



International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)



International  
Labour  
Office

# ***IPEC Evaluation***

**Building the knowledge base on the  
design and implementation of impact  
evaluation of child labour interventions**

**P.340.08.901.058 / GLO/08/58/USA**

**An independent final evaluation by an external consultant**

May 2013

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

## NOTE ON THE EVALUATION PROCESS AND REPORT

This independent evaluation was commissioned by the Evaluation and Impact Assessment Section (EIA) of ILO/IPEC and overseen by the Director of the ILO Evaluation Unit following a consultative and participatory approach. EVAL/EIA have 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 an external consultant<sup>1</sup>. The field mission took place in May 2013. 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> David Todd.

## Table of contents

List of abbreviations.....	v
Executive summary.....	vi
The Project .....	vi
The Final Evaluation .....	vi
Achievements Against Objectives.....	vii
Analysis According to Key Evaluation Criteria .....	viii
Good Practices.....	viii
Lessons Learned.....	ix
Recommendations .....	ix
1. Background .....	1
1.1 The Evaluation of Impact by IPEC.....	1
1.2 Impact Evaluation among International Development Agencies.....	2
2. The project: building the knowledge base on the design and implementation of impact evaluation of child labour interventions.....	3
2.1 Introduction to the Project .....	3
2.2 Project Objectives.....	4
2.3 Project Coordination, Support and Management.....	5
3. The final evaluation .....	6
3.1 Purposes of the Final Evaluation .....	6
3.2 Evaluation Processes .....	6
3.3 Methodology.....	7
3.4 Limitations.....	7
4. Project revisions.....	8
4.1 First Revision.....	8
4.1.1 Analysis .....	8
4.2 Second Revision .....	8
4.2.1 Analysis .....	9
5. Achievements against objectives .....	10
5.1 Introduction .....	10
5.2 Overview of Achievements Against Immediate Objectives .....	10
5.3 Analysis of Achievements Against the Immediate Objectives .....	13
5.3.1 Analysis of Achievement of Immediate Objective 1 (A).....	13
5.3.2 Analysis of Achievement of Immediate Objective 1 (B).....	13
5.3.3 Analysis of Achievement of Immediate Objective 2 .....	14
5.4 Analysis of Achievements Against the Development Objective .....	14
6. Analysis according to key evaluation criteria .....	15
6.1 Quality of Design .....	15

6.1.1	Findings .....	15
6.1.2	Conclusion .....	15
6.2	Relevance .....	16
6.2.1	Findings .....	16
6.2.2	Conclusion .....	17
6.3	Efficiency .....	17
6.3.1	Findings .....	17
6.3.2	Conclusion .....	18
6.4	Effectiveness.....	18
6.4.1	Findings .....	18
6.4.2	Conclusion .....	19
6.5	Sustainability .....	20
6.5.1	Findings .....	20
6.5.2	Conclusion .....	20
7.	Good practices.....	22
7.1	Use of Existing Evidence .....	22
7.2	Collaboration .....	22
7.3	Detailed Information Sharing and Discussions at Country Level.....	22
7.4	Partnership Based on Complementarity .....	22
8.	Lessons learned .....	23
8.1	Introduction .....	23
8.2	Lessons on Project Design.....	23
8.3	Lessons on Impact Evaluation .....	24
8.4	Use of RCTs and Quasi-Experimental Field Designs.....	24
8.5	Cost Effective Evidence .....	24
8.6	Country Ownership .....	25
9.	Recommendations .....	26
Annex 1.	Persons contacted .....	27
Annex 2.	Terms of Reference of the final evaluation .....	28
Annex 3.	Documents reviewed .....	44
Annex 4.	Analysis of achievements against ILO Programme-Wide Indicators .....	46

## Tables

Table 1: Achievement Against Indicators for Immediate Objective 1 (A) .....	10
Table 2: Achievement Against Indicators for Immediate Objective 1 (B).....	11
Table 3: Achievement Against Indicators for Immediate Objective 2 .....	12
Table 4: Overview of Achievement Against Immediate Objectives .....	12

## List of abbreviations

<b>3ie</b>	International Initiative for Impact Evaluation
<b>AP</b>	Action Programme
<b>C182</b>	ILO's Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, No. 182 of 1999
<b>CL</b>	Child Labour
<b>CMES</b>	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation System
<b>DED</b>	ILO/IPEC's Design, Evaluation and Documentation section (now EIA)
<b>DFID</b>	Department for International Development (UK)
<b>DIME</b>	Development Impact Evaluation Initiative (World Bank)
<b>DWCP</b>	Decent Work Country Programmes
<b>EI</b>	Education Initiative (USDOL)
<b>EIA</b>	ILO/IPEC's Evaluation and Impact Assessment section
<b>EVAL</b>	The ILO Evaluation Department
<b>HQ</b>	Headquarters
<b>IAF</b>	Impact Assessment Framework Project
<b>IE</b>	Impact Evaluation
<b>ILO</b>	International Labour Organization
<b>IO</b>	Immediate Objective
<b>IOCE</b>	International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation
<b>IPEC</b>	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
<b>ITC</b>	International Training Centre
<b>MTE</b>	Mid Term Evaluation
<b>NAP</b>	National Action Plan
<b>NONIE</b>	Network of Networks on Impact Evaluation
<b>PCC</b>	Project Coordinating Committee
<b>QE</b>	Quasi Experimental
<b>RCT</b>	Randomised Control Trial
<b>SIMPOC</b>	Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour
<b>SPIF</b>	Strategic Programme Impact Framework
<b>TAG</b>	Technical Advisory Group
<b>TBP</b>	Time Bound Programme
<b>TOR</b>	Terms of Reference
<b>UCW</b>	Understanding Children's Work
<b>UNEG</b>	United Nations Evaluation Group
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children's Fund
<b>UNDAF</b>	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
<b>USDOL</b>	United States Department of Labor
<b>WFCL</b>	Worst Forms of Child Labour

## **Executive summary**

### **The Project**

At the end of 2008, ILO-IPEC initiated a new project with funding from the United States Department of Labor (USDOL): “Building the knowledge base on the design and implementation of impact evaluation of child labour interventions”. Executed by the inter-agency programme, Understanding Children’s Work (UCW), this project aimed to support the design and implementation of pilot impact evaluations in selected child labour elimination projects, to pilot other methods to assemble relevant evidence and to develop a dissemination approach.

The project’s Immediate Objectives were:

- By the end of the project, the evidence base on child labour (CL) program impact will be extended through initial data collection for comprehensive CL impact evaluations and through modular impact evaluations.
- By the end of the project, access to information on impact evaluation methods/results in the area of child labour will be increased through the establishment of a web-based knowledge centre.

The project had the following components:

- Inventory and review of CL programs, type of interventions, impact evaluations and possible methodologies.
- Initial data collection for child labour impact evaluations.
- Modular child labour impact evaluations.
- Dissemination.

### **The Final Evaluation**

The purposes of this final evaluation include to:

- Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives
- Identify and document lessons learned and good practice
- Provide recommendations on how to strengthen the strategy of UCW and ILO-IPEC on Impact Evaluation as part of Impact Assessment

## Achievements Against Objectives

Indicator	Fully achieved	Partially Achieved	Not achieved	Comment
<b>Immediate Objective 1 (A):</b> <i>By the end of the project, the evidence base on CL programs will be extended through initial data collection for comprehensive CL Impact Evaluations.</i>				
1.1 Initial data collected for IE of an IPEC CL project.	x			
1.2 Initial data collected for IE of IPEC CL Project 2	x			
1.3A Initial data collected for impact of a World Bank child labour project.			x	Project proved unsuitable.
1.3B Initial data collected for IE of IPEC CL Project 3.			x	RCT not suitable. May not be time for new approach.
1.4 Number of learning events held presenting evidence and knowledge generated by impact evaluation exercises.		X		Only one major event towards project closure. More intended. Two draft papers presented, to US DOL and UNICEF.
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	

<b>Immediate Objective 1 (B):</b> <i>By the end of the project, the evidence base on CL programs will be extended through modular IEs.</i>				
2.1 Modular IE completed for development program with a bearing on child labour.	x			
2.2 Modular IE completed for a second development program	x			
2.3 IE completed for a third development program with a bearing on child labour.			x	Ran out of time, partially due to delayed extension <sup>2</sup> .
2.4 Child labour outcomes mainstreamed into IE of relevant development programmes.			x	Ran out of time, partially due to delayed extension. (UCW's participation in WB DIME Workshop treated as an input/activity).
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	

<b>Immediate Objective 2:</b> <i>By the end of the project, access to information on impact evaluation methods/results in the area of child labour will be increased through the establishment of a web-based knowledge centre.</i>				
3.1 Inventory completed of impact evaluations of program interventions relating to CL.	x			No Plan for Sustainability of Knowledge Centre.
3.2 Information base established on child labour impact evaluations (through knowledge centre).	x			No Plan for Sustainability of Knowledge Centre.
3.3 Inventory of current program interventions against CL.	x			No Plan for Sustainability of Knowledge Centre.
3.4 Information base established of projects in the area of child labour (through knowledge centre)	x			No Plan for Sustainability of Knowledge Centre.
4.1 Web-based knowledge centre established on child labour programming and impact evaluation	x			No Plan for Sustainability of Knowledge Centre.
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

<sup>2</sup> USDOL regards the report on the Modular Study of the Bright Programme in Burkina Faso as the third, although the April 2013 TPR reports this as an "Additional" output.

## Analysis According to Key Evaluation Criteria

Criterion	Achievement	Summary
Design	Moderate	Over-ambitious. Incomplete for objectives Inadequately relates tasks to resources
Relevance	Good	Addresses issues important to all its main stakeholders
Efficiency	Poor	Substantial delays. Components excluded. Inadequate coordination IPEC/UCW
Effectiveness	Moderate	Raised awareness of application of RCT/QE methods for CL. Field IEs adversely affected by inefficiencies leading to "last minute" delivery of final reports on baseline work Assembled and reviewed substantial data base on IEs and CL interventions. Pioneered modular CL component approach in broader evaluations
Sustainability	Poor	Inadequate plans for completion of IEs. Insecure future of Knowledge Centre.

### Good Practices

The project has exemplified a number of good practices, which feed into the lessons learned.

#### *Use of Existing Evidence*

The project has been innovative in bringing together, analysing and reviewing a substantial body of existing evidence on the impact of child labour. This is an important step, which needs to be made sustainable and built upon.

#### *Collaboration*

In keeping with the Inter-Agency nature of the executing body, UCW, the project has been able to develop and utilise partnerships with different parts of the World Bank system, FAO and other bodies. This has given access to a broad range of existing evidence and access to planned and current IEs, with relevance to CL. This has been a major contribution to the results of the project.

#### *Detailed Information Sharing and Discussions at Country Level*

The project has devoted considerable time and effort to discussion of impact evaluation (IE) with potential collaborating countries. This has included national and local politicians and public servants and with technical staff implementing projects. This has enabled countries to make informed decisions concerning the type of IE they will support, even where these decisions have not been as hoped for by the project team. This represents an example of good practice with respect to enabling country ownership of development processes.

#### *Partnership Based on Complementarity*

IPEC and UCW have worked through a partnership based on their complementary strengths. UCW has inter-agency networks, particularly with the World Bank, which enabled it to make an additional contribution to the work of IPEC. IPEC brought a strong and evolving approach to impact assessment and evaluation, located within the broader evaluation framework provided by the ILO Evaluation Unit, through its connections to UNEG and the broader development evaluation community.



## Lessons Learned

### *Lessons on Project Design*

- Project design should delineate a set of tasks and their results, which can be delivered with the time and resources available.
- Project design for a research activity should not specify what its results will be.
- Project design should specify what tasks are required to be undertaken and should not state or imply additional tasks, for which no resources are provided.
- The Changing International Development Landscape will require new ways of operating; since there is increasing emphasis on competitive bidding for all contracts, which reduces the possibility for sharing of information among potential competitors or of developing ideas jointly between donors and implementing institutions.

### *Lessons on Impact Evaluation*

- IE of Child Labour Should be Appropriately Located In Broader International Development Evaluation.
- Randomised Control Trial (RCTs) and Quasi Experimental (QE) Impact Evaluations need to be purposefully targeted.
- There is good scope for further reanalysis of existing data and for inclusion of CL modules in related IEs.

### *Country Ownership*

- Country ownership should be sought for the principle and practice of IE, rather than for a specific methodology.

## Recommendations

**Recommendation 1:** IPEC (EIA) and UCW should develop a formal collaboration agreement, which will establish the principles and potential modes of such collaboration, taking into account the increasing international emphasis on competitive bidding. The agreement would also consider approaches to broadening the potential range of funding sources for both bodies; through such means as the creation of a Trust Fund for research and evaluation of CL interventions and/or the possibility of creating a CL “window” in larger IE programmes, such as 3IE.

**Recommendation 2:** Future collaboration between IPEC EIA and UCW (and other partners) should have clearly established and specific procedures and associated resource allocations for management, administration, technical cooperation, reporting and financial transparency.

**Recommendation 3:** IPEC EIA should ensure that its project designs are accurately calibrated to (potentially) available resources, so that all immediate objectives are in principle attainable. Where substantial collaboration is expected among EIA projects, due account should be taken of the resource requirements of this activity.

