You should have checked school attendance register. Explain here the sources of your verification visit and activities.

This form has to be signed by a supervisor to the member of staff of the ILO-IPEC project conducting the verification.

By signing this form the supervisor confirms that the form was completed in full and accurately.

## Implementing Agency DBMR Aggregate Report

To be submitted every three months

**Implementing Agency:**

**Action Programme:**

**Date:**

**Monitoring period dates:** From: \_\_\_\_\_ To: \_\_\_\_\_

During the past three months, we have removed, protected and prevented children from child labour, and have new direct beneficiary children as follows (figures for last three months):

	Prevented		Removed		Protected	
	Services delivered by AP included educational services or training opportunities	Services delivered by AP did not include educational services or training opportunities	Services delivered by AP included educational services or training opportunities	Services delivered by AP did not include educational services or training opportunities	Services delivered by AP included educational services or training opportunities	Services delivered by AP did not include educational services or training opportunities
<b>Girls</b>						
Of which victim or at risk of CSEC					Not applicable for victims	Not applicable for victims
Of which victim or at risk of trafficking					Not applicable for victims	Not applicable for victims
<b>Boys</b>						
Of which victim or at risk of CSEC					Not applicable for victims	Not applicable for victims
Of which victim or at risk of trafficking					Not applicable for victims	Not applicable for victims

Number of new direct beneficiaries (have started to receive services this three-month period but are not yet reported)	G:	B:	Total:
--	----	----	--------

We have so far prevented, removed and protected children from child labour as follows (cumulative figures of Action Programme duration):

	Prevented		Removed		Protected	
	Services delivered by AP included educational services or training opportunities	Services delivered by AP did not include educational services or training opportunities	Services delivered by AP included educational services or training opportunities	Services delivered by AP did not include educational services or training opportunities	Services delivered by AP included educational services or training opportunities	Services delivered by AP did not include educational services or training opportunities
<b>Girls</b>						
Of which victim or at risk of CSEC					Not applicable for victims	Not applicable for victims
Of which victim or at risk of trafficking					Not applicable for victims	Not applicable for victims
<b>Boys</b>						
Of which victim or at risk of CSEC					Not applicable for victims	Not applicable for victims
Of which victim or at risk of trafficking					Not applicable for victims	Not applicable for victims

Has the above data been verified to be true and accurate by Implementing Agency coordinator/ supervisor/ manager through verifying the data by using the Implementing Agency Verification Form (should be attached to this report)? Yes / No

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Annex VI: Comments noted regarding the DBMA**

- The form is cumbersome. Some of the questions the children cannot answer, for example “how much does your parent earn?”.
- Form contains questions not appropriate for the child.
- There’s no life in it – many questions are not relevant.
- Documentation from ILO [DBMR] is too cumbersome.
- Data requirements drive us to report more on activities than on impact.
- Some of the questions are not relevant to what is being done.
- There are situations where you are unable to log on the data of the rescued children on the day of rescue – the form does not allow the insertion of the real date of contact with the child except you do it on the same day. That makes it seem as if one is not working.
- The level of documentation is cumbersome. The reporting requirement is extremely too much and time consuming.

## **Annex VII: List of persons interviewed**

### **ILO/ IPEC**

#### *Geneva*

- Ricardo Furman Wolf, Senior Evaluation Officer, EIA, Geneva
- Alexandre Soho, Senior Programme Officer, Geneva
- Simon Steyne, Social Dialogue & Partnership

#### *Nigeria*

- Sina Chuma-Mkandawire, Director, ILO Sub-Regional Office in Abuja
- Krishnamoorthy Kukkikatte, Technical Advisor, Abuja
- Sunday Uzu, Child Labour Focal Point, Abuja
- Denis Zulu, Chief of Programme, Abuja
- Agatha Kolawole, National Programme Officer, Abeokuta Ogun state
- Chinyere Emeka-Anuna, Programme Officer

#### *Senegal*

- Vera Lucia Paquète-Perdigão, Regional Child Labour Specialist, Dakar

#### *Ghana*

- Stephen McClelland, Chief Technical Advisor, Accra
- Lalaina Razafindrakoto, International Programme Officer, West Africa Projects, Accra
- Emmanuel Kwame Mensah, National Programme Officer, Accra
- Daniel Chachu, Monitoring & Evaluation Officer, Accra

### **U.S. Department of Labor**

- Tanya Rasa, Africa Division Chief, Office of Labor & Human Trafficking (OLHT)
- Cara Vilen, International Relations Office OLHT
- Kristen Pancio, International Relations Analyst, OLHT
- Celeste Lemrow, OLHT

### **ECOWAS**

- Dr. Daniel Ekl, Director, Directorate of Humanitarian and Social Affairs, Abuja
- Olatude Olayemi, Regional Advisor, Directorate of Humanitarian and Social Affairs, Abuja

### **Nigeria**

#### *Abuja*

#### *Federal Ministry of Labour & Productivity*

- Emmanuel Udoh, Acting Director, Inspectorate
- Yahaya A.U. Deputy Director, Inspectorate
- Joyce Udonwang, ADL
- A.N. Erem-Abung, ACLI
- Omolara Ogunbiyi, Child Labour Unit
- Ogunmuko Babatunde, ADF
- Adenike Adebayo-Ajala, Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association (NNEW)