**Recommendation 4:** IPEC EIA and ILO EVAL should formally review the IPEC work on impact assessment, evaluation of impact and impact evaluation (including the use of terminologies), to ensure consistency of approaches or, where necessary, to justify differences of approach or emphasis between

IPEC and EVAL. IPEC, in collaboration with EVAL, should ensure that its approaches and terminology are appropriately located in relation to broader international evaluation discussions. EVAL should consider how best to incorporate the IPEC work into its guidance documents for ILO as a whole.

# 1. Background

## 1.1 The Evaluation of Impact by IPEC

1. The aim of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) is the progressive elimination of child labour<sup>3</sup>, especially its worst forms. IPEC support at the country level is based on a phased, multi-sector strategy, which includes: strengthening national capacities to deal with child labour issues; supporting development of legislation; improvement of the knowledge base; raising awareness on the negative consequences of child labour; promoting social mobilization against child labour; and implementing direct action programmes to demonstrate appropriate approaches.
2. ILO/IPEC's role has been gradually changing, from an earlier focus on direct implementation to one of facilitation and provision of policy/technical advisory services to countries in formulating policies and programmes in pursuit the objectives of the two Child labour Conventions. In terms of evaluation, since 2000 a strategic area of IPEC's work has been developing approaches to "impact assessment". This work positions impact assessment<sup>4</sup> as a key area that can enhance the capacity of IPEC and its partners to implement child labour activities, through building the knowledge base on which interventions work, how and why. In January 2002, the Design, Evaluation and Documentation (DED)<sup>5</sup> section of IPEC convened an informal expert meeting in Geneva. This looked at how to integrate a theory of change approach into the work of IPEC and at the potential development of new methodologies that could support learning on the impacts on children and families of child labour interventions. The concept of impact applied has emphasised the issue of attribution rather than that of long-term change, which is one of the characteristics of DAC Glossary definition of impact.
3. The 2002 meeting identified three key principles to guide the planning and implementation of impact assessments; that impact assessments should be practical, credible and useful. The meeting supported the development of a Theory of Change approach, which gave rise to discussions leading to the development of the Strategic Programme Impact Framework (SPIF), which produced detailed guidelines, held training sessions in Washington DC and Bangkok and provided support, in particular to national timebound programmes. The instrument that has since been used extensively by IPEC to facilitate strategic planning and to illustrate the expected paths of change from an intervention or set of interventions.
4. Towards the end of 2002, DED embarked on its first specific project focussed on impact: "Measuring Longer Term Impact on Children and Families through Tracer / Tracking Methodologies." In 2006 IPEC's Global Action Plan, formulated in the Global Report on Child Labour, called for the development of and support to the application of methodologies that measure the impact of child labour interventions and policies. The purpose is to improve the identification of those interventions with effective and rapid results. That same year, IPEC embarked on a new 5-year project; "Impact Assessment Framework Project, Follow-Up to Tracer and Tracking

---

<sup>3</sup> Documents concerning the project vary in spelling according to their source. English spelling is generally adopted in this report.

<sup>4</sup> An overview of IPEC's work in this area is provided in the draft document "Impact Assessment Framework and Impact Evaluation of Child Labour Intervention Projects – Independent Evaluation," Burt Perrin. July 2011. This document includes the Mid Term Evaluation of the current project.

<sup>5</sup> In 2012 DED was renamed as the Evaluation and Impact Assessment (EIA) section. DED is used in this report in a historical context, while EIA refers to the current context.

Methodologies.” The Impact Evaluations were intended to play a complementary role to the numerous other evaluation approaches implemented by IPEC.

## **1.2 Impact Evaluation among International Development Agencies**

5. Attempts to agree on one “best” approach to impact evaluation among international development practitioners have not been productive. This is because different, but overlapping elements of available approaches have been emphasised by various stakeholders. Furthermore, methodological discussions around IE have raised fundamental and sensitive issues of the relationship between qualitative and quantitative methods in the social sciences, which cannot be resolved in the evaluation arena, if anywhere.
6. The range of approaches available has been explored in a number of documents, none of which is accepted by all parties as authoritative. The so-called “NONIE Guidelines”,<sup>6</sup> commissioned by a broad consortium of international development evaluation associations is the most widely referenced document. Experimental and quasi-experimental methods are extensively covered in the guidelines and are there characterised as methods most suited for IEs of “single-strand initiatives with explicit objectives—for example, the change in crop yield after introduction of a new technology, or reduction in malaria prevalence after the introduction of bed nets. Such interventions can be isolated, manipulated, and measured, and experimental and quasi-experimental designs may be appropriate for assessing causal relationships between these single-strand initiatives and their effects”. Further, as White and Phillips<sup>7</sup> have indicated, these methods are most suited for evaluations with both “large N” and “large n”. Both the overall population affected and the sample groups must be large.
7. Since the NONIE Guidelines, the broad trend among development practitioners has gravitated towards acceptance of “mixed method” approaches. These may include combinations of different quantitative methods, or of quantitative and qualitative methods or of either of these with “hybrids.”<sup>8</sup> This tendency towards eclectic approaches has been well summarised in a recent and influential DFID paper<sup>9</sup> and is also the position advocated in the recent United Nations Evaluation Group Guidance Document on Impact Evaluation<sup>10</sup>. It is notable that those institutions, which have heavily espoused experimental or quasi-experimental methods, tend to be either specific research based programmes (e.g. the World Bank DIME initiative) with special funding structures, or independent organisations (such as 3ie) or University-based. Most Evaluation departments in international agencies (where they have engaged with IE) have adopted a “mixed method” approach and have used such methods as Randomised Control Trial (RCTs) very sparingly and to address specific issues. This approach has been based both on an appreciation of the methodological issues involved and on the relatively high cost of RCTs (and of some quasi-experimental approaches) compared with the limited operational budgets and staff resources of such Departments.

---

<sup>6</sup> NONIE. Impact Evaluations and Development. Nonie Guidance on Impact Evaluation. (Leeuw, F. and J. Vaessen, J.) 2009.

<sup>7</sup> White, H. and Phillips, D. Addressing attribution of cause and effect in small n impact evaluations: towards an integrated framework. 3ie. New Delhi. 2012

<sup>8</sup> Such as Qualitative Comparative Analysis.

<sup>9</sup> DFID. Broadening the Range of Designs and Methods for Impact Evaluation. Working Paper No. 38, April 2012. (Stern, E. Stame, N. Mayne, J. Forss, K. Davies, R. Befani, B.)

<sup>10</sup> The Role of Impact Evaluation in UN Agency Evaluation Systems. Guidance on Selecting, Planning and Managing Impact Evaluations. Guidance Document. UNEG Impact Evaluation Task Force. 2013.

## **2. The project: building the knowledge base on the design and implementation of impact evaluation of child labour interventions<sup>11</sup>**

### **2.1 Introduction to the Project**

8. At the end of 2008, ILO-IPEC initiated a new project<sup>12</sup> with funding of USD 1.5 million from the United States Department of Labor (USDOL): “Building the knowledge base on the design and implementation of impact evaluation of child labour interventions”. Executed by the inter-agency programme, Understanding Children’s Work (UCW), this project aimed to support the design and implementation of pilot impact evaluations in selected child labour<sup>13</sup> elimination projects. It was expected that these impact evaluations would overcome through statistical counterfactual analysis perceived difficulties in attributing change to specific interventions.
9. The project was intended to produce statistically-robust empirical evidence relating to the impact of policies and programs on child labour, to help identify the factors behind success, through combining methodological development, targeted field research, capacity building and research dissemination. It would develop, with local partners, impact evaluations (using experimental or quasi experimental approaches), which were expected to provide evidence concerning not only whether specific child labour program interventions work, but also on how they work and on their relevance for broader replication. The evaluations were expected to provide answers concerning what impact specific interventions have had on a set of child labour and education-related outcomes and under what specific conditions. Where possible, the project would also look at costs, in order to compare the relative efficiency of various interventions. The evaluations were expected to complement broader ILO-IPEC efforts in the area of impact assessment and evaluation, although the exact mechanism through which this would be achieved was not specified. In this respect, the development of an evaluability framework, which was initially included in the project activities, later excluded and finally included again, was to play a supporting role. According to the Project Document an “initial inventory of CL impact evaluations will constitute a first step towards an “evaluability framework” describing the range of possible methods for CL impact evaluation and the types of interventions and specific circumstances for which each is best suited. The methods developed as part of the ..... project will also feed into the development of the evaluability framework. Such a framework is seen as a valuable potential tool for helping guide decisions concerning the type of evaluation needed for different program interventions in different programming contexts. The evaluability framework will lead to the development of evaluation protocols for the appropriate impact evaluations of CL interventions. It will be important for building the knowledge base among all actors in child labor, including international organizations, NGOs, governments, bilateral and multilateral agencies”.
10. The current project covers the first of what was envisaged as a two-stage research effort. This current stage focuses on evaluation design and initial data collection for three selected CL-related program interventions, while the second stage (beyond the scope of the current project) would involve follow-up data collection for the three selected program interventions, intended to allow for a comprehensive evaluation of both short- and longer-term impact.

---

<sup>11</sup> The texts of both the Project Document (Final Version: 25 September 2008) and the Evaluation TOR (21 May 2013 Revised Final) contain assumptions and “anticipatory findings” which have, as far as possible, been removed in this summary.

<sup>12</sup> Operational Date 30 September 2008, Closing Date End December 2012, revised to end May 2013.

<sup>13</sup> In view of the frequency with which the phrase child labour appears in text, it is abbreviated to CL.

## 2.2 Project Objectives

11. The project development objective is: To contribute to the progressive elimination of child labour by improving understanding of the effectiveness of programs addressing CL.
12. The project's Immediate Objectives (as designed)<sup>14</sup> are:
  1. By the end of the project, the evidence base on CL program impact will be extended through initial data collection for comprehensive CL impact evaluations and through modular impact evaluation.
  2. By the end of the project, capacity in CL impact evaluation will be strengthened through development of replicable impact evaluation protocols and targeted training; and
  3. By the end of the project, access to information on impact evaluation methods/results in the area of child labour will be increased through the establishment of a web-based knowledge centre.
13. The project (as designed) comprised five components<sup>15</sup>:

*A: Inventory and review of CL programs, type of interventions, impact evaluations and possible methodologies*

14. This project component would consist of an inventory of CL programs and CL impact evaluations. The inventory exercise would include cataloguing and categorizing current program interventions against child labour supported by ILO/IPEC, other USDOL grantees and other major actors in the area of child labour, in order to identify a typology of program interventions. The review was intended to help inform the selection of CL program interventions for the project components *initial data collection for CL impact evaluations* and *modular CL impact evaluations*. The outputs of the inventory exercise were also intended to serve as a starting point for the *web-based knowledge centre* on CL programs and IE. This initial inventory could constitute the first step towards creating an “evaluability framework” describing the range of possible methods for CL impact evaluation and the types of interventions and specific circumstances for which each is best suited.

*B: Initial data collection for child labour impact evaluations*

15. This component of the project would involve initial implementation of impact evaluations of programs directly addressing child labour. It constitutes the first of an envisaged two-stage research effort and focuses on impact evaluation design and initial design and data collection. The second stage of the evaluation process, beyond the scope of the current project, would focus on follow-up data collection for the programs included in this evaluation exercise, expected to allow for a comprehensive evaluation of both short- and longer-term program intervention impacts. The project was intended to include three CL interventions in this component. One of these should be an IPEC project; a second would be a USDOL-funded Child Labour and Education Initiative project (from fiscal year 2009) and the third a World Bank project (to be co-financed by the World Bank).

*C: Modular child labour impact evaluations*

16. This project component would support integrating child labour modules into planned impact evaluations by other organizations on programs in relevant policy areas. Technical support would

---

<sup>14</sup> Project Objectives were revised as discussed in Section 4.

<sup>15</sup> The components were later revised in line with the amended objectives.

be provided through this project component by adding questions or modules on child labour to planned impact evaluations with a bearing on child labour. This component would also support the analysis of datasets of already-completed IEs containing CL data that have not yet been analyzed.

*D: Capacity building on CL-related impact evaluation for further impact evaluation*

17. This project component was intended to involve training to project staff charged with the design and implementation of the projects targeted in the impact evaluation exercise described above (see component B) as well as to other groups involved in the CL-relating programming.

*E: Dissemination*

18. Dissemination and technical support of methodologies and data collection on impact evaluations on child labour (through a *web-based knowledge centre* and other activities). Building on the inventory exercise, this component should consolidate and provide access to state of the art information in the areas of CL programming and CL impact evaluation through establishment of a web-based knowledge centre.

## **2.3 Project Coordination, Support and Management**

19. It was intended that a Project Coordinating Committee (PCC) made up of USDOL, ILO/IPEC and the UCW Secretariat would provide strategic oversight and guidance in the implementation of the project. In addition, a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) made up of agency and external experts would contribute specialised technical inputs as required.

### 3. The final evaluation

#### 3.1 Purposes of the Final Evaluation

20. The purposes of this final evaluation are to:

- Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives and identify the supporting factors and constraints that have led to this level of achievement.
- Identify unintended changes, both positive and negative at outcome and impact levels, in addition to the expected results.
- Assess the relevance of the sustainability strategy, its progress and its potential for achievement.
- Provide recommendations on how to strengthen the strategy of UCW and ILO-IPEC on Impact Evaluation as part of Impact Assessment.
- Identify and document lessons learned and good practice to be used further in child labour projects and programmes, in particular in projects and initiatives on developing, implementing and supporting impact assessment, impact evaluation and related work.
- Assess how the work of the project on impact evaluation has contributed to the broader work of USDOL and ILO-IPEC in this area and beyond to encourage further work and involvement by others partners on IE of child labour interventions.

#### 3.2 Evaluation Processes

21. According to ILO evaluation policy and procedures all programmes and projects with a budget over USD 1 million have to be evaluated by an independent party. The ILO Evaluation Unit (EVAL) has granted decentralised authority to EIA for IPEC project evaluations based on the capacity, expertise and demonstrated independence EIA (previously DED) has developed over the last decade. However, since the current project is actually executed by EIA, a slightly different evaluation management structure to normal has been put in place, with the (EIA) Evaluation Manager reporting to the Director of EVAL for this specific evaluation only.
22. A mid-term evaluation (MTE) of this project was carried out in June 2011 in combination with the final evaluation of the Impact Assessment Framework project (GLO/06/51/USA). These evaluations were combined due to the perceived complementarity of the theme and approaches between the two projects and the resulting synergy between them. With hindsight, this combination was not fully effective, since much of the “joint” evaluation focuses on linkages between the two projects, which do not appear to have been central to the objectives of the current project.
23. The MTE concluded that this project was generally on track to achieve its identified outputs and recommended that it should maintain its current strategy. Recommendations included immediately looking for funding support in order to complete IEs started by the project, to look for ways to support the original objective of the evaluability framework and the expansion of the Knowledge Centre. Partly in response to this, a *second project revision* extended the project from December 2012 to May 2013. This was intended to enable the reintroduction of the work on the evaluability framework, additional modular impact evaluations and organization of dissemination events.



### 3.3 Methodology

24. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with its Terms of Reference.<sup>16</sup> A Desk Review was conducted of initially available project documents<sup>17</sup>. On the basis of this review an Inception Report was prepared, outlining how the assignment would be undertaken. Visits<sup>18</sup> were made to conduct interviews with the UCW team in Rome and with ILO and ILO/IPEC staff in Geneva. Additional documents were gathered during this process. Interviews conducted in person were supported by skype contacts with stakeholders in El Salvador and a telephone discussion with USDOL. A draft report was prepared and circulated to stakeholders for comments, on the basis of which the Final Evaluation was completed.
25. The evaluation used the following data-gathering methods:
- Documentary review.
  - Semi-structured in person interviews (ILO EVAL, IPEC).
  - Semi-structured telephone interviews (Country-based staff, USDOL).
  - Group discussions (UCW, IPEC-EIA).
26. These data were analysed and triangulated using:
- Specification of key evaluation questions, methods and analytical approach.
  - Comparison of documentary and interview data for consistency and key issues arising.
  - Comparison of data from different sets of stakeholders.
  - Identification of key issues emerging.
  - Assessing evidence in relation to TOR specifications and key evaluation questions.

### 3.4 Limitations

27. Although the project has conducted substantial work in three countries, no country missions were included in the assignment, to enable a detailed understanding of national level perspectives. However, desk officers and project staff gave some indication of issues arising and means of addressing them. The total period allowed for interviews in Geneva and Rome was one week, which meant that some potential respondents could not be contacted.

---

<sup>16</sup> Attached as Annex 2.

<sup>17</sup> Documents reviewed are listed in Annex 3.

<sup>18</sup> Persons contacted are listed in Annex 1.

## **4. Project revisions**

### **4.1 First Revision**

28. The project started on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2008. On 14<sup>th</sup> February 2011 a submission was made (and later accepted by USDOL) for a first revision. This proposed to discontinue a number of outputs and activities, namely:
- Training workshops on impact evaluation.
  - Initial data collection for a USDOL grantee project.
  - Evaluability framework for impact evaluation.
  - Technical report on the integration of child labour considerations into impact evaluation of development programs.
  - Development of technical protocols.
29. Resources saved from these budget lines were to be redeployed to cover increased mission costs to projects identified in Ghana and El Salvador and for additional UCW Support through the services of a specialist in Impact Evaluation. IE of the selected projects was to be undertaken within the overall Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation System approach, which had become a core approach of IPEC EIA.

#### **4.1.1 Analysis**

30. As part of the application, the project completed a section on “Effects of the Revision on Scope of the Project”. This states that the revision will bring “no change” to the project objectives. This assertion is somewhat surprising, since the revision actually required one of the three project “immediate objectives” (IOs) to be removed completely. This was IO2, which states that: “By the end of the project, capacity in CL impact evaluation will be strengthened through development of replicable impact evaluation protocols and targeted training”. Clearly, since both the training and the protocols were removed, the objective could not remain. But further, this could also be expected to have an effect on the capacity to implement the IEs, which are only being designed by the project, for implementation in a hypothetical “Phase 2”. This effect would arise because the component was intended to involve training for project staff charged with the design and implementation of the projects targeted in the impact evaluation exercise. These staff would (if trained) be able to play an important role in the actual IE. In view of the unclear situation concerning the availability of funding and technical support for the IEs themselves, the elimination of training for project teams therefore seems as if it could have substantial effects on the project objectives.

### **4.2 Second Revision**

31. A second revision, with no cost increase, was approved in December 2012, extending the project until 31<sup>st</sup> May 2013. This reallocated funds, with the intention of facilitating the delivery of outputs under component 1: (Inventory and review of CL programs, type of interventions, impact evaluations and possible methodologies) to organize dissemination events and support the integration of CL outcomes in IEs planned by other organisations and under Component 2 (modular evaluation). It also reinstated the output of an “Evaluability Framework for IE”.

#### **4.2.1 Analysis**

32. The process of the second revision is perceived differently by various project stakeholders. From the perspective of UCW, it shared its ideas with IPEC EIA in April 2012, but the decision from USDOL was not received until December 2012. In the meantime, it was not able to conclude agreements for collaborative work, including with FAO and the World Bank's DIME, because neither the funding situation nor the timescale for project closure were finalised. From the perspective of IPEC EIA, IPEC and UCW worked jointly to prepare a proposal, which would fit within the overall ILO/IPEC strategic approach, particularly with regard to its work with USDOL. IPEC had a June 2012 meeting with USDOL, at which processes to complete the IE work commenced by the project were discussed, including the potential for additional funding. At that time, exact details of the future IE work of the project were not known, so that precise budgetary requirements could not be documented. Further, USDOL did not make a commitment to provide any additional funds at the meeting or in follow-up discussions. Only once these processes had been completed, was EIA able to submit a revision proposal to USDOL (first version dated November 1<sup>st</sup> 2012), to extend the work at no additional cost. USDOL indicated that the official timescale for receipt of such proposals is six months before project closure.
33. USDOL has indicated that future funding should not have affected the no-cost extension, which was requested to provide additional time to complete deliverables that had already been budgeted for and planned, and is therefore not a reason for the heavily delayed submission of the no-cost extension project revision request.
34. The effects of the delayed second revision process cannot be precisely specified, since the key stakeholders do not agree on the issue and it is not possible to create a counterfactual in which the process was not delayed. It does appear, however, that UCW felt unable to fully pursue potential future collaborations and that this may have resulted in some lost opportunities.

## 5. Achievements against objectives<sup>19</sup>

### 5.1 Introduction

35. The level of achievement of the Development Objective is addressed after that of the Immediate Objectives, which form its contributory elements. To assist in analysis, the Immediate Objectives are sub-divided into their component parts in order to simplify the assessment of achievement against the stated indicators.

### 5.2 Overview of Achievements Against Immediate Objectives

36. Tables 1 to 4 below summarise achievements against the project's immediate objectives.

**Table 1: Achievement Against Indicators for Immediate Objective 1 (A)**

Immediate Objective 1 (A): By the end of the project, the evidence base on CL programs will be extended through initial data collection for comprehensive CL Impact Evaluations.		
Indicator	Achievement	Completed?
1.1. Initial data collected for IE of an IPEC CL project.	ILO Project identified: <i>"Eliminating child labour through economic empowerment and social inclusion"</i> (El Salvador). Govt. refused RCT and quasi-experimental approach substituted. Stakeholder consultation completed (IFPRI-supported). Project design approved, including IE. IE requirements annexed to Project Document. Selection criteria for project participation agreed. Baseline data collection completed May 2012. IE design finalised June 2012. Draft baseline report completed Feb. 2013 and revised on basis of DOL inputs.	Completed with quasi-experimental approach.
1.2. Initial data collected for IE of IPEC CL Project 2.	In view of need to change from the initial idea of a USDOL (2009) grantee, the selection process for the second project was prolonged and the roadmap for evaluation design took three years to complete. Project selected was: <i>"Towards child labour free cocoa growing communities in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana through an integrated area based approach."</i> Of the two countries, only Ghana participated. Agreement reached with Govt. Ministry to implement IE based on randomization at community level. Draft IE design developed early 2012. Baseline data collection completed by University Institute Oct. 2012 and report completed Dec. 2012. Process supported by UCW throughout.	Completed with RCT approach.
1.3(a) Initial data collected for impact of a World Bank child labour project.	After two years, a suitable WB project was identified. At three years, a preliminary project design had been completed and baseline data collected. Due to implementation issues, the project was dropped and a WB program in Togo was added. A draft IE design was completed in Aug. 2012 and WB is looking for funds to conduct the IE itself.	Not completed. Dropped.

<sup>19</sup> Principle data source: TPR April 2013

<b>Immediate Objective 1 (A) continued: By the end of the project, the evidence base on CL programs will be extended through initial data collection for comprehensive CL Impact Evaluations.</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Completed?</b>
1.3(b) Initial data collected for IE of IPEC CL Project 3.	Although not presented in TPR Section IIIA, Measurement Against Project Objectives, UCW has attempted to add a third IPEC project. This is: <i>"Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Shrimp and Seafood Processing Areas in Thailand"</i> . Substantial preparatory work was done, with the intention of undertaking an RCT IE. However, it appears that there are inadequate numbers of children to support experimental and control groups and that another approach will be needed. A design and survey instruments have been completed, but it is not decided if/how this work will go forward.	RCT dropped. No specific evaluation approach endorsed by project closure.
1.4. Number of learning events held presenting evidence and knowledge generated by impact evaluation exercises.	One learning event was held in Washington DC in April 2013.  Two working papers were also presented, one to US DOL and one at UNICEF HQ.	Partially completed. The indicator refers to "events", but only one formal event held by project completion.

**Table 2: Achievement Against Indicators for Immediate Objective 1 (B)**

<b>Immediate Objective 1 (B): By the end of the project, the evidence base on CL programs will be extended through modular IEs.</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Completed?</b>
2.1. Modular IE completed for development program with a bearing on child labour.	Mapping completed of WB interventions and IE experience relevant to CL. WB IEs suitable for modular evaluation identified and stakeholders engaged. Project included (Sept. 2010): <i>"Rural electrification in Bangladesh and India"</i> . Consultant recruited, analysis conducted, report drafted and under review. (analysis conducted of Bangladesh only).	Completed  (Almost)
2.2. Modular IE completed for a second development program with a bearing on child labour.	Discussion with WB in Oct. 2010, leading to inclusion of <i>"Rural Women's Economic Empowerment and Entrepreneurship Pilot in Nicaragua"</i> . Survey instruments developed, tested and data collection completed 2011. Data analysis of program impact on CL produced preliminary results, shared with WB. First draft report finalised, final draft expected by closure.	Completed  (Almost)
2.3. IE completed for a third development program with a bearing on child labour.	By March 2013, the <i>"South Africa Child Support Grant"</i> had been identified as a candidate, but cannot be completed within current project. A draft report on an "additional" study of the Bright programme in Burkina Faso was also finalised.	Not started
2.4. Child labour outcomes mainstreamed into IE of relevant development programmes.	Participation in WB DIME workshop in Dec. 2012 established possibility of mainstreaming CL outcomes into planned IEs of relevant health projects. Collaboration with FAO-ESA to include CL among outcomes of <i>"Malawi Social Cash Transfer"</i> program at draft agreement stage. Delays in establishing finance mechanism to transfer funds to FAO and in obtaining project extension place this collaboration in doubt.	IE not started.

**Table 3: Achievement Against Indicators for Immediate Objective 2**

<b>Immediate Objective 2: By the end of the project, access to information on impact evaluation methods/results in the area of child labour will be increased through the establishment of a web-based knowledge centre.</b>		
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>Completed?</b>
3.1. Inventory completed of impact evaluations of program interventions relating to CL.	Inventory of WB IEs of projects related to CL completed and regularly updated. Other sources, such as 3ie, Poverty Action Lab, also assessed and included as appropriate.	Completed for WB. Neither objective nor indicators limit this activity to WB.
3.2. Information base established on child labour impact evaluations (through knowledge centre).	Concept developed and website interface developed. Currently available as IE section of UCW website; regularly updated and maintained.	Completed. Sustainability not clear.
3.3. Inventory of current program interventions against CL.	Overviews of IPEC and USDOL EI programs completed and concept and structure of inventory ongoing. Two working papers completed and posted on-line: (1) the complex effect of public policy on CL and (2) Cash Transfers and CL.	Completed
3.4. Information base established of projects in the area of child labour (through knowledge centre)	Concept developed and website interface developed. Currently available as IE section of UCW website; regularly updated and maintained.	Completed. Sustainability not clear.
4.1 Web-based knowledge centre established on child labour programming and impact evaluation	Concept developed and website interface developed. Currently available as IE section of UCW website; regularly updated and maintained.	Completed. Sustainability not clear.