- Famakin A. Joseph, National Agency for Prohibition of Traffic in Persons (NAPTIP)
- Mustapha Saadu, NAPTIP
- Eigbadon Edeki Gregory, Programme Director, Galilee Foundation, Ibadan
- Osai Ilome, African Labour Watch Magazine
- Ayesha Ali Kadala, News producer and ASO Radio
- Adenike Adebayo-Ajala, Nigeria Employer's Association

*Abeokuta, Ogun State*

*Federal Ministry of Labour*

- Fatoki Clement, Head, Child Labour Desk
- Yemisi Davies, Labour Officer
- Dauda Kolawole, Labour Officer
- Joseph Jonah, Immigration Officer
- Chief S.O. Jinadu, Child Labour Monitoring Committee, CLMC
- Chief Labula, CLMC
- Kamoru Omojoro, CLMC
- Mr. Akinlolu, teacher
- Mrs. Akinlawon, teacher
- Local teachers, officials and children

*Ibadan, Oyo State*

- Bunmi Akanbi, Police Officer and Member, CLMC
- Mr. Ayandokun, Nigerian Immigration Service, Anti-Human Trafficking Division
- Local teachers, officials and children

**Ghana**

- Patience A. Quaye, Director, Anti-Human Trafficking Unit, Criminal Investigation Unit, Accra
- Osman Mensah, Consultant, JMK Consulting, Accra

*Ministry of Employment & Labour Relations*

- Modey, Chief Director
- Eugene Korletey, Chief Labour Officer
- Elizabeth Akanbomfire, Head, Child Labour Unit (CLU)
- Anthony Awotwe
- Mary Mensah, National Development Planning Commission (NDPC)
- Josephine Akaba, Commission on Human Rights and Administrative Justice (CHRAJ)
- Gifty Biyira, Ministry of Lands & Natural Resources (MLNR)
- Dzifa Ayime, MLNR
- Kenneth, Acting Coordinator - GCLMS, National Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour in Cocoa (NPECLC), MLNR
- Issah Mieshin, Monitoring & Evaluation Officer - GCLMS, NPECLC, MLNR
- Clarke Noyoru, Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection
- Victoria Natsu, Human Trafficking Secretariat, Ministry of Gender, Children and social Protection
- David Agbenu, Secretary, Ghana Journalist Association
- Kingsley obeng-Kyireh, Ghana Journalist Association, SOMOPAC

*Network for Community Planning and Development (NECPAD)*

- Paul Asamoah Kukwaw, Executive Director,
- Kofi Amoah, Accountant
- Benevolence Ocloo, Field Staff
- Peter Dyueh, Social Welfare Office, Asutifi District Assembly

**Benin**

- Francois Bautho, National Project Officer
- Laurette Tovalou Ekon
- Innocent Assogba, OBISACOTE
- Laure Irene Adoukonou, CNP
- Ibrahima Kpekpassi, DAFOP
- Rosemonde Akigbe, DJVA/MJSL
- Edith Guedegbe, DRH/MTPT
- Olga Ayilara, DSME/MS
- Sabirou Madjidi, CGTB
- Beatrice Lima, CSAIB
- Armand Couao-Zotti, OCPM
- Amen Costa Lino, OCPM
- Evelyne Kadadji, ABAEF
- Augustine Sagui-Koura, MERPMEDER
- Issadou Belinda Houssou, DGT
- Edouard da Costa, Terre des Hommes
- Diane Sobabe, DGT
- Eric Mehoul, GRADH
- Tidjani Mousse, DPJEJ
- Alphonse Gbetie, DRH/MEMP
- Michel Adannou, MDAEP
- Bienvenu Sambieni, DFEA
- Perpetue Djidjoho, DGIT
- Sylvie Chaou, DPJEJ
- Etienne Gandaho, MAEP
- Olivier Adjai Hounghedji, Tdh
- Bernard Hounkpe, CSTB

*Sê*

- Togbedji Deha, ARED
- Sossa Dassanou, ARED
- Issa Samir Chabi, ARED
- Patrice Madji, ARED

*Lokossa Adjacomey*

- Albert N'Sougan, President of the Local Council
- Marcel Idohou, Member
- Serafine Fanho, member
- Fanho Bosse, Member
- Martine Assogba, CPS

## Zakpota

- Fidele Kikan, Programme Manager
- Odette Assaba, Head, CPS
- Abel Dandlessa, President, ASEZ
- Blaise Adjaiwo, AEJT
- Gerard Edjan, AEJT

## Parakou

- Mohamed Alidou, Director, APEM
- Salifou Kassimou, APEM
- Rafiatou Mamoudou Ibrahima, DDTFPRAI
- Solange Gagu, DTFPRAI
- Serge Zime, Labour Officer