**Table 4: Overview of Achievement Against Immediate Objectives**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Fully achieved</b>	<b>Partially Achieved</b>	<b>Not achieved</b>	<b>Comment</b>
<b>Immediate Objective 1 (A): By the end of the project, the evidence base on CL programs will be extended through initial data collection for comprehensive CL Impact Evaluations.</b>				
1.1	x			
1.2	x			
1.3A			X	Project proved unsuitable.
1.3B			X	RCT not suitable. May not be time for new approach.
1.4		x		Only one event. More intended.
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Immediate Objective 1 (B): By the end of the project, the evidence base on CL programs will be extended through modular IEs.</b>				
2.1	x			
2.2	x			
2.3			X	Ran out of time, partially due to delayed extension.
2.4			X	Ran out of time, partially due to delayed extension.
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Immediate Objective 2: By the end of the project, access to information on impact evaluation methods/results in the area of child labour will be increased through the establishment of a web-based knowledge centre.</b>				
3.1	x			No Plan for Sustainability of Knowledge Centre.
3.2	x			No Plan for Sustainability of Knowledge Centre.
3.3	x			No Plan for Sustainability of Knowledge Centre.
3.4	x			No Plan for Sustainability of Knowledge Centre.
4.1	x			No Plan for Sustainability of Knowledge Centre.
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	

### **5.3 Analysis of Achievements Against the Immediate Objectives**

#### **5.3.1 Analysis of Achievement of Immediate Objective 1 (A)**

37. This Immediate Objective states that: “By the end of the project, the evidence base on CL programs will be extended through initial data collection for comprehensive CL Impact Evaluations”. The concept of “comprehensive CL Impact Evaluations” does not appear to have been defined in the Project Document or in other key documents. However, the emphasis in the Project Document is on experimental or quasi-experimental methods, with a preference for RCTs, where these prove appropriate. This emphasis has been adopted by UCW in implementation. The use of the word may also suggest some interlinkage with the IPEC EIA approach of Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Systems, of which the IE work may be seen as a component.
38. The project was dependent on establishing and developing relationships with a broad range of partners. These included: (mainly) Government agencies at country level for potential IEs; at institutional level for collaboration in such areas as Modular IEs; with USDOL to locate projects from specific Financial Years; and with the broader work of ILO-IPEC, including development of the CMES. Although the CMES process became delayed, this has not been specified in the TPRs as posing a discreet challenge to development of the IE project.
39. The focus of this Immediate Objective is on collected evidence on CL programs, with some implication that the evidence should be connected with impact, which is the focus of the project. However, baseline data certainly do not provide evidence of impact; they are simply the starting point from which such evidence may be gathered at a later stage. Since it was known at the outset that the project would, at best, collect only baseline data because of its limited time span this IO is therefore borderline unevaluable. However, if we consider the broad spirit of this objective, we can assess what has been achieved.
40. After the original intention for a mix of project implementers was abandoned in favour of three IPEC projects, the search for eligible projects accelerated. This proved a time-consuming and difficult process. Since randomisation for an IE should ideally be applied to the selection of beneficiaries before the host project commences, it is both technically demanding and ethically challenging for in-country implementers, who will often have a strong preference for selecting beneficiaries according to (mainly) socio-economic targeting procedures. In this respect, although UCW was committed to the full RCT approach, it is only in Ghana that the approach has been used. In El Salvador, the group of Government bodies engaged with the project supported an IE with a quasi-experimental approach, rather than as an RCT.
41. In summary, much has been achieved through the project’s exploratory work on experimental and quasi-experimental approaches, but these achievements relate more closely to IO2 than to IO1. They raised knowledge on the application of methods, rather than produced significant new evidence about CL programs.

#### **5.3.2 Analysis of Achievement of Immediate Objective 1 (B)**

42. This sub-objective states that: “By the end of the project, the evidence base on CL programs will be extended through modular IE’s”. Extensive work was undertaken to secure collaboration with projects, some of which could not be realised for various reasons; including the delay in confirming the project extension and difficulties experienced by UCW in finding the most appropriate way to transfer funds to partner international agencies. One set of modular data was generated for a WB project in Bangladesh, through analysis of information that had already been collected, but not

analysed. A second set was generated through contribution to a targeted follow-up survey to earlier WB IE work on a Cash Transfer programme in Nicaragua.

43. On the basis of the above factors, it can therefore be said that there has been a modest gain in evidence on CL impacts of broader spectrum projects implemented by the WB.

### **5.3.3 Analysis of Achievement of Immediate Objective 2**

44. The objective states that: “By the end of the project, access to information on impact evaluation methods/results in the area of child labour will be increased through the establishment of a web-based knowledge centre”
45. It has been shown above that this objective has been well achieved, through the conduct of inventories of relevant IEs and of CL projects and programs of IPEC, USDOL and World Bank. A database of more than 80 IEs, categorised under social security, education, labour market and communication/advocacy has been established and placed on line. Two working papers have been derived from this material and published.
46. The issue of sustainability of the database and website has not been resolved. Given that UCW is mainly financed by individual project activities and has no “core budget,” which could be used to update and sustain the facility, there appears to be a need to either establish support for UCW to continue the work or to relocate the material to some institution, which has predictable funding for this type of activity. In principle, ILO/IPEC would be an appropriate location, although specific resources would need to be obtained for the purpose.

## **5.4 Analysis of Achievements Against the Development Objective**

47. The Development Objective states that the project will: Contribute to the progressive elimination of child labour by improving understanding of the effectiveness of programs addressing CL. At this stage, it would be speculative to suggest that it has done so; but it is reasonable to conclude that it has modestly contributed to improved understanding. The most direct contribution is that of the database and review papers, with the work on modular components also generating some new knowledge. The major efforts of the project, which have undoubtedly been expended in pursuit of RCTs, have made an indirect contribution, through the light they have shed on the practical difficulties of conducting such IEs, the alternative approaches that may be used effectively when they are not feasible and the processes involved in constructing reliable baseline datasets.



## **6. Analysis according to key evaluation criteria**

### **6.1 Quality of Design**

#### **6.1.1 Findings**

48. The project design document (Final Version: 25 September 2008) can be analysed in two parts. The first of these is the Objectives, Outputs and Activities (Section 2.3), which is clear, reasonable and potentially implementable. The second consists of a surrounding text, which is a mix of practical suggestions as to how the work might be implemented and managed, disconnected information on the progress of Child Labour prevention and a scarcely concealed “textbook” on impact evaluation, which is based upon numerous assumptions, some of which few practitioners would find convincing. Further, the document provides information concerning what types of interventions might be included, what questions should be asked in the IEs, what resources training should draw upon, how logical frameworks should be drawn up and a general excess of detailed suggestions. The document also states that the work of the project will be closely integrated with a broad variety of other evaluation initiatives of IPEC, although there is no provision for this in its activities or resources.
49. It is not clear that the Project Management structure envisaged in the design was feasible. Under this<sup>20</sup>, the UCW Project Coordinator is said to be the Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) and project manager “under ILO rules”. ILO-IPEC is to provide “administrative and technical support”. However, the UCW team working on the project actually have ILO staff contracts and are thereby incorporated in the ILO management structure, ultimately reporting to the Director of IPEC. ILO-IPEC is therefore actually performing a management as well as a support role, which later contributed to tensions and delays in the implementation process.
50. The project was also to have a Project Coordinating Committee made up of representatives of USDOL; ILO/IPEC and the UCW Secretariat; which would play a role in “strategic oversight to and guiding implementation of all phases of the project”. Further, a Technical Advisory group made up of agency and external experts would “provide specialist input regarding the technical components of the project”.

#### **6.1.2 Conclusion**

51. The project design document has a usable core, which has been confounded by an over-ambitious, and prescriptive description of how the project might be implemented and what it should achieve. The design did not include the role the project should play in helping ILO-IPEC to develop its overall strategic approaches to evaluating CL interventions.

---

<sup>20</sup> See Project Document P19.

## 6.2 Relevance<sup>21</sup>

### 6.2.1 Findings

52. The project is intended to “contribute to the progressive elimination of child labour by improving understanding of the effectiveness of programs addressing CL”. Since ILO-IPEC is one of the leading operators in this field, the project should therefore assist it to understand the results to which it is contributing or which might be directly attributed to it. From an ILO perspective, the Governing Body has indicated that IE should be pursued and has agreed with the basic definition of the practice and guidance the ILO Evaluation Unit has provided. So ILO is moving into IE and evidence based policies and IPEC continues to play a leading role when it comes to impact evaluation within the ILO, based on its accumulated experience in the area. IPEC management promotes the need to document evidence and give a sound foundation, often to things, which practitioners already “know”, but with no firm basis. The RCTs under the IE project are expected to give an opportunity to learn, both from their processes and the results. They are part of the foundation for further development of the ILO approach to Impact Evaluation, which has been outlined by the Evaluation Unit in its Guidance Note 13. ILO is in the process of learning when IE is appropriate, where, when and how to do it, within the overall ILO evaluation policy.
53. Although the project has drawn, in particular, on the experiences of the World Bank, building on UCW’s comparative advantage as a multi-institutional programme, ILO does not expect to be able to directly translate the WB experience into its own work. This is because it does not have the financial resources of the World Bank, which has been able to “plug” IE into activities implemented through major loans, which ease the way for RCTs to be incorporated as part of the package. As a smaller financial player, ILO will have to negotiate carefully to include IE in its programmes; and the current project has given insights into such processes and the types of responses that can come from different in-country stakeholders.
54. The IE project executed by UCW relates to many other IPEC activities and programmes. These have included tracer and tracking studies, development of the Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation System (CMES) approach and of the Impact Assessment Framework. The level of collaboration originally envisaged with SIMPOC did not fully materialise. There was initial collaboration in considering how best to approach the Ghana RCT, but it appears that SIMPOC’s statistical approaches do not have a strong project focus and are not directly relevant to the development of RCTs. Also, more generally, SIMPOC has a full portfolio of activities and is not in a position to prioritise detailed collaboration with other programmes.
55. In ILO partner countries, Ministries of Labour are often not strong advocates of IE and ILO is trying to influence them, particularly in middle-income countries, to move IE into the national budget. Despite its relatively difficult start in ILO, the concept of using RCTs as a means of measuring impact has been picked up by some partner countries and Peru and Indonesia have received support from IPEC to help them set up more “rigorous” evaluations of their projects and programmes.

---

<sup>21</sup> The OECD-DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management defines relevance as “The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies”.

### **6.2.2 Conclusion**

56. The project has proved relevant to the interests of its key stakeholders: for USDOL in terms of understanding the potential role and contribution of econometric-based IE methods; for ILO as a contribution to its institution-wide approach to IE, using a range of methods; to IPEC EIA as part of its established and evolving set of M&E approaches, embodied in the concept of Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation System (and including such elements as the SPIF, Tracer Studies and, DBMR) ; for UCW as an element of its broad portfolio of approaches to understanding children's work, where IE is already established as an important element. Beyond these immediate stakeholders, the project has made a relevant contribution to institutional partners, notably the World Bank, in terms of expanding the range of thematic areas covered by experimental and quasi-experimental IE methods to include CL; to a broader range of potential stakeholders, able to gain information on IE of CL activities through the Knowledge Centre; and to a number of ILO member states through their participation in the processes involved in IE selection, design and implementation, as well as capacity building received.

## **6.3 Efficiency<sup>22</sup>**

### **6.3.1 Findings**

57. Overall, the project has not been efficient. The initial intention to include a USDOL-funded Child Labour and Education Initiative (EI) project as one of the three was apparently held up by delayed release of 2009 funds by the US Government and difficulties in deciding if any such project could be included. In the end, the decision was taken to include three IPEC projects. The first of these was identified around June 2010 (two years after project commencement), the second in March 2011 (after the first project revision) and the third in 2012, after the decision to drop a WB program in Togo, which had run into implementation issues. This latter cannot be seen as an efficiency problem, but rather as part of the learning experience of trying to implement RCTs. So the first project to be included in the IE field program was not finalised until half way through the project and the last only in the final year.
58. Since the IE field component of the work had been so delayed, with knock-on effects to other components, the decision was taken by UCW and IPEC to request a no-cost project extension. This process was inefficient (see section 4.2). UCW submitted documentation to IPEC in April 2012, in order to meet the USDOL deadline of 6 months before project closure (31 Dec. 2012). EIA submitted the first draft proposal to USDOL on 1<sup>st</sup> November, the last month before closure. From an IPEC-EIA perspective, this time was needed to conclude discussions with USDOL about potential future activities and to coordinate the project with other EIA activities. From a UCW perspective, the uncertainty relating to the timing and funding of the project adversely affected its potential to conclude new partnerships to carry forward the work. From a USDOL perspective, the submission was received beyond the deadline.
59. Other aspects of inefficiency revolve around the split between the technical management of the project by UCW and its financial control from IPEC-EIA. UCW appears to have found it difficult to obtain accurate information on the current and future financial situation of the project, which reduced its ability to make the most efficient decisions concerning the allocation of resources.

---

<sup>22</sup> The OECD-DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management defines efficiency as "A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results".

60. An additional area concerns the extent to which the intended overview mechanisms were able to contribute towards project efficiency. The PCC met on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2008 and again on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2009. In both cases, the result reported in the relevant TPR is “feedback reflected in current workplan”. There appears to be no formal record of any other meetings. Rather, further contacts among the parties represented on the PCC were informally coordinated by UCW. The TAG met on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2009 and discussed minimum project design criteria for a quantitative IE and how to approach IEs for USDOL EIs (which were later dropped from the project). It met again on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2010 and discussed the IE in El Salvador and that in the Democratic Republic of Congo (later dropped from the project). There appears to be no formal record of any additional meetings and UCW has mainly discussed technical issues among its network of contacts.
61. It can therefore be concluded that the PCC and TAG did not make the full contribution expected of them towards project monitoring and support, which may have contributed towards weaknesses in implementation efficiency.

### 6.3.2 Conclusion

62. The project has been *inefficient* on several fronts, notably with regard to the timing of activities and coordination, particularly between UCW and IPEC-EIA. The unavailability of USDOL 2009 funded projects for inclusion meant a belated change to selection criteria for one of the IE field projects. Finalisation of this selection process took nearly two years; half the time span of the project. Since fieldwork began late (among other reasons), a project extension was sought, but processing of this request within IPEC was substantially delayed, so that the extension was approved too late for some activities to be included.

## 6.4 Effectiveness<sup>23</sup>

### 6.4.1 Findings

63. The project has had mixed performance with regard to effectiveness. The establishment of a web-based Knowledge Centre, incorporating some 80 relevant IEs and an inventory of CL interventions and IEs, as well as production of two synthetic review papers constitutes a very effective component and an important contribution to knowledge on means of addressing CL.
64. In terms of RCTs, one (Ghana) has been developed and designed and baseline data have been collected and analysed. A second IE is at the same stage, but using a quasi-experimental design (El Salvador). In the third case (Thailand), it is not clear what work on IE will be done, since the numbers of beneficiaries and of potential control group members were insufficient to support an RCT and no alternative approach has yet been finalised. Overall, the in-country work to date has been of good quality and countries have appreciated the learning experience of participating in the planning process, even where it has not led to an RCT.
65. However, questions concerning the overall effectiveness of the IE country work are raised by the decision of the first project revision to exclude the detailed capacity development component. According to the Project Document (P9), this training would specifically target (among others) national level staff engaged in implementing the projects under IE and would provide them with “conceptual, theoretical and methodological underpinnings required for measuring the impact of

---

<sup>23</sup> The OECD-DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management defines effectiveness as “The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance”.

programs on child labour outcomes”. Since it was always the intention of the IE project to hand implementation of the actual IEs (beyond baseline) to national stakeholders, the exclusion of the training programme, which would contribute to their capacity to undertake this task seems highly likely to have reduced the effectiveness of the project.

66. More broadly, there are reservations concerning the effectiveness of the project in contributing to knowledge of the impacts of CL interventions through implementation of RCTs (or quasi-experimental alternatives), when it was not designed to conduct the IEs. The process through which the actual IEs would be conducted and managed was unclear in the original project concept and remains so. Projects themselves are said to have some funds allocated for the IEs and UCW has small amounts of funding and staff time left to support the process (although the current project will be closed), but it does not appear that these resources will be sufficient to support the entire IE process, including analysis and reporting. The project can therefore be assessed as effective on this dimension only so far as has been reached by closure; namely in clarifying some of the issues around methodology choice, local ownership and scope of IE coverage in multi-stranded and multi-site interventions. It has not directly contributed to knowledge on impacts through the IEs it has put in place, which have yet to be implemented. This was inherent in the design of the project, which was adapted to the duration of available funding rather than to the requirements of conducting IE.
67. The modular component was moderately effective. It proved time-consuming to identify suitable WB projects, but once this stage was completed two different approaches have been identified and successfully piloted. Under the first, existing data sets have been analysed from the perspective of CL; while under the second, an additional module of questions focussed on CL has been added to an IE, which has been planned but not implemented. In the two cases implemented (Bangladesh and Nicaragua), analytical reports should be finalised by project completion, so that a contribution will be made to the evidence base on impact of interventions, which include activities relevant to Child Labour
68. The systems established to assist the project to operate effectively included a Project Coordinating Committee and a Technical Advisory Group. Both institutions played a formal role early in project implementation, but seem to have become informal network resources later in the process. There is no evidence to suggest that they made their intended contribution. As discussed in Section 6.3 above, neither the PCC nor the TAG met regularly and it is therefore assessed that they did not make their intended contribution towards project effectiveness.

#### 6.4.2 Conclusion

69. Overall, the project has been moderately effective. It has been effective in terms of *evidence concerning CL program impact* mainly through its work on inventorising and reviewing CL activities and IEs relevant to them and incorporating this material into a Knowledge Centre. Modular approaches have also modestly contributed to this evidence base, while the work on field-based IEs, having only proceeded to baseline stage, cannot be said to have generated *evidence on impact*. Information on *methods* has been achieved largely through processes involved in establishing country-based IEs and has been compromised by various delays encountered by the project, which have meant that final versions of baseline reports have become available only at the “last moment.” Further, only one formal knowledge event (supplemented by two presentations of Working Papers to specific audiences) was held by the project and that only one month before the revised closure. This does not seem an effective way of sharing and discussing with peers the knowledge generated by the project over a four-year period.

## 6.5 Sustainability<sup>24</sup>

### 6.5.1 Findings

70. Measures taken to ensure the sustainability of project benefits are weak. Although the two main bodies responsible for implementation and execution will both still be working on related activities, neither has identified specific financial or human resources to continue with the work in the medium term. Both IPEC and UCW are reliant on project-based funding for their programmes and have no “core funds” to enable them to support discretionary activities. This places the future of the “Knowledge Centre” in some doubt. The management of such a centre has financial and human resource implications. The content of the inventory of IEs and CL interventions will need updating, revision and maintenance. To remain current and relevant, further review papers will be necessary over time. There is no formal plan for this process, still less an assured financial commitment.
71. The field-based IEs are at a preliminary stage. Two baseline data sets have been collected and analysed, but the complex process of conducting and analysing the IEs of the effects of the interventions is at an early stage. Efforts have been made to secure funding through the interventions themselves, whilst UCW has a limited commitment to provide technical support for a few months. There is a danger that the IEs will be conducted at a time when it is too early to see impacts, simply to take advantage of UCW’s support. This could be counter-productive, since the countries concerned may conclude that IEs require substantial efforts but produce no results in addition to those, which could be obtained through conventional evaluation methods. The absence of a comprehensive sustainability plan for the IEs (at least in El Salvador and Ghana) is an omission, which should be urgently rectified.
72. The modular approaches, which show considerable promise to generate evidence in a cost-effective manner, have also been “squeezed” by the belated project extension, to such an extent that some potential partnerships have been dropped. At the moment, there is no clear plan (or resources) to continue with this work, which has produced draft reports on two projects within the closing months of the project. This has not allowed time for either the results or reflections on the methods to be digested, analysed and built upon.
73. IPEC is continuously refining its approaches to evaluation, including IE and has projects with overlapping approaches to those of the IE project (notably GEM). However, discussions with EIA team members engaged in other IE activities indicated that the sharing of knowledge and experiences between these and the project under evaluation has not been effective. This emphasises the need for a specific plan (or set of options) to ensure sustainability of the knowledge gained through the project..

### 6.5.2 Conclusion

74. Measures taken to ensure sustainability of the benefits of the project are *weak*. There are no definite plans to sustain and build upon the Knowledge Centre; the process of developing modular approaches to CL IE is coming to an end just as its first results are emerging; and the implementation of field-based RCTs or quasi-experimental IEs has no clear structure for continuing technical and managerial support for a timescale sufficient to allow impacts to emerge. Whilst it can be anticipated that IPEC EIA will build upon what it interprets as the key gains made by the IE

---

<sup>24</sup> The OECD-DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management defines sustainability as “The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time”.

project, particularly through similar activities such as the GEM project and its continuing work on CMES, this does not amount to a clear sustainability strategy.

## **7. Good practices**

75. The project has exemplified a number of good practices, which feed into the lessons learned.

### **7.1 Use of Existing Evidence**

76. The project has been innovative in bringing together, analysing and reviewing a substantial body of existing evidence on the impact of child labour. This is an important step, which needs to be made sustainable and built upon.

### **7.2 Collaboration**

77. In keeping with the Inter-Agency nature of the executing body, UCW, the project has been able to develop and utilise partnerships with different parts of the World Bank system, FAO and other bodies. . As an example of this process, for FAO, the April 2013 Project TPR (P5) specifies that “A draft agreement of collaboration has been prepared and is currently being finalized. UCW will provide financial support to FAO to mainstream child labour outcomes in the IE of the SCT, including in the design of the impact evaluations and the inclusion of child labour questions in the baseline and follow-up questionnaire. It was agreed that the IE report prepared by the PtoP project will include the analysis of the impact of the SCT on child labour carried out by the UCW programme”. In the case of potential collaboration with the World Bank DIME, the same TPR notes (P5): “intention to collaborate was established with DIME to conduct a comprehensive and systematic mapping of the DIME IEs of projects with a possible bearing on child labour. However, it was not possible to formalize the collaboration due to the late project extension and revision”.
78. The pursuit of appropriate collaboration has given access to a broad range of existing evidence and access to planned and current IEs, with relevance to CL. This has been a major contribution to the results of the project.

### **7.3 Detailed Information Sharing and Discussions at Country Level**

79. The project has devoted considerable time and effort to discussion of IE with potential collaborating countries. This has included national and local politicians and public servants and with technical staff implementing projects. This has enabled countries to make informed decisions concerning the type of IE they will support, even where these decisions have not been as hoped for by the project team. This represents an example of good practice with respect to enabling country ownership of development processes.

### **7.4 Partnership Based on Complementarity**

80. IPEC and UCW have worked through a partnership based on their complementary strengths. UCW has inter-agency networks, particularly with the World Bank, which enabled it to make an additional contribution to the work of IPEC. IPEC brought a strong and evolving approach to impact assessment and evaluation, located within the broader evaluation framework provided by the ILO Evaluation Department, through its connections to UNEG and the broader development evaluation community.



## 8. Lessons learned

### 8.1 Introduction

81. It is rare that projects produce lessons, which have not been expressed before, often many times. In this sense, it is usually the case that the lessons are already available, but have yet to be widely applied. Many of the lessons from the current project are of this nature and may therefore appear somewhat generic. Nevertheless, since they arise from this specific project, it is appropriate to state them.

### 8.2 Lessons on Project Design

82. *Project design should delineate a set of tasks and their results, which can be delivered with the time and resources available.* In the current project design, “the evidence base on CL program impact” was expected to be extended, even though the IEs, which were an important component of that process, would not be conducted during the project. The project was “envisaged as a two-stage research effort” (Project Document P1), but resources were not set aside to implement that approach, presumably because of procurement regulations. This led to a project design, which could not generate the necessary outcome to meet Project Objective 1 as stated.
83. *Project design for a research activity should not specify what its results will be,* since this may compromise the research. In this case, for example, the Project Document states that the “impact evaluations to be supported through the project will provide evidence concerning not only whether specific child labour program interventions work, but also on how they work and on their relevance for broader replication” (P1). The capacity of RCTs to deliver on all of those dimensions is highly debated and the evidence of the project RCTs, one way or the other, could only be expected to modestly contribute to the debate, rather than to provide the conclusive evidence envisaged by the project design.
84. *A project design which states or implies activities for which no resources are provided is likely to promote unrealistic expectations.* The Project Document provides numerous references to other activities and products in the field of IE, particularly of IPEC; such as the Strategic Programme Impact Framework, tracer studies methodology, other focus group and rapid assessment methodologies. It states that: “Synergies and complementarities with the work of IPEC on impact assessment will be identified and incorporated throughout this project”. However, there is no project component for such activities, which are time consuming. This design weakness underlies a number of tensions evident in the project as implemented; with UCW wishing to focus on those activities and deliverables specified and resourced under the project components and IPEC EIA expecting a more broadly collaborative relationship to be developed.
85. *The Changing International Development Landscape will require new ways of operating.* IPEC formerly received an earmarked allocation of funds specified by the US Congress through USDOL. This gave it some room to develop programmatic approaches and long-term relationships, including in the field of evaluation. That system is no more and IPEC-EIA is now one of several potential partners for USDOL in the area of evaluation of CL activities, as determined in each individual case by the results of bidding processes. Principles of procurement transparency make the concept of long-standing partnerships at best marginal. In future, therefore, it would be appropriate to specify in proposals for work with USDOL (and other donors operating similar systems) what level of information sharing will be undertaken between the project and stakeholders outside of its boundaries and to specify this work as a set of activities, for which resources are provided.

### 8.3 Lessons on Impact Evaluation

- IE of Child Labour Should be Appropriately Located In Broader International Development Evaluation.
86. There has been an underlying tension in the project between seeking new knowledge on IE methodologies and attempting to understand child labour interventions. Although the Project Document refers in passing to the broader discussion in international development on Impact Evaluation, it does not firmly locate the efforts of the project within that discussion. Thus many of the potential “lessons,” which appear to be emerging from the project are simply confirmation of generic aspects of RCTs, which by definition apply in the field of CL. For example, some of the characteristics of RCTs that have been established in the debate in development evaluation circles include that they are: expensive, time consuming, potentially unacceptable to countries or institutions, demanding of high level econometric expertise which may not be available, better suited for single strand than multi-strand interventions (unless the multi-strands are approached as a set of individual strands) and stronger on internal than external validity. Discovering that such attributes apply to RCTs of CL interventions is therefore not an *increase* in knowledge on impact evaluation methods in the area of child labour, but simply confirmation that the basic attributes of econometric-based IE methodology are not sector specific.
87. The implication of this lesson concerns the sequencing of project activities, which could be applied for future projects. Rather than the sequence of the current project, which “bundled” exploration of IE methods with exploration of CL impacts, it is suggested that any future projects could separate these out. The sequence would therefore be: 1) describe “state of the art” approaches on IE methods in international development<sup>25</sup>; 2) assess specific features of CL interventions, (if any) which may require modification of generic approaches; 3) pilot CL-modified approaches (if needed) in specific programme of CL project IEs; 4) mainstream as appropriate broader application of IE to CL interventions. Such an approach would fall within the overall process of Evaluability Assessment promoted by IPEC.