## Cote d'Ivoire

Nom et prénoms	Structure	Fonction
M. Sigui Mokie	BIT	
Alice Koiho Kipre	ASA	Coordonnateur général
Nguessan Fulgence	KAVOKIVA	Président du conseil d'Administration
Thomas Hayes	USDOL	Attaché économique
Edouard Ladigou	CGECI	Chargé des relations avec l'extérieur
Kra Felix	FESACI	Secrétaire général
Koffi Yao	FESACI	Membre
Rabe Jean Claude	FESACI	membre
Ehouman Kouassi	FESACI	Membre
Zoro Elisabeth	DIGNITE	
Boga Dago	DIGNITE	Secrétaire general
Bai Sra	DIGNITE	
Nguetta Martin	DLTE	Directeur exécutif
Alexis Gnaly	DLTE	Statisticien
Missa Celestin	DLTE	Statisticien
Yao Patricia Sylvie	CNS	Secrétaire exécutif
Amany Michel Ange Konan	CNS	Directeur de cabinet
Son Jerome	CNS	Conseiller technique santé
Mme Kombo	UGTCI	Coordonnatrice projet
Boua Edouard- Bonzou	UGTCI	Secrétaire général union régionale
Kouassi Assamoi	EEP AKAKRO	Directeur d'école (Abengourou)
Nanan Koffi Messou II	Village de Djangobo	CHEF DE VILLAGE
Tiemoko Philippe	ANADER	Enseignant champ école
Kouakou Kouame Firmin	Comité local de vigilance (NIABLE)	Président
Traore Banbadjan	Gendarmerie d'Abengourou	Commandant de brigade
Amalaman Ndjabo Daniel	Prefecture d'Abengourou	Commissaire de police
Bini Sylvestre	Tribunal du travail de Daloa	Inspecteur régional du travail
Soro Aboulaye	EPP Kouassikankro	Directeur
Aka Marc Aubin	EPP Kouassikankro	Enseignant
Konan Koffi Brenard	EPP Kouassikankro	Enseignant
Kouadio Konan Emmanuel	EPP Kouassikankro	Enseignant
Koffi Date Honore	EPP Kouassikankro	Enseignant
Koffi Yao Nestor	EPP Kouassikankro	Enseignant
Kouassi Patrice Essy	COGES	Président
Kone	Garage mécanique (BONON)	Chef de garage
Bahi Acouba	Inspection enseignement primaire (Daloa)	Inspecteur de l'enseignement primaire

## Annex VIII: Evaluation matrix

Areas of evaluation	Project objective	Source	Selected indicator or evidence statement				Evaluation team comments
			Planned targets		Achievements		
			Quantitative	Qualitative	Quantitative	Qualitative	
Project design	Impact Efficiency Flexibility	Project Docs Observation	n/a	Logical flow Consistency	n/a	Framework logical Activities defined Implementation able to adapt	Activity descriptions too prescriptive; log frame logically presented;
Effectiveness & efficiency	Impact Efficiency	Interviews Review of data	Outputs reached	Efficient implementation producing results	Project funds well-used in challenging environments	Project met most deadlines & made adjustments to local realities	Reporting thorough & timely; management structures well designed for complex implementation across four different countries & sectors
Capacity building	Strengthened local institutions	Interviews Doc review	No baselines established	Individuals trained & inst cap strengthened	Individuals trained; cap not necessarily strengthened	Increased awareness of WFCL & mechanisms to eliminate via individual trng	Could not definitively determine whether inst capacity was strengthened or not
Relevance	Lasting positive impact in important area	Interviews Doc review	n/a	Affecting individual lives	# children & families reached exceeded	Strong impact on children w/drawn & on some families assisted; decision-makers sensitized	High degree of relevance for all impacted.
Sustainability	Continued elimination of WFCL post-project	Interviews Review of sustainability examples	# of children w/drawn will continue	Institutions strengthened & sensitized to eliminating WFCL	Too early to determine	National level entities sensitized & able to continue activities if funding available	Stage set for improved resource- mobilization; efforts at local level needed to help communities take actions themselves
Unanticipated impacts	n/a	Interviews Observations	n/a	n/a	n/a	Produced several positive impacts	Several activities resulted in lessons Learned (e.g., organizing informal pre-enrolment orientation sessions)
Good practices	To develop or adopt some	Interviews Observations	n/a	n/a	n/a	Several important GPs evolved such as partnering with diverse local entities (media, youth groups, etc) to sensitize on WFCL	Partnering and identifying local champions worked well to extend awareness-raising that led to improved sustainability
Impact	Direct impact on children & families; awareness-raising & policy changes; models established on how to reduce WFCL	Project docs Interviews Observations	# children w/d # children in school # families assisted # institutions strengthened # policies improved or adopted	Awareness of importance of WFCL & how to eliminate it raised; foundation laid for scale-up.	All quantitative targets were reached or exceeded	Impact achieved on target beneficiaries, opinion-makers, local communities, media, CSOs, etc. Models established & lessons learned on how to organize anti-CL efforts at nat'l & local levels	Impressive quantitative results achieved. Whether impact can be sustained without project assistance is viewed as unlikely without resource mobilization at nat'l & local levels. Also, more significant impact beyond direct beneficiaries uncertain given magnitude of WFCL problem.