### 8.4 Use of RCTs and Quasi-Experimental Field Designs

- RCTS and QE Impact Evaluations need to be purposefully targeted.
88. In view of the high costs and specific expertise requirements of these methods, it would be appropriate to determine in advance those types of interventions, for which they are most suitable, then to shortlist imminent projects that might fit and explore their specific suitability, including in terms of country ownership. The current IE project had to make substantial and time-consuming efforts to find potential host interventions, before it could start its evaluation activities. This work would in part correspond to the concept of an “evaluability framework,” which was removed from the project in the first revision and belatedly reinstated in the second.

### 8.5 Cost Effective Evidence

- There is good scope for further reanalysis of existing data and for inclusion of CL modules in related IEs.
89. Both the inventories of CL activities and of IEs relevant to CL produced valuable information at low cost. Some review work of this material has also been conducted. There appears to be more

---

<sup>25</sup> There is now a substantial body of authoritative documents on the issues involved, so that this is not a major task.

scope for focussed use of existing data and reports. Similarly, the insertion of CL modules into other relevant IEs has begun to produce results and could be replicated or increased in future.

## **8.6 Country Ownership**

90. *Country ownership should be sought for the principle and practice of IE, rather than for a specific methodology.* National Governments or their institutions may not encompass RCTs, either generally or in specific cases. IPEC should therefore ensure that the message conveyed to countries does not specify or imply that one method of IE is the best, while others are less valid or valuable; but should present a broad range of methods, which can be used in combination to best fit particular situations.

## 9. Recommendations

91. **Recommendation 1:** IPEC (EIA) and UCW should develop a formal collaboration agreement, which will establish the principles and potential modes of such collaboration, taking into account the increasing international emphasis on competitive bidding. The agreement would also consider approaches to broadening the potential range of funding sources for both bodies; through such means as the creation of a Trust Fund for research and evaluation of CL interventions and/or the possibility of creating a CL “window” in larger IE programmes, such as 3IE.
92. **Recommendation 2:** Future collaboration between IPEC EIA and UCW (and other partners) should have clearly established and specific procedures and associated resource allocations for management, administration, technical cooperation, reporting and financial transparency.
93. **Recommendation 3:** IPEC EIA should ensure that its project designs are accurately calibrated to (potentially) available resources, so that all immediate objectives are in principle attainable. Where substantial collaboration is expected among EIA projects, due account should be taken of the resource requirements of this activity.
94. **Recommendation 4:** IPEC EIA and ILO EVAL should formally review the IPEC work on impact assessment, evaluation of impact and impact evaluation (including the use of terminologies), to ensure consistency of approaches or, where necessary, to justify differences of approach or emphasis between IPEC and EVAL. IPEC, in collaboration with EVAL, should ensure that its approaches and terminology are appropriately located in relation to broader international evaluation discussions. EVAL should consider how best to incorporate the IPEC work into its guidance documents for ILO as a whole.

## **Annex 1. Persons contacted**

### **Rome 14<sup>th</sup> May**

- Furio Rosati, UCW
- Gabriella Breglia, UCW
- Jacob de Hoop, UCW
- Scott Lyon, UCW

### **Geneva 15<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> May**

- Alex Soho, Desk Officer for the Ghana CCP project
- Claudia Ibarguen Tinley, EIA-IPEC, Project Director, Global Evaluation and Monitoring Project
- Constance Thomas, IPEC Director
- Guy Thijs, Director ILO Evaluation Unit
- Keith Jeddere-Fisher, Evaluation Officer, EIA-IPEC – providing support to the IE in Thailand and Evaluation Manager
- Lars Johansen, IPEC, Desk Officer for the El Salvador project
- Mary Read, Head, IPEC, USDOL focal point
- Peter Wichmand, Head, EIA-IPEC
- Ricardo Furman, Evaluation Officer, EIA-IPEC – providing support to the IEs in El Salvador and Ghana
- Wahidur Rahman, IPEC, Desk Officer for the Thailand shrimp project
- Yacouba Diallo, SIMPOC/ILO

### **Contacts by Phone/Skype**

#### *USDOL*

M&E Officer, M&E division

#### *El Salvador ILO/IPEC Project (Translation by Maria Salazar (EIA))*

Jesus de La Pena, CTA

William Lazaro, M&E officer

## Annex 2. Terms of Reference of the final evaluation



### **International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour ILO/IPEC**

### **Terms of Reference**

**Revised Final:**  
21.05.2013

### **Independent Evaluation of the project on Impact Evaluation of Child Labour Interventions**

ILO Project Code	GLO/08/58/USA
ILO Project name	Building the knowledge base on the design and implementation of impact evaluation of child labour interventions (UCW Project)
ILO Project Number	340.08.901.058
ILO Iris Code	101452
Country	Global
Duration	44 months
Starting Date	30 September 2008
Ending Date	31 May 2013
Type of evaluation	Final
Project Language	English/French/Spanish
Executing Agency	ILO/IPEC and Understanding Children's Work (UCW) Project
Financing Agency	USDOL
Donor contribution	USD 1,500,000

## List of Abbreviations

<b>3ies</b>	International Initiative for Impact Evaluation
<b>AEA</b>	American Evaluation Association
<b>AP</b>	Action Programme
<b>C182</b>	ILO's Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention, No. 182 of 1999
<b>CL</b>	Child Labour
<b>CMES</b>	Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation System
<b>DED</b>	ILO/IPEC's Design, Evaluation and Documentation section (now EIA)
<b>DWCP</b>	Decent Work Country Programmes
<b>EIA</b>	ILO/IPEC's Evaluation and Impact Assessment section
<b>EVAL</b>	The ILO Evaluation Department
<b>HQ</b>	Headquarters
<b>IAF</b>	Impact Assessment Framework Project
<b>ILO</b>	International Labour Organization
<b>IO</b>	Immediate Objective
<b>IOCE</b>	International Organization for Cooperation in Evaluation
<b>IPEC</b>	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
<b>ITC</b>	International Training Centre
<b>NAP</b>	National Action Plan
<b>SIMPOC</b>	Statistical Information and Monitoring Programme on Child Labour
<b>SPIF</b>	Strategic Programme Impact Framework
<b>TBP</b>	Time Bound Programme
<b>UCW</b>	Understanding Children's Work
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children's Fund
<b>UNDAF</b>	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
<b>USDOL</b>	United States Department of Labor
<b>WFCL</b>	Worst Forms of Child Labour

## I. Background and Justification

### ILO-IPEC

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. 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 of ILO/IPEC's support to national programmes should be analysed. For further information please see : <http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/decent-work-agenda/lang--en/index.htm>
3. The operational strategy of IPEC has, over the years, focused on providing support to national and local constituents and partners through their project and activities. Such support has to be, to the extent possible, provided in the 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 frameworks or programmes have provided such focus.
4. Over the last years, ILO/IPEC's role has been gradually changing. It moved from direct implementation to facilitation and provision of policy/technical advisory services to countries in formulating concrete policies and programmes in pursuit the two Child labour Conventions objectives.
5. While the scope of IPEC interventions has broadened, a new strategic framework has been developed to enhance the multiplier effects and synergies in order to increase the impact of the supported activities. As the impact of IPEC is increasingly at an upstream level, for example through the support provided to member states on interventions associated with the Time-Bound Programme (TBP) approach, there is an increased focus on indirect impact and, consequently, a need to provide tools with which to measure such impact. In addition, the global action plan formulated in the Global Report on Child Labour 2006 calls for the development and support to the application of methodologies to measure the child labour impact of interventions and policies with a view to identifying those with more effective and more rapid results.
6. Achievements of IPEC should be measured and assessed according to the changes generated in the lives of the children and families, both as a result of the enabling environment and as a result of targeted interventions.



## Impact Assessment in ILO-IPEC

7. Since 2000, a strategic area of work for IPEC has centred on developing approaches to impact assessment. Impact assessment is a key area that enhances the capacity of IPEC and partners to implement child labour activities and build the knowledge base on which interventions work, how and why (which ones have an impact). The centrality of impact assessment should be viewed in the context of ILO-IPEC's target of 2016 for eliminating the worst forms of child labour set in the second Global Report of 2006. With three years remaining, it is imperative to substantially upscale and accelerate action. This requires properly identifying what are the most suitable and sustainable strategies. This is where the work of evaluation and impact assessment continues to be crucial. A number of global projects have provided the resources for this work.
8. In January 2002, the Design, Evaluation and Documentation (DED)<sup>26</sup> unit of IPEC convened an informal expert meeting in Geneva. The meeting centred on how to integrate a theory of change approach to the work of IPEC and the potential development of new methodologies that could support learning on the longer term impacts on children and families of child labour interventions.
9. The 2002 meeting identified three key principles to guide the planning and implementation of impact assessments; that impact assessments should be practical, credible and, above all, useful. Impact assessment methodologies, it was concluded, needed to be able to demonstrate what had been accomplished whilst providing evidence of what remained to be done. A concrete result of the meeting was the decision to develop a framework to capture and analyse the theory of change of a project or programme. The Strategic Programme Impact Framework (SPIF), produced as a result, is an instrument that has been used extensively to facilitate strategic planning and illustrate the expected paths of change from an intervention or set of interventions.
10. During ILO-IPEC's development of the Time Bound Programme (TBP) approach and concept, DED commissioned a paper, "A Guide to Assessing the Impact of Time Bound Programmes."<sup>27</sup> The paper introduced impact assessment in the context of a TBP as an exercise looking at the "big picture", the overall contribution of a broad array of interventions on the ultimate goal, the elimination of child labour. It identified the importance of also thinking about the ultimate benefits of "indirect" strategies (for example policy development, capacity building, institutional development, coordination, and awareness raising).<sup>28</sup>
11. Towards the end of 2002 DED embarked on its first "impact" project: "Measuring Longer Term Impact on Children and Families through Tracer / Tracking Methodologies." The aim of the tracer methodology was to develop an instrument that could be used in providing evidence of impact on children and families that had been part of an ILO-IPEC intervention. The approach centred on gathering of data at one point in time *after* a specific intervention had finished. The tracking methodology presented a systematic approach for following a specific sample of participants through repeated enquiry over a period of time. A Final Review Meeting of the Tracer methodology took place in Geneva in December 1-2, 2004. The lessons from the pilot tracer studies were explored and adjustments to the methodology agreed. A Synthesis Report from the five pilot studies provided an overview of the main findings.

---

<sup>26</sup> In 2012 DED was renamed as the Evaluation and Impact Assessment (EIA) section. DED is used in these ToRs where it is correct in a historical context, otherwise EIA is used.

<sup>27</sup> Burt Perrin, "A Guide to Assessing the Impact of Time-Bound Programmes" Paper V-2 of TBP MAP Kit, 2003.

<sup>28</sup> A paper produced shortly after the one prepared for the TBP was: Burt Perrin, "How to Plan and Carry out Impact Assessments of Child Labour Interventions" DED 2004.

12. In 2006 IPEC's Global Action Plan, formulated in the Global Report on Child Labour, called for the development of and support to the application of methodologies that measure the impact of child labour interventions and policies. The purpose is to improve the identification of those interventions with effective and rapid results.
13. That same year, IPEC embarked on a new 5 year project; "Impact Assessment Framework Project, Follow-Up to Tracer and Tacking Methodologies." The project built on the work accomplished earlier, for example, by using the adjusted Tracer methodology for six additional Tracer Studies. The project recognised the opportunity to set the foundation, with a longer term perspective, on the type of technical assistance and support it would offer governments and other partners on impact assessment. To be better positioned to offer this technical support the project embarked on the development of other specific tools and methods (to be eventually integrated into an "impact assessment toolkit") such as the "guidelines for assessing indirect impact of policy development, institutional building, legislative support and awareness raising."
14. It was recognised that the impact methods, developed up until then, were limited in their capacity of establishing unqualified causality between observed impact and an intervention. Conceptually this had been managed through the idea of "plausible attribution."<sup>29</sup> At the end of 2008, ILO-IPEC initiated a new project with funding from the United States Department of Labor (USDOL): "Building the knowledge base on the design and implementation of impact evaluation of child labour interventions". Implemented by the inter-agency, Understanding Children's Work (UCW) Programme, this project foresaw the design and implementation of pilot impact evaluations in selected child labour elimination projects. It was expected that these impact evaluations would overcome through statistical counterfactual analysis the issue of attribution.
15. An expert meeting was held in June 2011 to review the approaches of ILO/IPEC on impact assessment on the context of the above two projects. This expert meeting was also utilised as a significant input in the mid-term evaluation of the 2008 project.
16. The 2008 project; "Building the knowledge base on the design and implementation of impact evaluation of child labour interventions." is the scope of this evaluation and is described in more detail below.

## **Background to the project**

17. This project is oriented to produce statically-robust empirical evidence relating to the impact of policies and programs on child labour to identify the factors behind success, through combining methodological development, targeted field research, capacity building and research dissemination.
18. The project is developing, with local partners, impact evaluations (i.e. experimental or quasi experimental approach) to provide evidence concerning not only whether specific child labour program interventions work, but also on how they work and on their relevance for broader replication. The evaluations will provide answers concerning what impact specific interventions have on a set of child labour- and education-related outcomes under what specific conditions. Where possible, the project will also look at costs, in order to compare the relative efficiency of various interventions.

---

<sup>29</sup> The expert meeting in 2002 had concluded that one should aim to demonstrate a reasonable attribution or credible association between CL interventions and the impact that was observed. The paper on "How to Plan and Carry out Impact Assessments of Child Labour Interventions offered guidance on how to do this in practice.

19. The evaluations should complement qualitative information generated by ILO-IPEC through the development of Strategic Programme Impact Frameworks (SPIF), use of qualitative techniques and tracer studies.
20. The current project covers the first of what is envisaged as a two-stage research effort. This current stage focuses on evaluation design and initial data collection for three selected CL-related program interventions, while the second stage (beyond the scope of the current project) will involve follow-up data collection for the three selected program interventions, allowing for a comprehensive evaluation of both short- and longer-term impact.
21. The project is part of the broader UCW strategy of using research to mobilize and inform action against child labour. The project is structured around the following development and immediate objectives.
22. The project development objective is: *To contribute to the progressive elimination of child labor by improving understanding of the effectiveness of programs addressing CL.*
23. The project's Immediate Objectives are:
  1. *By the end of the project, the evidence base on CL program impact will be extended through initial data collection for comprehensive CL impact evaluations and through modular impact evaluations.*
  2. *By the end of the project, capacity in CL impact evaluation will be strengthened through development of replicable impact evaluation protocols and targeted training; and*
  3. *By the end of the project, access to information on impact evaluation methods/results in the area of child labour will be increased through the establishment of a web-based knowledge center.*
24. The project comprises 5 components:
  - a. *Inventory and review of CL programs, type of interventions, impact evaluations and possible methodologies;*

This project component consists of an inventory of both CL programs and CL impact evaluations. The inventory exercise consist of cataloguing and categorizing current program interventions against child labor supported by ILO/IPEC, other USDOL grantees and other major actors in the area of child labor, in order to identify a typology of program interventions. As such, the review helps informing the selection of CL program interventions for the project components Initial data collection for CL impact evaluations and Modular CL impact evaluations. The outputs of the inventory exercise also serves as a starting point for the web-based knowledge center on CL programs and IE.

- b. *Initial data collection for child labor impact evaluations;*

This core component of the project involves initial implementation of impact evaluations of programs directly addressing child labor. It constitutes the first of an envisaged two-stage research effort, and focuses on impact evaluation design and initial design and data collection. The second stage of the evaluation process, beyond the scope of the current project, would focus on follow-up data collection for the programs included in this evaluation exercise, allowing for a comprehensive evaluation of both short- and longer-term program intervention impacts. Three

ILO-IPEC projects have been selected for inclusion in the evaluation exercise, one in El Salvador, one in Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana and one in Thailand.

*c. Modular child labor impact evaluations;*

This project component supports integrating child labor modules into planned impact evaluation by other organizations on programs in relevant policy areas. Technical support is provided through this project component to adding questions or modules on child labor to planned impact evaluations with a bearing on child labor. This component also supports the analysis of datasets of already-completed IEs containing CL data that have not yet been analyzed.

*d. Capacity building on CL-related impact evaluation for further impact evaluation;*

This project component involves training to project staff charged with the design and implementation of the projects targeted in the impact evaluation exercise described above (see component b) as well as to other groups involved in the CL-relating programming.

*e. Dissemination and technical support of methodologies and data collection on impact evaluations on child labor (through web-based knowledge center and other activities).*

Building on the inventory exercise, this component consolidates and provides access to state of the art information in the areas of CL programming and CL impact evaluation through establishment of a web-based knowledge centre.

25. The project is managed under a Project Coordinating Committee made up of USDOL, ILO/IPEC and the UCW Secretariat to provide strategic oversight and guidance in the implementation of the project. Moreover, a Technical Advisory Group made up of agency and external experts was created to contribute with specialised technical inputs as required.
26. A first project revision reduced activities relating to component d above (training workshops on impact evaluation) and removed the activity to develop an evaluability framework (part of component a) so that there would be more resources available for supporting child labour Impact Evaluations in IPEC projects (component b).
27. A second project revision extended the project to May 2013. This enabled the reintroduction of the work on the evaluability framework as an identified follow-up resulting from the mid-term evaluation. It also enabled the project to carry out additional modular impact evaluations and to organize related dissemination events.
28. The mid-term evaluation was carried out in June 2011 and this concluded that the project was generally on track to achieve its identified outputs and recommended that it should maintain its current strategy. Recommendations included immediately looking for funding support in order to complete IEs started by the project, to look for ways to support the original objective of the evaluability framework and the expansion of the Knowledge Centre.

## **Background to the evaluation**

29. As per ILO evaluation policy and procedures all programmes and projects with a budget over USD 1 million have to be evaluated by an independent party. An evaluation focusing on the strategic achievements and experience can form the basis for discussion on further action in this area of work.

30. The management of IPEC evaluations is carried out by the Evaluation and Impact Assessment (EIA) section of ILO/IPEC. The ILO Evaluation Unit(EVAL) has granted decentralised authority to EIA for IPEC project evaluations based on the capacity, expertise and demonstrated independence that EIA has developed over the years. Since this project is executed by EIA, a different evaluation management structure to normal has been put in place, with the Evaluation Manager<sup>30</sup> reporting to the Director of EVAL and not to the Head of EIA.
31. Evaluation for the purpose of learning and planning and building knowledge is an essential part of ILO/IPEC approach. It contributes to building the knowledge base on action against CL and the capacity for using such knowledge. This is particularly so for global strategic programmes such as this one.
32. The mid-term evaluation of the project was carried out in June 2011 in combination with the final evaluation of the Impact Assessment Framework project (GLO/06/51/USA). These evaluations were combined due to the complementarity of the theme and approaches between the two projects and the resulting synergy between them.

## II. Purpose and Scope

### Purposes

33. The purposes of this final evaluation are:

1. Assess the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives and identify the supporting factors and constraints that have led to this level of achievement.
2. Identify unintended changes, both positive and negative at outcome and impact levels, in addition to the expected results.
3. Assess the relevance of the sustainability strategy, its progress and its potential for achievement.
4. Provide recommendations on how to strengthen the strategy of UCW and ILO-IPEC on Impact Evaluation as part of Impact Assessment.
5. Identify and document lessons learned and good practice to be used further in child labour projects and programmes, in particular in projects and initiatives on developing, implementing and supporting impact assessment, impact evaluation and related work.
6. Assess how the work of the project on impact evaluation has contributed to the broader work of USDOL and ILO-IPEC in this area and beyond to encourage further work and involvement by others partners on IE of child labour interventions.

### Scope

34. The evaluation will look at all activities and results implemented from September 2008 to the date of the evaluation.
35. The evaluation should look at the programme as a whole, including issues of initial project design, implementation, lessons learnt and degree of replicability for current and future programmes.
36. The analytical scope should include identifying levels of achievement of objectives and explaining how and why they have been attained. The purpose is to help the stakeholders to learn from the on-going experience and for the findings to feed into reflection on further strategic work in this area.

<sup>30</sup> The Evaluation Manager has not been significantly involved in project implementation.

### III. Suggested Aspects to Address

37. The evaluation should be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Framework and Strategy; the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluations; the specific ILO/IPEC Guidelines and Notes; the UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards, Ethical Guidelines, Code of Conduct; and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard.
38. The evaluation will address the overall ILO evaluation concerns of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability to the extent possible as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation: Principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations, January 2012 [http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_168289/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_168289/lang--en/index.htm)
39. Gender concerns should be addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: “Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects” [http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165986/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm) All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the evaluation process.
40. 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.
41. 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 the Evaluation Manager. 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.
42. The main categories that need to be addressed are the following:
  - Design.
  - Effectiveness of the project (Implementation process and achievement of objectives).
  - Relevance of the project.
  - Sustainability.
  - Special Aspects to be Addressed.

### IV. Expected Outputs of the Evaluation

43. The expected outputs to be delivered by the evaluation team are:
  - 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 consider the points defined in the EIA Inception report outline.
  - Draft evaluation report.

- Final evaluation report including:
    - 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.
    - Lessons learnt.
    - Potential good practices.
    - Appropriate Annexes including present TORs and a list of those consulted by the evaluation.
44. The total length of the report should be 20 - 30 pages for the main report, excluding annexes; additional annexes can provide background and details on specific components of the project evaluated. The report should be sent as one complete document and the file size should not exceed 3 megabytes. Photos, if appropriate to be included, should be inserted using lower resolution to keep overall file size low.
45. All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided both in paper copy and in electronic version compatible for Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with ILO-IPEC and the consultants. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of ILO-IPEC. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.
46. The draft final report will be circulated to key stakeholders for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the Evaluation Manager and provided to the evaluator. In preparing the final report the evaluator should consider these comments, incorporate as appropriate, and provide a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated.

## V. Evaluation Methodology

47. In ILO/IPEC, evaluations of its projects are carried out to enhance organisational learning. As per IPEC procedures, a participatory consultation process on the nature and specific purposes of this evaluation was carried out prior to the scheduled date of the evaluation. Inputs were received from key stakeholders including constituents and implementing agencies. Based on inputs from a number of stakeholders the ToRs were finalised and circulated under the title 'Final 07.05.2013'. That was the version that was available to the evaluation consultant during his information collection and that guides his analysis. Further important comments were received from a stakeholder on that version and the present Terms of Reference ('Revised Final 21.05.2013') was developed. The evaluation consultant was provided this version 'for information' during the report writing period. The main changes are to the section on the management of the evaluation.
48. The following is the proposed evaluation methodology. While the evaluator can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with the Evaluation Manager and approved by EVAL, 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.

49. The evaluation will be carried out using a desk review of appropriate materials, including the project documents, progress reports, and other outputs of the programme, results of any internal planning process and relevant materials from secondary sources. At the end of the desk review period, it is expected that the evaluation consultant will prepare a brief document (i.e. inception report) indicating the methodological approach to the evaluation in the form of the evaluation instrument, to be discussed and approved by the Evaluation Manager.
50. Interviews with the donor representatives and ILO HQ and backstopping officials, and programme officers will be carried through face-to-face interviews or conference calls during the evaluation process.
51. The evaluator will undertake a visit to ILO HQ in Geneva and to the UCW office in Rome and will also have phone contact with other partners and implementing agents in the intervention countries.
52. The evaluator will be responsible for drafting and finalizing the evaluation report, including incorporating feedback from stakeholders to the draft report.
53. The Director of EVAL will provide oversight of the evaluation process. The Evaluation Manager will provide technical and administrative support and in consultation with EVAL, be responsible for consolidating the comments of stakeholders and submitting them to the evaluator.
54. It is expected that the evaluator will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct and follow the UN evaluation standards and norms.
55. The evaluator responsibilities and profile:

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desk review of programme documents</li> <li>• Development of the evaluation instrument/ Inception report</li> <li>• Briefing with the Evaluation Manager</li> <li>• Interviews with IPEC HQ, UCW, donor, projects, consultants and others (by phone if appropriate)</li> <li>• Draft evaluation report</li> <li>• Finalize evaluation report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No prior active involvement in the project implementation</li> <li>• Significant expertise on approaches to impact evaluation and impact assessment.</li> <li>• Experience with strategic focused, comparative reviews of work on impact evaluation and similar</li> <li>• Familiarity with the ILO and IPEC approach to evaluation and impact assessment in the child labour thematic area is highly appreciated</li> <li>• Relevant background in social and/or economic development.</li> <li>• Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development and projects, in particular with policy level work, institutional building and local development projects.</li> <li>• Experience in evaluations in the UN system or other international context as team leader.</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 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 essential, working knowledge of French and/or Spanish appreciated.</li> </ul>



## Evaluation Timetable and Schedule

56. The total duration of the evaluation process including submission of the final report should be within one month from the end of the field mission.

57. The timetable is as follows:

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	No of days
I	Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of EIA/IPEC briefing material</li> <li>Desk Review of programme related documents</li> </ul>	5
II	Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visits to IPEC HQ, Geneva</li> <li>Visit to UCW Rome</li> <li>Interviews with partner projects/organisations and other stakeholders</li> </ul>	8
III	Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft report based on desk review, interviews and validated findings</li> <li>Debriefing as required</li> </ul>	5
IV	Evaluation Manager	<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
V	Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included</li> </ul>	2
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>20</b>

58. Summary schedule

Phase	Duration	Dates
I	5 days	1 – 7 May
II	8 days	10 - 18 May
III	5 days	20 - 24 May
IV	1 week	
V	2 days	By 31 May

59. Sources of Information and Consultations/Meetings

Available at HQ and to be supplied by EIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects document</li> <li>Project revision request forms</li> <li>Mid-term evaluation report</li> <li>EIA Guidelines and ILO guidelines</li> <li>Consultancy reports</li> </ul>
Available in UCW and to be supplied by UCW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical Progress Reports</li> <li>Consultancies reports</li> <li>Relevant publications</li> </ul>

60. Consultations with:

- Projects management, staff (ILO HQ and UCW).
- Project CTAs and M&E Officers of partner projects (El Salvador, Ghana and Thailand).
- Consultants that have worked and/or are working with the projects.
- ILO/HQ and regional/country level program officer and programme heads.
- Partner agencies in pilot countries that implemented projects' outputs (i.e. studies).

- Other stakeholders involved in the work such as partners in the components of the project, Government stakeholders, possibly some policy makers etc.
- USDOL M&E Unit.
- ILO Evaluation Department.

### **Final Report Submission Procedure**

61. The following procedure is used:

- The evaluator will submit a draft report to the Evaluation Manager who will review this for consistency with the evaluation ToRs in consultation with ILO/EVAL and if necessary request further work on the draft.
- The Evaluation Manager will forward a copy of the draft report to key stakeholders for comments on factual issues and for clarifications.
- The Evaluation Manager will consolidate the comments and send these to the evaluator by date agreed between the Evaluation Manager and the evaluator or as soon as the comments are received from stakeholders.
- The final report is submitted to the Evaluation Manager who, after clearance from EVAL, will then officially forward it to stakeholders, including the donor.

## **VI. Resources and Management**

### **Resources**

62. The resources required for this evaluation are:

- Fees for an international consultant for 20 work days.
- Fees for local DSA in Geneva and Rome (6 days).
- Travel from consultant's home residence to Geneva and Rome in line with ILO regulations and rules.

63. A detailed budget for internal management purpose is available separately.

### **Management**

64. The evaluation will be managed by an Evaluation Officer that has not been significantly involved in the project – the Evaluation Manager. Any technical and methodological matters with EIA will be discussed with him, should issues arise.
65. The director of EVAL will provide oversight of the evaluation process and the Evaluation Manager will consult with him at all key steps. At all stages in the process the Evaluation Manager will keep EVAL informed on progress and will discuss any issues that arise directly with EVAL.
66. IPEC will be responsible for providing administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission.

## **Annex I: Suggested Aspects to Address**

### **1. Design**

- Determine the validity of the project design, in particular whether it assisted or hindered the achievement of the project goals as set out in the Project Document and project revisions.
- Assess whether the project design was logical and coherent:
  - Were the objectives of the project clear, realistic and likely to be achieved within the established time schedule and with the allocated resources (including human resources)?
  - Were the linkages between inputs, activities, outputs and objectives clear and logical?
  - Was there a need to adjust the design and were any changes made?
  - How relevant are programme indicators and means of verification? Please assess the usefulness of the indicators for monitoring and measuring outcomes.
  - Assess how logical and realistic was the time frame for project implementation and the sequencing of project activities?
  - Were the expectations of the roles, capacity and commitment of stakeholders realistic and likely to be achieved?
- To what extent have key external factors been identified and assumptions formulated in the Project document? Have the identified assumptions on which the project was based proven to be true? Assess the impact of any external factors (expected and unexpected).
- Assess whether the problems and needs were adequately analysed and determine whether the needs, constraints, resources and access to project services of the different beneficiaries were clearly identified taking gender issues into concern.
- How have gender issues been taken into account in the project design in its components and outcomes?
- How has the strategy for sustainability of project results been defined at the design stage of the project?
- How does the project design fit within and complement existing or previous initiatives on impact evaluation, both within UCW, ILO-IPEC and USDOL as well as broader initiatives?

### **2. Achievements of objectives**

- Examine the preparatory outputs of the delivery process in terms of effectiveness of preparation for project implementation.
- Assess the level of achievement of the immediate objectives.
- How has the project responded to positive and negative factors (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?
- Assess the programme's gender mainstreaming activities.
- Identify projects and policies that have been influenced by the project and assess the effect.
- Discuss the relevance and use of the knowledge centre, considering other available knowledge centres beyond IPEC and UCW.

- Have resources been used efficiently? Has the implementation of activities been cost-effective? Will the results achieved justify the costs? Could the same results have been attained with fewer resources?
- Identify challenges to implementation of the project, including challenges in communications and collaboration between ILO/IPEC, UCW and USDOL.
- Assess the quality and extent of dissemination (i.e. utility) of project outputs with relevant stakeholders.

### **3. Relevance of the Project**

- Examine whether the programme responded to the real needs of the beneficiaries and stakeholders.
- Assess validity of the programme approach and strategies and its potential to be replicated.
- Assess whether the needs and demands that gave rise to the programme still exists or have changed.
- Assess the technical and operational capacity of the project to respond to IPEC needs in terms of impact assessment?
- How relevant are the selected pilot projects to present good cases that could identify learning about impact of child labour interventions?
- How does the work fit with the broader strategy on impact analysis with UCW project, ILO-IPEC and USDOL?
- What is the strategic fit with broader initiatives and approaches on impact evaluation, in particular for child labour but also impact evaluation in other areas?

### **4. Sustainability**

- Assess to what extent a phase out strategy was defined, planned and if steps have been taken to ensure sustainability. Assess whether these strategies had been articulated/explained to stakeholders.
- Assess what contributions the programme has made in strengthening the capacity and knowledge of partners and to encourage ownership of the programme to partners.
- Assess programme success in leveraging resources, networks and linkages for ongoing and continuing efforts in CL impact evaluation and application for learning and management of CL initiatives and beyond.

### **5. Special aspects to address**

- How has the project influenced SIMPOC and what is the potential for further complementarity or integration with the work of SIMPOC?
- How effective has the programme been at stimulating interest and participation in the programme at the national and international level?
- How can IPEC (EIA and SIMPOC) and UCW work better based on the complementarities and experience of this project?
- In what way should rigorous quantitative impact evaluation continue to be a priority area in ILO-IPEC and UCW? What are the implications for organization, staffing and development?

- What is the potential for continuing the work and enhancing it, building on the work of the project and other related work, both for UCW, IPEC and partners as a whole?
- Please assess advantages and disadvantages of working through an interagency programme like UCW compared with direct implementation by EIA (as in the GEM model).

### **Annex 3. Documents reviewed**

*Annotated Bibliography on Impact Assessment and Evaluation.* Prepared as part of Impact Assessment Framework Project (GLO/06/51/USA) Internal Note. ILO/IPEC. March 2011.

*Comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Strategies (CMES).* Impact Assessment Framework Project (GLO/06/51/USA).Initial Generic Guidance Note. ILO/IPEC. March 2011.

*Concept Note/Guide on Baseline Studies and Impact Assessment.* International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour. International Labour Organization. August 2011

*Criteria and guidelines for the evaluation of the impact of child labor interventions.* M. Manacorda. UCW. February 2009

*Detailing the necessary steps to set up and manage a Tracer Study.* Impact Assessment Framework Project (GLO/06/51/USA) ILO-IPEC. Impact Assessment Framework. Internal Note. January 2011

*Eliminating Child Labour in El Salvador through Economic Empowerment and Social Inclusion: IMPACT EVALUATION DESIGN.* UCW. April 4, 2012.

*Estimating the number of indirect beneficiaries of ILO/IPEC projects and programmes.* Impact Assessment Framework Project (GLO/06/51/USA.) Internal Note for Monitoring and Reporting Purposes. ILO-IPEC. March 2008.

*Framework for the Evaluation of National Action Plans on Child Labour.* ILO/IPEC. Richard Longhurst. August 2012.

*Grant Modification/Notice of Obligation.* Grant Modification 2: USDOL/ILO. December 2012.

*Guidance Note 13: Impact Evaluation.* ILO – Evaluation Unit. Revised. April 3, 2013.

*Guidelines for Impact Assessment of Enabling Environment Interventions for the Elimination of Child Labour.* ILO-IPEC. July 2011.

*Impact Assessment Framework and Impact Evaluation of Child Labour Intervention Projects. Independent Evaluation. Draft Final Report.* Burt Perrin. 9 July 2011

*Impact Assessment Framework: Follow up to Tracer and Tracking Methodologies.* GLO/06/51/USA. Annex G: List of Studies and Products (all quantitative and qualitative studies).

*Impact Evaluation Design.* Part of the Project: *Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Shrimp and Seafood Processing Areas in Thailand.* UCW. November, 2012.

*International Labour Organization – IPEC. Technical Progress Report.* Global. October 2012

*International Labour Organization – IPEC. Technical Progress Report (TPR) – [Global].* OCTOBER 2011.

*International Labour Organization – IPEC. Technical Progress Report (TPR) – [Global].* April 2011

*International Labour Organization – IPEC. Technical Progress Report .[Global].* April 2012

*International Labour Organization – IPEC. Technical Progress Report (TPR) – Global. March 2009*

*International Labour Organization – IPEC. Technical Progress Report (TPR) – Global. March 2010*

*International Labour Organization – IPEC. Technical Progress Report (TPR) – Global. September 2010*

*International Labour Organization – IPEC. Technical Progress Report. Global. April 2013.*

*International Labour Organization – IPEC. Technical Progress Report (TPR) – Global. September 2009*

*International Labour Organization (ILO). International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC). Multi-bilateral Programme of Technical Cooperation (Final Version: 25 SEPTEMBER 2008). Government of the United States of America. (The “Project Document”)*

*Introduction to Child Labour Impact Assessment Toolkit. ILO/IPEC. June 2011.*

*Inventory of Tracer Studies and or Impact Assessment Studies in USDOL FY 05-08. Impact Assessment Framework Project (GLO/06/51/USA). ILO/IPEC. July 2009*

*LIFE TRANSITION STUDY. Concept Note and Initial Methodology. Impact Assessment Framework Project (GLO/06/51/USA). Initial Concept and Proposed Methodology Note. ILO/IPEC. August 2011.*

*Projet de Développement Communautaire au Togo Composante « Travaux à Haute Intensité de Main d’oeuvre » STRATEGIE D’EVALUATION D’IMPACT1. Understanding Children’s Work (UCW) Programme. Dede Aduayom Houeto. 08 Juillet 2012*

*Street Children Support Project (DRC): Impact Evaluation Strategy. Revised Draft (February 2, 2011). Michele Tarsilla. Evaluation Consultant. World Bank.*

*Technical criteria for the impact evaluation of USDOL-funded Child Labour Education Initiative (EI) projects. UCW. July 2009.*

*Technical issues for the impact evaluation of components of ILO/IPEC projects. UCW. September 2009*

*The selection of USDOL EI programs to be subject to Impact Evaluation: general considerations. UCW. July 2009.*

*Towards Child Labour Free Cocoa Growing Communities in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana through an Integrated Area-based Approach: IMPACT EVALUATION DESIGN. Understanding Children’s Work (UCW) Programme. June 4, 2012*

*Tracer Studies – Lessons Learned. Impact Assessment Framework Project. (GLO/06/51/USA). Internal Note. ILO/IPEC. August 2011.*

*USDOL-funded ILO Projects. Project Revision Form. USDOL modification number:01. Submission Date: 14 February 2011.*

#### **Annex 4. Analysis of achievements against ILO Programme-Wide Indicators**

ILO requires its activities to report against its Programme-wide Indicators, specifically with regard to the Global Monitoring Plan for Outcome 16 for 2010-15. These indicators and even their sub-indicators are primarily intended to help ILO to ensure that all activities are in line with its objectives and, judging from the entries made in project reporting, they have not proved useful in assessing the achievements of the project. ILO Indicator 16.1 refers to “The number of member States in which constituents, with ILO support, take significant policy and programme actions to eliminate child labour in line with ILO Conventions and Recommendations”. The theoretical causal pathway along which the IE project might contribute to this objective would be long, complex and indirect and it is not possible to state that the project has made significant progress towards this end.

The sub-indicators are only slightly stronger in terms of the possibility of plausible attribution of the project towards their realisation. **Sub-indicator 16.1.1** requires that: “Policies, programmes and/or action plans are adopted or implemented by one or more of the ILO’s constituents, to bring them in line with international labour standards to prohibit and eliminate child labour”. Although specific IEs, once completed, might make a small contribution towards such a situation, this cannot be claimed for the completion of a baseline study, which was always intended to be the end-point of the current intervention. It cannot be ruled out that the inventory of IEs and the establishment of the Knowledge Centre could influence some parties to move towards actions towards the removal of child labour, but again it would be extraordinarily difficult to produce evidence that this is the case.

**Sub-indicator 16.1.2** covers the following: “Time-bound measures to eliminate the worst forms of child labour as a matter of urgency are implemented by one or more of the ILO’s constituents.” As with **16.1.1**, it is not plausible that the completion of a baseline study, or the conclusion of an IE module in a broader evaluation, or the availability of a knowledge base could be shown to have contributed to such a development. The remaining two indicators under **16.1** are of a similar nature and make no contribution to meaningful reporting.

**Indicator 16.2** is as follows: “Number of member States in which constituents, with ILO support, take action to adopt or modify their legislation or reinforce their knowledge base on child labour. ” The first two sub-indicators could not be plausibly related to the current project. The second two are somewhat more relevant. **Sub-indicator 16.2.3** refers to: “Mechanisms and systems are established or strengthened so that up-to-date sex-disaggregated data and statistics concerning the situation of child labourers are available’. Although it cannot be ruled out that a successfully completed IE of a major project might make some contribution to this situation, the indicator actually seems far more relevant to the work of SIMPOC in strengthening data systems.

**Indicator 16.2.4** is as follows: “Targeted data collection and analysis and research are undertaken by constituents and other national partners to expand the knowledge base on child labour and to document lessons learned”. In this case, it is clear that the project could potentially be shown to contribute towards attainment of this sub-indicator and of **Indicator 16.2** itself. It is therefore somewhat surprising that this sub-indicator remains blank, even in the TPR for April 2013.

#### ***Overview on Achievements against ILO Programme-wide Indicators.***

The Programme-wide Indicators and even their sub-indicators are mostly not evaluable for the current project. The project has made a contribution towards **Indicator 16.2.4**, although this has not been reported in the final TPR.